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ABSTRACT
The narrative of the United States is of a "nation of immigrants" in which the language shift patterns of earlier ethnolinguistic groups have tended towards linguistic assimilation through English. In recent years, however, changes in the demographic landscape and language maintenance by non-English speaking immigrants, particularly Hispanics, have been perceived as threats and have led to calls for an official English language policy.

This thesis aims to contribute to the study of language policy making from a societal security perspective as expressed in attitudes regarding language and identity originating in the daily interaction between language groups. The focus is on the role of language and American identity in relation to immigration. The study takes an interdisciplinary approach combining language policy studies, security theory, and critical discourse analysis. The material consists of articles collected from four newspapers, namely USA Today, The New York Times, Los Angeles Times, and San Francisco Chronicle between April 2006 and December 2007.

Two discourse types are evident from the analysis namely Loyalty and Efficiency. The former is mainly marked by concerns of national identity and contains speech acts of security related to language shift, choice and English for unity. Immigrants are represented as dehumanised, and harmful. Immigration is given as sovereignty-related, racial, and as war. The discourse type of Efficiency is mainly instrumental and contains speech acts of security related to cost, provision of services, health and safety, and social mobility. Immigrants are further represented as a labour resource.

These discourse types reflect how the construction of the linguistic 'we' is expected to be maintained. Loyalty is triggered by arguments that the collective identity is threatened and is itself used in reproducing the collective 'we' through hegemonic expressions of monolingualism in the public space and semi-public space. The denigration of immigrants is used as a tool for enhancing societal security through solidarity and as a possible justification for the denial of minority rights. Also, although language acquisition patterns still follow the historical trend of language shift, factors indicating cultural separateness such as the appearance of speech communities or the use of minority languages in the public space and semi-public space have led to manifestations of intolerance. Examples of discrimination and prejudice towards minority groups indicate that the perception of worth of a shared language differs from the actual worth of dominant language acquisition for integration purposes. The study further indicates that the efficient working of the free market by using minority languages to sell services or buy labour is perceived as conflicting with nation-building notions since it may create separately functioning sub-communities with a new cultural capital recognised as legitimate competence.

The discourse types mainly represent securitising moves constructing existential threats. The perception of threat and ideas of national belonging are primarily based on a zero-sum notion favouring monolingualism. Further, the identity of the immigrant individual is seen as dynamic and adaptable to assimilationist measures whereas the identity of the state and its members are perceived as static. Also, the study shows that debates concerning language status are linked to extra-linguistic matters.

To conclude, policy makers in the US need to consider the relationship between four factors, namely societal security based on collective identity, individual/human security, human rights, and a changing linguistic demography, for proposed language intervention measures to be successful.

Keywords: national identity, societal security, threat, language policy, ethnolinguistic conflict, human rights, language rights, ethnicity, multilingualism, loyalty, immigration, instrumental, integrative, critical discourse analysis, language attitudes, representation, English, Spanish, United States.
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Introduction

The idea that national unity is achieved through a one nation-one language model is based on the nineteenth century concept of 'nation', which attempted to join relatively isolated societies. This view is questioned today since contemporary societies, and on a wider scale, countries, contain ethnolinguistic groups which are demanding rights to use their language and express their culture publicly within a state. As a movement, multiculturalism involves, in its essence, an opposition to the dominant view of monoculturalism associated to the notion of a monolingual nation. Herder's application of the uniqueness of an individual to the group level, distinguishing a people, a Volk, with their own culture from other Volk (Taylor 1994a:30-31), allows for a conceptualisation of multiculturalism with the implication of meetings between distinct cultures.

Migration and the development of the means of communication in the modern era have led to an increased contact between different linguistic groups, and consequently, an increased salience of multilingual situations at a local level. Similarly, technological communication development has increased interaction between speakers of different mother tongues separated by geographical distance. A further significant factor, particularly as regards integration in the general sense of the individual becoming a full member of a community, is that immigrants can now also maintain contact with their home countries e.g. through frequent visits as well as via the Internet, TV and radio.

Thus, multilingualism is a part of the everyday life for a large number of the people and institutions in the world (Phillipson 2003:3). Although the diversity of people within western countries has led to expressions of cultural hybridity, references to states still use stereotypes based on a non-existent idea of cultural and linguistic homogeneity (Phillipson 2003:58).

The issue of linguistic diversity has gained significance due to its recognition by societies containing multilingual groups, an aspect which may become a contributing factor for conflict between ethnolinguistic groups and thus pose a challenge to the existing state. Using central, eastern and south-eastern European countries and the role of the Organisation for Security and Co-operation in Europe (OSCE) in helping the regimes in these regions transit into democracy as an example, Grin and Daftary (2003:xviii) claim that language is a political matter. In the same way, Patten and Kymlicka also claim that the issue of linguistic diversity entered the political agenda recently as a consequence of the ethnic conflicts in Eastern Europe, since many of them resulted in the establishment of linguistic boundaries. After the breakup, countries that before had documents attributing minority language rights now prioritised official monolingualism. Thus, language status was among the first laws drawn up by the
independent countries. This tendency resulted in a perception of threat among the affected linguistic minorities who experienced a loss of status and prestige and who responded through mobilisations in the form of peaceful protests as well as in violent demands for secession (Patten and Kymlicka 2003:2-3).

Linguistic conflicts in western and in Eastern Europe have mainly arisen when a dominating group in the country imposes its language as the language of the state. These attempts have led to resistance and sometimes stimulated secessionist notions (Patten and Kymlicka 2003:4). Western organisations responded to the ethnolinguistic conflicts in the neighbouring eastern countries by drawing up guidelines for best practices of 'good' liberal democracies and placing these as conditions for entrance into the European Union and NATO. However, this exercise also revealed linguistic problems within the stable western countries that drew up the guidelines, and therefore also serve as recommendations for the same. Examples of the documents that were written to deal with ethnolinguistic diversity are the 1992 European Charter for Regional or Minority Languages, the 1995 Framework convention for the Protection of National Minorities, and the Oslo Recommendation in 1998 by the OSCE on Linguistic Rights of National Minorities (Patten and Kymlicka 2003:3-5). It is worth noting the absence of rights or protections for immigrant groups specifically. Patten and Kymlicka point out that several countries in the West have linguistic issues that are still unresolved such as Flanders in Belgium, Quebec in Canada, Catalonia and Basque in Spain, as well as Puerto Rico in the US (Patten and Kymlicka 2003:4). In the United States, the inclusion of new territories as states or decisions concerning border controls have had the explicit goal of making sure that an Anglophone majority would be maintained. A case in point is Hawaii, which only became a state when an English speaking majority was settled in the area (Patten and Kymlicka 2003:24-25). Another example is that Puerto Rico's qualification for inclusion as a state has been debated because it does not have English as its dominant language (Barreto as cited in Patten and Kymlicka 2003:24-25).

However, although the existence of international declarations on language rights and an overall movement towards multilingualism, “there has been great reluctance to view policies of official bilingualism or multilingualism as ‘rights’ rather than pragmatic accommodations” (Patten and Kymlicka 2003:3-5).

Therefore studies in language policy need to address linguistic diversity and its link to the inclusion of linguistic minorities in the respective larger communities. If a common language is necessary for democratic participation of individuals in the public debate, then the problem of which language(s) to choose arises. If the language of the majority is chosen, then
linguistic minority members would have to choose between shifting to the dominant language or accepting a peripheral position in political public discussions (Patten and Kymlicka 2003:16-17). Standardisation and codification of a particular language within a state, often with negative effects on other languages and dialects, have been used as a means for strengthening political power (Phillipson 2003:25-26, 28). In the case of the United States, Fishman forwards the view that the English Only movement – which advocates monolingualism – may actually have the adverse effect than the intended, i.e. it may give rise to conscious actions of commitment by speakers of a threatened language and hence lead to a reinforcement of the language that it aims to weaken (Fishman 1999:154).

The integration of immigrants in countries with an established dominant language has brought into focus the complexity of issues associated with intrastate linguistic diversity. Linguistic integration, through learning the dominant language of the host country was considered a natural and unavoidable process by citizens of the target countries and immigrants themselves. However, immigrant 'transnationalism' – "the tendency of immigrants to maintain regular connections back to their country of origin" (Patten and Kymlicka 2003:7-8) – has affected the historic pattern of linguistic shift towards the dominant language and there is speculation that newly arrived immigrants maintain contact with their countries of origin and, as a consequence, do not integrate linguistically, i.e. do not learn the dominant language well enough or not at all. The rise of multicultural ideology, in which integration takes place parallel with the expression of an ethnic identity rather than its abandonment, has meant that the expectation of assimilation (minorities culturally change/shift towards the host society) has been affected. In other words, integration processes, rather than assimilation, are in focus. In the context of the US, Patten and Kymlicka state that older processes of 'Americanisation' or assimilation are being replaced by the public expression of minority ethnic identity. Furthermore public institutions are expected, by some, to adapt to the new positions taken up by diverse ethnic cultures (Patten and Kymlicka 2003:7-8) and thus accommodate minority identity factors. This attitude influences the establishment of the type of language policy which in turn affects the daily communication of members in a society, in this case the American society, especially in their interaction with institutions.

Issues regarding the establishment and implementation of a language policy are associated to the rules of language practiced by public institutions such as the language (variety) that officials use. Another issue is the consideration of whether state entitlements are linked to linguistic status or linguistic competence of a person; and if linguistic behaviour in the private sphere – the civil society, the market and the family – are to be regulated by public
institutions (Patten and Kymlicka 2003:16-17). Language policy is thus deliberate action to affect the direction of the language use of a community. Language policy can be seen as an attempt to deal with state-nation or nation-state identification in multicultural societies in the face of the challenges caused by an ever increasing globalisation. According to Spolsky, policy making and its successful implementation are dependent on acceptance of its usage in the everyday practice by the speakers of the community in question (Spolsky 2004:222). Thus, for its effectiveness, a language policy must gain legitimacy among the members in the community to which it is directed. Spolsky (2004) states that for a language policy to be successful it needs to take into account the relationship of consistency between linguistic factors (language intervention by an explicit plan, language practice/behaviour by the users and the beliefs and ideology in the community) and extra-linguistic factors. Both these factors, the linguistic and extra-linguistic, are time and society specific.

Thus, a language policy, whether explicit or implicit, exists within a complex context. The United States is part of the Inner circle occupied by the "traditional cultural and linguistic bases of English", i.e. countries in which English is the first language (Kachru 1988, 1992:356-358)\(^1\). The dominance of English in the country was established during the colonial migration period. However other national minorities, native to the country before colonialism and recent immigrant groups, have also affected the Anglophone society with their cultures to the extent that the US is often described as a multicultural society.

The influence of new groups can be related to the idea that a state is constantly adapting to changing circumstances both within and outside its borders in order to guarantee its stable existence. The United States of America is an example of a stable democracy caught up in these changes mainly due to its history as a country founded on contact at the local level of different cultural and linguistic groups. Historically, through linguistic assimilation, these groups have assumed English as the de facto language of the federation. Bourhis and Marshall state that in the past, the language policies of the United States have either followed an assimilation ideology involving government regulation, definition and protection of the national culture, or a civic ideology i.e. a non-interventionist ideology in which language is regarded as an instrument of governance and culture rather than a symbol (Bourhis and Marshall 1999). According to Kloss (1977:2, 45), tolerance-oriented rights, described by him

\(^1\) Three concentric circles are distinguished in Kachru's model. The Inner circle countries, often regarded as the norm providers for the English language, are followed by the Outer circle countries which are regions in which English was introduced during the colonisation period and that now have institutionalised non-native varieties of English, namely English as a Second Language (ESL). The Expanding circle includes countries in which English is given the position of English as a Foreign Language (EFL) and therefore it has limited function and no official status (Kachru 1988; Kachru 1992).
as laws that imply "that federal, state, and municipal governments do not interfere with efforts on the parts of the minority to make use of the ethnic tongue in the private domain – e.g., newspapers, religious life, secular associations, and most important, private schools", have been "handled very generously", except for the period at the end of the nineteenth century when mother tongue schools came under debate. For Kloss, US language policies have historically been based on relative tolerance, with the exception of the World War I period in which measures were taken against the use of German by German-Americans. By the end of the war, suppressing language measures had extended to all minorities (Kloss 1977:52). The view of relative language tolerance in the US is opposed by Wiley who claims that linguistic assimilation has been the main ideology and that English monolingual ideology became the hegemonic definition of the American identity after World War I (Wiley 2000).

Recently, there have been growing concerns that English is losing its dominant position in the American society due to a steady increase of non-English speaking immigrants (Mauk and Oakland 2005:8-12). In the context of this thesis, the large number of non-Anglo, non-English speaking immigrants, mainly of Latin American descent, has given rise to fear among members of the majority/dominant group that explicit ethnocultural expressions may result in fragmenting the US. It is necessary to point out that the terms 'majority' and 'minority' are used here with regard to relations of power and is, therefore, not based on demographic strength. The growing numbers of Hispanics in the US are often referred to as a problem even though statistically and in terms of power they are a minority in the country.

From the perspective of population numbers, the hegemonic positioning of English in the country is interesting if one takes account of the various language groups that have migrated and participated in constructing the history of the US, and that the Anglo-descendants were and are rather small in number. According to the US Census Bureau 2000, Hispanic or Latino race individuals constitute 12.5 per cent of the population (US Census Bureau 2000a). The US Bureau 2000 also reported that the three largest European ancestries2 were German (15.2 per cent); Irish (10.8 per cent) and English (8.7 per cent) which although maintaining the same rank as in the 1990 census had decreased in size by more than 20 per cent. African-Americans and Mexican ancestries were reported at 8.8 per cent and 6.5 per cent respectively (US Census Bureau 2000b; cf. US Census Bureau 2000a). These statistics foreground some of the ethnic diversity in the US as well as the difference between reality and perception of group sizes.

---

2 "The Census Bureau defines ancestry as a person's ethnic origin, heritage, descent, or "roots," which may reflect their place of birth, place of birth of parents or ancestors, and ethnic identities that have evolved within the United States." (US Census Bureau 2000b)
As mentioned above, language contact due to immigration is often regarded as a temporary situation since immigrants are expected to acquire the language of the host country (Coulmas 2005:158). However, if a large demographic group maintains its immigrant language, the members of the host country may feel threatened. The issue of official language status has sparked public debate in the media in the US dealing primarily with the functions of English and Spanish within its borders. The United States has a growing population of Hispanics from under 5 per cent of the total population in 1970 to 12, 5 per cent in 2000 (as mentioned above US Census Bureau 2000a). Projections indicate an increase to 15, 5 per cent in 2010 (US Census 2008). Among the languages used at home in 2000, Spanish speakers made up approximately half of the total immigrant language speakers in the country. A survey of the English language ability of immigrant groups in the US has shown that 51 per cent of the Spanish speaking population over 5 years of age spoke English very well, 21 per cent spoke it well, 18 per cent did not speak it well and the remaining 10 per cent did not speak English (US Census 2003). The rising number of non-English speaking immigrants has led to a call, by some members of the population, for a language policy establishing English as the official language of the United States.

The debate regarding the need for a policy stating English as an official language entails that the hegemonic role of English in the country is challenged. It is therefore interesting to study the attitudes regarding integration of ethnolinguistic minorities as a societal security issue in the United States. Societal security in Waever's (1993:23-26) definition concerns the capacity for a society to sustain its identity under changing conditions.

**1.1 Aim**

The overall aim of this study is to contribute to a better understanding of language attitudes and, by extension, to language policy making in multicultural societies where daily interaction between different language groups can lead to perceptions of threat to societal security.

Although studies in language policy mention security and deal with aspects related to security, these have not attempted to systematically provide a gathering of the different attitudes that relate societal security and language policy making. This study aims at filling that gap by mapping the field of societal security to language policy making, and thus investigates the speech acts of security that occur in the public debate in four main newspapers in the United States. The choice of the United States for investigation in this study is based on its historical construction as a nation of immigrants, and consequently of contact between diverse ethnolinguistic groups.
The present focus of the study is narrowed to the perception of threat caused by immigrant presence in the country. The reason for focusing on immigration is due to the increased intensity of global movements and the rise in the media of issues related to integration through language and national identity.

Since successful implementation of a policy is dependent on its acceptance by those affected by the measures (Spolsky 2004), it is hence necessary to gain an understanding of the views expressed by the public. This study focuses on the attitudes expressed in newspaper articles, as a first step to contributing to the integration of the concept of 'societal security' in language policy studies. Accordingly, the study investigates the discourse related to immigration and societal security in online newspapers in the United States. This investigation hopes to contribute to language policy making studies and practices that have as goal the achievement or sustainment of societal security in situations of ethnolinguistic contact.

Morgan (2006:16) presents two questions regarding speech communities which will constitute the starting point of this study, namely: "How do speech communities manage to incorporate hegemonic norms and how do they also produce norms, values, and attitudes that do not incorporate hegemony and are in opposition to the dominant discourse" (Morgan 2006:16) e.g. of American identity? Thus in this study, Morgan's questions translate into the issues regarding hegemonic discourses of one nation-one language, namely how the speech acts (obtained through text analysis) of security represent English as the national or official language of the United States and/or express pluralisms in a multicultural society.

The specific questions for carrying out this study are as follows:

1. What discourse types are present in the articles in relation to language and immigration?
2. What linguistic identities and relations are present in the articles as regards immigrants?
3. What kind of interdiscursivity is present in the articles?
4. How do the answers to the above three questions relate to issues in the wider context of the social, namely societal security with language as a focus?

The use of the term 'discursive types' in this investigation is based on Fairclough's three-dimensional framework for critical discourse analysis which is developed in more detail in section 4.3.2. In brief terms, discourse types refer to the combination of ways of speaking or
writing about a specific issue such as the choice of words and expressions in specific genres (TV programmes, newspaper articles, among others). This study will take online newspaper articles from the news and opinion sections as the genre in which the linguistic analysis of word choices will be carried out to uncover discourse types (see Fairclough 1995b:33 for his view of texts as commonly intertextual hybrids of different discourses and genres) in accordance with Question 1 of the aim. This study focuses on the choice of words constituting ways of speaking in the articles, rather than on genre, i.e. the structure of the articles. Ideology, namely common-sense or natural ways of signifying reality are important factors in this investigation. Question 2 deals with the role of the English language in the American society as a national and ethnic identity marker. Question 2 also refers to the expressions of relations of power e.g. through modal verbs, and the way language groups are represented and "talked" about. The key aspect is that language is seen as socially constitutive and constituted and also as a site of struggle for new ways of interpreting and expressing the social (Fairclough 1995a:131; Fairclough 2001:2), which can be identified through the presence of interdiscursivity (Question 3 of the aim). A situation of interdiscursivity arises when a communicative event includes different genres and discourses more identified with other domains (Fairclough 1995b:55-56). My reading of Fairclough's approach entails that this study will identify interdiscursivity based on the use of words or expressions more often related to different spheres, i.e. the domains of politics, economics, environment, military (in line with the state security sectors parallel to societal security in Waever's dual model of security in section 4.1.2). The use of metaphors and similes are also seen as possible markers of interdiscursivity. Finally, the link from the first three questions to the wider societal security is a necessary factor within discourse as defined by Fairclough as a practice for not only "representing the world, but of signifying the world, constituting and constructing the world in meaning" (Fairclough 1992:64). Thus, the answer to question 4 will reveal how societal security with language in focus is constructed in the American context as regards immigration of non-English speaking groups.

1.2 Method and material: An overview
This section introduces the method and material used in this study (see chapter 5 for a more detailed account). This analysis consists of data collected from four newspapers in the United States between April 2006 and December 2007. The time period is chosen because of the Senate's approval to declare English as the national language in May 2006 – although the demands were for an official language status – as an amendment to the immigration bill in
which there were calls for amnesty to illegal immigrants. The bill did not pass the House and therefore died. President Bush supported a bipartisan immigration bill in the House but gave up in 2007 due to opposing voices. In 2010, the immigration bill had once again become part of the public debate at a national level after Arizona passed a new strict statute on illegal immigration.

The criteria for the choice of newspapers are based on their size and regional association. The newspapers selected for the study are: USA Today, The New York Times, Los Angeles Times, and San Francisco Chronicle (six articles from each newspaper). All articles are from the respective newspaper websites.

In order to uncover the ideologies surrounding language as a societal security issue, the linguistic analysis of the data is limited to the parts of the articles that refer to aspects of an existing threat in relation to the English language. The data is approached using critical discourse analysis, more specifically Fairclough's three-dimensional framework (sections 4.3.1 and 4.3.2). Since Fairclough's approach requires that the text is linked to the social context in which it occurs, the examples from the data are related to wider social concepts and theories specifically from sections 3, 4.1, and 4.2.

As a result of the data analyses in the present thesis, certain patterns are visible in the discussion of the topic of official English. These patterns indicate two discourse types namely the discourse type of Loyalty and the discourse type of Efficiency. For the linguistic analysis, repetition of content (including those expressed through synonyms) e.g. in adverbs, verbs among others, play a significant role in identifying the discourse types. In line with the critical discourse analysis tradition used in this investigation, word choice and repetition also indicate power relations between the identities present in the data, both in their positioning as speakers or as spoken about. Interdiscursivity, indicated mainly through metaphors and similes of immigrant and immigration representation, as well as the use of terms from different fields in the society, such as economy and politics, are included in the discourse types of Loyalty and Efficiency. Genre considerations have been kept to a minimum, namely only as regards establishing that the articles are from the news and opinion sections. The structure of the articles themselves is not considered to be necessary for achieving the aim of this investigation but rather to be taken up in future studies that investigate the media institution as such.
1.3 Outline

This study has 7 chapters. Chapter 1 includes an introduction with a general background to the topic, and indicates the significance of the investigation. It also contains the aim of the study with specific research questions followed by an overview of the method and material (presented in more detail in chapter 5). The introductory chapter concludes with an outline of the investigation.

Chapter 2 places the social context of this study in the United States of America in which a historical overview of migration and language policies is presented. This chapter finishes with a short description of the federal system and the legislation procedures in the country since they form a base for understanding the processes involved before a policy is implemented in the United States.

Chapter 3 introduces some concepts and theories that that are relevant to the theoretical approach of language policy and security in Chapter 4. Aspects of identity from a national and multicultural perspective are followed by concerns related to multilingualism and the definition of speech communities. Since this study deals with state-related identity and contact between different linguistic groups, the concept of loyalty and, to a lesser degree trust, are considered in a separate section. Finally aspects of power in inter-group relations are presented using Bourdieu's (1991) concepts of habitus and symbolic domination which are followed by sections on language shift, and language conflict and contact. Throughout are examples and references to concrete cases that are related to the topic under study.

In Chapter 4, Buzan's (1991) proposal for widening the traditional approach to security studies at the start of section 4.1 serves as a base for the main security approach in this study, namely societal security presented by Waever (1993), which further develops Buzan's framework. Waever's model separates societal security from state security in which the former has its focus on identity. Moreover, since societies are constituted by individuals, the concept of human security (CHS 2002-2003) is also presented. Whereas the approaches to security taken by Buzan and Waever emphasise a collective entity, human security is centred on the individual.

Section 4.1 on security is followed by a presentation of language policy issues (section 4.2) beginning with a general introduction of language policy as dealt with in the academic literature of the field. The section of language rights is included on the assumption that any action on language policy by a state has an impact on the language rights of communities as well as individuals within its borders. With regard to this, studies dealing with security in relation to language policy making are also presented in this section. The term 'insecurity' in
Ager's (2001) study on motivation in language policy making closes this section. Whenever possible, the theoretical background is exemplified to better show the connection between theory and real life situations.

The final section of chapter 4 contains a short introduction to language attitudes followed by an account of critical discourse analysis. Specifically, Fairclough's model for language analysis based on power relations and ideology is described and also used to analyse the data. Fairclough's approach to discourse analysis has three components: discourse as text, discursive practice and discourse as social practice and involves a textually (linguistically) oriented discourse analysis to studies of social and cultural change (Fairclough 1995a; Fairclough 1995b; Fairclough 2001). This theory is useful in the present study since it aims to uncover ideological power mechanisms in linguistic practices. Fairclough's theory is suited to the study of attitudes expressed in newspaper articles. A section dealing with some aspects of Halliday's functional grammar are included since Fairclough draws on it.

Chapter 5 begins with a description of the data and the method in which it was collected and analysed followed by considerations regarding newspapers as sources of information – more specifically what makes an event a news issue. This section closes with a historical overview of the newspaper industry in the US.

Chapter 6 constitutes the data analysis and results sections, indicating the discourse types of Loyalty (section 6.1) and Efficiency (section 6.2). The discourse types contain speech acts of English as an official language, representations of immigrants as the Other, and immigration/immigration debate as related to sovereignty, race and war. A summary is provided at the end of each speech act subsection. Sections 6.3 and 6.4 summarise the discourse types and relate these to the theories of security and language policy.

Chapter 7 closes the study with concluding remarks and generalises the findings and conclusions to the implications this investigation has for studies of language policy making with regard to societal security, as well as presents suggestions for further research. Lastly, the bibliography and an appendix with a list of the newspaper articles on which this research is based are provided.
2 The United States: A historical background

2.1. Migration

International migration has given the United States a composite make up of different multicultural and multiethnic identities (Bourhis and Marshall 1999:244-266). As a result, multilingualism is an integral part of the United States. Crystal states that groups with different linguistic backgrounds have immigrated to America to escape religious persecution, revolution, poverty and famine, and its demographic diversity includes groups from different parts of the world such as Europeans, Latin Americans (Crystal 1997:31), Africans, and Asians, as well as indigenous American Indian groups. According to Bourhis and Marshall, the United States has followed in its policies both a civic ideology, i.e. an instrumental view on language, and an assimilation ideology, i.e. a view of language as a symbol (Bourhis and Marshall 1999:244-266). Historically, the perception of threat from other languages has been limited in the US since language conflicts have been seldom. This has meant that governments have not needed to resort to legislation to regulate language usage. Thus, a policy of laissez faire has been adopted (Crawford 2001:1) since immigrants that arrived in the US acculturated quickly. Nevertheless, if conflicts did arise, the government took measures (Crawford 2000:2). This is in line with Bourhis and Marshall's claim above regarding language policies in the US (Bourhis and Marshall 1999:244-266). According to Fishman, although two processes have been present throughout the American history namely self-maintenance and Americanisation, most attention has been paid to the latter process (Fishman 1966:15). However, with regard to Fishman's claim, it is worth noting that Bourhis and Marshall state that before 1900, official documents were printed in English as well as in other languages (Bourhis and Marshall 1999:244-266) and as a consequence of contact with different languages, the English language has acquired features from the languages spoken by the newcomers (Johnson 1997:802).

The melting pot ideology of blending cultures may have not been put into effect successfully, if one takes account of Breidlid et all's (1996:35) formulation: "Leaders of some immigrant groups felt the overt pressure to assimilate as a threat. During the first decade of this century the general idea was that the nation should work actively to mix new immigrants into "the melting pot". Giving up old cultural ties in the process, the immigrant would hopefully emerge as a genuine American. As a result the melting pot idea was often fought…" (Breidlid et al. 1996:35). The metaphor of a 'salad-bowl', instead of the 'melting pot', was advocated by those who favoured a multicultural United States (Johnson 1997:803).
Changes in the demographic base of the United States are affecting views of the core identity of American nationality. The European-based Anglo-American assimilation process has been countered with a more multicultural and multiethnic notion of the American national identity3 (Bourhis and Marshall 1999: 244-266). Asian, South and Central American and Caribbean immigrants have made up the main immigrant groups since the 1980s (Mauk and Oakland 2005:5). The 1990s marked the highest number of immigrants – over 1,800,000 – admitted4 into the US. In 2002, permanent legal residence was granted to 1,063,732 immigrants (usinfo.state.gov 2002). Also, of the legal immigrants admitted during that year, 63 per cent were listed under the family sponsorship programme, 16 per cent for employment, 12 per cent as asylum seekers or refugees and a remaining 3 per cent were linked to the relief act of Nicaragua and Central America, NACARA (usinfo.state.gov 2002). Mexico accounted for 20.6 per cent of the number of illegal immigrants and was followed by India with 6.7 per cent and China with 5.8 per cent (usinfo.state.gov 2002). 65 per cent of legal immigrants chose to live in the following six states: 291,216 in California; 114,827 in New York; 90,819 in Florida; 88,365 in Texas; 57,721 in Jersey; and 47,235 in Illinois (usinfo.state.gov 2002). Latinos constitute the largest immigrant minority group (Mauk and Oakland 2005:5), which in 2002, along with Asians made up 75 per cent of the legal immigrant residents, namely 51 per cent for Latinos and 24 per cent for Asians (Mauk and Oakland 2005:62).

Although the question of the link language-national identity has been focused on in various stages of its history, the 1980s marked the beginning of an intensive movement, namely to make English the official language of the country (Crawford 1992:1). Another proposal for dealing with the perceived threat from non-English speaking immigrants was to make proficiency in English a requirement for entry into the country or for obtaining citizenship (Patten and Kymlicka 2003:24-25). After 2001, the elite and the general public expressed different opinions regarding immigration. Whereas the political, economic, and cultural elite did not object to the large numbers of immigrants, the general public saw immigration as linked to issues of national security and differences in culture (Mauk and Oakland 2005:67). Bearing in mind the ethnic diversity of the US, debates have focused on national unity and identity as well as ethnic pluralism and multiculturalism (Mauk and Oakland 2005:8-9). Symbols such as the national flag, the pledge of allegiance to the flag, the

---

3 This description varies from the difference between assimilation and the melting pot models presented by Giddens (2001: 256) – see section 3.1.1.

4 The number of admitted immigrants for permanent residence during a year in the United States does not correspond to the number of migrants that entered the country during that year (usinfo.state.gov 2002) since many individuals are in the country illegally.
national anthem, among others, have been used to construct a national identity and promote loyalty to the idea of 'Americanness'. This type of symbolic unity is intended to reduce or compensate for the boundaries created by economic, social, ethnic and class distinctions (Mauk and Oakland 2005:10).

The opinions of the two main oppositional groups can be identified regarding the debate surrounding language and immigration. On the one hand, there are groups e.g. US English and the Federation for American Reform (FAIR), that favour stricter immigration and language policies (Ricento 1996:150-151). FAIR and the Council for Inter-American Security have supported groups such as U.S. English and English First (Hernández-Chávez 1995:158). On the other hand, those in favour of a pluralistic, multicultural approach and who are positive towards affirmative action in support of minorities, include organisations of professional language associations as in the "National Association for Bilingual Education (NABE), Teachers of English to Speakers of Other Languages (TESOL), the Modern Language Association" (Ricento 1996:150-151). There are also ethnic groups active e.g. the "League of United American Citizens (LULAC), the Puerto Rican Defense and Education Fund, the Mexican American Legal Defense and Education Fund (MALDEF) and the National Council of La Raza" (Ricento 1996:151). In their resolution opposing Official English and English Only measures of 1989, and in their capacity as a national civil rights organisation, MALDEF, states that such initiatives "undermine the development of languages other than English as resources of the nation essential to international commerce, diplomacy, and national security" (MALDEF 1992:150).

The efforts to maintain English as the only dominant language since the formation of the US derive from the view of it as a tool for facilitating democracy among linguistically diverse groups. This policy indirectly promoted the gradual assimilation of minority language speakers towards English (Ager 2001:110-111). The pull towards English monolingualism has led minority groups to voice identity-related concerns about their cultural and linguistic heritage (Crystal 1997:31).

Regarding the relationship between the state and language, Tollefson claims that the state can create feelings of security and belonging by using language as a way of expressing nationalism (Tollefson 1991:208). In a similar vein, leaders of minority groups may regard reduction of contact and interaction with other ethnolinguistic groups, especially the dominant group, as a way of creating security through social distance (Cartwright 2006:204). This can be related to Fishman's view that the loss of a language also entails a loss of a secure sense of identity (Fishman 1995:60). Thus, language may be used as the boundary creator. However,
reduction of contact or increase of social distance between members of different communities also leads to lack of empathy and less knowledge and understanding of the Other (Cartwright 2006:204) which in turn affect levels of tolerance. In a 1990 poll that surveyed the general population based on six core characteristics related to Americanism, Latinos were seen as the least patriotic of minority groups, which included Jews, blacks, Asians, and southern whites. Latino secessionist concerns were seen as a threat to the nation's security (Schmid 2001).

According to Tollefson, the language policy of the United States towards refugees and immigrants is to integrate them into the social, political and economic arenas of the society through education. However, English as a Second Language (ESL) classes for refugees only supply language education that it is minimally sufficient for them to carry out low paid work and from which it is difficult to advance (Tollefson 1991:103, 108). Based on this, Tollefson (1991:104) argues that language education supplied to immigrants is a way of creating a workforce for marginal jobs which offer limited security and no prospects for increasing knowledge of the language of the host community or employability by acquisition of new skills. According to Kymlicka, there are immigrants that sometimes are not included in programmes for second language learning such as is the case of the Cuban exiles in Miami, who have been excluded from many integration measures since there were expectations that this group would return quickly to their country (Kymlicka 2002:363). Since individuals that completed the educational and integration programmes still demonstrated apparent difficulties in achieving economic advancement, the metaphor of English as a tool for social mobility of immigrants must be viewed as not being entirely correct (Tollefson 1991:104). Further, the acquisition of English in the US is seen as based on individual motivation. Those refugees who acquire English are regarded as hard workers, while those who do not manage to speak English well after undergoing the ESL program are seen to be unmotivated and held responsible for their lack of success. The ability to speak English is considered as a sign of loyalty in United States (Tollefson 1991:110) and is defined by the US Immigration and Naturalisation Service as "a basic citizenship skill" (Gutstein as cited in Tollefson 1991:110-111).

Immigration and language contact are conducive to government measures directed at affecting the linguistic behaviour of newcomers. According to Schmid, due to the presence of immigrants and their growing power and recognition, Americans feel vulnerable as regards their security and identity (Schmid 2001). In the case of the United States, the threat may be seen as coming from the increasing use of Spanish in the public space and semi-public space. The public space is the space that is open and free for people to use and meet e.g streets, parks.
and squares. In contrast, the private space is the space that only a few people can use and have access to, e.g. home. Semi-public space is available to the public but only for certain purposes e.g. shops and restaurants (Hirsch and Shearing 2000:86; Conway and Roenisch 1994:131). Some prominent figures in organisations campaigning for Official English claim that Mexican-origin secessionists are a threat to national security (de la Garza, Falcon, Garcia and Garcia 1994:229). In connection to this, the state can regulate or impose via language policy measures that limit language usage in homes, in the streets, in associations and activities of the civil society, as well as in businesses and corporations. The question then is to what extent the state should influence language usage in these settings (Patten and Kymlicka 2003:23) without creating a conflict of interests.

2.2 Constructing the US through language policies

Individual state regulations regarding language must be in conformity with the US Constitution (Schiffman 1996:274) even though the United States does not have a declared official language (Schildkraut 2005). Language rights are not explicitly guaranteed in texts and provisions in the United States (Schiffman 1996:216) but in May 2006, the Senate added an amendment (S.AMDT.4064 to S.2611) proposed by Sen. Inhofe to an immigration bill (Comprehensive Immigration Reform Act 2006) sponsored by Sen. Specter declaring English the national language (109th Congress S.2611). Although the declaration of a national language is mainly symbolic, the action may encourage groups to attempt the establishment of further declarations strengthening the role of English. The most recent application at the time of writing is the English Language Unity Act of 2007 (HR 997) and reflects Bourhis and Marshall's (1999:244-266) view that the US faces decisions regarding language choice, ethnic identity, equality and social justice.

There are divided views on why the English language was not given official status when the founding fathers wrote the American Constitution in the period around 1787. A possible explanation is that it was assumed that the founding fathers' ethnic and cultural homogeneity would be maintained in the future generations of Americans. The possibility of including a language provision was also disregarded as posing a possible threat to the formation of a union. During this period, German, French and English were used in official and unofficial political documents. The spread of information was seen as an important means of creating loyalty among the different ethnicities (Schildkraut 2005).

However, there was disagreement regarding the role of English in the country. Two views could be distinguished. Benjamin Rush, a member of the Continental Congress, saw education
in any language as important for the survival of the newly established nation. On the other side of the debate were John Adams and Noah Webster who believed in the notion of a common language for social and political development. Webster was also against regional accents and the co-existence of languages since he saw them as creating divisions (Schildkraut 2005:12, Webster 1992:34).

A further explanation as to why the US Constitution or early legislation did not have any recommendations regarding English or other languages is because most of the colonists came to America in search of religious freedom and not freedoms connected to language (Schiffman 1996:258). Even at a later date, although the matter of a national language was discussed at the time of the War of Independence, no actual official decision was taken (Spolsky 2004:92). For the founding fathers, language was seen as a matter of individual choice (Schmid 2001:169). Hernández-Chávez (1995:141-142) claims that although no explicit statement was made in the Constitution regarding an official language, English has always been the de facto language imposed in various forms since the establishment of the new federation e.g. for citizenship as well as legislative, judicial and administrative activities. According to him, other languages were allowed for political advantage, namely to facilitate communication with non-English speaking groups in order to gain independence. An explicit reference to English as the official language would create conflict and affect cooperation for independence.

In 1795, the first Congressional vote took place regarding language. The first bill permitted Congressional laws to be printed in German and English. However, it was voted down and the second language bill was passed that required the use of English as the only language in which federal statutes should be printed. This bill was passed with George Washington's signature. From 1795 to 1950 immigration policy debates in Congress were common and focused on ethnicity and immigration. But debates about language remained mainly at the state and local levels until after World War II when language once again was taken up at the federal level (Schildkraut 2005:12).

After 1820, immigration from Britain reduced and was substituted by those coming from northern Europe, Norway and Germany as well as from Ireland. Kloss states that although not overtly stated, the languages spoken by the old-established settlers enjoyed a tolerance that later settlers to the United States were not granted (Kloss 1977:288-293). Schiffman however adds that, due to the immigrant waves from Germany, tolerance to German speakers was no longer unquestioned by the 1870s, and several attempts were made to pass laws legislating against the use of German. Some researchers believe that this diminishing of tolerance
particularly directed to the German language, was based on the fact that most of the immigrants were now migrating for political and economic reasons rather than religious persecution (Schiffman 1996:221-224).

After 1882, immigration of Greeks, Jews, Italians and Slavs increased in numbers. In the second part of the 19th century, riots resulted in stopping Asian immigration (Schiffman 1996:224). The 19th century is the period in which immigration was at its highest and also when the construction of a more explicit policy begins. Schiffman claims that during the nineteenth century a covert policy based on an American linguistic culture was constructed and even though the overt policy was tolerance, assimilation towards English continued and realised for instance in the absorption of non-English speakers resulting from the Mexican War and the Louisiana Purchase, the Americanisation of immigrants in public schools, xenophobic movements, and an increased intolerance towards non-English speakers (Schiffman 1991:231-232). Despite this, attempts to make English the official language have not succeeded. Nevertheless, although languages like German were used to recruit soldiers during the period of the Civil War, subsequent demands to recognise languages other than English have been minimally successful (Hernández-Chávez 1995). Thus, although the colonisation process (which included linguistic assimilation of Native Americans) involved linguistically diverse groups, English became hegemonic (Schiffman 1996:249, 265). According to Mertz (1982), there was an increasing belief during the nineteenth century that the meaning of American ideas such as truth, freedom and justice, could only be communicated in the English language and as Schiffman states: "Mertz calls this a 'folk-Whorfian' notion" (Schiffman 1996:232-233). Mertz's (1982) claim is that the US courts made decisions on language laws based on a folk theory, explaining that the theory links US citizenship, identity, and the capacity to speak English. He claims that according to this theory, the socialisation process of children through the English language not only shapes the way they perceive the world, but also shapes their possibility to be politically loyal to the US by understanding certain political concepts that only knowledge of the English language permits. This can be indirectly related to Spolsky's statement that President Roosevelt also linked the maintenance of immigrant languages with divided loyalty to the state (Spolsky 2004:98).

Inter-linguistic contact had increased due to the war with Mexico in 1848 in which Mexico lost territory that today are the states of Texas, New Mexico, Arizona, and California, as well as other areas of land that presently are part of other states (Schiffman 1996:249, 265). In spite of clauses guaranteeing the maintenance and practice rights of Spanish speakers as
regards their customs, religion and language in the Treaty of Guadalupe-Hidalgo for the handover of California to the United States, these rights were later reduced by statutes and ad hoc regulations and by 1879, provisions for publications in Spanish were almost completely absent (Schiffman 1996:266-267, 265). Thus, after 1848, Spanish was no longer recognised as a "sovereign" language of the southern states, and German and French were no longer strong languages (Spolsky 2004:93). Furthermore, the Nationality Act of 1906 put forward oral proficiency in English as obligatory, to which compulsory literacy was added in 1940 (Schiffman 1996:233). In 1878, California was the first "English-only" state since it revoked Spanish language rights that were recognised in California's first Constitution in 1849, as well as voted for English to be the only language used in official proceedings – a situation that lasted until 1966 (Crawford 1992:52).

Although during the post-Civil War period there were tendencies to favour English monolingualism in the country, there was still loyalty among immigrants to their language of origin which was used at home, at community level and in newspapers. In bilingual educational programmes, immigrant languages were used in teaching while English was taught as a second language (Ager 2001:110-111; Spolsky 2004:95).

By the end of the 19th century, immigrants from southern and eastern European countries made up most of the numbers. These immigrants were poorer and less educated and the majority were Catholics, Eastern Orthodox or Jewish. In this respect, they had cultures that differed much more from the Anglo-Americans in comparison to previous groups. This difference led to xenophobic perceptions of threat among some of the groups (Schiffman 1996:234). In 1906, knowledge of English became a condition for citizenship (Ager 2001:110-111). Arguments for Americanisation in the 1910 were based on fear of revolution by immigrant workers (Spolsky 2004:98). Therefore employers required their workers to learn English. This is related to the belief that it was necessary to eliminate any feelings of divided loyalties immigrants may have to their country of origin. In this case, an absence of loyalty was expressed by the use and knowledge of certain languages (Spolsky 2004:98). However in 1913, Spanish was allowed to form the base of the Spanish bilingual 'Cosmopolitan School' similar to those already functioning for the German, French, and Italian languages (Schiffman 1996:269). In 1920, immigration was reduced to the numbers of 1890 and foreign language education was removed from public elementary schools since bilingualism was considered harmful for children and un-American (Schiffman 1996:238). In other words, the teaching of foreign languages was not prioritised by the government and during the 1930s English-only legislation dominated in public education (Spolsky 2004:96).
The requirements for language proficiency were included in the Internal Security Act of 1950 which also stopped admission of any non-American who could be considered a danger to the public interest, welfare or safety of the country (Schmid 2001:38-39). The reference to knowledge of English in the Internal Security Act may be seen to create favourable conditions for interpretations that naturalise the link between these two factors.

The imagined identity of the United States as a monolingual country can be linked to historical events, policies, and wars that began during the late nineteenth century and the beginning of the 20th century. During this period, political loyalty to the nation was linked ideologically to the capacity of speaking English without an accent. This can be contrasted to the early publication of documents in immigrant languages that were used to spread information and thus guarantee loyalty to the young nation. Thus, language, in this early period, was seen as a private concern of the individual and was not yet linked to notions of American national identity and loyalty expressed through language. At the same time, new arrivals were not expected to maintain their mother tongue for a long period of time. Some measures were taken to privilege English such as the Enabling Act of Louisiana 1811 and its first constitution positioned English as the language used in documents of the state even though there were many French speakers (Schmid 2001:168-169, Hernández-Chávez 1995:142). Wolfe (1998:133) claims that the strong significance of loyalty in relation to the American identity may indicate that patriotism is a significant moral value in the United States. Schmid (2001:172) states that the link between using English exclusively and the notion of being a loyal American has intensified the conflict between old citizens and new Americans (Schmid 2001:172) since the latter are increasingly perceived as maintaining their mother tongue. Hernández-Chávez (1995:157) further states that "[l]inguistic acculturation is still seen as the sine qua non of efforts to forestall the "quebeckization" of Aztlán, or the U.S Southwest by irredentist Mexicans". Another example showing fear related to bilingualism is the reference Crawford (1992:395) makes to Senator Steve Symms', an Idaho Republican, warning that bilingualism in Canada and India has led to division and conflict, writing that "Symms reduces language diversity to an internal security threat".

America's participation in World War I led to calls for the prohibition of the German language in the United States. Although no general law was written, various acts issued by state councils indicated intolerance to German which resulted in the language shift of German speakers towards English (Schiffman 1996:236-237).

However during the Second World War, on realising that there was a lack of speakers of foreign languages that were needed as a resource for defence and government agencies,
military training programmes in the Navy and Army were started for some languages. Specifically, language issues gained new interest when in 1958, the Soviet Union launched a space satellite *sputnik* and investigations of the Soviet educational system indicated that the citizens spent a considerable amount of time learning languages. In connection to this, "Congress then passed the National Defence Education Act (1958), which appropriated money for the study of specific areas of the world ('Area Studies'); it also appropriated money for the teaching of non-Western languages" (Schiffman 1996:239-240). Also, many volunteers with the Peace Corps learned new languages during their placement in different parts of the world (Schiffman 1996:240). According to Spolsky (2004), in recent years there have been efforts supported by the intelligence agencies to improve language teaching, especially at the advanced level. The contract has been signed to establish a university associated research centre largely devoted to language. These examples of language management, not yet matching the Soviet language schools that produced fluent speakers of English and other languages for diplomatic and intelligence jobs, constitute language policy motivated by national security (Spolsky 2004:103).

Contradicting immigration measures and attitudes were evident in the McCarran-Walter Immigration and Nationality Act of 1952 which removed racial barriers for naturalisation but kept in place the immigration quotas of ethnicities from different countries (Schildkraut 2005:12). Also, in the 1960s, new ideas appeared on language issues in connection to the Civil Rights Act (Schiffman 1996:239-240) and a change took place so that national policy began to support multilingualism and multiculturalism (Spolsky 2004:96).

In 1965, Immigration and Nationality amendments (amending the 1952 Act) were passed. Country-related immigration quotas were dropped and the focus was on reuniting families (Schildkraut 2005:12). Between the periods 1960-1990, immigration increased from Asia and Latin America indicating a shift away from immigrants with European descent. According to the Immigration and Naturalization Service's (INS)\(^5\) 1999 statistics, 70 per cent of immigrants came from Asia, Latin America and the Caribbean (Schildkraut 2005:12).

In light of the changes in demography and the influence from the civil rights movement, Congress passed two laws considering the needs of language minorities, namely the Bilingual Education Act and the Voting Rights Act (VRA). The former, introduced in 1968, dealt with the provision of funding for programmes with bilingual education and guaranteed funding for programmes that did not use English as a medium for teaching (Spolsky 2004:99). Interestingly, in relation to costs of implementing education in different languages, Grin states

\(^5\) now the Bureau of Citizenship and Immigration Services under the Dept of Homeland Security
that "the added expenditure entailed by moving from a monolingual to a bilingual education system is much smaller than commonly believed" since children attend schooling in any case, thus the cost of educating individuals is present regardless (Grin 2006:88), although, according to the present author, education or recruitment of proficient bilingual educators may entail additional costs. Spolsky states that in 1974, the Supreme Court ruled in the case *Lau versus Nichols* that it was a violation of the 1964 Civil Rights Act if schools failed to provide opportunities for meaningful participation of non-English speaking students, and consequently could be judged guilty of discrimination. Furthermore, Title IV of The Civil Rights Act of 1964 (which also opened the possibility for the federal government to participate in language management) was used in language discrimination court cases in favour of bilingual education. Based on the ideas of human and civil rights, discrimination based on language should not occur, and government services must be provided in a way that makes these services accessible to those that do not speak or read English. The Bilingual Education Act of 1968 expired in 2002 and it was not prolonged since critics of the Act saw it as a way for language maintenance by minority groups (Spolsky 2004: 99, 105). However, with the expiration of the Bilingual Education Act "the English-teaching portion of the programme was kept in the paragraphs of the No Child Left Behind Act" (Spolsky 2004:107).

The Bilingual Education Act was founded on the situation and number of Spanish speakers and the drop-out rate of Mexican-American children (Schiffman 1996:240). Also, the Cuban revolution in 1959 brought large amounts of Spanish speaking refugees, many of which were part of the 'bourgeois', and were interested in maintaining their Spanish language. Special programmes directed to children whose mother tongue was Spanish, as well as bilingual education for Spanish and English speaking children were initiated (Schiffman 1996:240). Later focus was more directed to helping disadvantaged children, which also resulted in the introduction of new languages in schools (Schiffman 1996:267-268).

The second law that was passed for the benefit of language minorities included amendments in 1975 to the VRA of 1965 in which it was stated that bilingual voting assistance was to be provided for communities that contained at least 5 per cent of citizens that spoke a language other than English. In 1992, the 5 per cent requirement was changed to communities that had at least ten thousand citizens (Schildkraut 2005:12-13).

In the late 1960s and 1970s, a wave of migrants – Asians from East Africa and the ethnic Chinese minority from Vietnam – arrived in the US. These groups of refugees had as main destinations the US, Britain, Australia, Hong Kong and Malaysia. Their presence gave rise to debates about what methods would be best to manage accommodation of these new groups
into the wider society. In the US, the debate oscillated between keeping them together as a
group or splitting them up to achieve their assimilation and isolation from their community of
origin. These debates were later replaced by concerns regarding the degree of protection and
support of their cultural differences by the state. These discussions became related to the
rights of ethnic minorities, which were consequently placed on the political agenda since it
became clear that Spanish speaking minorities and Native Americans were suffering
discrimination similar to that experienced by the black population (Watson 2000:7).

After the 1970s, the assimilationist model in the US was replaced by a more tolerant and
pluralistic ideal which allowed immigrants to maintain parts of their heritage such as food,

dress, and religion. These expressions of identity were no longer viewed as unpatriotic or 'un-
American' (Kymlicka 1995:14). However, the 1980s marked a new turn in the debate
regarding the campaign for official English (Crawford 1992:1). In 1981, Senator Hayakawa
(R-CA) introduced an amendment to the Constitution to declare English as the official
language of the US. Similar bills have been introduced in every Congress since 1981 and died
(Schildkraut 2005:13). This can be said to be a result of greater tolerance towards immigration
and legislation being more accepting of languages other than English which have, however,
caused fear of losing the 'American identity' among certain groups. The organisation, US
English was founded in 1983 with the objective of making English the official language of the
United States and positioning itself against bilingual education and services. Although the
organisation was unsuccessful in its goal to add an amendment to the US Constitution, it had
varying degrees of success in states which have large amounts of Spanish speakers such as
California, Arizona, Florida and Colorado. This support is also a response to the fact that
some activities and areas in the communities required some knowledge of Spanish (Ager
2001:110-111). During this period, there was also support for multilingualism in many states
and localities, reflected in the use of the term 'English-Plus' (Schiffman 1996:245). The
English Plus movement is a reaction to the English-Only movement and advocates for high
proficiency in English and knowledge of at least one other language. The members of the
movement also suggest that language assistance should be provided to guarantee accessibility
to education, essential services and electoral processes (English Plus Movement 1987).

The campaign for official English is based on arguments such as the necessary role of
English as a bonding agent in the multicultural country, today's immigrants do not learn
English, and coercive methods have to be used in order for English to be learnt. Other
arguments used by these organisations are that language diversity leads to ethnic conflict and
that newcomers entail an increase in costs in the areas of welfare and unemployment (Crawford 2000:6-8). With regard to reactions to a speech by the secretary of education, William Bennett, in the mid 80s against the Bilingual Education Act, Crawford notes that letters of support to the secretary focused on changes in the demography and cultural contact. Some of the comments were of illegal aliens on welfare, communities being overrun by Asians and Hispanics, "macho-oriented" foreigners trying to impose their culture on Americans, and – a special concern – the out-of-control birth rates of linguistic minorities. Some writers singled out particular groups for abuse: "Today's Hispanics, on the whole lack the motivation of earlier immigrants." Others worried that they would be "forced to learn a foreign language" (i.e., Spanish) or that the interests of the "English-speaking majority" would be sacrificed on the altar of affirmative action… (Crawford 1992:4).

US English Inc founded in 1983 by US Senator Hayakawa aimed to make English the official language of the US with the claim that this measure would help immigrants learn and speak English. English is seen as necessary for immigrants to succeed in the country. As mentioned briefly above, the endeavours of US English Inc have influenced several states to pass laws for official English (Spolsky 2004:106, 108). In 1986, California approved Proposition 63 which was a language referendum for English-only initiatives, but which did not affect the actual language behaviour in the society (Schiffrin 1996:270-272). The English First movement supported the English-only initiatives and was against Executive Order 13166 of 2000 that, in light of the Civil Rights Act of 1964, aimed at improving the accessibility of federal programmes and activities by individuals with limited proficiency in English. The English for the Children movement was also against bilingual education and reached a degree of success in several states e.g. the approval of Californian Proposition 227 in 1998, as well as in Colorado, Massachusetts and Arizona (Spolsky 2004:106, 108). An anti-bilingual initiative, based on California's Proposition 227, passed in Arizona with 63 per cent of the votes in November 2000 (Schmid 2001:172, 175). According to these organisations, the present policy towards languages in the United States constitute a threat to English by facilitating language shift from English towards other languages (Spolsky 2004:106, 108).

In this context, it is worth pointing out that language policy choices in the educational field are of importance because they not only have direct consequences of how education should be delivered, such as which language is to be used in teaching today, but also affect the linguistic repertoires of future generations. According to Patten and Kymlicka, legislation and
public initiatives in some of the states in the US have endeavoured to limit the use of bilingual programmes in schools aimed at children with limited proficiency in English (Patten and Kymlicka 2003:21; see also Schmidt 2000:18-19). Californian Proposition 227 has as objective the removal of the majority of bilingual classes in state public schools (Schmidt 2000:81). Criticism of bilingual educational programmes lasted throughout their implementation and although successful, they also failed in some situations. The Californian referendum Proposition 227 in 1998 to remove bilingual education was passed on the basis of these failures. Similar criteria were also successful in Arizona and Massachusetts leading to a majority of votes for the removal of bilingual education (Spolsky 2004:104).

The Bill Emerson English Language Empowerment Act for English as the official language of the government was approved in the House of Representatives in 1996 but later died in the Senate. The bill included that all naturalisation ceremonies were to be held in English and further repealed the bilingual voting provisions of the VRA (Schildkraut 2005:13).

By 1999, 22 states had passed symbolic declarations making English the official language (Schmidt 2000:29). These symbolic gestures can influence individuals’ identification with the state or with their own linguistic group. Any policy regarding a particular language affects the daily life of its speakers and their interaction with members inside and outside their community. Choice as to which language should be used in public institutions such as courts and legislatures, both in internal communication and also in communication with the public on matters of rights and duty, can be regarded as an excluding process and even unjust and may lead to conflict. According to Patten and Kymlicka, in August 2000, President Clinton passed an Executive Order based on the Civil Rights Act’s prohibition of discriminating measures, to provide service to people with limited proficiency in English e.g. by organising translations and employment of bilingual persons (Patten and Kymlicka 2003).

In the 108th Congress, attempts to achieve legislation at a federal level regarding English had not died and in 2003 the National Language Act (H.R. 931) was introduced in the House of Representatives and was sent to committee. The Act states that

The Government of the United States shall preserve and enhance the role of English as the official language of the United States of America. Unless specifically stated in applicable law, no person has a right, entitlement, or claim to have the Government of the United States or any of its officials or representatives act, communicate, perform or provide services, or provide materials in any language other than English. If exceptions are made, that does not create a legal entitlement to additional services in that language or any language other than English (National Language Act H.R. 931).
It is interesting to note the name of the bill as the "National Language Act" but the text refers to "English as the official language of the United States" which from a sociolinguistic language policy perspective carries different implications in which the former is symbolic and the latter affects the interaction between government institutions and individuals in their daily life. The Act further repeals the Bilingual Education Act and terminates the Office of Bilingual Education and Minority Languages Affairs. It also repeals bilingual voting requirements and imposes the requirement of the English language in ceremonies of admittance of new citizens (National Language Act 2003:H.R. 931).

In sum, recent language debates in the United States have been triggered by three changes. Firstly, during the 1980s and 1990s, large immigration waves brought attention to the increasing linguistic and multicultural composition of the nation. Bilingualism was seen as a threat to national unity and increased the perception that new immigrants were not learning English. Secondly, language entitlements such as the Bilingual Education Act of 1968 and the 1975 amendments to the Voting Rights Act of 1965 increased the language controversy. Thirdly, the 1965 immigration legislation in which racial criteria were removed from the United States immigration laws brought new challenges to the melting pot concept since many minority groups were still experiencing economic and social disadvantages (Schmid 2001:8). Schmid further states that the civil rights movement had an impact on the social and legal systems which consequently put forward measures to increase civil rights as well as protection to groups and individuals. As response to these changes the official English movement was organised. Americans felt resentment in paying taxes for the benefits of immigrants and perceived civil rights and protective measures as threats: "In general, there has been a sense of vulnerability that has torn away at America's sense of security and identity"(Schmid 2001:4-8, 39). Insecurity is expressed by a desire for more restricted immigration, an increase of conflict between different ethnic groups and an increase in movements supporting language policy to strengthen English. Also, the referendum in 1995 in Canada regarding the sovereignty of Quebec has increased concerns that the unity of America is threatened (Schmid 2001:4-8, 39). The size and perceived language maintenance of Latinos especially in the Southern states of the US may cause some people to suggest that America may be on the same path as Quebec. The amendment to the immigration bill passed by the Senate in 2006 may be seen as a reaction to this concern. Finally, according to Schmid, the rapid increase of Asians (385 percent) and Hispanics (141 percent) between 1970-1990 increased patriotism and nationalist sentiments. The recognition of bilingualism by the
government has also contributed to place "language as a source of conflict in the political arena" (Schmid 2001:42).

The following section gives an overview of the legislative system in the US in order to describe some of the factors involved in language and immigration policy making.

2.2.1 Legislation process
In the United States the governmental power and functions are distributed in three branches – executive, judicial and legislative (Usa.gov 2009). The executive branch composed of the president, vice president, the cabinet members (heads of departments) and the heads of the independent agencies, is the governmental power in charge of enforcing laws. The judicial branch deals with discussions regarding the meaning of laws and their application. This governmental section also reviews laws to make sure that they do not break the Constitution. The legislative branch refers to the bicameral Congress comprised of the Senate and the House of Representatives, as well as agencies that assist the Congress (Usa.gov 2009).

The American political system is based on a notion of "separation of powers" in which the Congress has the legislative power and its main function is to make laws. The duration of a Congress is two years. Among the sources of legislation, the idea and draft forwarded by a Member is primary. Also, some ideas for legislation may originate from the Members' constituents, individuals or groups (Johnson 2003). The legislative process is further described as emphasising the "protection of the minority, allowing ample opportunity to all sides to be heard and make their views known. The fact that a proposal cannot become a law without consideration and approval by both Houses of Congress…." is seen as a sign of a good legislative system (Johnson 2003).

The Senate has two members from each state, each holding one vote – regardless of the population size. Following the 108th Congress, the House of Representatives is composed by 435 Members which are elected every other year from the states in accordance to their population size. Each member of the House has one vote. In addition, a Resident Commissioner from Puerto Rico and Delegates from the District of Columbia, American Samoa, Guam and the Virgin Islands are included. However the Resident Commissioner and the Delegates cannot vote in the House (Johnson 2003).

The federal government shares power with the individual states. The power of the individual state is guaranteed in the Tenth Amendment to the Constitution by imposing restrictions on the extent of federal government actions (Hallenberg 1998; United States Senate 1996). Nevertheless, state law must be in line with federal law.
3 Building bricks for societal security

This section introduces aspects that the present author believes are relevant for a language analysis using a societal security perspective on the official English debate in the United States. The concept of societal security is core to this study and is further developed in section 4.1. However a short reference to the definition of societal security is that it has its focus point on identity and concerns the existence of real or perceived threats to the sustainment of a collective identity. In light of this, the accounts below deal with various aspects that relate to identity in the United States. Thus aspects that can define a collective are taken up (sections 3.1 Race, ethnicity and national identity; 3.2 Multiculturalism; 3.4 Speech community; and 3.5 Loyalty and trust) and focus is placed on those aspects related to language as an identity marker (sections: 3.1 regarding national identity; 3.3 Multilingualism; 3.6 Habitus and symbolic domination; 3.7 Language shift; and 3.8 Language conflict and language contact).

Since societal security falls within the constructivist view, the presentation will mainly relate to the view of human relations as socially constructed. To begin with, the concepts of 'race' and 'ethnicity' are discussed since these categories are significant in the construction and perception of collective entities.

3.1 Race, ethnicity and national identity

The significance of identity for societal security, its treatment in various academic and non academic writings, and references to identity in informal everyday situations entails that there is such a phenomenon that is discussed and therefore can be studied. The concepts of 'race' and 'ethnicity' are two ways in which identity can be established. In this study, these concepts are taken to be socially constructed. A social constructivist approach "rests on the belief that reality is socially constructed and emphasises language as an important means by which we interpret experience" (DeLamater and Hyde 1998; see also Berger and Luckmann 1966 for further discussion of the influence of language in the construction of the individual's "knowing" in everyday life). Essentialism is the opposing view to social constructivism and is based on a fixed essence to a "form" that does not change over time. It is this form that creates discontinuity between forms. One form is different from the other since it has a different essence and thus continuous variation is not considered in this perspective. This is based on a belief that things are unavoidable, natural as givens and determined in biological terms (DeLamater and Hyde 1998). It could be argued that a problem with this view is that it entails that it is possible to identify a core essence. If one leaves aside biological/physical
distinctions, it is difficult to determine the core abstract essence of for instance an individual's personality. There is further the difficulty of determining the relationship between the core physical and abstract identities that make up one individual. The social constructivist view allows for influence from the social environment on the individual's personality and possibilities or life chances, while also taking account of givens such as defining, visible physical characteristics that position the individual in social interaction.

When referring to race certain physical features are distinguished by individuals in a community as having social significance for marking group differences and boundaries. This implies that the choice of whether skin or hair colour carries social meaning for identity marking constructs the idea of race in a community. Giddens offers a definition of race as a set of social relationships which allow individuals and groups to be located, and various attributes of competencies assigned, on the basis of biologically grounded features. Racial distinctions are more than ways of describing human differences – they are also important factors in the reproduction of patterns of power and inequality within society (Giddens 2001:246).

The term 'race' is often placed within inverted commas to emphasise its disputed descriptive value. Also, since race is seen as a social construct with or without 'biological' basis, it is difficult to refer to stable boundaries between races (Giddens 2001:246). More variation is seen to exist inside a group denominated as constituting a race than between different racial groups. Furthermore, certain attributes are often fixed to an individual's personality based on their race membership (Eriksen 1997:34).

In respect of contact between different language groups, Schmidt's (2002) critical discourse study of racialisation in the debate regarding English-only in the United States has shown that there are two group formations which refer to race, the pluralists and the assimilationists. The pluralists argue that the policy of official-English as promoted by the assimilationists is racist. On the other hand, the assimilationists themselves claim that they aim to create an inclusive and equal society, which is prevented by bilingualism. Schmidt's paper further argues that socially constructed power relations link the English language with 'whiteness'. There is an ideological context in which Americans that do not speak English and who are not of European origin are racialised as the Others (Schmidt 2002). With regard to the debate of official English, Gonzalez and Melis (2001) view the English-only movement as undemocratic since it aims at excluding the linguistic and racial Other from the public sphere and constructing, by implication, the public sphere as white and middle class. From a different perspective, while creating a relation to notions of superiority through dehumanisation, Santa
Ana's research of metaphorical portrayals of Latinos in the *Los Angeles Times* during the period from 1992 to 1998 (Santa Ana 2002:56) showed that immigrants were predominantly portrayed as animals, invaders or carrying sub-human qualities, in which the immigrant as an individual is lost in a collective view. The metaphor immigrant as animal was the most dominant metaphor in the *LA Times*. In Santa Ana's study, immigration is further represented as a danger or threat – burden, dirt, disease, invasion, and waves/waters. The metaphor immigration as dangerous waters was the most dominant metaphor associated to the movement of people arriving in the United States (Santa Ana 2002:72, 83). According to him, this type of public discourse brings forward a negative view of immigrants (Santa Ana 2002:xii).

'Ethnicity' is a term used to distinguish groups on the basis of cultural practices and the social meanings attached to them. The most common characteristics that distinguish ethnic groups from each other are "language, history or ancestry (real or imagined), religion and styles of dress or adornment" and are based on factors that are learned (Giddens 2001:246) that is, they are acquired through socialisation. Ethnicity is produced and reproduced as a social phenomenon and provides an identity based on history. The use of ethnicity is considered problematic since it may function as a collective term to refer to those that do not belong to the dominant culture thus creating boundaries between 'us' and 'them'. Although ethnicity is a term to be applied to all members of any group, it is often used in relation to minority groups (Giddens 2001:247-248), indicating stable patterns of power relations. Moreover, a group that is dominant in one country may constitute an ethnic minority group in another country.

According to some scholars, 'new racism' has substituted the old "biological" racism. 'New racism' also referred to as 'cultural racism' discriminates against certain groups based on cultural differences. Thus groups that differ culturally from the majority are marginalised or criticised for not assimilating. By some, 'new racism' is seen to have a political aspect, as in the support by some politicians for official 'English-only' language policies in the United States (Giddens 2001:252).

The concepts of 'race' and 'ethnicity' can be seen as relevant to societal security in the US since it is a country built on immigration of various groups. Its past history especially as regards slavery is one in which domination was justified with arguments of racial difference. The US Census Bureau for population statistics uses race as a category and there are references to Latinos as brown people and to African-American individuals as black. The concept of ethnicity is interesting from the debate on official English since this language is
historically linked to the arrival of white Anglo-Saxon descendants to the country.\textsuperscript{6} From a societal security perspective, the large immigrant population of Hispanics as carriers of the Spanish language carries implications for identity construction in the United States (see subsections 3.1.1 and 3.1.2 for further discussions on the formation of a national identity).

When groups carrying distinguishing characteristics that form a boundary for identification come in contact with other groups, new forms of interaction are created. These usually feature maintenance of identity. It is possible to say that a negotiation of social relationships takes place, which may be the result or may result in one group feeling that their identity, and thus their societal security, is threatened. In most cases, the minority is expected to move towards the culture of the majority in different processes such as assimilation and integration.

The specific content of the term 'assimilation' varies among scholars but it is in general terms used to describe the processes and the results of inter-ethnic contact in which one group takes on features from another group to the extent of replacing its original culture. Several terms are used in relation to assimilation, such as 'amalgamation' which Gordon defines as the blending of races as a biological fusion by "interbreeding and intermarriage" and contrasts it to assimilation which he initially states is restricted to the "fusion of cultures" but later in his presentation of full assimilation places amalgamation as one of the stages (Gordon 1964). R. E. Park has further defined assimilation in reference to cultural behaviour with political implications. For him, (social) assimilation is "the name given to the process or processes by which peoples of diverse racial origins and different cultural heritages, occupying a common territory, achieve a cultural solidarity sufficient at least to sustain a national existence" and also that assimilation has only taken place when the immigrant as a member in the particular society does not encounter discrimination or prejudice (R.E. Park as cited in Gordon 1964:63). This view entails social change in which certain distinctions defining ethnicity would either disappear or would not be considered as significant for marking difference in the given society. The view of membership can thus be said to be based on the acceptance of an individual by the group and is to a certain extent beyond the individual's control.

In his study of the delimiting boundaries of the Lue people in Thailand, Moerman (1965) suggests that an emic membership to an ethnic group must be considered i.e. the individual's own beliefs, identification, and behaviour which confirm their belonging rather than objective

\textsuperscript{6} During the Second World War, the term 'ethnics' was used in the United States in relation to particular groups (e.g. Jews, Italians, Irish) that were seen to be inferior to those of British descent (Eriksen 1997:33).
etic boundaries being determined. Moerman (1965) shifts the definition of ethnic membership to an emic category which in anthropological literature refers to that view which originates from the native or culture and contrasts with etic which is based on the concepts and descriptions of the researcher and are considered as culturally neutral. The researcher or more specifically for Moerman's study, the ethnographer must "discover, in each instance, which features are locally significant for purposes of assigning labels" (Moerman 1965:1220), which in the view of the present author can be extended to sociolinguistic studies of language policy, i.e. making the emic identity as most relevant for successful language intervention (see also Spolsky's model in section 4.2 for the significance of people's beliefs in language policy implementation).

According to Eriksen, the possibility of the individual affecting their own membership is associated to the idea of ethnicity as a relational concept and not a static property. Further, its relational characteristic includes the idea of minimum contact between groups that regard each other as culturally different and that the cultural differences are visible and regularly noticed in inter-group interaction. In this way, inter-ethnic relations are a result of the perception of cultural differences as socially relevant. Ethnicity constitutes a social identity as it is held in contrast with others. Eriksen further states that ethnicity carries both the political and symbolic aspects based on organisational gains and losses in inter-group interaction as well as the creation of identity (Eriksen 1997:39). It is also worth considering that if factors of group disadvantages and advantages become salient, they may lead to ethnolinguistic mobilisations based on relative deprivation.

Weber (1997:18) defines 'ethnic groups' as "those human groups that entertain a subjective belief in their common descent because of similarities of physical type or of customs or both, or because of memories of colonization or migration". Members of ethnic groups are linked by an identity that is presumed. The belief in a shared ethnicity is mainly due to the organisation of a political community, which often continues even when the political community dissolves (Weber 1997:19).

Although there are variations of custom and physical resemblance within members of groups that feel affinity within a particular territory, group belonging is also a strong sentiment among immigrants. This identification may lead to group formations based on sentiments of relationship to the common native country even though the individuals may not consider returning to their country of origin and are adjusted to the host country (Weber 1997:18). Thus, although foreign-born individuals may maintain their mother tongue they may not have any desire of returning to their home country. Also, it is worth adding that an
expressed affinity to their native country may be imposed by outsiders who group individuals under one shared label implying and constructing their homogeneity and affinity. According to Weber, language can also contribute to a perception of similarity after the political community has broken up. However, if members of the community experience significant differences within themselves as regards custom, physiology and particularly language, the belief of a shared ethnicity may not survive political disintegration (Weber 1997:18).

3.1.1 Language and the state

Anderson (1991:6-7) provides the concept of 'imagined community' as an explanation for the feeling of unity that members of a nation may feel in relation to its sovereignty, as well as the perception and image that community members have towards each other even though they will never interact directly. In this definition, the nation is imagined as a community because, even though there may exist inequality and exploitation, "the nation is always conceived as a deep, horizontal comradeship" (Anderson 1991:6-7). Similarly, Weber uses the concept of 'nation' as a "pathos which is linked to the idea of a powerful political community of people who share a common language, or religion, or common customs, or political memories". In addition to these factors, Weber further includes race to the list as a source for generating national identification. A state in this form may already exist or may be desired (Weber 1997:26). Thus from the perspective of societal security, it is when the collective identity that is considered to function as a "glue" for membership and is accepted as such by the members is threatened, that ethnic differences become more salient and ethnic boundaries more pronounced. It is at this point, that the choice of what constitutes the social focus of ethnic differentiation is significant.

Ager recognises three types of communities or social groups in a society namely the speech community, the political community, and the ethnic community. In the speech community, members are linked by language. The political community relies on political organisation and its documents. Within this type of grouping, membership to the state or citizenship is realised through *jus soli* based on residency within the territory or *jus sanguinis* based on birth. The third type of community Ager presents is the ethnic community in which the members are unified by a perceived shared origin (Ager 1999:4-6).

Based on Ager's definitions of community, language may be seen as a contributing factor for distinguishing groups and creating group membership. In line with the focus of this study, it may be said that Ager's perspective also allows for language to contribute to a possible perception of threat to an existing group. For Ager, nationalism can provide a motive for
language policy making and planning (Ager 2001:13-39). In other words, identity, especially
its expression in nationalism, represents a motive for language intervention.

The word 'nationalism' however, implies different goals and attitudes, such as nationalism
as a defensive response to globalisation, nationalism based on xenophobic attitudes to other
nations originating in colonialism, fear of or concern about powerful neighbouring nations, or
nationalism that is expressed in relation to granting collective and the individual (political,
economic and language) rights in which the collective right is often imposed on the individual
both by authorities as well as minority and regional communities. In the case of language the
issue is often regarding education (Ager 2001:37-38). Moreover, Ager presents France as an
example of a nationalism that relies on conceptions of the superiority of France, its culture
and ideas of the French Revolution and the Republic. This ethnic-based notion rejects
regional or immigrant particularism in favour of assimilation converging on one language,
culture and territory – factors that represent symbols of unity and act as guarantors of the
continuing of the state (Ager 2001:19). In contrast, nationalisms can also be based on a
rationalist approach e.g. the autonomy of Catalonia in Spain in which the interpretation of
nationalism relies on the speakers within the region. Language has a central role in Catalonian
identity and the emphasis is on a shared linguistic identity rather than ethnicity, homogeneity
and assimilation (Ager 2001:25) since there are several other language groups in the
autonomous community. In the context of the United States, it may be possible to assume that
the French and Catalonian types of nationalisms are present if one takes account of references
to the notions expressed in the Constitution and Founding papers, particularly the liberal view
on freedom and equality similar to references regarding the French Revolution, as well as the
idea of uniting diverse language groups under one language of communication, namely
English, similar to the function of the Catalonian language.

According to Gellner, nationalism has its roots in the requirements of the industrial
society. Nationalism is linked to education through the demands of the modern industrial
society based on the idea of sustained growth which requires availability of labour and the
possibility of communication across the society. The provision of a widespread labour force
with common basis entails the supply of education to individuals through specialists whereby
an obligatory shift of supply of knowledge from the local group to a central educational
system takes place. Thus nationalism is "the organization of human groups into large,
centrally educated, culturally homogeneous units..." (Gellner 1997:66). Since this view of
educational infrastructure is large and costly, the state is seen as the only actor capable of
enforcing and sustaining a homogeneous culture which is no longer diversified and based on locally distinguished, illiterate cultures or traditions. Therefore,

the employability, dignity, security and self-respect of individuals, typically, and for the majority of men now hinges on their education; and the limits of the culture within which they were educated are also the limits of the world within which they can, morally and professionally, breathe. A man's education is by far his most precious investment, and in effect confers his identity on him (Gellner 1997:65-68).

These considerations bring forward the significance of knowledge of the dominant language in a particular country which in the case of the US, and of relevance for this study, would be proficiency in English for the individual's "employability, dignity, security and self-respect" and identification (Gellner 1997:67).

Thus, the term 'nationalism' is, like 'ethnicity', based on cultural similarities. For Eriksen, nationalism is defined on an idea of state in which cultural boundaries and political boundaries coincide. In addition, within this definition, if an ethnic movement makes demands for the establishment of an independent state it becomes a nationalist movement (Eriksen 1997:35). Based on this view, it is possible to state that since the definition of an ethnic group may vary, the content of nationalist movements may also vary, depending on what is considered to be socially significant.

The instability of ethnic identities may be related to Fasold's (1984:4, 8) view that multinational states are less stable than nation-states. Departing from the prominent role language has for nationalism, the sense of nation is regarded by him as more problematic for a multilingual state. Fasold suggests two possible alternatives for a state, namely to develop a national language – and deal with the problem of selection – or to create a nationalism that does not rest on language. A state can contain one or more languages, although those that have several language groups within its borders often have one official language. However, sharing a language does not entail a sentiment of national identity, as the conflict in the Former Yugoslavia has demonstrated (Fasold 1984:4, 8). In the same way, groups speaking distinct languages from the majority may still perceive a shared feeling of nation with the main group as in the sense of belonging to the French 'nation' felt by German speaking individuals of Alsace based on a shared culture and political past (Weber 1997:24). Pavlenko and Blackledge summarise the relationship language and identity as complex, in which language is used for various objectives which may appear together or isolated. Language may be used to mark national and ethnic identities, may function as symbolic capital, or may be used as a tool for social control e.g. by imposition of languages on a minority or immigrant
group. They further claim that aspects of power are always either explicitly or implicitly present in different forms of language use (Pavlenko and Blackledge 2003:2).

Romaine (1995:316) states that in the case where assimilation attempts by the dominant culture lead to strengthening differences between the groups, language and dialect are sometimes used as symbols of identification. Some ethnicity movements find expression through emphasising language. In a similar vein, Giddens states that in inter-group contact in which there is a majority and a minority situation, the notion of sharing common interests and loyalty to the minority group is often increased if a member of the minority group experiences prejudice and discrimination. Thus, opinions and attitudes built on stereotypes about a group may lead to a stronger social cohesion of the minority group, even though no negative action is taken towards the group (Giddens 2001:248, 251). Since stereotypes distort reality and are, to a certain extent, fixed and difficult to change, stereotypical characterisations of a particular group (Giddens 2001:250) are sometimes used to assess individuals of the group – regardless of whether these are perceived as positive or negative. Thus from this standpoint, it can be argued that an individual's action that can be linked to a group stereotype strengthens it for all the individuals in the group, which consequently leads to the boundary between the individual and the group becoming fuzzy and reinforcing each other due to mutual referencing.

The construction of in-group and out-group membership as regards immigrant integration in the US, reflects Petersson's (2003:6) claim that individuals who are associated to a collective identity may draw advantages from their group belonging. However, those not included in the group are marginalised. Exclusion from membership in groups can have negative consequences if individuals are experienced as the Other or as enemies e.g. as in the case of first generation immigrants. This is particularly relevant in cases where relations of power are in play. The creation of Otherness can be related to Saussure's view of the production of meaning through language in a network based on relationships of similarities and differences (Saussure 1972:113-114). The relationship is established by the presence of signs that carry two forms, the signal, which is the physical form (also referred to as 'signifier'), and the 'signified' referring to the mental concept that the signifier points to. Different signs should carry different meanings since absolute synonyms do not exist. The system is built to accommodate the scope of meaning of each sign in relation to the other terms in the system (Saussure 1972:67, 114). This may serve to be particularly interesting in the construction of identities since it can be related to the degree of generality or specification of terms which reflect perceptions of attitudes and differences, and to the possibility of integrating new words into semantic domains of nation-related group identification.
Furthermore, Said's theory of representation is useful in considering the establishment of immigrants as the Other in the United States. Focusing on the portrayal of the Orient by the West, Said claims that the western cultural hegemonic discourse of Orientalism identifying the European 'us' from the non-European 'them' creates the idea that the European identity is superior to other non-European cultures: "In a quite constant way, Orientalism depends for its strategy on this flexible positional superiority, which puts the westerner in a whole series of possible relationships with the Orient without ever losing him the relative upper hand" (Said 1978:7). The Oriental is given voice through the Westerner, and it is the Westerner, by assumption of their own superiority, that knows what the Oriental feels and also what is best for them (Said 1978:35, 41). The negative images of the Arab in the United States, Said claims, are encircled in "racism, cultural stereotypes, political imperialism, dehumanizing ideology" (Said 1978:26). Said focuses on how the Orient is represented and on the "unnatural" descriptions of it (Said 1978:21). The issue of truth is contrasted to representation in that written language is not a "delivered presence but a re-presence, or a representation" (Said 1978:21). History is seen as reconstructing its Others through the establishment of opposites in a process of struggle. Debates about what stands for Frenchness or Britishness is a process of interpreting identities in relation to Others. These struggles may find their expression in the political sphere such as in immigration policies (Said 1978:332). Therefore, in the United States, the representation of immigrants as Others may not only be reflected in arguments for particular immigration measures, but also in demands for official English – thus keeping an unequal status of languages in the country and affecting access to information by non-English speaking groups, which may lead to perceptions of threat among these minority groups.

When dealing with challenges posed by contact between different ethnic groups, multiethnic societies assume three models of ethnic incorporation – assimilation, the melting pot, and pluralism. The model of assimilation entails that immigrants adopt the values and norms of the majority population in their entirety (section 3.7 Language shift and language maintenance can be read with the concept of 'assimilation' in mind). Thus immigrants are expected to abandon their language, way of dressing, lifestyles and cultural views in order to be part of the society. Within this view, children of immigrants should become 'Americans'. At the same time, these second generation immigrants actively construct the image of the United States as a "nation of immigrants" (Giddens 2001:256-257). While assimilation of minority groups entails a one-sided change of culture in order to participate in the larger society, the concept of 'integration' in the context of the United States, according to Bernard
(1967), has allowed for difference of culture within a frame of social cohesion. However, for Gordon (1964:68, 246) integration is just one stage in the goal towards complete assimilation. The concept of 'integration' in the model of the melting pot as described by Giddens (2001) involves the development of cultural patterns based on the blending of immigrant cultures to the pre-existing population's culture creating new diverse environments, similar to the amalgamation stage presented by Gordon (1964) although this was based on a notion of biological blending. In Gidden's description, the immigrant population's traditions and customs help shape the social environment of the receiving country. In the case of the United States, different groups have contributed to the appearance of a hybrid culture in the country although the historical positioning of the "Anglo" culture has maintained dominance. The third model of cultural pluralism refers to the creation of a plural society in which subcultures are recognised as equal. In this perspective, members of ethnic minority groups should have the same rights as those of the majority population and ethnic differences are respected as a significant part of the national life. In the United States, ethnic differences relate primarily to inequality rather than equal but independent membership in the national community (Giddens 2001:256-257). The last two models may be difficult to achieve fully in practice since they entail that dominating groups would not feel existential threats from minorities and are pragmatic to different cultures even if they carry the possibility of a diminishing of their own dominant status or a demand/request of a shared status of cultures. In the case of the melting pot model, there is the question of what aspects of culture are allowed to become hybrid? In other words, in the case of language, this could be reflected in the function (domains) of the various languages in the American society which would also be a matter of resource availability at the state level for provision of services in these languages. Also, if there are many ethnic groups, carrying different languages, the problem arises how a pluralistic model is possible if all languages are not included in the provision of services. Another factor is if hybrid language culture includes aspects of code switching – the back and forth switching between languages in the same conversation – and if so, if this is compatible with national identity construction. In the reference above, Giddens (2001) points out that the Anglo culture has maintained a dominant position in the United States. This implies that the underlying position is of inequality of status (cf. Said's 1978 reference to "flexible positional superiority"; see section 4.2 for goals of language policy with regard to models of society based on assimilation/monolingualism or pluralism/multilingualism and more specifically section 4.2.3 for insecurity as a motive for language policy making). Appiah states that collective identities originate cultural identities which are created in structured relations, and are the result – not
the cause – of conflict. Thus, identity allegiances should be regarded as constructed and liable to change (Appiah 2005:64), and can be linked to Gumperz's claim that language can have an active role in the production and maintenance of social and ethnic identities (Gumperz 1982:7), and also a shared perception of community.

3.1.2 Language and identity construction

This thesis takes a poststructuralist approach to identity. Poststructuralism adds the role of power to the social constructionist perspective of identities, i.e. identities are seen as produced and negotiated in discursive interaction. Furthermore, hybridity is considered as a characteristic of identity, which entails that identity is not dichotomised or limited (Pavlenko and Blackledge 2003:13).

Fishman applies the view of socially constructed identities to ethnicity and identity, and argues that if ethnic identity is constructed then linguistic identity – since it is often linked to ethnic identity – must also be constructed. He further argues that feelings of belonging can vary in intensity in situations of conflict. Languages can be used for uniting and creating group identity and group loyalty, as well as to divide groups. Both involve making a distinction between 'them' (external features, i.e. not 'us' or in the case of nationality –"not a French national" or of relevance to this study "not an American national") and 'us' (internal features, which also includes a shared heritage, belief systems and a language i.e. to be a French or an American national and not a Swiss for instance) to define groups (Fishman 1999:154). In a related way, Le Page and Tabouret-Keller claim that labelling a language in relation to a specific group in which the language not only "denote[s] the linguistic system felt to be the property of the group, language as used by them, but also connote[s] the social values attached to the group…" (Le Page and Tabouret-Keller 1985:235). The particular language becomes a separate entity that can be claimed and is therefore a possession that is specific to the group. It also becomes the carrier of the social values of the group. In this quality, if the language is threatened, the group will act to protect it as a possession (Le Page and Tabouret-Keller 1985:234-236).

Moreover, linking language and identity in group formations, May (2005) refers to the instrumental quality of language and states that the ability to communicate in a specific language entails the ability to identify with individuals as well as the ethnic, and national identities to which the language is associated (May 2005). In the same way, Taylor sees the role of language in defining an individual's identity as the result of interaction with other
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people that are significant to the individual (Taylor 1994a:32). Thus, identities may be distinguished in the processes of interactions with others.

Appiah suggests that every collective identity is formed by three elements. Firstly, the collective is formed by the availability of terms in public discourse that categorise some people as members of a particular group. These terms are shared by the majority of members of a particular society, and there is a degree of consensus regarding them such as the formulation of stereotypes (which may be true or false), what the typical group member is like, their typical behaviour, and how they can be recognised. Secondly, these labels/terms undergo a process of internalisation to form the identity of individuals, i.e. individuals construct and view themselves as members of the group. This identification affects the behaviour of the individual since they will tend to act in conformity with expectations. Lastly, the third element refers to the existence of patterns of behaviour towards the members of specific groups. Behaviour and treatment towards a given individual is based on identification of their group membership (Appiah 2005:66-69).

Therefore, according to Appiah, the attachment of a label affects how individuals are viewed at the social and psychological level since perception is restricted to available labels, which mark and construct the identities that are accessible. The individual enacts their own identity and makes choices based on identification with labels – factors which influence the construction of their own identity (Appiah 2005:66) and relations to others. In this context, one can refer to the use of the collective term 'Hispanic' in the US which according to Daniels is artificial since it identifies Mexican Americans and Puerto Ricans who only resemble each other in aspects of language, religion and poverty (Daniels 1990: 326). In respect to this, it is further worth noting that the Hispanic group is the only group in the US that is defined by the language that its members speak (Appiah 2005:115). Kymlicka also considers the problems linked to the label of 'Hispanic' by referring to its use in the US Census since the 1960s in which all ethnic or national Spanish speaking groups, namely Puerto Ricans, Chicanos, Cubans, Mexicans, Spaniards, etc. are aggregated under a label which thus includes national minorities such as the Puerto Ricans and immigrants from Latin America. These groups may have different linguistic integration goals. Cuban refugees and illegal Mexican migrant workers, who are also grouped under the 'Hispanic' label, have different motives as regards the acquisition of English in relation to each other and other Spanish speaking groups. Cubans see themselves as exiles and expect to return within a short time to Cuba. Also, the larger society does not place great efforts in attempting to linguistically integrate them. Mexicans are in a similar situation but their return is involuntary since if they are illegal, they are under
a constant risk of deportation and they do not have access to the language learning programmes that are offered to other immigrants (Kymlicka 1995:16).

Romaine states that some immigrants may experience feelings of rootlessness caught between two cultures but not really belonging to either their country of origin or the host country. Acceptance of bilingualism by the greater society becomes an important factor for identity formation of the immigrant individual (Romaine 1995:315). In her study of attitudes in Californian newspapers regarding Proposition 63 for making English the official language of the state of California, MacKaye claims that language serves as a site for beliefs and attitudes. The supporters and opponents of the English language movement both argue from similar views on language, namely language as a common bond, language as ethnicity, and language as access. Language is also used as an ethnic boundary marker of 'us' and 'them'. Mackaye concludes with a claim that language policy makers need to have a holistic approach on language policy decisions (MacKaye 1990).

Ethnic and cultural diversity in societies are mainly a consequence of migratory movements. Also, the arrival of immigrants in a country has demographic, economic and social consequences. According to Buzan (1991, 1998) immigration is one of the most significant factors for a real or perceived threat to societal security in the host country (see section 4.1). Giddens states that the current increase in immigration rates in western countries and the challenge it poses to ideas of present day national identity have led to a revision of the notion of citizenship. In the case of the United States, the classic model of migration has been adopted in which immigrants have been encouraged to come to the country – although limited by quotas and restrictions on intake – and citizenship has been granted. However, illegal models of immigration have increased as a result of stricter immigration laws in many western countries. In the US, there is a growing number of Mexican "illegal aliens" (Giddens 2001:258-259), a factor that has drawn attention to the need to improve border control protection.

The question of citizenship and illegality can be related to the different formations of ethnicity in states suggested by Kymlicka (2002:349). According to him, there are five ethnocultural groups in western democracies, namely national minorities, immigrants, metics, racial caste, and isolationist ethnoreligious groups, such as the Amish (Kymlicka 2002:349). A description of these identity formations – with the exception of the isolationist ethnoreligious group will follow since this type of collective is defined by virtue of its religion-based separateness rather than ethnolinguisitic contact.
National minorities, are groups that had societies in the territory before being incorporated into a larger state e.g. through conquest, annexation or union. The Hispanics in Mexico after the war in 1848 are an example of such a group. They were subjected to the imposition of literacy tests and experienced the arrival en masse of non-Spanish speaking individuals based on a policy aimed at outnumbering Hispanics in the region (Kymlicka 1995:11-12). In spite of this, the Chicanos in the South West of the United States have not mobilised in order to regain the establishment of Spanish speaking institutions. This factor can be compared to the actions taken by the Puerto Ricans, who demonstrate nationalist awareness by mobilising to maintain Spanish speaking institutions and self-governing rights after involuntary incorporation into the US in 1898. These examples indicate that the claims for national recognition and maintenance by minority groups vary (Kymlicka 2002:351, 363; Kymlicka 1995:11-12). Disempowerment of national minorities has been based on a need to eliminate the feeling of loyalty these groups have to a particular national identity since this is seen as a threat that might lead to secessionist claims. However, based on recent studies, the acceptance of the distinct nationality of national minorities has become a way of guaranteeing loyalty to the state of these groups (Kymlicka 2002:351-352, 363). This can be related to the initial allowance of linguistic diversity in the eighteenth century as a way of guaranteeing loyalty to the young nation (see section 2.2).

In comparison to national minorities, immigrant groups are composed of individuals that have voluntarily decided to leave their country of origin and immigrate to another country (Kymlicka 2002:352-355). According to the United States law of immigration, an immigrant is an individual that is "lawfully admitted for permanent residence in the United States" (usinfo.state.gov2002). Other terms used in the INS\(^7\) reports when referring to immigrants are: "aliens who are granted legal permanent residence; aliens admitted for legal permanent residence; immigrants admitted; and admissions" (usinfo.state.gov 2002). Kymlicka divides immigrant groups into two types: the immigrants that arrive legally under immigration policy and have a right to citizenship after a short period subject to fulfilling certain conditions such as learning the country's official language, its history and/or political institutions, which he calls the 'immigrant group', and the 'metrics', constituted largely by those that have entered the country illegally (Kymlicka 2002:352-355).

\(^7\) "The Immigration and Naturalization Service (INS) and the U.S. Customs Service no longer exist. Their functions and responsibilities were transferred to three agencies under the United States Department of Homeland Security (DHS): Customs and Border Protection (CBP), Immigration and Customs Enforcement (ICE), and the U.S. Citizenship and Immigration Services (USCIS)." (usa.gov 2009)
Immigrants are expected, and have traditionally accepted, to integrate into the culture of the target society, as well as learn the official language in order to acquire citizenship. Before the 1960s, the 'Anglo-conformity' model in the US required assimilation as a guarantee of loyalty and productivity in the society and public expressions of (non-Anglo) ethnicity were considered unpatriotic (see section 3.5 for a discussion of expressions of loyalty). However, most recently, immigrants have tried to renegotiate the terms of integration in favour of a more tolerant approach that allows and supports the maintenance of some aspects of their heritage (Kymlicka 2002:352-355). According to Kymlicka, in order to achieve fairer integration, the state should recognise adaptation as a long-term process that crosses generations and that special accommodation for immigrants, such as provision of services in the immigrants' mother tongue are necessary for achieving integration. In addition, he considers that it is also necessary that the identities and practices of immigrant groups are given the same degree of respect as enjoyed by the majority group with regard to their cultural identity. The second type of immigrant group, the metics, includes not only immigrants that have illegally entered the country but also those considered to be temporary migrants such as refugees or guest-workers. Metics usually put forward claims for permanent residency and access to citizenship and often consider their target country as their home. In response to their presence, western democracies are increasingly granting amnesty and citizenship (Kymlicka 2002:353-357).

Kymlicka also distinguishes African-Americans as a group due to their unique history of segregation based on race and their uprooting from their cultures of origin, language and separation from group and family members. Blacks cannot be considered as foreign citizens even though they have not been allowed as full members in the American nation (Kymlicka 2002:360-361). The civil rights movement of the 60s was an attempt to change the social boundaries placed on this group but today, they are still facing discrimination in many areas of the American society. Kymlicka claims that African-Americans as a group can be seen as denationalised since they do not belong to any other nation. This group is further divided in its demands from the state. Whereas some focus on the systems for integration others prefer to strengthen segregation in the form of nationalism in which black is redefined as a "nation" (Kymlicka 2002:360-361). Related to the issue of demands on the state, Du Bois claims that the blacks in the United States had what he called a 'double-consciousness' – a way of looking at oneself through the outsiders gaze. The black individual is divided into two selves or thoughts, i.e. that of a black individual and that of an American individual – a twoness that is in constant struggle (Du Bois 2006).
The different claims for rights can be related to Smolicz's argument that ethnic groups vary in the choice of the core values that distinguish them from other groups. Ethnic groups that are language-centred place their distinct existence in relation to other groups on the maintenance and development of their language. Under Smolicz's theory of core values these groups position their identity on linguistic core values. Usage of the community's language by an individual functions not only for communication purposes but also as an 'identity-marker', i.e. indicates belonging to that specific group. He further claims that learning a second or a third language is a way of forming bonds between speakers of different languages without depriving individuals of their linguistic heritage and is, therefore, a bridge that promotes friendship and cooperation functioning also as a linguistic resource for cultural and economic productivity at both the individual and societal levels (Smolicz 1995:236-237).

According to Fishman, the maintenance of culture in relation to ethnicity is much more strongly linked than is ethnicity and language maintenance for immigrants in the United States. Bilingualism among immigrants occurs long before the process of de-ethnisation or bi-culturalism takes place. Thus

ethnicity and culture maintenance appear to be much more stable phenomena than language maintenance. On the one hand, most immigrants become bilingual (i.e., English displaces the hitherto exclusive use of their mother tongue in certain kinds of interactions) much before they embark on de-ethnization or seriously contemplate the possibility of bi-culturalism. On the other hand, marginal but yet functional ethnicity lingers on (and is transmitted via English) long after the ethnic mother tongue becomes substantially dormant or is completely lost. Curiously enough, the lingering of marginal ethnicity prompts and supports respect, interest, and nostalgia for the ethnic mother tongue, causing language loyalists to entertain renewed hopes for revitalization even though displacement is far advanced. Thus the very resultants of deep-reaching socio-cultural change carry with them seeds of further change and of reversal (Fishman 1966:399).

Integration in the US has mainly focused on reducing inter-group conflict and improving relations between different ethnic/racial groups. The civil rights and cultural movements during the 1960s marked the change towards integration from an earlier monoculture and a similar process has led to a dualist model of integration consisting of a private ethno-American and a public American citizen. Thus, the public culture was characterised by an American identity for social cohesion, which was defined monoculturally although with some pluralist allowances (Goldberg 1994:6). Related to this is Ager's view of the projected image of a country in the construction of identity (see section 4.2.3), which can function as a motive for language policy (Ager 2001:74-75).
The American public demonstration of unity is reflected in Pavlenko and Blackledge's claim that conflicts linked to ideologies of language and identity in meetings in multilingual societies entail the negotiation of identities resulting in language choice and attitudes that are related to factors of politics and power. Negotiation is a result of inequality and takes place between individuals, majority and minority groups, as well as institutions – all differentiating in power. Identity options available to individuals within the sociohistorical context are subject to legitimisation and attribution of hierarchical value within a given contextual ideology (Pavlenko and Blackledge 2003:2-3).

The struggle between language ideologies can be seen in relation to the construction of a country's image based on multiculturalism or nationalism (Ager 2001; see section 4.2.3). For Watson, an emphasis in the direction of one of the movements implies the reduction of significance of the other. In the United States, ideas have oscillated between multiculturalism and nationalism (Watson 2000: 18). Schildkraut's (2005:3) New Jersey interview-based study shows how different ideas and images of the American national identity and people's views of the role of the participating citizen in the polity, affect their opinions about language policies. According to Perea, two motivations related to negative attitudes towards immigrants and closing of borders are identified as constituting support for official-English measures, namely the nation's or the family's economic security; and secondly racist/anti-immigrant attitudes particularly towards Latinos and Asians (Perea as cited in Schildkraut 2005:3). A third likely explanation is linked to the American way of life connected to notions of American ideals and/or the American national identity (Schildkraut 2005:4-5). In the second half of the twentieth century, reference to identity in the US began to indicate duality through the use of 'hyphenated identities', for instance Italian-American, Polish-American, and Chinese-American, etc. (Watson 2000:98) as a sign of movement towards multiculturalism. However, Mauk and Oakland write that according to the US Census 2000 Supplemental Survey, more individuals describe their ethnic ancestry as "US" or "American" rather than including a hyphenated identity (Mauk and Oakland 2005:16).

Watson (2000:38-39) identifies questions related to multiculturalism and nationalism, namely whether an American identity allows for multiculturalism, that is, with groups competing for equality of treatment, or whether immigrants should be required to work towards constructing a homogeneous entity through the commitment taken when acquiring citizenship (Watson 2000:38-39). Whatever goals are selected, their attainment is complicated by the fact that the construction of identity is complex and involves extra-linguistic factors. According to Mauk and Oakland (2005:4, 8), there are three possibly conflicting major
cultures in the US – ethnic, political-legal, and the economic and consumer cultures, which influence notions of what is regarded as 'Americanness' and national identity. The ethnic culture reflects the

Native-American civilizations, European colonial settlement, African-American slavery and immigration movements…The second is a political-legal culture based on individualism, constitutionalism and respect for the law. It tries to unite the people under ideal versions of 'Americanness', such as egalitarianism, morality and patriotism, which should be reflected in political and legal institutions. The third is an economic and consumer culture driven by corporate and individual competition which encourages profit and consumption of goods and services (Mauk and Oakland 2005:4).

Grin studies the influences that linguistic and economic processes have on each other (Grin 2003:1). His point of departure is identification of an economic problem, defined as a situation when choices have to be made for the allocation of limited resources. The notion of choice also assumes the rationality of actors' (individuals, firms and states) actions based on the goal of maximisation of utility (well-being) for the individual and profits for firms. The rationality hypothesis assumes that actors behave as if they have taken into account the costs and benefits of a specific possible action and does not guarantee that they have actually carried out an actual explicit calculus. Although, economics allows for altruistic action in the objectives of individuals, most often the individual is regarded as being concerned with their own well-being (Grin and Vaillancourt 1999:11).

Until the late 1980s, the focus had been mainly on language and ethnicity as possible contributing explanations to determining economic variables such as income from labour. However, recently there is interest in the way economic variables can affect linguistic ones (Grin and Vaillancourt 1999:14; Grin 2006:80-81). Empirical studies in the United States have shown in figures for 1990, that the labour income of Hispanic immigrants in areas with a high proportion of Hispanic population such as Arizona, California, Colorado, New Mexico, Texas, Florida and New York, was approximately 14 per cent less than the earnings of the white population if they had knowledge of English but 24 per cent less if they did not speak English. These differences were less in the rest of the country (Grin and Vaillancourt 1999:16). Thus the concentration of the group in a particular region was significant to their earnings.

Following these thoughts on language as an identity marker, with particular reference to the American society, identification is seen here as resulting from a complex process in which salience for what counts as significant for identity may shift, but is nevertheless present in the
creation of 'us' and 'them' relations. The next section takes a further look at identity and relates it to issues of multiculturalism. In this respect, two aspects are worth mentioning. Firstly, multiculturalism assumes the possibility of establishing boundaries of distinction between cultures and as a result, an identification of 'us' and 'them'. The second aspect is a consequence of the first based on the assumption that groups are discrete entities of culture, namely that there may consequentially be an over-simplification of group membership, similar to that suggested by Fishman (1991:190-191) in which a heterogeneous group e.g. Spanish speakers composed of Mexican-Americans (also referred to as Chicanos), Puerto Ricans (also called Baicuas), Caribbeans including Cubans, and Central and South Americans are often referred to as one collective under the label 'Hispanic'. According to Fishman, these different groups have only recently realised and accepted the outsider's view of them as a unified ethnic entity. Fishman (1991) further points out that in reality there are great differences between and within these groups as regards urbanisation, wealth, racial belongings (white and non-white denominations), period of arrival, reasons for immigration to the US and legal status.

3.2 Multiculturalism

The growing presence of different groups and cultural diversity in societies has led to an acknowledgement of the identity movement known as Multiculturalism. 'Politics of difference', 'identity politics', and 'the politics of recognition' are some of the terms used as its synonyms (Kymlicka 2002:327). The concept of 'multicultural' contains in its meaning distinctiveness of cultures, a universal view of the importance of culture, and implies recognition that all cultures are equal. A 'multicultural society' refers to several cultures existing in the same society although modern anthropology considers that there is no clear boundary between cultures (Watson 2000:1-2). It is also possible to some extent to link the morphological structure of the word, namely multi+culture, to ideas of separately existing cultures. Watson states that the definition of culture is problematic although it is generally defined by difference in which group belonging is based on a shared language, history, religious beliefs and moral values as well as geographical provenance (Watson 2000:1).

3.2.1 The debate on multiculturalism

Kymlicka suggests three stages for the debate concerning multiculturalism. In the first stage, before 1989, multiculturalism was seen as leaning towards communitarianism, since cultural community members were mobilised towards guaranteeing recognition and protection of the community. Communitarians see multiculturalism as giving value to the community rather
than leaving the decision of maintenance of cultural practices to the choice of the 'autonomous individual'. In this view, individual choices can destroy communities. Thus the aim is to restrict choices that can have a negative impact on the community (Kymlicka 2002:336-337). During this first stage, the communitarian conception of the individual as embedded in the roles and relationships of a society, and therefore inheriting a way of life that defines what is good, is dominant. Owing to this reasoning, individuals are products of social practices rather than capable of independent choice. During this stage, the defence of multiculturalism involved the critique of liberalism from a communitarian perspective, and minority rights were seen as a defence of the communal from liberal individualism (Kymlicka 2002:337).

In the second stage, the focus of the debate shifts from a communitarian view on minorities to the possibility of including multiculturalism within the liberal theory. This is partly a consequence of the claim that public recognition of minority rights and support for minority languages and practices fall within liberal democratic values. Kymlicka belongs to the strand of liberal culturalists that endorse the view that issues of minority culture and identity that do not clash with liberal values of freedom and equality allow for a group-differentiated rights approach (Kymlicka 2002:338-339). Critique of this perspective lies in the difficulty of defining the boundaries of distinct cultures and that the freedom and well-being of the individual is by default linked to the growth of their own culture. In this view, the formation of a bond to a given culture or a given language is a choice taken by the individual, and therefore group related rights do not need to be considered as a necessity. Accordingly, the critics see the costs of these choices as part of the responsibility of individuals and therefore not to be subsidised by the state (Kymlicka 2002:339).

Kymlicka argues against this particular liberal view since the language and culture of the individual are not choices made voluntarily but instead are consequences of birth. Also, an individual's access to their own minority language and culture may affect their ability to make meaningful choices. It is therefore unreasonable to require minorities to carry costs of e.g. language shift since members of the majority do not have equivalent expenses (Kymlicka 2002:339-340).

Kymlicka distinguishes two kinds of "collective rights" or "group rights" that fall within the liberal school of thought. One type, to which Kymlicka recommends an attitude of scepticism, are those based on intra-group relations, namely 'internal restrictions' that the group applies on its members to protect itself from internal differences of opinion including cases where the individual chooses not to abide by traditions. In this case, group solidarity is placed as primordial. The second type is based on inter-group relations and are 'external
protections' that protect the group from effects of decisions taken in the larger society that may impact on the group's existence and identity. The rights that fall within this category are language rights, land rights and representation rights. However, caution must be taken in considering that granting external protection rights to a particular minority group may lead to the marginalisation of another group – a situation that would be inconsistent with liberal principles. A reference is often made in this respect to the use of protection arguments in order to validate the system of apartheid in South Africa. In sum, the debate of multiculturalism during the second stage has mainly focused on the circumstances in which deviation from the liberal normative approach of benign neglect would be acceptable (Kymlicka 2002:340-341, 345) by some theorists.

The third stage in the conceptualisation of the debate on multiculturalism is the question of whether the processes for nation-building by the majority in liberal democracies such as promotion of a common language, perception of common membership and equal accessibility to social institutions through a common language, affect minorities in a negative way. Also, if injustices result then the question lies in whether minority rights can provide protection to those affected unjustly. Kymlicka further cites Canada, Switzerland, Belgium, and Spain as examples where government measures encourage the existence and sustainment of at least two societal cultures within the state. Kymlicka's presentation of the third stage is a departure from the debate on justification of benign neglect (Kymlicka 2002:344-347) and rather focusing on the idea that "we can only understand the politics of multiculturalism by seeing it in relation to the politics of nation-building" (Kymlicka 2002:370).

Kymlicka uses the term 'societal culture', as a culture that is concentrated in a geographical space and is based on a shared language that is used in private and public societal institutions. The use of the term 'societal' is to emphasise the fact that the focus is on shared language and social institutions instead of shared religious beliefs, family traditions and personal lifestyles (Kymlicka 2002:344-347). In the US, most Americans take part in a societal culture with English as the shared language (Kymlicka 1995:76-77) although the debate regarding Official English indicates that the current idea of societal culture is challenged especially by the language maintenance patterns of Hispanics. According to Kymlicka, the spread of Anglophones across the territory of the US in the past, the deliberate timing of individual state inclusion in the federation, and the establishment of state boundaries were influenced by the number of Anglophones in the different regions. The dominant role of English in the country has its origins in these procedures. Today, English is reinforced by laws requiring children to learn it in schools. Also knowledge of English is a condition to qualify for government
employment, entrance into the country for immigrants under 50 years of age, and a necessity for obtainment of citizenship. Given these conditions, in the third stage, minorities are left with four choices: to emigrate, to integrate and negotiate terms of integration, to seek self-government, or to accept marginalisation (Kymlicka 2002:344-348).

3.2.2. Renewed views on citizenship

In the past, there has been an assumption that non-white groups that were allowed to enter Western democracies would assimilate. However, today these immigrant groups, along with other marginalised groups, are demanding a renewed concept of 'citizenship' that is based on inclusion and accommodation rather than stigmatisation and exclusion of identities and differences (Kymlicka 2002:327). The traditional notion of a consequential relationship between citizenship rights and national integration is questioned since groups that have acquired the rights of citizenship still experience marginalisation and stigmatisation due to their socio-economic status and socio-cultural identity. This has led to a demand for a 'differentiated citizenship' (term used by Iris Marion Young as cited in Kymlicka 2002) in which "members of certain groups would be incorporated into the political community, not only as individuals, but also through the group, and their rights would depend, in part, on their group membership" (Kymlicka 2002:329). However, since these groups are heterogeneous, and composed of individuals with differing opinions, the claims and subsequent support given to each group may vary (Kymlicka 2002:329), which may, in turn, lead to conflict based on a perception of marginalisation by those groups not included in measures granting more rights.

There are two politics against inequalities in western democracies, the 'politics of redistribution' focusing on socio-economic injustices based on an economic hierarchy; and the 'politics of recognition' focusing on cultural injustices which are based on status hierarchy between groups. Since members of groups that have achieved economic equality have not experienced the removal of status inequality, the idea of attributing differentiated citizenship is very much debated (Kymlicka 2002:332-334).

The demands of ethnocultural groups – immigrants, national minorities and religious groups – for recognition and accommodation of particular distinctive identities and needs are a result of the struggle against the status hierarchy in western democracies positioning the Christian, heterosexual, white man at the top (Kymlicka 2002:334-335). It must however be added that power relations and subsequent hierarchies of status are present in most relations of social interactions and thus constitute the way western, as well as non-western states are built up.
In relation to this, Taylor (1994a:25, 40-41) states that the recognition or misrecognition by others affects the construction of identity. Taylor endorses a communitarian view that although similar to the view of multiculturalism proposed by liberals such as Kymlicka, the starting point for the construction of identity lies at the collective level and the possibility of distinguishing distinct cultural groups. According to him, Kymlicka's view only focuses on the survival of existing cultures rather than the maintenance of the culture for future generations. Taylor's approach to multiculturalism and identity within the concept of the 'politics of recognition' is an idea that individuals recognise the importance of culture in the lives of others by relating to the significance it has in their own sense of having a distinct identity and belonging. Thus, from this viewpoint, the recognition of culture is an important factor in identity construction (Taylor 1994a). For him, recognition is related to the view of the definition of the self as a dialogical process created through interaction with 'significant others' (a term introduced by George Mead as cited in Taylor 1994b). Thus the actions of individuals gain meaning in relation to the 'significant others'. Accordingly, the individual negotiates their identity and meaning in dialogue with others through a common language, used in its wider sense to not only include words but also the languages of art, gesture, etc (Taylor 1994b:79).

Nevertheless for Taylor, it is also important not to assume that different cultural forms are equal or have equal value since different cultures have different understandings of worth (Taylor 1994a:64). Taylor (1994b:98) claims that for a member of one culture to understand another culture's worth it is necessary to include Gadamer's notion of a 'fusion of horizons' in which the dialogue between people with different backgrounds serves to broaden their understanding and horizon. In this way a judgement of worth of another culture's worth would be reached by the individual transforming partially their own standards (Taylor 1994b:98). A similar idea can be said to be associated with the idea of the melting pot in the US, which however is now seen as not having been entirely successful (see section 3.1.1).

### 3.2.3 Ideologies of multiculturalism in the US

The notion of worth is also related to how meetings of cultures are recognised in political ideologies. McLaren (1994:47-55) distinguishes three types of multiculturalism in the context of the United States, namely conservative or corporate multiculturalism, liberal multiculturalism and left-liberal multiculturalism. Conservative multiculturalists aim towards the construction of the common culture by eliminating foreign languages as well as regional and ethnic dialects. They direct criticism towards the use of non-standard English and
provision of bilingual education. In this strand, ethnic groups must accept the euro-American norms of the majority in the United States before being added to the dominant culture. Also, English is viewed by its adherents as the only possible official language of the United States. Therefore although the term diversity is used, the underlying ideology is of assimilation (McLaren 1994:49). In relation to this view, it is possible to refer to the English-only and English First proponents who consider language as an assimilative tool. The requirement for citizenship related to the knowledge of English can also be linked to this view. The idea of an official language for assimilative purposes carries with it the problems related to hierarchies and acceptance of non-standard varieties. It seems to the present author that discussions of official language often take for granted a non-existence of status related issues of same language varieties – implying a hegemonic understanding of the norms to be attained, especially in the above description of conservative multiculturalism.

Liberal multiculturalism forwards the view that there is a natural equality between races – whites, African-Americans, Latinos, Asians, etc. Supporters of this position believe that individuals can compete equally in a capitalist society – leading to a position of 'benign neglect'. However, since this is not the case in the US due to the absence of social and educational opportunities that allow equal competition in the marketplace, some liberal multiculturalists believe that constraints in the cultural, social and economic areas can be changed in order to provide more equality between groups. Interestingly, liberal multiculturalism bases its ideas and norms of citizenship on Anglo-American cultural-political communities which also entails a biased starting point as regards whose values are taken as the norms and applicable to other cultural groups (McLaren 1994:51).

Left-liberal multiculturalism elevates cultural differences rather than focusing on equality of races since these, according to this point of view, suppress cultural differences of behaviour, values and social practices, among others. In this perspective, 'otherness' is exoticised and difference is placed in an authenticity related to the past. Thus there is an assumption that there is an authentic "African-American" or a "Latino" experience. Its focus on essentialism excludes the situated effects of history, culture and power. The occurrence of difference is separated from historical and social happenings. This view further ignores the role of power in the situated representations of meaning and locates/attributes authority or political correctness in advance to voices of those that have physical closeness to an oppressed individual or are themselves an oppressed individual (McLaren 1994:51-52). McLaren argues against this by stating that "one must be willing to examine personal experience and one's speaking voice in terms of the ideological and discursive complexity of
its formation" (McLaren 1994:52).

McLaren puts forward a critical and resistance multiculturalism focusing on the construction of identity and social meaning through language use and forms of representation. In line with the poststructuralist view, signs and significations are seen as constantly shifting and therefore their fixedness is only temporary and representations are consequences of social struggles over the meaning of signs (McLaren 1994:53). If one sees multiculturalism as the existence of different cultures within a state, critical multiculturalism allows for flexible group boundaries and cultural change due to individuals changing group affiliations.

Within critical and resistance multiculturalism, culture is conflictual wherein the idea of difference is central. Furthermore, differences are constituted by asymmetrical relations of power (McLaren 1994:53-54). Also, according to McLaren, the liberal and conservative approaches to multiculturalism ignore – and cannot deal with hegemonic domination and affirmation of differences at the same time. McLaren criticises the liberal view of the American society as based on a consensus in which minority aspects are not integrated but added onto the dominant structures ignoring the aspects of power and privilege that are in play. Furthermore, the liberal and conservative positions are criticised since they assume an already existing justice which only requires distribution. For, McLaren justice is constantly created and is also the locus of struggle (McLaren 1994:54-55).

Within critical multiculturalism, language has an important role in the production of experience since all experience is mediated through words. McLaren states that the relationship in the western world between language and thought is built on a system of differences based on binary opposition in which the primary term defines the norm on which cultural meaning is based. The secondary term exists in a hierarchy of dependence and in a dichotomising position. However, change is possible since for the multicultural critique, "the relationship between signifier and signified is insecure and unstable" (cf. Saussure's view of language in section 3.1.1). There is an ideological struggle between signs for the domination of a particular system of representation that legitimates a certain view on reality. Difference is then consequently viewed from within a system of relations founded on domination (McLaren 1994:55-58). Ebert exemplifies this by the use of the terms 'negro' and 'black' in the politics of race in the US. In the same way that 'negro' indicated a fixed racial difference in the 1960s, the term 'black' is used more recently by the white population to refer to the black subject with significations of criminality and violence as well as social degeneration (as cited in McLaren 1994:56).

Signifying practices are also revealed in the study by Muñoz Jr (1989:10) who claims that
the term 'Hispanic', implies a lack of recognition of the multicultural and multiracial origins of
the people of Latin America residing in the United States and their different realities and
experiences – a view that can be related to Fishman's (1991:190-191) statement that the term
'Hispanic' is in fact a very wide term for a heterogeneous group (see section 3.1). Etymologically the term is originated from "Hispania" referring to the area of the Iberian Peninsula which today is mainly Spain. The use of this term then ignores the complex racial and cultural ancestry of today's Latin Americans (McLaren 1994:57). Finally, within the context of a state, multiculturalism constituted by meetings between perceived ethnically differentiated groups also carries the possibilities of meetings between different language speakers. The identification of groups on the basis of language implies the assumption of a clear definition of boundaries between linguistic groups entailing a sense of fixedness and stability of difference. The next section looks at factors related to multilingualism.

3.3 Multilingualism
Linguistics has generally changed from its single view of the homogeneous community of
formalist and descriptive Chomskyan linguistics to a multidimensional linguistics that takes
account of extra-linguistic as well as linguistic factors (Nelde 1997:285). Due to its usage in
social arenas, the study of multilingualism involves taking into consideration factors from
different disciplinary perspectives (Clyne 1997:302) thus aiming to relate extra-linguistic and
linguistic factors.

The term 'multilingualism' can be used in two ways. On the one hand, it can refer to an
individual's knowledge of languages – also referred to as 'bilingualism'. On the other hand, it
can be used to make reference to the sociolinguistic repertoire of a society – also referred to as
'societal multilingualism' (Clyne 1997:301). Spolsky offers another, although similar, division
in which 'multilingualism' characterises any given society that has more than one language,
and 'plurilingualism' refers to the languages a member of a multilingual community has
acquired (Spolsky 2004:4). For Kaplan and Baldauf, 'bilingualism' is the knowledge of more
than two languages at the individual level – often implying that there is a dominating or "first"
language for the individual. Also, if a common language exists between the individuals in a
society it is likely that it has "some sort of 'official' status" (Kaplan and Baldauf 1997:216-217) although this does not imply a consensus or lack of resistance among all groups to the
selected common language.

Multilingualism in a society or nation is characterised either as 'de facto' or as 'official'. The former may exist in a nation that is territorially divided into different languages but in
which most of the inhabitants grow up as monolinguals as is the case of Switzerland. The latter involves public documentation and government declaration of a language as official as is the case in Canada (Clyne 1997:301-302). Linguistically diverse societies can have two types of multilingualism – symmetrical and asymmetrical multilingualism. In the former, languages share the same status, whereas in the latter there is a hierarchy between the languages (Clyne 1997:306). Societal multilingualism leads to different languages having different functions in different domains (Fasold 1984:8). The positions of the languages in a society carry implications for its speakers, that is, the more domains a language functions in a given society, the more advantages its speakers have as members of that society. These advantages are wide, ranging from aspects of education and work, to factors related to status and power.

3.3.1 Fragmentation or unification?
In spite of the view by some that multilingualism gives insight into other cultures and "cosmologies" (Phillipson 2003:3), the story of the construction of the Tower of Babel by monolinguals and the resulting multilingualism has led to fear of its potential for creating division and is often seen as undesirable (Romaine 1995:321-322). Therefore, minorities often face linguistic and cultural assimilation, since most dominant linguistic groups are not favourable to granting minority rights. Moreover, two myths are pointed out as contributing to the negative attitudes towards granting minority language rights. On the one hand, the myth argues that monolingualism is important for economic growth. On the other hand, according to the second myth, granting minority linguistic and cultural rights threatens the survival of the nation state (Skutnabb-Kangas, Phillipson and Rannut 1995:3, 5-6). The same concerns regarding insecurity may exist in state nations. With regard to this, the present study looks at the perceptions of insecurity in the US.

Crawford suggests that three possible types of responses are distinguishable in relation to language diversity. The first response regards language diversity as something minor but which should be changed. The second response places multilingualism as a threat to harmony and wealth, and therefore needs to be eliminated. Thirdly, language diversity can be viewed as a cultural asset and a human rights issue. Crawford further adds that the choice between these alternatives is a personal value judgment (Crawford 2000:2). The truth value of the claim in the second response can be investigated by looking at real situation examples. Crawford also states that there is a need for a policy regarding bilingualism in the US (Crawford 2000:2). Linguistic minority groups as well as others, such as bilingual teachers and civil libertarians,
view policies restricting languages as a threat and also perceive English-only proponents as members of far right politics (Crawford 2000:4).

The idea that national unity can only be achieved by having one language can be traced to the nineteenth century philosophers Herder and Humboldt. For them, nation and culture are founded on language. With regard to this, two different notions for the monolingual nation-state in Europe can be distinguished – the national romantic vision and the republican ideology. The former views a shared language and culture as a uniting factor for the nation as a collective identity. This vision often involves the oppression of minority languages. The latter, the republican ideology emphasises freedom, equality and fraternity for all within the nation regardless of the language used privately. Still, the republican vision also considers a shared language as important. Additionally, in both visions, higher status is given to the language used by the dominant group and includes a disregard for the actual sociolinguistic variation within its borders (Phillipson 2003:3, 41-42).

The formation of nations in the nineteenth century was an example of aggregating different communities under one label, which is one of the processes by which societal multilingualism develops. Linguistic diversity can also arise as a consequence of migratory movements. The phenomenon of migration can be related to Tönnies' (1887/2001; 1887/1963 as cited in Guibernau and Rex 1997:2, 7; Jenkins 2008:132) terms of 'Gemeinschaft' and 'Gesellschaft', in which the former refers to a primary type of community in which bonds are created through kinship, shared customs, beliefs, and language as well as the same locality or neighbourhood. This primary community also has a myth about its origin and has a strong sense of bonding and belonging. Whereas Gemeinschaft is considered to characterise a traditional society, Gesellschaft is the link created by individuals in the modern society when they meet for a purpose. Thus there is an aspect of interest or exchange in the relationship (see also Durkheim's 1933 terms of 'mechanic solidarity' for similarity as a bond and 'organic solidarity' or interdependent complementarity of function as a bond for related ideas of community to Gemeinschaft and Gesellschaft respectively). According to the present author, it is possible to argue that the concept of 'Gemeinschaft' can be related to the goals of assimilation in the sense that there is a core identity that exists in which language has a role linked to Tönnies description that "[T]he general use of a shared language, with its real possibility of understanding what another person is saying, brings human hearts together" (Tönnies 1887/2001:35). To some extent, the idea of integration relates to Gesellschaft through participation of individuals in public space and semi-public space, as well as in the public sphere.
For Fasold, linguistic contact can occur due to migration (for reasons of control of territory and of smaller sociocultural groups, or through immigration); 'imperialism' (due to colonisation, annexation and 'economic imperialism'); federation (in which one state has political rule over various ethnic groups or nationalities); and border area multilingualism (in which borders and sociocultural group belonging do not coincide). These processes are not mutually exclusive and can be simultaneous. All four processes are visible in the history of the US, i.e. the acquisition of Mexico in 1848 is an annexation-type imperialism, as well as a movement of ethnic borders (Fasold 1984:9-12) for instance in the case of migration of Anglophone speakers into the annexed areas; or as in the case of migration of large groups of Americans taking up residence in the area. Fasold further indicates that a case of forced federation may be taken from the perspective of the Native Americans in the southwest part of the country (Fasold 1984:9-12). Multilingualism exists in all regions where state/country languages meet geographically. In the case of the US-Mexican border, multilingualism is a product of the movement of people and daily contact between individuals and authorities from both countries.

Presently, although immigrant languages go through the process of bilingualism and language shift, a constant flow of immigrants maintains multilingualism in the US (Spolsky 2004:110) aided for instance by possibilities provided by the Internet and lower travel costs. The term 'commuter nation', which was first applied to the travel patterns of Puerto Ricans, is used to describe the behaviour of other groups (Ager 2001:113). Commuters and migrants creating the 'commuting nation' often create circumstances for the appearance of bilingualism in both the target and native countries. This contrasts with past immigrant patterns whereby the immigrant lost touch with their home country (Ager 2001:115). According to Gonzalez and Melis (2001:47), the Spanish language is seen as a threat in the United States. The Americanisation movement sees the "new" immigrants (mainly Latino and Asian) as less capable and less positive to learning English therefore posing a threat to the position of English and to the process of Americanisation. Valdes (as cited in Gonzalez and Melis 2001:9) claims that not only are the growing numbers of immigrants in the US seen as a threat, multilingualism is connected to un-American. In his study of the debate in the US regarding English as an official language, Crystal (1997) compiles the pro-Official English arguments from different studies, namely that English is a bond for political unity; multilingual policies are expensive and take away the incentive to learn English and reduces immigrants chances to better paid jobs; bilingual education programmes are taught by teachers with inadequate proficiency in English creating socially inferior varieties, i.e. "ghetto
dialect”; English-immersion programmes facilitate transition into mainstream classes; bilingual programmes are used to maintain cultural identity and to reduce integration; non-immigrants are sometimes forced into bilingualism in school environments or to be eligible for a professional position, since monolingualism in English is insufficient; and finally since there is difficulty in deciding when official status should be given on the basis of the number of speakers of a particular language, official recognition should only be given to English to avoid the risk of conflict (Crystal 1997:122-130). On the other hand, the anti-official position holds that the majority of immigrants are assimilating well especially second generation thus there is no risk for political fragmentation; There is motivation to learn English as it facilitates success; Limits on cultural pluralism restricting and controlling self-expression of minorities will result if a bill on Official English is introduced; Monolingualism is not a guarantee for social harmony since religion, politics may cause conflict; Boundaries between public and private discourse and the definition of 'official' with regard to language is difficult to establish. To this effect, freedom of expression is put at risk since the public domain would dominate over, and affect, the private domain; Removal of resources combined with an emphasis on English will damage language stability; and finally foreign language knowledge would benefit international business and political diplomacy (Crystal 1997:117-128).

Multilingualism is a part of everyday life for the majority of people and institutions in the world (Phillipson 2003:3) but there exists an expressed homogeneity of the state which is mostly based on cultural or linguistic aspects (Phillipson 2003:58). This attitude is also reflected in the study of language. Although only 30 per cent of the population in the world is monolingual, linguistic models have always taken monolingualism as the norm (Oksaar 1996:8).

According to Clyne (1997:304) enforcement, support, acceptance, tolerance, or rejection of multilingualism or special language status are often visible in language policies and/or are expressed in community attitudes. In a similar vein, Appiah claims that since most modern states are multilingual, management of language is complex and that both the role of language as a marker of identity and as an instrument of citizenship should be taken into account in policy making procedures (Appiah 2005:104-105). In addition, Oksaar (1996:8) claims that language policies drawn for facilitating linguistic integration of minorities sometimes ignore the fact that cultural values, such as an individual's minority language may have emotional value. This oversight may affect group relations. Oksaar further claims that such abstract factors are sometimes lost to policy makers since they are difficult to account for in statistical information. Freindreis and Tatalovich's (1997) investigation based on the 1992 American
National Elections Study (NES) looks at the extent of mass support for official-English legislation. Using five hypothesis from previous studies regarding the cause and nature of the English-only discussion, i.e. racism, ethnic rivalry, class politics, as well as political and cultural issues, they conclude that support for official-English is wide; insufficient evidence is obtained to state that support is due to partisanship based on social-class or racial/ethnic antagonism; and attitudes to official-English are related to symbolic views of national identity and cultural diversity. They further claim that the significance of core values and conflict of values will increase in importance in the public and scholarly discourse, and in political debate.

The next section will deal with how a group can be defined as a community from a language perspective since definitions of group boundaries influence which individuals are affected by language policy measures as these are often group-directed.

3.4 Speech community

The discussion of multilingualism implies an existence of a distinct monolingual group which is affected by the appearance of other distinct language groups. Bearing this in mind, it becomes necessary to look at the different definitions of a community identified by language, namely the speech community – also referred synonymously to as a 'linguistic community'⁸ (Hudson 1998:24) and its implications for understanding the language situation in the US. This is in line with the linguistic anthropological view mentioned by Duranti which assumes that the existence of a language variety entails a community of speakers and that the community serves as a referential point for both the individuals using the variety and the researcher studying language use in the community (Duranti 1997:72).

The sociological use of 'community' refers to a group of individuals that share knowledge as well as possessions or behaviours. Linguists use this term in the combination 'speech community' to identify another type of social organisation. The concept of 'speech community' emphasises language practices and unity, and is viewed as a more natural way of distinguishing groups for sociolinguistic enquiry than depending on geographical criteria alone (Mesthrie 2000:37) as political boundaries often cut across speech communities existing in geographical language variety continuums. This view, i.e. that perceptions of common language practices sometimes do not equate to formally established geographical boundaries is in line with Moerman's (1965) emic emphasis on categories in which identification departs

---

⁸ 'Linguistic community' is not to be confused with 'language community' which is "sometimes used to discuss the superset of speakers of the same language in different parts of the world" (Mesthrie 2000: 37).
from culture and depends on the beliefs of the individual. The problem with these perspectives is their reliance on relative views which may affect the establishment of categories or common language practices based on who the researcher asks. This would mean that the same study may give different results if the categories by which the study is initiated differ.

3.4.1 Constructions of speech communities

For a multilingual community to be considered a speech community it is necessary that it has shared rules of speaking and interpreting language usage (Mesthrie 2000:37). Mesthrie combines existing definitions of speech community and states that its core meaning is of a group of people that have frequent contact with each other through a shared language or have common ways of interpreting language usage (Mesthrie 2000:38). The phenomenon of geographical language continuum brings difficulties to the issue described as "common" and "shared" since, as mentioned above, the question then arises as to who defines the shared features?

According to Bloomfield, a group of individuals that interact through speech, i.e. that share a system composed of speech-signals, form a speech community (Bloomfield 1933:29, 42), which according to him is also the "most important kind of social group" (Bloomfield 1933:42). However he also points out that the boundaries of language are not coterminous with economic, political or cultural grouping since cultural phenomena such as religion can sometimes unite groups that otherwise form distinct speech communities. The political unit of the United States includes groups that do not speak the English language such as American Indians, Spanish speakers and immigrants that have not undergone assimilation through language acquisition (Bloomfield 1933:42) and shift. Speech communities are also of different sizes, and members' proficiency in the different varieties that exist within the community can vary (Bloomfield 1933:43, 45).

Hymes (1974:47) challenges Bloomfield's definition of speech community, by claiming that sharing the same linguistic knowledge does not automatically entail that members of a community have a sentiment of belonging and unity. For Hymes, there is a difference between being a participant in a speech community and acquiring membership in a community. He clarifies that it is not enough to have knowledge of the "patterns of speaking as well as of grammar" or a definition based on interaction since criteria for membership in a community may vary between different groups (Hymes 1974:50-51). According to Hymes the speech community has its point of departure in the social, thus a social group needs to be
identified (Hymes 1974:47). This is in line with the reversal of Bucholz’s image of the speech community as "a language-based unit of social analysis" by Patrick (2001:577) to suggest the view of the speech community as a "socially-based unit of linguistic analysis". The argument for viewing speech communities as social constructs is exemplified by Salzman in the difference attached to Indian English and American English in which speakers may not be seen as belonging to the same speech community since the varieties and the rules for speaking are different enough to distinguish the two groups although both varieties have a common base (Salzmann 1993:194).

Hymes writes that it is necessary for linguistics to relate language use to the meanings that usage carries in the social thus "the starting point of description is not a sentence or text, but a speech event; not a language, but a repertoire of ways of speaking; not a speech community defined in equivalence to a language, but a speech community defined through the concurrence of rules of grammar and rules of use" (Hymes 1974:120).

Hudson (1998:29-30) states that the identification of an objective speech community used in sociolinguistic analysis does not exist and is instead dependent on subjective notions of community identification. Thus, claims regarding social types e.g. 'Londoner' or 'American', are subjective and do not validate the arrangement of the sociolinguistic reality in objective terms of speech communities (Hudson 1998). This approach is linked to Le Page and Tabouret-Keller's (1985) view of the individual as using language as a means to identify with the group/groups they choose. This can further be linked to Corder's view of a speech community as "made up of people who regard themselves as speaking the same language; it need have no other defining attributes. In other words, a speech community is defined by its speakers' beliefs rather than objectively by its language" (Corder 1973:53; cf. Moerman in section 3.1). This definition may be seen as allowing variation in the proficiency of the speakers and self-identification, and can be indirectly related to Bolinger's account for human group forming and the existence of an infinite number of speech communities. According to Bolinger, individuals are motivated by many factors to form communities; among them is security, self-identification, and religion (Bolinger 1975:333). This claim can also mean that a person's identification to a specific community can vary depending on the circumstances.

From Morgan's perspective, the discussions on speech communities are based on two different views of how language and discourse are defined. On the one hand, there is an "objective" linguistic analysis that does not take into account social beliefs, attitudes, and political aspects, among others, and which often reflects the view of the dominant culture, e.g. in the choice of a national language or a prestige dialect. On the other hand, there is a view of
speech communities which includes representation through language and discourse, and contributes to the maintenance, enforcement and reproduction of cultural hegemony. Representation through language forms the framework whereby the individual can meaningfully take part in a society (Morgan 2006:3-4).

According to Morgan, the 'speech community' (with boundaries varying from the level of nation-state to chat rooms) concept involves the view of the social construction of language and

is recognizable by the circulation of discourse and repetition of activity and beliefs and values about these topics, which are constantly discussed, evaluated, corroborated, mediated, and reconstituted by its members. One's awareness of the issues is determined by whether and to what degree speech communities are in crisis. For some, awareness is ingrained in the cultural fabric and thus represents unmarked usage that encompasses the community's historicity, politics, ideology, representation, and so on. Though these values are agreed upon, that does not necessarily mean that there is complete consensus about the implementation of these principles. Rather, what is at stake is knowledge of the symbolic, market, and exchange value of varieties and styles within and across speech communities (Morgan 2006:5).

From the point of view of language contact in the context of the United States, Morgan's statement of varieties and styles can include languages in a multilingual society and the domains in which they appear.

Duranti (1997:76-78) claims that alternative norms mark resistance to decisions on official language and are significant strategies in the construction of parallel social and ethnic identities e.g. maintaining a variety as the unique symbol of ethnic identity or as attributing prestige to it due to its link to economically strong groups.

Duranti proposes "a speech community to be the product of the communicative activities engaged in by a given group of people" (Duranti 1997:82). This definition allows for the view of a speech community as a non-static entity dependent on human communicative activities originating in the social rather than an already constituted object of inquiry. Furthermore, this definition can be related to Salzman's view that social activities may overlap thus leading to an overlapping of speech communities, and therefore, allowing for vertical membership from the local, national, regional, and global or horizontal inclusion by the interaction of social groups. In this way, individuals can belong to several speech communities and can adjust their speech towards a specific community (Salzmann 1993:194). The implication for multilingual societies is that group boundaries are constantly being recreated, or what might be termed 're-fixed', at an informal level even though there are available labels attached to "established" groups (cf. Appiah 2005 in section 3.1.2).
3.5 Loyalty and trust

Connor (2007) puts forward loyalty as an emotion that is present in different layers of social interaction – the family, communal and national levels – and is manifested in action referred to as acts of patriotism, such as waving a national flag. Feelings of loyalty may lead to collective action related to issues of identity. According to Connor (2007:77), "the loyalties a nation's citizens express are critical in understanding the identity of the country and its people". Loyalty is further defined as a reciprocal emotion between the individual and the collective in which for instance national loyalty gives an identity and belonging to the actor, which is itself reinforced and reproduced as a concept by the behaviour and actions of the individuals of the nation. Also, national loyalty is upheld by a combination of common language, geography, history, traditions, among others. Social institutions – in which the government is central due to its control of society through legislation, education and military – have an active role in building loyalty towards the state.

Connor's (2007) view of loyalty is of a constructed concept that is used to include or exclude actors by creating an emotional attachment to a group and a sense of belonging among its members. The emotion of loyalty does not exist without the presence of the Other and the existence of the Other is often accompanied by conflict and exclusion. It is in these circumstances of difference that a separate identity is defined.

Within the context of the nation, Wolff (1968:60-65) distinguishes two types of loyalty as obligation or commitment, namely contractual loyalty (similar to civic nationalism in Connor 2007) which is realised through promises of commitment; and natural loyalty (similar to ethnic nationalism in Connor 2007), which only includes those who are born in the country in question. Since it is assumed that one is naturally loyal to the country in which one is born, ethnic nationalisms assume loyalty by right of birth. In contrast, contractual loyalty is regarded as a weaker form of loyalty, which must be proven (Wolff 1968; Connor 2007). For Connor (2007:81), if an actor is to be included based on citizenship loyalty, he/she needs to possess the specific cultural capital such as race, colour, ethnicity and religion or else take the position of the Other. In the relationship between a state and an individual, this would entail being characterised by labels such as 'foreigner'. Acquisition of the language of the host country is often linked to issues surrounding the integration of immigrants and therefore can be seen as a concrete example of expected expression of contractual loyalty. For example in Schmid's (2001) study of the US, the events towards the end of the nineteenth century are seen as linking the English language to loyalty and the idea of an American national identity.
Language loyalty is defined as the conscious maintenance of an individual's mother tongue in language contact situations with different ethnic communities, and attempts at language maintenance by a minority group are regarded as manifestations of ethnic loyalty. The term 'language loyalty' is therefore connected to language maintenance (Niculescu 1996:715-16) which can only be defined as such if circumstances suggest preference for language shift (Coulmas 2005:158). From the perspective of minorities, resistance to language shift may be influenced by factors such as a common collective memory, whether true or false, or a perception of an ethnic identity (Niculescu 1996:715). Also relevant, is Edwards' (1985:49) statement that language and the fate of its users are connected so that if a language dies or declines it is because the situation in which the speakers of that language find themselves has also changed. Furthermore, and in relation to language contact, Swann claims that code-switching may be perceived as an action of demonstrating loyalty to the mother tongue since it is a way of accessing different social identities by reference to language (Swann 2000:171).

The maintenance of a language – or language loyalty as defined by Niculescu – allows for the possibility that there is a link between the social and ethnic identity of a community and the language that it speaks (Niculescu 1996:719). In this respect, Nelde (1997:288) cautions that interpretation of statistics in census and public opinion surveys often cannot account for the role that language loyalty and prestige play in the identity of an individual.

Individuals and groups cannot be isolated entities and are in fact in constant interaction. Even if language groups were to use a common language, and by implication demonstrate loyalty outwardly through language, it can be assumed that proficiency levels are important to avoid misunderstandings that may lead to negative attitudes between groups. Gumperz states that initial situational difficulties in mutual understandings in inter-ethnic contact and individuals that have different backgrounds may, in the long-term, become value-loaded. As a result, misunderstandings may serve to increase the gap of difference due to conflict of goals and values, which are then subsequently linked symbolically to identity through recurrence. Different language use, based on the choices of words, phrases or tones can affect trust between participants in an interaction (Gumperz 1982:3, 8). According to Seligman, trust is necessary for a society to function. The problem of trust has become important in the modern social and political orders because of the fragmentation of identities that have followed modernity in the western world (Seligman 1997:6, 16).

For Seligman, trust is a modern phenomenon (Seligman 1997:6) in the sense that modern societies exist on an ideology of trust based on inter-related networks of trust. In human interactions the problem of risk is dealt with by referring to trust (Seligman 1997:8-9).
Seligman argues that a form of trust between individuals in a given society is necessary for the maintenance of social order (Seligman 1997:7). If familiarity no longer forms the basis for solidarity then the preconditions of trust also diminish (Seligman 1997:172). Thus, language can be seen as a tool that has a significant role in constructing familiarity. If patterns for language use change then a lack of trust between the participants in an interaction may arise. This can also be related to expressions of patriotism as described by Connor (2007) and the requirement for outward expressions of loyalty, which minimise uncertainty regarding someone else's intentions. For Seligman, trust is a situation of vulnerability due to a certain degree of ignorance or basic uncertainty regarding someone else's motives (Seligman 1997:22). Departing from Seligman's line of thinking, a speech community with members sharing norms of language usage is a basis for the creation of trust. This entails that individuals that do not share the same language may have difficulty in creating a feeling of certainty and a familiarity of interaction with their interlocutors, and consequently, may experience difficulty in building trust, which in turn affects the functioning of the society in which these individuals interact. In the case of this study, the building of trust between Americans and immigrants is at stake. In the context of the US, Nicolau and Valdivieso (1992:317-318) state that the spread of assumptions claiming that Hispanics are reluctant to learn English or accept its role in the American society has promoted ethnic tensions that negatively affect Hispanic integration. According to them, these suspicions of Hispanics have led members of the American society to send Hispanics a message that reads: "We don't trust you – we don't like you – we don't think you can fit in – you are too different – and there seem to be far too many of you".

Even though there may be resistance to or acceptance of a certain group, relations and contact between different groups are inevitable and result in the establishment of hierarchies based on what is considered to have legitimate value. In light of this, the next section will deal with notions of power and participation of the individual in different social contexts.

3.6 Habitus and symbolic domination

For Bourdieu, all linguistic exchanges are relations of power between speakers or groups. In explaining social relations and identities, Bourdieu presents the concept of 'habitus' as the social structures that each individual has programmed within them and which affects their behaviour and their understanding of the world around them (Bourdieu 1991:37). Habitus is thus "a set of dispositions which incline agents to act and react in a certain way. These dispositions generate practices, perceptions and attitudes which are 'regular' without being
consciously co-ordinated or governed by any 'rule'' (Bourdieu 1991:12). The habitus thus governs an individual's practices and beliefs and also determines an individual's linguistic behaviour and value judgements regarding language (Spolsky 2004:186). The behaviour of an individual is dependent on the social views, norms and practices within a social context whereby certain ways are seen as more appropriate than others. These choices of what is most adequate are part of a long historical process. The emergence of a dominant language or a set of linguistic practices is a result of historical conflict (Bourdieu 1991:5).

The habitus is not only produced by the market but is also significant in its reproduction (Bourdieu 1991:81-82). Bourdieu uses the terms 'field' or 'market' to refer to a "structured space of positions in which the positions and their interrelations are determined by the distributions of different kinds of resources or 'capital'" (1991:14). The field/market is the place of action where individuals are in constant struggle to either maintain or change the distribution of capital (Bourdieu 1991:14). Examples of markets are for instance the linguistic, labour, political, economic or educational markets (Bourdieu 1991:298). The market is linked to the individual by its influence on the types of competence an individual acquires and the constraints imposed on its usage. In other words, the individual has access to certain forms of speaking and also speaks in different ways depending on the market they are interacting in. The use of language is based on the practices that are considered legitimate in that particular society (Bourdieu 1991:81-82) and with regard to that particular market. Each individual, through experience, has unconsciously acquired a notion of the social values of different linguistic uses in a variety of markets. This entails that the individual must possess knowledge of the value of one's own linguistic repertoire which also indicates the position of the individual in the market (Bourdieu 1991:82). Consequently, since individuals act within specific contexts, it is the relation between habitus and markets that serve as the base for practices and perceptions (Bourdieu 1991:14).

Bourdieu suggests that there are different types of capital – 'economic capital' dealing with material wealth; 'social capital' (Bourdieu 1991:14, 230), which refers to significant and influential contacts an individual has in the given society; 'cultural capital' which is the scope of the individual's knowledge and acquisition of skills; and 'symbolic capital' which refers to the accumulated status, prestige, reputation, fame originating from the capital of other fields and in which linguistic power plays a significant role. Also the acquisition of one type of capital can be converted and used in another market e.g. education can lead to better employment possibilities (Bourdieu 1991:14; Mesthrie and Deumert 2000:343). For Bourdieu, the position of an individual in the social space is in terms of the position they
occupy in the fields and the organisation of power in the various fields as regards the different types of capital. The symbolic capital is a separate capital in the sense that its form, such as prestige, reputation and fame, is dependent on the perception and recognition of the different kinds of capital as legitimate. Bourdieu sees the economic field as dominating and imposing its structure on the other fields – although he also gives a prominent position to cultural capital (Bourdieu 1991:230, 244). In my reading of Bourdieu, this also entails that that the hierarchical positioning of the individual in the economic field will ultimately define their positioning in the other fields and, in light of Mesthrie and Deumert's interpretation of Bourdieu, in which an individual's capital is dynamic and therefore changes throughout their life (Mesthrie and Deumert 2000:342-344), an immigrant individual must first achieve a positioning in the economic field to be an active member of a society and thus have a strong chance of increasing their symbolic capital. Acquisition of specific education is also important to the individual but its obtainment requires long-term involvement and commitment – a possibility that is often unavailable to newly arrived immigrants, especially if they have immigrated for economic reasons. A further consequence of this line of thought is that any attempts at integration or assimilation must come through strengthening a position in the economic field of the immigrant individual. According to Bourdieu, the market is a place of struggle over symbolic power and those speakers that do not have the legitimate competence are subject to exclusion from domains in which this competence is used (Bourdieu 1991:54, 242). With regard to the official English debate taken up in this study, an indication of existential threat is perceived in the linguistic marketplace due to the arrival of immigrants who maintain their language, particularly Hispanics. This thesis attempts to map the perception and space occupied by these immigrants in the social through the attitudes expressed in newspaper articles.

The accumulation of capital is related to an ideology of legitimate competence that entails that those that have the dominant competence will work towards the reproduction of this competence as the only legitimate capital (Bourdieu 1991:56). Thus, symbolic domination is the process of imposition of norms by the dominant group(s) as regards the legitimate competence to be used in the formal markets (Mesthrie and Deumert 2000:344). The distinction as dominant is only guaranteed if access to the means of production of it is unequally distributed (Bourdieu 1991:56), a factor that is guaranteed by the exclusion mentioned above of those that do not possess the legitimate competence. This is interesting in the case of language, since Spolsky (2004) and Grin (2006:81) both state that the more a language is used, the more value it gains – setting it apart from "standard economic goods".
This view is in contrast to my reading of Bourdieu's perspective in which the value of the individual in the marketplace reduces as more people acquire the same skill.

According to Bourdieu, linguistic utterances are the result of the dialogue between the linguistic market and the linguistic habitus, a subset of the social habitus of an individual. Linguistic habitus includes not only grammatical knowledge but also communicative competence (Bourdieu 1991:37). The subset of dispositions comprising the linguistic habitus influences the future linguistic practices of the individual. In certain linguistic markets, some products have higher value than others and the practical competence (communicative competence) of the individual is the ability to produce the expressions that are valued in the specific markets, a competence that is unequally distributed in societies (Bourdieu 1991:37).

The distribution of linguistic capital is also linked to the distribution of other types of capital which help to locate the individual in the social. This means that linguistic variation locates speakers in a society (Bourdieu 1991). The individual that has the most linguistic capital has advantages in the social space. The individual gains advantage in the given society if their linguistic capital is unequally distributed and as such the capital is awarded higher value (Bourdieu 1991:18). This may also apply to the language the individual speaks in a multilingual society. Regarding Spolsky's claim that the value of a language increases the more people there are that use the language (Spolsky 2004:6), it can be argued that this is only applicable if one sees language as an entity and not as containing varying social status conferred to different linguistic variations. In other words, one might say that a language gains higher value – using Spolsky's meaning – if one million people speak it rather than ten thousand. However within that group of a million, maintenance of difference through social hierarchy entails that some linguistic expressions within that language variety are more valued. Consequently, those that have acquired those sought after expressions are at an advantage in that given society – using Bourdieu's line of thought. Looking at the ideological debates regarding bilingual education of working-class Latino-immigrant families in Colorado and California, Galindo concludes that the linguistic capital of the group is dependant on recognition from social institutions such as teachers and officials and not so much on whether members of communities possess them or not. Galindo sees Latino parents as excluded from participating in their children's schooling because their linguistic resources are devalued. Editors of monolingual newspapers as well as policy makers disregard the need for bilingual competencies and the possibilities of multilingualism in a global economy. He further states that in anti-bilingual education discussions and accounts of previous immigrant groups, the English language and the processes of linguistic assimilation followed by language loss are
presented as a natural and unavoidable phases towards becoming an American (Galindo 1997).

Therefore, the concept 'linguistic market' can be related to the value of the languages spoken in multilingual societies. In the context of this study, this would mean that the use of English may have a higher symbolic value in the American market, which is transferred to the value of the verbal production of the speaker using English. Thus, in this way, different languages have different values in the marketplaces in the US and, as Bourdieu (1991:46) states, the "integration into a single 'linguistic community', which is a product of the political domination endlessly reproduced by institutions capable of imposing universal recognition of the dominant language, is the condition for the establishment of relations of linguistic domination" (Bourdieu 1991). In other words, people who speak a dominant language or have acquired the dominant linguistic features have advantages, but it is important to note that it is not the dominant language itself that has power rather its speakers. According to Bourdieu, reference to an official language as the language reinforces its established authority and dominance. The official language representing the state and social uses through institutions becomes or is the "objective" norm by which linguistic practices are measured (Bourdieu 1991:45-46). Symbolic domination only functions if a linguistic practice is given recognition from a group as a form of symbolic capital and thus gains legitimacy. A legitimate language is therefore dependent on the recognition in the society for its legitimacy to be validated (Bourdieu 1991:72-73).

Criticism to Bourdieu's model is that he does not give significance to the possible resistance of symbolic domination and that he focuses on relations of power rather than the idea of solidarity (Mesthrie and Deumert 2000:350). An aspect of resistance may be situations in which the use of non-recognised (in terms of accepted forms based on legitimacy) linguistic products may carry value in dominated in-group relations. In other words their usage attributes status to the individual within the minority or powerless group. Consequently, in non-dominant groups, a certain capital may be seen as more valuable to acquire than others in order to mark resistance and/or solidarity.

In light of the difference of value of the different types of capitals, and more specifically, the difference of value of the various languages in the marketplace, the next section looks at issues surrounding language shift and language maintenance.

3.7 Language shift and language maintenance
Contact between different language groups due to immigration is expected to lead to the new
arrivals adopting the host country’s language as their main mode of communication in the society. For Fishman (as cited in Mesthrie and Leap 2000:253), language shift is a gradual process by which the individual or minority community replaces their original socialising language with another language. This can be related to Clyne’s view that it is necessity that determines the long-term usage of languages (Clyne’s 1997:308). Bearing in mind Clyne's statement of language usage based on necessity, it is important to consider aspects of intolerance and lack of structural/institutional support for using or maintaining minority languages. According to the present author, these factors are primary and determine the long-term necessity that individuals feel towards usage of certain languages or language varieties rather than others.

Ager states that linguistic insecurity may result in language shift since speakers become aware of the low prestige connected to their language or language variety. He further claims that the protection and preservation of linguistic identity, as well as the more general identity of the community, is essentially connected to the community’s own self-image (Ager 1999:9). This view is derived from Fishman’s (1991:28, 96, 179, 197) claim that a positive self-image of a community may halt or reverse language shift processes. Moreover, referring to the perception of external threats affecting social, technical and cultural changes in a particular society, Ager claims that groups within powerful communities, with resources and self-awareness, will feel less insecure than groups that occupy a weaker position in a given society (Ager 1999:9).

It is not possible to discuss language shift without referring to the opposed process, namely language maintenance, i.e. "the continuing use of a language in the face of competition from a regionally and socially more powerful language" (Mesthrie and Leap 2000:253). The size of the group of speakers may affect language maintenance patterns e.g. Hispanics in the US are said to maintain their language since new immigrant groups are constantly arriving. Other factors are language status and economic value of the language (Clyne 1997:309), which can be related to Bourdieu's concept of the 'linguistic market' in which the choice of code reflected in an individual's linguistic behaviour indicates the legitimised capital (Mesthrie and Deumert 2000:349). Furthermore, language maintenance is also dependent on the motivation or power demonstrated by its group of speakers. According to Spolsky (2004:204), although Spanish speakers in the US have gained recognition in the political sphere as voters, there is no significant mobilisation by members of this group towards reversing the present language shift processes towards English.
Furthermore, what factors – language, dress, religion etc. – carry identity and can be perceived as subjected to domination is dependent on what Smolicz (1995) calls "core values". He claims that groups have core cultural values that are fundamental to their existence and that some groups may place language as a core value (Smolicz 1995), an action which makes language a possible referent for security. According to Smolicz, maintenance of a language is best accomplished in groups in which language is a part of other core values, such as historical consciousness, religion or family cohesion rather than when language alone is the value marking identity (Smolicz 1995:235-237; Smolicz cited in Clyne 1997:310; see also Smolicz cited in Ager 2001:101-102 for expressions of core cultural values in Polish, Chinese and Welsh communities in Australia).

According to Clyne, Smolicz's "core theory" encounters the problem of what a "group" is, since constellations may vary within large communities due to political, religious or social reasons (Clyne 1997:310). Another possible argument against Smolicz's emphasis on language maintenance through language being one of several core values is that there is a greater tendency to create group boundaries and more differentiated groups since identity becomes more specific, which may result in greater occurrences of inter-group conflict. In other words, the greater the number of features (or core values) members have to have in order to become part of a group, the greater the possibility that smaller groups will form and the greater the tendency for inter-group friction. In other words, if language forms the tool by which individuals can communicate, then the higher the proficiency acquired due to communication, the greater the tendency to identify with the language and thereby the group/individuals that speak it. This is then the belief that instrumental use of language can lead to intrinsic identification in which language becomes what Smolicz calls a "core value". However, if language is only a part of a set of other core values, then membership into a specific group can be very restricted, since the new member's characteristics needs to be compatible with several factors.

Smolicz's view is related to Réaume's view that language and culture are connected since language provides the conceptual frames for expression and a way of living (Réaume 1994). This can be further related to the Sapir-Whorf hypothesis in which an individual's perception of the world is affected by the language they speak and its culture-based categories that serve to organise the world (as cited in Wardaugh 2002). Thus, the protection of a specific culture can be achieved to some extent by protecting the language in which that culture is expressed. Réaume further sees language as a participatory good in which its usage, maintenance and
development is a collective action and further argues for the right for linguistic security\(^9\) as a group right, bearing in mind the definition of right in which "X has a right if an aspect of X’s wellbeing is sufficient reason to justify imposition of duties on others" (Réaume 1994:120, 127) and further states that:

The right to linguistic security, then, can be understood, first, as the right to pursue normal processes of language transmission and maintenance without interference. This right would preclude any attempt to prohibit use of the language in the normal range of contexts or to prohibit the education of children of the group in the language (Réaume 1994:129).

This is mainly accomplished through laws – and thus causing impact based on its collective effect. Secondly, Réaume relates linguistic security to the contexts or domains in a society where language can be used to reflect unequal relations of power e.g. subtle forms of interference in language use which maintain inequality such as organising governmental institutions by taking for granted that individuals will speak the language of the majority. Thus organising social structures such as establishing a monolingual school system or labour market may force members of minority language speakers to assimilate linguistically – a result achieved without explicit coercion through law (Réaume 1994:129-130). Bearing in mind Réaume's view relating linguistic security to group rights, the question then arises to what extent the majority e.g. in the US, has a duty towards providing measures of ensuring immigrant minority language maintenance, if one takes account that the state has limited resources to distribute. This aspect can be linked to Bloomfield's (1933:55-56) claim that in the US, immigrants, especially children of immigrants, often undergo language shift. However, the more educated the parents, the greater the possibility of their children becoming bilingual. Thus, in the less educated groups, language shift is more common. In this way, group formations can be said to vary even within subgroups. Studies have nevertheless shown that language shift is often accomplished by the third generation e.g. Veltman's (1983:213) study indicates that immigrants in the US shift to English closer to the second generation gap rather than to the third generation. However this trend may change if one takes account of Clyne's (1997:310) claim that the cultural value system of a society may transform and affect the position of a particular language as a core value, and therefore, create a possible change in the direction of language shift that is taking place in the US.

\(^9\) The concept of 'linguistic security' is different to that of 'linguistic insecurity'. Linguistic insecurity refers to the negative language attitudes or feelings that speakers have towards their own native variety or to the features it contains resulting in insecurity regarding the correctness of the forms they use when speaking.
Giles, Bourhis and Taylor (1977:308-310) present a model that deals with the viability of the survival of a group that is identified by their mother tongue through 'vitality' of a group. The concept of 'vitality' is linked to those aspects that make a group behave as a separate collective in inter-group situations. Thus, ethnolinguistic vitality is an accumulation of sociocultural aspects that position a group as a functioning distinct entity. If the vitality of the group is low, then it will have fewer chances to continue as a distinct collective entity. Consequently, the higher the vitality of the group, the greater the possibility the group has to survive as a society. The vitality of a language group is based on factors such as status, demography and institutional support (Giles, Bourhis and Taylor 1977:308-310). In the context of the US, this entails that Hispanics have significant group vitality potential due to their large numbers and, if these numbers are consequently replenished by new arrivals, motivation for language maintenance may increase, increasing also, Hispanic group vitality. Barker et al (2001) present a paper on the possible effects that the English-only movement may have on people's view on the language vitality of minority groups or in some cases of their own group. Particular focus is on Hispanic groups. Fear underlies concern among the Anglo majority for the status of English, resulting in action to limit the opportunities of linguistic minorities to education, information and tradition; even though studies have shown that there is no reason for this insecurity. Their study shows that the Spanish-language group, although increasing in numbers, is not a challenge for the English-language group since they are still limited in economic and political power as well as educational level (although Spanish is making its presence felt in the mass media and in many communities). Wright (2005), in a critical discourse analysis of the media representation of language policy in major US newspapers during the end of 2002 and the beginning of 2003, concludes that the Spanish language is significant in the context of the United States but attitudes are contradictory. Businesses train their own English speaking staff to learn a foreign language but do not hire bilinguals and at the same time there is antagonism towards programmes for teaching English. Debates concerning educational programmes that are bilingual are interpreted as Spanish-only and often relate to debates about immigration and the school board. In contrast, foreign language learning for monolingual English speakers is seen positively. Also, the levels of English proficiency achieved by immigrant children are severely viewed if they fall short of fluency whereas English speakers are only expected to attain basic knowledge in the foreign language program (Wright 2005).

García (1983) claims that "the concept of sociolinguistic planning for the benefit of ethnic minorities has largely been ignored in the United States" (Garcia 1983:43). She further
identifies sociolinguistic issues that are important for Hispanics in the United States namely, the social organisation of the ethnolinguistic group; the position of Spanish mother tongue schools as social institutions supported and controlled by the ethnic community, and as support for self-categorisation; and lastly the prescriptive planning of languages in Spanish – mother tongue schools must take account of minority language rights according to her. García declares that Hispanics must claim recognition as an ethnolinguistic minority. Her focus is on the establishment of schools. Bearing García's appeal in mind, it is worth noting that Spolsky (2004) states that the responsibility of speaking and maintaining a mother tongue falls on the individual rather than the state. He also believes that the state should make language choice available but not force people to continue to speak a language due to their origin (Spolsky 2004:130-131).

Fishman (1972:123-154) relates language maintenance to the social context in which the speakers find themselves. For him, language shift patterns in different countries are not the result of greater or lesser language loyalty, and therefore not an example of the significance of language for group maintenance, but rather they reflect the degree of tolerance for linguistic pluralism practices in the whole society. In a related way, García, Morin and Rivera's (2001:46-47) study shows that Puerto Ricans, who despite a significant shift towards English, still face problems of integration and discrimination. In light of this, the next section develops further aspects related to tolerance with regard to inter-ethnic conflict in multilingual societies.

3.8 Language conflict and language contact

According to Spolsky, ethnicity may serve as a motive for conflict based on language (Spolsky 2004:1-3). Conflicts between ethnic groups result from tension, resentment, differences of opinion which cause uncertainty – factors which are present in inter-ethnic contact situations (Nelde 1987:607). Williams (as cited in Nelde 1987:607) defines conflict between ethnic groups from a sociological perspective as "contentions involving real or apparent scares, interests, and values, in which the goals of the opposing group must be fought, or at least neutralized, to protect one's own interests (prestige, employment, political power, etc.)". In other words, inter-ethnic conflict is characterised by competition, threats, and sanctions.

According to Nelde, the extent of conflict and its development depends on three factors: the quantity of issues that are relevant to the parties and that cause friction between the groups involved; the existence of factors that equalise or mitigate the contact; and the level of
uncertainty experienced by the participants. These factors reinforce and escalate each other (Nelde 1987:607).

Confrontation of different standards, values and attitudes related to identity provide sufficient conditions for potential language conflict (Nelde 1997:292; Nelde 1987:609). Language contact and conflicts should be seen as a result of the relationships between speakers of different languages and not as a consequence of languages coming in contact (Nelde 1997:285, 291). In the case of this study, the focus is on the attitudes resulting from the contact between immigrant language groups and the dominant English speakers in the US (other investigative focuses may consider alternative group formations such as class – sociolects, or regions – dialects). Crystal's (1997:13, 16) claim in this respect nevertheless must be noted, namely that multilingualism in a community does not entail civil conflict e.g. Switzerland, Finland, Singapore, in the same way that a single shared language does not entail absence of civil unrest e.g. the American Civil War, the former Yugoslavia and Northern Ireland.

According to Stavenhagen, interethnic conflicts are usually caused by extra-linguistic struggles originating in structural inequalities (Stavenhagen 1990:39). This entails that if political and economic power are shared relatively equally i.e. in a way that is satisfactory to the groups involved, then conflict based on ethnic and linguistic difference is avoidable. However, this can be regarded as impossible to achieve in practice and therefore the distribution of limited resources by the state and the granting of group related rights may lead to dissatisfaction if certain groups regard themselves as deprived. Language conflict as constructed through disagreement on extra-linguistic factors is also expressed in the statement by Nelde (1987:608) in which the

climax of a political language conflict is reached when all conflict factors are combined in a single symbol, language, and quarrels and struggles in very different areas (politics, economics, administration, education) appear under the heading language conflict. In such cases, politicians and economic leaders also operate on the assumption of language conflict, disregarding the actual underlying causes... with the result that language assumes much more importance than it has at the outset of the conflict (Nelde 1987:608).

Language conflict can arise if a dominant language group controls authoritative institutions in the society followed by advantages to in-group members. Tension can also arise if one language variety or one particular language is asserted as the only means of communication or social mobility (Dixon and Simpson 1994:1957; Nelde 1987:607-8). In this environment, the other groups are left with the choice of assimilating or resisting, the latter
being the choice of groups that are larger demographically or form a stronger limited group. Loyalty among group members can be used to promote cohesion or disintegration and language loyalty, as a base of asserting identity, can be used as a political tool to mobilise political participation. In this respect, through their link to identity, attitudes connected to loyalty and pride can lead to conflict. The Hayakawa amendment, presented in 1981, aimed at declaring English as the official language of the US is an example of the expectation that a linguistic minority should acquire the identity of the majority or dominant group by means of linguistic assimilation (Dixon and Simpson 1994:1957-1959).

Thus, the choice of what status is to be attributed to what languages and the respective functions and domains in which these languages are used in the context of a multilingual country can be a source of conflict (Dixon and Simpson 1994:1957). Nelde claims that in any society, a system of hierarchy of linguistic communities is always present – a fact that entails that there is always a potential for conflict (Nelde 1997:294).

Finally, as regards relationships between ethnic groups, although languages cannot be said to be the cause of ethnic violence, they may nevertheless be seen as a contributing factor (Spolsky 2004:2) towards instability especially if it is perceived as a core referent for group identity. With regard to this, and in light of Turi's (1995:111) claim that language legislation has as goal the resolution of language problems resulting from language contact, conflict, and inequality, the next section will deal with issues related to security and language policy making theories and concerns.
4 Theoretical and methodological points of departure

4.1 Security studies

There are two views on security studies, the traditional perspective focusing on military power with a state-centred approach, and a recent, broader perspective that calls for the referent objects of security not to be confined to the military-political sectors but to also include the economic, societal and environmental sectors (Buzan 1998:1). An explanation for the rise of this new approach, lies in the changes that resulted in the international system due to the breakdown of bi-polar Cold War structures, which brought in its wake a new generation of writers who saw the need to extend the study of security.

Discussions about what should be included in security studies also indicate a lack of consensus concerning the definition of 'security'. The same then may be said regarding the expression 'national security'. Since this study deals with immigration in the US, below are some attempts to define 'national security' as taken up in Buzan (1991):

Security, in any objective sense, measures the absence of threats to acquired values, in a subjective sense, the absence of fear that such values will be attacked (Wolfers as cited in Buzan 1991:17).

[National Security is] the preservation of a way of life acceptable to the ... people and compatible with the needs and legitimate aspirations of others. It includes freedom from military attack or coercion, freedom from internal subversion and freedom from erosion of the political, economic and social values which are essential to the quality of life (National Defence College, Canada as cited in Buzan 1991:17).

[A] threat to national security is an action or sequence of events that (1) threatens drastically and over a relatively brief span of time to degrade the quality of life for the inhabitants of a state, or (2) threatens significantly to narrow the range of policy choices available to the government of a state or to private, nongovernmental entities (persons, groups, corporations) within the state (Ullman as cited in Buzan 1991:17).

Since their founding, modern states have been faced with cultural and political challenges brought by migration. Transnational migration challenges one of the main features of sovereignty of a given state namely, control of its borders. States are thus faced with expenses attached to keeping stricter border controls. An example is the US-Mexican border in which there are social, economic, and political costs in maintaining border security (The Economist as cited in Heisler and Layton-Henry 1993:149). Movements from the less developed parts of the global economy can be described in terms of a "process of chain
migration" in which new migrants follow the example of those that have already migrated. Thus, the increase of immigrants in the host country may be seen as resulting from networks of family ties (Heisler and Layton-Henry 1993:149) or possibly also information spread widely in the immigrants' native countries.

The meeting between two groups can lead to one collective identity feeling threatened by the other. At the level of the state, protection of the national culture can become a part of state security policy. However, if minorities perceive measures of state protection as threatening, a situation of security dilemma may arise in which groups increase measures to protect their own identity as a result of a perception of threat from another group (Noreen et al. 2002:21). This relationship of defence can be described as a dialogically reinforcing reaction process and since, as Fishman, May, Taylor, among others describe, language as linked to identity (Fishman 1972; Fishman 1966; May 2005; Taylor 1994a:32), language can become the locus of struggle between groups.

4.1.1 Broadening security studies

Security in social science literature is defined as the absence of threat in which threat may be based in real circumstances. In some cases, a threatening picture may be perceived even though the threat itself may not exist.

The construction of threat is part of a process which can be analysed at three different levels, although all need not be present. At one level, threat occurs in the mind of the individual. Secondly, the threatening picture may be constructed due to people speaking of something as a threat. The transference then is from a perceived threat existing as a thought to a spoken threat entering or being securitised in the social sphere. In this way, a threat may enter the public debate via the media and possibly even enter the next level, namely become part of the political agenda (Noreen et al. 2002:10-13). The present study is concerned with the discourses of threat in the public debate in newspapers in the United States regarding official English, which can be related to the study carried out by Noreen et al who mapped the ways in which politicians and opinion makers such as journalists and researchers in the Baltic countries expressed perceived threat after their independence from the Soviet Union, i.e. from the 1990s to the start of the new millennium (Noreen et al. 2002:9-10).

According to Buzan, the concept of 'security' has never been properly developed and has been treated as secondary by the realist and idealist schools of International Relations (Buzan 1991:2-3). The notions of 'power' and 'peace' as regards the problem of national security have dominated the approaches of the realist and idealist schools respectively. The realists see
security as a derivative of power, which is the prime motive for actors/states. Those that have a dominating position have consequently more security (Buzan 1991:2-3). In the realist school, the premise is that states are constantly struggling for a power position in a system of anarchy by which each state competes for achieving its national interests. In this view, military power is the most significant coercive factor for winning a dispute (Kegley, Jr. and Wittkopf 2001:31, 457). In contrast, the idealists see security as a result of peace. In other words security, for the idealists, is a consequence of peace, i.e. peace is a guarantor for security. The idealists claim to have a holistic view and focus on finding a solution to war (Buzan 1991).

Buzan places the notion of 'security' between the notions of 'power' and 'peace', and presents a framework of security as a motive for behaviour (see section 4.2.3 for Ager's study on insecurity as a motive for intervention on language behaviour). Buzan's comprehensive perspective (Buzan 1991:2-3) is in line with the constructivist view and its emphasis on the significance of shared ideas that are developed by the actors through interaction. This means that meanings are not only constructed but also define the interests, identities and images of actors (people and groups), which in turn, affect their international behaviour (Kegley, Jr. and Wittkopf 2001:45). The concept of 'identity' is central in social constructivism and from this viewpoint the identity of the state is seen as always under construction. The components that make up the identity of a state are mainly connected to: territory, since it forms a geographical base for national identity; sharing a common language, which leads to stronger feelings of belonging with some individuals rather than others; having common traditions in which religion can be a significant factor; and a shared history that may influence the perception of a distinct identity. The elements of language, tradition and history can be grouped together as cultural factors (Noreen et al. 2002:19-20). Within social constructivism, institutionalised collective beliefs create norms and procedures that guide the actions of entities such as the state or international organisations. A social constructivist approach allows the study of what people express focusing on what is being represented (Noreen et al. 2002:15-16).

According to Buzan, Waever and de Wilde (1998), securitisation refers to an urgent, existential and prioritised issue that should be dealt with by top leaders. However securitisation only takes place if those that are the object of the threatening scenario perceive the issue as a threat, even though a real threat may not exist. Thus the presence of an existential threat must be accepted by the audience for securitisation to take place. Securitisation as a process is a speech act, that is, it is the utterance of security that brings into existence a threat. Moreover, the construction of threatening pictures as a speech act – a
securitising move – is in line with social constructivism and the Copenhagen School from within which Waever presents the speech act approach to security (Buzan, Waever and de Wilde 1998:23-34). Thus, it is not enough for a discourse of existential threat to be linked to a referent object to create securitisation. This process is instead referred to as a securitising move. It is when the audience accepts the issue as a threat that the issue is securitised. The securitising actor must be an authority although it is not necessary that it is an officially defined authority (Buzan, Waever and de Wilde 1998:25, 33). Buzan, Waever and de Wilde further view securitisation as an intersubjective process and "want to avoid a view of security that is given objectively" since it is difficult to measure whether an issue is "really" a threat (Buzan, Waever and de Wilde 1998:30). At the same time, they state that:

the label subjective, however, is not fully adequate. Whether an issue is a security issue is not something individuals decide alone. Securitization is intersubjective and socially constructed: Does a referent object hold legitimacy as something that should survive, which entails that actors can make reference to it, point to something as a threat, and thereby get others to follow or at least tolerate actions not otherwise legitimate? This quality is not held in subjective and isolated minds; it is a social quality, a part of a discursive, socially constituted, intersubjective realm (Buzan, Waever and de Wilde 1998:30).

For the purpose of this thesis, the spread and influence of the mass media – through newspapers – is seen as a possible site for securitising moves. The patterns of speaking will be seen to identify the speech acts of societal security. The referent object of security is the English language and its role as the language of the United States. The threat that actors can point to is that of the presence of immigrant non-English speaking groups.

Furthermore, Buzan stresses that semantically the word 'security' implies that the referent can only be secure or insecure, i.e. it involves an absolute condition. Also, since security can be further defined as the attainment of freedom from threat (Buzan 1991:18), the audience of a security speech act is left with a dichotomising position for action.

Buzan's approach extends the traditional concept of 'security' to include societal, economic, political, and environmental dimensions alongside the existing military dimension (Buzan 1991:xiv). These five dimensions are seen to affect each other (Buzan 1991:20). Buzan further classifies societal security as consisting of the maintenance of language, national identity, culture, customs, and religion (Buzan 1998: 7-8). Societal security refers to the collection of ideas, practices and customs that function as identifying and distinguishing characteristics of members of a given social group. Identity in this model is the carrying feature of a society (Waever 1993:23-24). As regards identification patterns, Buzan
(1998:139) further describes the United States as a society marked by loyalty to a 'Gesellschaft', namely as "a rational contractual agreement among individuals" (see also Tönnies 1887/2001) based on utility (Waever 1993:18).

This investigation will focus on Waever's further development of societal security (section 4.1.2) from Buzan's framework. However, a brief overview of the other sectors presented in Buzan's model of security follows since each sector exists in a state of dialogical relationship to the other sectors. The disaggregation into sectors in Buzan's theory is only used as a means of identifying patterns that otherwise may not have been visible in the complexity of the whole entity. The analysis of the parts is then reassembled since the items in the sectors do not exist independently of the other sectors. In general terms, economic security relates to access to resources, finance and markets to maintain welfare, as well as a strong and powerful state, in which strength refers to internal cohesion and power is related to external relations. This sector is based on relationships built on products, finance and trade. Political security refers to the stability of states, governing systems as well as ideologies that legitimise the state and the systems of government. Environmental security is focused on the maintenance of the biosphere. Lastly, military action is about the offensive or defensive relationships between states based on perceived intentions (Buzan 1991:19, 97; Buzan, Waever and de Wilde 1998:7-8). Another way of describing the sectors is by means of the forms of interaction they identify. Thus

the military sector is about relationships of forceful coercion; the political sector is about relationships of authority, governing status, and recognition; the economic sector is about relationships of trade, production and finance; the societal sector is about relationships of collective identity; and the environmental sector is about relationships between human activity and the planetary biosphere (Buzan, Waever and de Wilde 1998:7).

Within this framework, all states are vulnerable to military, environmental, economic, political and societal threats (Buzan 1991:98). Although not of direct significance for the focus of the current investigation, the present author considers that cybertechnology, particularly the Internet, should be given more prominence in the framework, possibly even separating it as a sector on its own. During 2010, mass media – tv, radio and newspapers (e.g. BBC, CNN, The New York Times, The Guardian, Swedish Television (the news “rapport”) – reported cases of deviation of information through unknown sites and the exposure of classified documents on the world wide web (the WikiLeaks site). A further aspect is also the facilitation the internet allows for the formation of transnational communities.
Moreover, for Buzan, a security analysis needs to take account of both domestic and international perspectives, since these are essential to make sense of the problem of security (Buzan 1991:60-61). Buzan argues for an integrative approach to understanding the national security problem in which consideration of all levels – individual, national and international security – and the issues related to the different sectors – military, political, economic, societal and environmental security – should be taken into account (Buzan 1991:362) while maintaining a state-centric approach with the state as the referent object of security (Waever 1993:25). The levels and sectors serve as departing points of enquiry permitting different angles rather than functioning as isolated areas for policy or study (Buzan 1991:368). One of the reasons given for a broad approach to security is the growing network of security interdependencies in the international system which may reduce military threats between some states but may also bring the appearance of other types of threats, such as economic dependency or societal threats to groups fearing disappearance into international cosmopolitanism (Buzan 1991:368-369) and to which can be added the threats deriving from the widespread use of the Internet. Based on the reasoning of the growing significance of non-military threats, Buzan (1991:138) identifies the multiculturalist fragmentation of the United States as a possible future regional problem.

Furthermore, individual and national securities depend on the existence of a strong state. The strong state is mainly concerned with protection from external threats but the "idea of the state, its institutions and its territory will be clearly defined and stable in their own right" (Buzan 1991:100, 106). The process of creating state-nations and the building of strong states may have negative consequences for individuals and groups (Buzan 1991:106) whose interests may be ignored or perceived as such. With regard to the focus of this study, the case of benign neglect of minority languages, or actual intervention to strengthen the majority language and prohibition of minority language usage by the government may lead to feelings of insecurity and a situation of security dilemma, as mentioned in Noreen et al (2002:21 in section 4.1). Buzan calls for the need to consider the internal structure of the state with the issue of national security of the state. Thus, in Buzan's framework, the state, as principal actor, is identified as the referent object for security. Individual security is subordinate to national and international security. The state has both negative and positive effects on the security of the individual within its borders but this relationship is reciprocal in the sense that the state is also affected by the goals the individual identifies as the means for attaining security (Buzan 1991:54, 58, 103).
Thus, the relationship between individual and national security is not necessarily harmonious. Security provided by the state to the individual is done by means of direct or indirect threats, which may have intended or unintended consequences. Tolerance to the authority of the state by the individual is high. However, there is a permanent tension between the individual and the collective. Individuals can enhance their own security against threats from the state and against external threats that the state has not managed to control or lessen.

Direct action by the individual includes measures such as participation in organisations as in militant or vigilante groups. Indirect measures take the form of political actions in which, for instance, the individual creates pressure groups in order to affect state policy as a means of achieving greater individual security. Buzan names four threats that individually oriented security actions can pose to national security. The first of these problems refers to individual or sub-state groups that become national security threats when they take the form of separatist movements, revolutionaries or terrorist organisations. The second implication is the effect caused by the movement of people and ideas over state borders which may make fuzzy distinctions between domestic and national security. It may be difficult to separate between citizens and foreigners – the latter of whom may still serve or be seen to serve the interests of their native state. The third implication for national security due to the individual's strive for security, are the indirect political pressures and restrictions on the state by its citizens through public opinion and its possible consequent influence on state policy. This kind of threat is affected by the limited possibilities that the state may have at its disposal to affect public opinion. The fourth implication factor is the role individuals can take as leaders of a state and their subsequent impact on national security policy making. In this situation, there is no clear boundary between the leader and the state (Buzan 1991:50-54). The second and third individual-based threats to the state are of interest in the debate regarding official English in the US.

Moreover, in order to deal with the many, fragmented and possibly contradictory security objects of the state, Buzan suggests a descriptive model to study state and national security. The model divides the state into three components which are all subject to threats, namely the idea of the state (creates its legitimacy among the people and as such forms its socio-political characteristic), the institutional expression of the state (governs the physical base), and the physical base of the state (population and territory). These components are interdependent but it is possible to isolate them for the purposes of analysis (Buzan 1991:65, 66). The state is therefore made up of polity, society and territory. Although the physical base – territory – is important to the state, the essence of its existence is mainly of a socio-political character.
Furthermore, although state institutions are physical expressions of the state, their functioning requires that the population has a deeply embedded idea of the state. Therefore it is the idea of the state, its socio-political level that becomes the main object of national security (Buzan 1991:64). Buzan uses the notions of 'strong' or 'weak' states to refer to the level of socio-political cohesion of a state. Buzan's use of 'state' and 'weak state' differs from other authors' usage since they use 'state' when referring to governing institutions and 'weak state' refers to governments such as the American that are highly constrained and/or diffusely structured in relation to their societies” (Buzan 1991:97-98). For Buzan, strong states that are also strong powers, i.e. based on economic and political capability – as is the case of the United States – have lesser vulnerabilities than weak states and weak powers. In Buzan's view of strong states, many threats are either absorbed or prevented due to their stability, size, and resources. Thus, these states with a strong socio-political cohesion are relatively protected from most threats (Buzan 1991:114). With regard to socio-political unity, this study deals with the discussions affecting the idea of the state caused by a change in the physical base namely the composition of the population in the US as a result of immigration particularly from Latin America.

The idea of the state is regarded as the most central and abstract part of the model (Buzan 1991:69). Buzan suggests that the idea of state is mainly built on the importance of nation and its organising ideologies (Buzan 1991:70). Buzan defines nation as "a large group of people sharing the same cultural, and possibly the same ethnic or racial heritage and also mainly of people who share a history" (Buzan 1991:70). States and nations can give rise to each other. State institutions can be used to give rise to nations e.g. the government of the United States has consciously acted to create an idea of nation from its different territories and peoples (Buzan 1991:71). However, government intervention to maintain cohesion e.g. by policies that affect favourably the positioning of a particular language, can lead to feelings of relative deprivation by other language groups.

The complex relationship between state and nation are evidenced in the civil unrests resulting from attempts by governments to disregard natural nations in the formation of state borders. National identity is then a fundamental aspect to the problem of national security and can either strengthen or weaken a state (Buzan 1991:72). If there is coincidence between the state and the territory of a nation then the state may focus on protecting its cultural identity. Related to this, a nation-state in its purest form entails placing the nation before the state (Buzan 1991:70-71). This can be defined as a 'primal nation-state' since the nation has a pivotal role in creating the state and gives the state strong identity internationally and strong
legitimacy within its borders (Buzan 1991:73). In contrast, countries built on immigrant peoples, such as the United States, fall into the category of 'state-nation' in which the state creates the nation in a top-down process. The state supports certain cultural elements such as language, arts, law which, with time, distinguish the state as a cultural entity and attaches a nation-like identification to it. Also, citizens attach social loyalties to the state as in the case of the dual identity of 'hyphenated' Americans. Consequently, even though citizens in the US maintain a dual identity, they are not territorially organised, and there is accommodation of their new American national identity (Buzan 1991:72-74) in the morphological structure of their hyphenated identities, although it is worth noting the high concentration of Hispanics in the Southern states. A case in point is mentioned by Ager when referring to the demonstrated resistance of Puerto Ricans towards attaching hyphenated labels to themselves. For him, this action can be interpreted as a sign of their resistance to assimilate in the host country (Ager 2001:113).

Threats are problematic to define. One reason is the difficulty in separating objective and subjective threats at the individual level. There may also be a contradiction or difference between actual threats and perceived threats. Further, fears that lead to policy decisions may differ from the fear perceived by the population at large. In this environment, a state may decide to meet threats to national security by adopting one of two actions namely a passive policy, i.e. waiting for the threat to gain significance in size and deal with resolving the causes, or an active policy, i.e. taking action while threats are still small, thus protecting their vulnerabilities. The impact of threats and what is considered a threat is subject to change over time (Buzan 1991:115, 138, 141-142). Human migration is a particular type of threat that Buzan regards as a complex threat (Buzan 1991:93) since it impacts on the composition of the population in the target country and leads to changes in social interaction patterns. In light of this, the next section looks in more detail into societal security i.e. the relation between immigration, identity and real or perceived threat.

4.1.2 Societal security

Waever (1993) further develops Buzan's (1991) alternative theory to the traditional view of state-centred security. For Waever, societal insecurity based on ethnonational threats has substituted state sovereignty and military concerns. His approach is based on a study of the significance of societal security for integration in the European context (Waever 1993). Using Buzan's five-sector theory, namely military, political, economic, environmental and societal, for the framework of security of the state, Waever (1993) proposes a new approach to the
field of security studies composed of a dual focus system of security. Instead of including society as one of the five sectors of state security, as presented by Buzan (1991), Waever suggests a dual system of organising referents, viz, on the one hand, state security with its focus on state sovereignty, made up of four sectors – military, political, economic and environment – and on the other hand, societal security with its conceptual focus on identity (Waever 1993:24-26). The dual system assumes state security and societal security as the focal points between the individual and the international levels of security. The definition of societal security is not based on nations as states but instead refers to large-scale, self-supporting distinct groups (Waever 1993:21, 26; Buzan, Waever and de Wilde 1998:119). The difference between a society and a social group is that the former contains a wide identity construction that can challenge a state by becoming a territorially politically organised group. National identity is the most significant and largest social and political identity (Waever 1993:23). Two types of opposing identities can be pointed out as making up national identity in different degrees, namely political identity and cultural identity. The former refers to the French tradition of identity of the civic-state nation, and the latter to the German, ethnic tradition of identity or people-nation (Waever 1993; Waever and Kelstrup 1993:39, 77). Nationalism is seen as a type of societal identity. In times of conflict, national identity has the capacity of positioning itself in the centre of all other identities. Only religion and nationalism have the capacity of reproducing the 'we' identity through time – a factor that reinforces their positions forming the base for political entities (Waever 1993:22). Therefore, Waever sees nationalism as distinct from nation by virtue of being a political action, whereas in comparison nation is a social fact. For Waever, national identity arises after the establishment of ethnic identity although it must be noted that not all ethnic identities are connected to a national identity (Waever 1993:38-39). Additionally, the coincidence of nation and state is seen to most likely contribute to the security of both units which implies that there is greater probability to societal insecurity in states that are multinational (Buzan 1993:41). However, if one takes account of Smolicz's (1995, see also section 3.7) view of groups identifying with core referents to create distinctions in relation to other groups, and the constructivist view of identity as dynamic, it could be argued that there is a risk that even within 'nations', conflict may arise if there exists disagreement on what forms the core referent(s) of identity for the group.

Societal security, therefore, has its area of function in large social entities (Waever 1993:21) and is defined as
the ability of the society to persist in its essential character under changing conditions and possible or actual threats. More specifically, it is about the sustainability, within acceptable conditions for evolution, of traditional patterns of language, culture, association, and religious and national identity and custom (Waever 1993:23).

Thus, societal security concerns the perception of threat by a given society to the survival of its identity (Waever 1993:23). When people refer to a 'we' identity, language and culture are often used as the base. However, Waever claims that this base is not an essential characteristic of societal security and therefore "it must remain logically open that communities can be, or become, based on whatever people take to be the decisive basis for them. When this 'it' is threatened, 'our' identity is threatened, and 'societal security' comes into play" (Waever 1993:40).

Although societal security focuses on a collective, the study of individual security (see section 4.1.3 on Human security) is recognised by Waever as important since threats directed to the security of individuals and small groups can affect other groups or, in an upwards movement, influence the stability of the entire society (see section 4.1.1 on individually oriented security actions). However, this does not mean that the definition of societal security should be understood as the sum of the security of individuals or smaller groups, since this would give the impression that security is based on an aggregation of parts. In societal security the emphasis lies on the collective and the relationships between societies and the state (Waever 1993:20).

Even though the separation of societal security from the traditional analysis in security studies entails that new perspectives are brought into focus which would otherwise have not been visible, it also implies a partial view since some aspects are emphasised over others (Waever, Buzan, Kelstrup and Lemaitre 1993:185). A reason for focusing on societal security is primarily due to the fact that it is not often that state and societal boundaries coincide, Also, the referent objects of security are different in the sense that the definition of state is based on "fixed territory and formal membership, whereas societal integration is a much more varied phenomenon" (Buzan, Waever and de Wilde 1998:119). Furthermore, societies are regarded as independent entities that carry identities and which, on perception of threats, take action to defend their identity (Waever, Buzan, Kelstrup and Lemaitre 1993:185). Since identity is the conceptual focus and organising frame of societal security, if a community perceives a threat to its survival as a collectivity on the basis of its identity, then a situation of societal insecurity has arisen. Groups which constitute referent objects of security are maintained by the loyalty of members. The same feelings of loyalty and belonging are activated by arguments claiming
that there is a threat to the survival of the shared 'we' identity (Buzan, Waever and de Wilde 1998:119, 123).

The threats to societal identity can vary from limiting the possibilities of expression to affecting the conditions for its reproduction. Negative measures can include the prohibition to use the language and names used by a particular social group. Other restrictive measures are related to dress codes, education and worship (Waever 1993:43) – factors that are often linked to expressions of identity. Language, although the most common ground for national identity, cannot, according to Waever (1993), constitute the only and sufficient factor for threat and conflict to arise since there are nations that are formed without a shared language as in the case of Switzerland. Also, or in contrast, there are cases in which language does not lead to joining of communities such as in the case of Alsatians, who although German speakers, view themselves as belonging to the French 'nation' (Waever 1993:40; Weber 1997:24).

Communities are formed and based on factors that are dependant on what people consider as important for keeping them together and when this factor is threatened it is then that the identity of the group is threatened and thus societal security becomes an issue (Waever 1993:40; see Smolicz 1995:236-237 in section 3.7 for core identity features). With this in mind, language and culture can be said to not form fundamental unchanging features for establishing societal security since the definition of nation based on these factors is a consequence of historical contingency that constructs identity (Waever 1993:40).

Distinguishing societal security as an entity separate from state security has the advantage of bringing into focus issues of identity and migration and consequently widening the debate of security. Also, societal security makes evident the problems related to integration policy such as situations in which identities that are affected by the process of integration may react by attempting to obstruct or reverse the same processes (Waever, Buzan, Kelstrup and Lemaitre 1993:186).

However as Waever, Buzan, Kelstrup and Lemaitre point out, separating societal security as an independent entity brings certain disadvantages. Firstly, due to society not being as solid a coherent unit for analysis as the state, it is the various institutions or actors – with varying degrees of legitimacy – that speak on its behalf. Secondly, the concept of 'societal security' can be seen as giving legitimacy to actions that lie outside the government such as those involving violence. In this way, societal security may involve actions that de-legitimise the state. Thirdly, the question lies in the definition of society and its relation to the individual members and the degree of perception of shared identities for its definition. Fourth, the objective of security studies is to eliminate circumstances that lead to the need to speak about
security. It therefore works towards de-securitisation. In other words, the long-term aim of security studies is the removal of issues from the security agenda (Waever, Buzan, Kelstrup and Lemaitre 1993:187-189). It can be claimed that the use of 'societal security' as a concept entails the achievement of security as a policy goal as desirable, thus drawing attention to securitisation rather than de-securitisation and as such falling into the realist school's thought in International Relations (see section 4.1.1). It also implies a possibility of attaining full security – if one considers Buzan's (1991) argument of security as an absolute term – which according to the present author, is paradoxically often lessened by policies, as intervention always carries a distribution of advantages or disadvantages and thus a lessening or gaining of power, status, and/or prestige for specific groups.

Furthermore,Waever states that it is necessary to keep in mind that societies have multiple political and social identities of which national identity becomes the most dominant – and around which all the other identities become organised – in times of uncertainty. Therefore the relationship between the possible different identities in a society must be considered as hierarchical and subject to change (Waever 1993:22). This implies that not only are identities dynamic but also the relationship between groups carrying identities can be considered as dynamic. A further implication is that societal identity can be formed from organising communities in different formations. National identity is established by shift along a continuum of two opposing poles, namely the political identity of the French tradition and the cultural identity from the German tradition of ethnic groupings (Waever 1993:39).

The constructability of national identity as mentioned by Waever (1993) has led to questions of whether identity is fixed at any given point. Waever, Buzan, Kelstrup and Lemaitre's (1993) use of society as a distinguished referent of security is, according to Roe, criticised as objectifying society and identity. Debate has circulatd around the issues of whether society and identity are objects or processes. If they are seen as the former then they will have a static and fixed quality. If, on the other hand, society and identity are perceived as processes then they carry dynamic and changing attributes. Buzan and Waever maintain that their approach is constructivist and that identities at some point become constructed as a result of processes and practices therefore making identity a "thing" and consequently containing the necessary qualification for it to be used as a referent for security as an identifiable entity. Within the Copenhagen School (and therefore also for Buzan and Waever), identities are said to be temporary and subject to reconstruction – qualities that allow their identification as a "thing" to which individuals create a relationship (Roe 1999:193). Norms and conventions that relate to the "performance" of an ethnic identity contribute to the idea of identification as
a "thing". Lindholm (1993:15) explains that "ethnic identities and ethnicity are both chosen, voluntary and constructed/invented/imagined and perceived as absolute, given and fixed".

Competing identities and migration constitute the most prominent threats to societal security. Contesting identities become threats when they are mutually incompatible which also means that an individual cannot hold two identities at the same time (Buzan 1993:43-44). Thus attempts are made to create clear boundaries between groups and group membership. It is worthwhile noting that viewing identities as dynamic and constructed implies that criteria for incompatibility between groups can change. In cases where the state and the boundaries of the nation are not the same, there will be an inverse relationship between the state and the nation, in which an increase in the security of one increases the insecurity of the other (Waever 1993:26). As regards nationalist movements, Van Evera (1994:28) states that these movements often create images of minorities inside the national borders as having malign intentions that need to be suppressed. By arguing from these perspectives they put forward arguments for not granting minority rights. According to Van Evera (1994:13) the American nationalism is relatively tolerant to minorities – a characteristic it holds in common with other immigrant nations. A view that is similar to Kloss' (1977) claim regarding language policies in the US but which is also contested by Wiley (2000), who claims that there has been an inclination to linguistic assimilation in the country (see section 1).

A dynamic view on societal identity implies that not all change will be perceived as constituting threats and also that these are perceived equally among all groups. Smaller communities and individuals may perceive vulnerabilities and threats in cases where the larger collectivities or society do not find the survival of their identity challenged (Buzan 1993:42). In the US, opinions differ regarding the use of Spanish and its official recognition as well as regarding immigration numbers. Groups that perceive the American identity as represented in terms of the white Anglo-Saxon individual will feel a greater threat from the arrival of non-Anglo-Saxon immigrants. On the other hand, individuals or groups that consider the American identity as based on the ideology of the melting pot will perceive immigration from non-white Anglo descent as less threatening (Buzan 1993:43). Buzan, Waever and de Wilde (1998:125) state that "if a nation is built on a melting pot ideology of different groups blending into one new group, the existing national identity will be vulnerable to a reassertion of racial and cultural distinctiveness...(e.g. multiculturalism in the United States)." Here it is important to make a distinction between perceived threats that are real and perceived threats that, although unreal, come to have real effects (Buzan, Waever and de Wilde 1998; Buzan 1993:43).
The identity of a society can gradually change due to immigration or is perceived as likely to change because of contact with new groups. According to Buzan (1993:43), a breaking point might be reached in which the numbers of individuals that have immigrated begin to have social and political impact and as a consequence affect the identity of their host environment. This is where the level of tolerance of a society towards multiculturalism and adaption or absorption becomes an issue (Buzan 1993:43, 45). The types of behaviour displayed by immigrants may create intolerance within the majority population to rising immigrant numbers. A behavioural example that can create negative attitudes is if the immigrant works towards maintaining the identity of their home country and expresses it in an extreme form by minimising interaction with the target community or by creating cultural ghettos – as is the case of some Hispanics in the United States. However, immigrants may also seek absorption into the target community leading to the disappearance of their cultural identity due to acculturation of new generations into the target majority community (Buzan 1993:45). Nevertheless, the view of the Other as foreign may lead to immigrant minorities, although socialising into the national culture and learning the host language, still not being perceived as full members of the national group by the dominant population (Waever 1993:22).

Although integration patterns and levels of tolerance towards new cultures are often sources of conflict, immigration is still an option for many people. Ager (2001:109) provides two motives to explain immigration patterns to the US. On the one hand, negative reasons, so-called push factors originate in the immigrant's country and are occasioned by factors such as persecution due to religion, politics, economics, lack of resources, social aspects or race, natural catastrophes, employment, and war (Ager 2001). In relation to the migration of Hispanics in the US (bearing in mind the numbers of immigrants that cross the physical border to North America), it is possible to say that political-economic conditions (as well as criminality) can be seen as contributing push factors. According to Ager (2001), these kinds of migrants or refugees may attempt to reconstruct their home society in the new country. This may be of significance for this study if one relates it to patterns of integration and segregation and to Buzan's statement above, namely that the behaviour of immigrants may create feelings of intolerance. Ager also identifies positive reasons for cross-border movement of people, so-called "pull" factors originating in the richer countries and which attract immigrants who hope to improve their personal economic situation (Ager 2001:109). In the case of the US, its reputation as a nation of immigrants and the widespread image of the "American Dream" can be seen as "pull" factors for encouraging immigration. Ager further
identifies personal relations such as marriage as constituting a possible motive. Other factors are labour shortages, high wages, peace and stability, or low-cost living. These migrants may wish to assimilate and adopt the language of the host country (Ager 2001:109; Tollefson 1991:107) in which intentions for long-term settlement may have significant weight. However, in some cases although immigrants plan to settle in the new country, they may still maintain their home country's language and customs, which may also indicate a failure of integration planning in the host country.

Buzan, Waever and de Wilde emphasise migration as one of three combinable factors that can cause threats to societal security of the receiving community. The other two being horizontal competition and vertical competition. Horizontal competition deals with a change in the behaviour of a group due to influences from neighbouring countries e.g. cultural influences such as the fear of Americanisation in Canada or, at a more local level, the fear of English speaking Canada in Quebec. Vertical competition refers to the integrating (e.g. the EU) or secessionist regionalist (e.g. Quebec) projects for inclusion into a more widely or narrowly defined identity. A possible fourth issue of threat is depopulation e.g. due to wars, policies or natural catastrophes (Buzan, Waever and de Wilde 1998:121).

Societal threat is most felt when newcomers have a different ethnicity or culture (Buzan 1991:93). Buzan further states that due to migration, redefinition of the 'nation' and by implication the idea of the state may be necessary. Fears regarding changes affecting the idea of the state have greater political impact than the idea of cosmopolitanism, and therefore are easily mobilised as a security issue within a political agenda, as in the case of Latin Americans in the United States who are establishing bilingualism in parts of the US. Further, laws on international migration have little impact in creating impermeable borders. Additionally, Buzan stresses that migration can relate to the economic and environmental sectors since new arrivals may be seen as competing for scarce resources. Thus, local conditions determine whether newcomers are considered as constituting threats to a national identity or as economic and/or cultural resources. He further claims that the issue of migration is becoming important as a part of the security agenda, especially for the richer countries (Buzan 1991:93-95).

Within the dual system of security presented by Waever (1993) in which societal security is separated from state security (cf. Buzan 1991 in section 4.1), the economic framework is seen as based on the capitalist global economy, which can constitute a threat to societal security from three situations, namely the efficient and inefficient working of capitalism as well as threats originating in the structural system of global capitalism. Looking at the first
point of efficient capitalism, one of the main conditions on which it rests is the need for individuals to feel insecurity in the marketplace. A further threat is due to an efficiently working capitalist system which creates tension between the traditional societal identities such as language, history, and culture, and capitalism's tendency to homogenisation of culture through wider and global interactions as well as its class-creating mechanisms. While weakening traditional societal identities, modern capitalism has also created a new identity for citizens, namely citizens as consumers, which may, to some extent, compete with former traditional national or societal identities. Furthermore, modern capitalism affects socialisation processes by reducing shared norms which often promote successful inclusion of youth or immigrants. Thus, by diminishing social interaction and participation of marginalised groups, modern capitalism augments feelings of insecurity. The dissatisfaction of marginalised groups may find expression in demonstrations, terrorism, and crime, low participation in education and employment, as well as increased welfare dependency (Buzan 1993:51-55). The relationship between capitalism and societal security may be viewed as conversely proportional since political measures can be taken to limit the effects of adaptation and competition imposed by capitalism – although these actions are not in line with liberal economic ideologies. The government, by managing the economy and limiting the effects of the market, can work towards increasing welfare, economic security as well as strengthening a feeling of national identity among its citizens. This is related to the view that nationalism, i.e. the forming of strong societal identities can act as a counterbalance to capitalism's divisive forces – although at the same time debilitating liberal practice. In this way, the capitalist class conflict becomes less significant to the idea of nation building (Buzan 1993:53-54) in what Anderson (1983 as cited in Buzan 1993:53-54) describes as a shared ‘imagined community’.

Secondly (with continued focus on capitalism as given in Waever's dual security model), threat to societal security can arise when the inefficient workings of capitalism lead to recession or depression. A decrease in welfare and the surfacing of greater inequalities in income and wealth may even force governments towards protectionist measures in relation to other states e.g. by placing restrictions on trade, in order to maintain social harmony. Thirdly, the global workings of capitalism lead to a centre-periphery structural relationship of strong and weak economies. The few centre economies control and shape the international economy by establishing the norms and rules of action. The economies in the periphery are mainly providers of raw material and manufacturers of low technological products, which in trade have the lowest profit margin and fiercest competition (Buzan 1993:51-55). For the purpose of this thesis, societal security in the United States is seen as possibly threatened by the influx
of immigrants from weaker economies in search of income. The United States government is then faced with providing services for integration of these groups which may be perceived as a threat by some Americans since the newcomers are non-Anglo, non-English speakers. This can be linked to Buzan's claim that the issues of self-definition and demographic change in the US have led white Americans of European descent to fear that immigration and the socially explicit cultural confidence displayed by immigrant groups will eventually result in a fragmented, multicultural country. This threat is seen as the most urgent and overshadows fears of the United States becoming a Spanish speaking country (Buzan, Waever and de Wilde 1998:131) although these are also present.

Waever, Buzan, Kelstrup and Lemaitre state that governments have a significant role in creating conditions favourable for societal security through legislation. Drafting policies with offensive or defensive strategies to deal with a societal insecurity problem also means addressing for whom and by whom the strategies are placed. Several possible actors at different levels can be involved namely from the individual, the societal, the state levels, and also the international level. Societies that feel threatened may respond by strengthening their societal identity e.g. by reinforcing aspects of culture such as language and religion with the aim of increasing cohesion and distinctiveness of the group (Waever, Buzan, Kelstrup and Lemaitre 1993:191-192) and possibly also by constructing a scenario for mobilisation. However, the defensive approach can also lead to a more cosmopolitan and multicultural approach in the economic, political and cultural spheres although simultaneously maintaining group identity. In the case of the United States, however, an opening of societal identity towards multiculturalism has weakened social cohesion due to ethnic divisions and a perceived lessening of the role a common shared language – English – has in providing the basis for social belonging and unity (Waever, Buzan, Kelstrup and Lemaitre 1993:192).

Societal security dynamics are present at both the national and regional levels in North America. In the case of the US, loyalties exist to the country and to the individual states as in outward expressions of patriotism seen for instance in California, Texas, Massachusetts and New York. Despite demonstrations of loyalty being widespread, there are growing claims that the norms in the societies reflect only the ideas and ways of the dominant white European-descendants and that it is necessary to make space for independent definitions of other ethnoracial groups. Although these issues form part of the general agenda of politics and culture, they become security matters when the arguments are based on survival of cultures (Buzan, Waever and de Wilde 1998:129) in which language and its usage may be a factor that is identifiable and thus a referent. The relevance of this issue is supported by Buzan's
statement that societal insecurities originating in migration issues are likely to gain importance in future discussions regarding national security (Buzan 1991:95) which can become language oriented if the immigrants are carriers of a strong "foreign" language from a geographically adjacent region.

Although language is included in Waever's model (as well as in Buzan's five sector security framework) as part of societal security, there lacks an analysis focusing solely on language from a security perspective, which is the gap this investigation attempts to fill by studying attitudes. The significance of public attitudes towards immigrants is relevant in light of Buzan's statement that few states are willing to undertake the costs related to absolute border control and that states are influenced by public opinions in the media (Buzan 1991:50-54; Buzan 1993:46).

The next section will look at the concept of 'security' from an individual perspective since a dialogical relation between collective and individual identity is assumed bearing in mind the changes that take place when cultures and the people that practice the cultures meet on an everyday basis.

4.1.3 Human security
Individuals participate in the construction of a society which in turn offers them group membership and furnishes the individual with a sense of security (see Bolinger 1975). However, the goals that the society, community or group may have for guaranteeing the survival and development of the collective may collide with those of the individual member.

The concept of 'human security', as presented by the United Nations Human Development Report (UNHDR), refers to the conditions for which people can safely and freely exercise their choices with a degree of confidence that today's opportunities will not have disappeared by the next day (UNHDR 1994:23).

Human security has its primary focus on human life and dignity rather than armaments. Its scope is universal since it concerns all people in all parts of the world. Human security is interdependent since it is based on the idea that countries are no longer isolated and that there is interconnection between countries in a way that when the security of people is at risk in any part of the world, it will affect other countries. Furthermore, it favours the view that it is easy to ensure human security by prevention rather than intervention at a later stage; it is people-centred which means that it "is concerned with how people live and breathe in a society, how freely they exercise their many choices, how much access they have to market and social opportunities – and whether they live in conflict or in peace" (UNHDR 1994:23).
A report by the Commission on Human Security (CHS) 2002-2003 states that:

Human security means protecting vital freedoms. It means protecting people from critical and pervasive threats and situations, building on their strengths and aspirations. It also means creating systems that give people the building blocks of survival, dignity and livelihood. Human security connects different types of freedoms – freedom from want, freedom from fear and freedom to take action on one's own behalf (CHS 2002-2003).

One of the policy conclusions arrived at by the CHS dealt with the protection of migrants and the provision of information through the public media. Another issue is accessibility to education in order to allow the individual to develop skills that enable them to practice their rights and responsibilities in political issues. A further conclusion was the need to ameliorate aspects linked to health and work-related opportunities. One of the overall themes in this document is respect for diversity and the promotion of multiple identities (CHS 2002-2003). It is therefore interesting to see how human security is present in attitudes expressed regarding the presence of immigrants who do not know the language of the host country. This study will investigate how factors of human security are present in the case of the immigrants in the US.

The 1994 UNHDR’s focus on global security indicated seven categories as constituting human security. Economic security is based on the acquisition of a guaranteed minimum income which secures also a minimum level of freedom from poverty either through job security or public financing. Food security refers to access to basic food. Health security is about accessibility to health care as well as protection from diseases. Environmental security focuses on protection from environmental destruction. Personal security is security from physical violence such as physical torture, war, ethnic tension, crime, and child abuse. Political security is freedom from political oppression and the honouring by the society of civil and political rights. Finally, community security relates to the protection and continuation of traditional cultures and ethnic groups since these provide security to people through membership. The feeling of community belonging also entails that the individual takes on the cultural identity and values of the community as their own (UNHDR 1994). Members of minority groups may feel that they cannot adjust fully into the majority community since this may be viewed as an abandonment of their minority culture by their own community. In this context, it is important to note that traditional communities might also oppress their community members (see Kymlicka 1995, 2002 in section 3.2.1).

The broad and inclusive definition of human security as presented above has been criticised for being one of its weaknesses. However, it is precisely its encompassing definition that drafters of the concept believe to be its strength (UNHDR 1994:24-33, Paris 2001:90).
a common denominator, most definitions of human security "emphasize the welfare of ordinary people" (Paris 2001:87) but the concept also allows individual nations to adapt it to their own interests (Paris 2001:90) which has been a source of criticism. The concept leaves room for wide interpretations of the minimum level of human security. A further problem is that nations are free to decide if all factors or only a combination of some factors of security need to be achieved. A further disadvantage is the vagueness of the concept which makes difficult the allocation of scarce resources by decision makers (Paris 2001:92). Tabyshalieva claims that in spite of these criticisms, and although the concept of 'human security' is still widely debated since its publication in the 1994 UNHDR, it is an important concept in security studies (Tabyshalieva 2006:13).

In this respect, although members of the Copenhagen Peace Research Institute, which include Buzan and Waever, propose a broadening of the concept of 'security' with 'societal security' as a separate focus and the position of the collective as more fundamental to security studies than the individual's security, they still acknowledge the significant role of the individual for security issues e.g. the use of human security as an argument for attaining political ends (Tadjbakhsh 2005:6; Tadjbakhsh 2009, Møller 2005:82, 102). Waever's (1993) approach also recognises the dialogical effects of one security level on another. Also, if there is a perception of threat to an individual's immediate security, the individual may react by showing less tolerance to others (UNHDR 1994:23). In a case study from the Balkans, Møller illustrates that national, societal and human security with their respective referent objects – state, societal groups, and individuals – are connected, and influence each other since the achievement of one form of security may lead to reduction in the other form. It is, thus, important to be aware of the relationships and effects of the different forms of security on each other when planning strategies to solve security problems (Møller 2005:79, 119-120).

Tadjbakhsh further states that since the concepts of 'security' and 'insecurity' are context-dependent for their meaning, security should be redefined to take account of the subjective experience of the individual in their daily life (Tadjbakhsh 2009). For this reason, attitudes expressing perceived or real threat are important for deciding policies. This study investigates attitudes expressed in newspapers in the US regarding immigration and its relation to attitudes concerning the role of the English language in the country.

Since government measures are aimed at members of a state and may have the effect of reinforcing or reducing security at both group and individual levels, the next section will look at political actions on language, that is, government actions that are aimed at affecting the everyday language behaviour of members of a state.
4.2 Language policy

Language policy is the official planning of language by a political authority and is therefore, linked to political power. All language policies, in similarity to other policies, may be successful or may not attain their goals (Ager 2001:5-7). Language policies may have underlying agendas such as social and economic gate-keeping, increase of political power, or economic exploitation. A language policy applied to different groups in a nation state may have different effects. An example of this is the support for English in North America since the colonial period until the early 20th century. For some groups, namely those of European origin, the goal was acculturation (see section 3.1 for a discussion on related concepts such as ‘assimilation’) with the purpose of complete assimilation at the structural level. Native American groups were subject to deculturation with the purpose of subordination but without incorporation at the structural level (Ricento 2000a; Ricento 2000b; Wiley 2000) thus entailing that members of this group are largely marginalised without significant institutional support for integration. For Ricento, language ideologies exist in relation to other non-language-oriented ideologies (Ricento 2000b:4).

Some countries, but not all, have explicit language policies i.e. they exist in written form and are part of constitutions or established by law (Spolsky 2004:4). Intervening in language usage requires the existence of a community that is definable as a cohesive group such as those units formed by politics, ethnicity and processes that emphasise languages as an identity marker e.g. by including language as a precondition for group membership related to decisions of for instance citizenship or the strengthening/augmenting of linguistic vitality by active use of a particular language (Ager 2001:86).

The language policy process that directly concerns this study is status planning, which involves the selection of languages/varieties for certain functions in a given society – particularly concerning the choice of a national or official language and its implementation. According to Spolsky, choice and implementation are dependent on their legitimacy and their coincidence or agreement with the language practices and ideology of the community in question (Spolsky 2004:6, 218). Haugen (as cited in Deumert 2000:389) uses the term ‘acceptability criterion’ which refers to the possibility for a society to accept proposed changes in status planning.

Status policy has as objective the increase of prestige attached to a language variety by making sure that it is used in particular official or public domains (Ager 1999:1). In the case of the United States, it is interesting to note that English already has a de facto dominant
position in the society and is the language that is used in public domains although it may sometimes share a particular domain with a minority language, as is the case of the use of Spanish in the labelling of retail products.

Status policy implementation is guided by ideologies. Cobarrubias (1983) outlines four typical ideologies for inducing language planning action, namely linguistic assimilation, linguistic pluralism, vernacularisation and internationalisation. Assimilation relies on the belief that everyone should speak and function in the dominant language in the given society. The dominant language is placed in a superior position and under this ideology equal minority language rights are in principle not granted. There are different types of assimilation e.g. New Mexico and areas of Colorado California occupied by America in 1846 are examples of assimilation through colonisation while Hawaii, Alaska, Louisiana and Texas serve as examples of assimilation by annexation (Cobarrubias 1983:63-67; cf. Fasold 1984:9-12 for processes of linguistic contact in section 3.3.1). This definition seems to concern assimilation as regards the use of language in official instances such as education or in the formulation of legal documents. It is however unclear whether Cobarrubias then acknowledges that under this type of assimilation, parallel bilingualism can occur in the private sphere, bearing in mind the implications of acceptance or tolerance and status. In Giddens' (2001) use of the term 'assimilation', no room is left for national and immigrant minority languages in a society. As regards the other three language planning ideologies, Cobarrubias further defines pluralist planning as permitting and recognising different languages in a society. Pluralism can range from tolerance for specific functional use such as religious rituals and/or education to recognition of official status – the strongest form of pluralism. Thus a pluralist ideology can permeate all levels and sectors of a given society or only certain aspects of life within that society. The official bilingual status in Louisiana and New Mexico – until they were granted statehood – are examples of situations close to what can be defined as pluralistic ideologies of language. Cobarrubias is also careful to point out that the 1968 Bilingual Act is not according to him a step towards pluralism since the programmes that were included in the Act were transitional and aimed for a shift to all-English education as the ultimate goal rather than granting continued official language status. The third type of ideology taken up by Cobarrubias is vernacularisation which involves the officialisation of a selected and restored indigenous language. The fourth ideology, namely internationalisation is the selection of a language of wider communication – a non-indigenous language – as the official language e.g. in instruction and trade. English as a lingua franca is an example of such a language (Cobarrubias 1983:63-66).
Ideologies of language planning exist in a social context and in reference to this Kaplan and Baldauf (1997) present three questions that must be considered when dealing with bilingualism and language status. They ask whether it is an issue "of 'languages in competition' (Wardaugh 1988) …or language requiring territories (Laponce 1987…) or can and do languages co-exist depending on their use, function, and status?" (Kaplan and Baldauf 1997:216). These factors are related to language contact and conflict situations and can serve as a guide for language policy making. Phillipson (2003:67) shows Finland and Switzerland as examples that indicate that linguistic and ethnic difference do not exclude peaceful coexistence (Phillipson 2003:67). Furthermore, according to Phillipson, worldwide experience has shown that it is possible to organise education to make competent bilingual or multilingual speakers regardless of the status of the individual's mother tongue (Phillipson 2003:63).

An instrumental approach to language planning posits language as a means for efficient communication. Identity and group solidarity functions of language are not dealt with and language attitudes are perceived as changeable and adaptable to the proposals of language planning through propaganda or use of political power and authority. In contrast, language planning from the sociolinguistic approach emphasises language use and language attitudes within the social and symbolic context. Thus, acceptability of language planning from this view must take account of extra-linguistic factors, i.e. social, cultural and political aspects. In other words, linguistic features are not considered as the sole determinant of language attitudes (Deumert 2000:398-399).

The need to regard language policy making in a wider sphere is also presented in Spolsky's three component model for policy making. Spolsky contextualises language policy placing it in dialogue with extra-linguistic aspects, namely "social, political, economic, religious, demographic, educational and cultural factors" (Spolsky 2004:ix). Within this perspective, attempts to intervene in the language practices and beliefs of language users are affected for instance, by economic and population changes since these may influence the values that particular language varieties carry in the society (Spolsky 2004:186). This can be linked to the need of complementarity as expressed in Grin's view, namely that the study of language processes needs to include contributions from various disciplines in a relationship of complementarity and that in the case of an economic perspective to language policy qualitative non-market values need to be included in the quantitative economic analytical framework of language issues (Grin 2003).
This view of language policy falls within an 'ecological approach' which entails studying the relationship between a language and its environment. For Spolsky, language policy is seen as functioning within a system of ecology comprising linguistic (the official and non-official varieties of a language) and extra-linguistic elements (Spolsky 2004:6, 41, 218). Spolsky's model consists of a three divisions ranging from the micro to the macro levels of language namely language practices, language beliefs and language policies and planning. In this model, all these elements need to be taken into account for a language policy and its implementation to be successful (Spolsky 2004:39). Language practice refers to the choices made by the individual – at varying degrees of conscious choice from the available sociolinguistic repertoire, ranging from sound and word to chosen or appropriate language variety or language, in the case of a multilingual community. In these terms, language practice is linguistic behaviour, and therefore refers to what individuals do (Spolsky 2004:5-14, 217). The beliefs and ideology prevalent in a speech community concerning language and its usage are the choices of linguistic behaviour available to the individual, who needs to take account of value judgments based on community norms (Spolsky 2004). Language beliefs and ideology refer to what individuals believe should be done (Spolsky 2004:14). On a similar note, Hornberger (2006:34) emphasises that language planning and policy studies are enriched by the inclusion of critical perspectives and emphases on ideology, ecology and agency. According to Spolsky, although a policy may exist, it is still uncertain whether it will be implemented, and if so, whether implementation will be successful (Spolsky 2004:11). In other words, success is dependent on the consistency between language management (other authors use 'planning', 'engineering' or 'treatment' to refer to the same activity), language practice and language beliefs as well as other factors that are specific to each place and time (Spolsky 2004:222). A possible criticism of Spolsky's model is its emphasis on individual choice and its implication towards an underlying liberal ideology even though he takes into account norms and conventions restricting choice.

Spolsky identifies four conditions that were present in the various language policies he studied. The first refers to the perceived sociolinguistic situation, i.e. the number and kinds of languages and respective number of speakers, as well as the value attached to each language. In some countries, the existence of marginalised language varieties may be ignored and may lead to, for instance, a false perception of a community as monolingual. The second condition refers to the national, ethnic, and other identities in a community. The symbolic value of what is/are considered as being the national language(s) of a modern nation state is an important factor in language management. The national language(s) is/are expected to be taught in
schools and used in public life. The third condition concerns globalisation processes and the increased influence and prevalence of English in the sociolinguistic repertoire of individuals. Proficiency in English, due to its status as a language of wider communication, is seen as bringing economic advantages. Lastly, the fourth condition identified by Spolsky links recognition of language choice and human civil rights. International covenants and supranational organisations have emphasised the need to acknowledge and allow an individual or group to use their own language. Favourable views of linguistic pluralism have led some governments to recognise a limited set of rights depending on the fulfilment of certain criteria: territorial – if a language has a significant number of speakers in a given geographical space; demographic – indigenous groups are given advantage for recognition of rights in comparison to immigrant groups or individuals with foreign worker status; and functional limitation – a state's services are most likely to be provided in minority languages whereas educational services in these language are least likely to be accepted as state responsibility (Spolsky 2004:219-222). All of the conditions allow for language to be used as a contributing factor to ethnolinguistic tension. In her study covering the language debates in the US, Schmid (2001) refers to the role of extra-linguistic factors in her statement that the official English movement uses language as a replacement for tensions arising from demographic and cultural change – changes which have increased a feeling of insecurity among Americans. The results showed that bilingualism is perceived as a threat to national unity. She further states that the "controversy over official English and bilingualism is about competing models of Americanism" which is a reference to the beliefs and ideologies that exist in the society (Schmid 2001:4-10). Since different linguistic groups in a state have or are perceived as having different status, resulting in hierarchies of power, the next section will look into the differentiation of groups in a state from a language rights perspective.

4.2.1 Language rights

Discussions concerning language rights have tended towards two possibilities namely linguistic convergence, in which assimilation and a single common language within a country is regarded as the most desired method for obtaining national unity, social cohesion and deliberative democracy. The other possibility is the presentation of models that strive towards linguistic diversity and the preservation of languages that have a weaker position in the particular society claiming that diversity is a public good – similar to the argument used for the maintenance of ecological diversity – and that it is a right that belongs to speakers of languages that are under threat (Patten and Kymlicka 2003:37).
At the supranational level, "The United Nations Charter adopted in 1945 proclaimed respect for human rights and fundamental freedoms, equality and absence of discrimination. The 1948 "Universal Declaration of Human Rights (article 2/1) included language as one of the criteria that might not be used for discrimination" (Spolsky 2004:118). Phillipson further describes the UN Declaration of 'universal' human rights as built on the values of "representative democracy, the rule of law, and civil society that aims at creating freedom, peace, human dignity, equality and social justice" (Phillipson 2003:55). Bearing in mind these criteria, Skutnabb-Kangas, Phillipson and Rannut claim that linguistic rights/linguistic human rights (LHRs) should be a part of basic human rights (Skutnabb-Kangas, Phillipson and Rannut 1995:1-2). Varennes (2007:115-116, 124) states that linguistic rights can be derived from individual human rights since these are based on the principles of non-discrimination and freedom of expression. He further explains that since minority language speakers do not have the same LHRs as majority language speakers, LHRs should in this view, be included in international and national law.

For Skutnabb-Kangas, Phillipson and Rannut, LHRs at the individual level involves a positive identification in the link between the individual and their mother tongue; the right to learn the mother tongue, as well as basic education conducted in it. At the individual level, LHRs also include the right to use a minority language in some official contexts and also to learn the dominant language of the country of residence. At the collective level, LHRs attribute the right for the existence of the minority group, for the development of the group's language and establishment of education conducted in the minority language. It also includes representation in political affairs, autonomy in culture, religion, education, among others, and support of the same by means of financial grants. These rights are also connected to access to a fair trial and maintenance of the group's cultural heritage (Skutnabb-Kangas, Phillipson and Rannut 1995:1-2). Patten and Kymlicka state that the demand for universal language rights as defined within the framework of LHRs, i.e. that it is applied to all individuals "regardless of history, numbers, or nationhood – is precisely its weakness. The only sorts of rights that can be defined in this universal way are minimal rights, primarily tolerance rights plus a few very modest promotion or accommodation rights” e.g. the supply of court interpreters (Patten and Kymlicka 2003:34-35). Examples of tolerance rights are those that allow linguistic minorities to publish their own magazine, establish their own cultural organisations, create their own schools and not be discriminated due to their mother tongue. These rights are in line with "traditional individual rights" namely freedom of speech, press, association, and non-discrimination. Promotion rights are for instance the right to have public-funded minority
language schools/radio/TV, to use the minority language with public officials, have legal proceedings in the minority language, have access to government documents in the minority language, or the right for the minority language to have official language status.10 (Patten and Kymlicka 2003:34-35).

The main focus of LHRs on public funded primary education of an individual's mother tongue as a universal right does not attain the target of the right to use the minority language in public administration, media and higher education which are placed as secondary – social demands/requests/wishes which are voiced in many linguistic conflicts (Patten and Kymlicka 2003:35). The UNESCO Convention against Discrimination in Education in 1960 supported the use of minority languages in separate educational programmes as long as they did not constitute an obstacle to the learning of the culture and language of the larger community (Spolsky 2004:118) thus favouring the state's existence over ethnolinguistic minorities that may have been forcefully incorporated into the state and confirming its sovereignty.

Phillipson makes a distinction between the right for an individual to learn their mother tongue and the official language of the country of residence from the right to learn a foreign tongue. The latter is an enrichment right not a human right. In enrichment rights the mother tongue in question is not at risk of dying (Phillipson 2003:155). However, enrichment rights may be important for a multilingual society since learning a foreign language is considered to reduce ethnocentricity and prejudice and increase tolerance towards other cultures (Phillipson 2003:96).

The International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights from 1966 states that in cases of crime, individuals are entitled to have the charge made in a language that they understand. Similarly a defendant is allowed to use an interpreter in a court case (Spolsky 2004:118). In 1994, the United Nations Human Rights committee reinterpreted article 27 from the covenant of 1966 to include immigrants and refugees in the originally stated protection of minority groups recognised by a state directing that ethnic, religious, and linguistic minorities should be allowed to express and practice their culture and religion as well as use their language (Spolsky 2004:120-121). The United Nations Convention on the Rights of the Child in 1989 dealt with the linguistic needs of the Child who belongs to a minority group or is indigenous. In 1990, the United Nations adopted an International Convention on the Protection of the Rights of all Migrant Workers and Members of their Families that included language rights. In 1992, the United Nations Commission on Human Rights

10 A more comprehensive differentiation of the rights, namely tolerance- vs. promotion-oriented rights, norm-and-accommodation vs. official-language rights regimes; personality vs. territoriality rights regimes; and individual vs. collective rights as described by Patten and Kymlicka (2003) is given below in this section.
adopted a Declaration on the Rights of Persons belonging to National or Ethnic, Religious and Linguistic Minorities, which included "whenever possible" state measures to enable minorities to learn or have instruction in their mother tongue (Spolsky 2004:119).

According to Johnson, the idea of policies benefiting all individuals from the perspective of justice is an unrealistic practice. As support for his claim, he refers to the application of Affirmative Action for "racial preferences" supported by law in the US, which led to only benefitting a portion of the targeted group i.e. well-off blacks and Hispanics, but at the same time, the measure disadvantaged all the poor in the country (Johnson 1997:803). Thus government measures need to be more specific about which groups are targeted rather than focusing on ethnic and racial differences since these, as all other social categories, are not homogeneous. Similarly, Phillipson (2003:87) states that in the case of the US, a laissez faire policy towards language affects social justice since there are differing levels of proficiency in English among members of a society. In this way, a policy directed to all may increase inequalities.

Lagerspetz argues that an instrumental consideration of the role of language in the life of an individual justifies the establishment of language rights. The view is based on individual rights associated with the autonomy and well-being of individual members of a particular group, in line with the liberal argument, and is thus not an argument for a group rights policy based on the notion of 'cultural conservation'. Furthermore, according to Lagerspetz, the state must be involved in a distributive function since language is necessary for running public services. Therefore, a common language is considered to be necessary for citizen participation in a democracy, and since choosing an official language is always a distributive act, it cannot be left to the market (Lagerspetz 1998). This argument might be criticised for allowing room for interpretation of measures to oppress ethnocultural expressions based on an instrumental approach that permits the claim by the state of knowing "what is best for the individual".

From their survey, Patten and Kymlicka (2003:26) refer to four ways for organising language policy and language rights options: tolerance- vs. promotion-oriented rights (first introduced by Kloss in 1971 and most used when dealing with language rights literature); norm-and-accommodation vs. official-languages rights regimes; personality vs. territoriality rights regimes; and individual vs. collective rights.

Tolerance rights guarantee individuals the right to make language choices in their private sphere without interference from the government. Promotion-oriented rights refer to the language used by public institutions. This category of rights was presented by Kloss (1971:259; also cited in Patten and Kymlicka 2003) in which he distinguished between
'immigrant' language groups which should only be granted tolerance rights, and language
groups that have historical roots in the state and have kept the use of their language. Thus,
'national' groups should be granted both tolerance and promotion rights (Kloss as cited in
Patten and Kymlicka 2003:26-27). Although Kloss proposes that immigrants do not have the
right to demand promotion rights since these are paid by public funds, he does put forward the
idea that immigrant groups may be granted promotion-oriented rights if they prove that they
can keep the language alive among the third generation, i.e. "only after the language can be
held to have taken root" (Kloss 1971:260-261). Criticism of Kloss' differentiating of groups
could be argued from the point of view that immigrant groups, would mostly be granted
tolerance rights in the US, since studies have indicated that by the third generation language
shift is a common phenomenon. Also it could be said that the absence of promotion-oriented
rights directed to large immigrant minority groups in effect reproduces the dominant position
of English. Patten and Kymlicka (2003) state that since it is impossible for promotional rights
to be granted to all language groups, an alternative would be for rights to be granted based on
achievement of certain factors by the language groups regardless of whether they are 'national'
or 'immigrant' linguistic groups such as the attainment of a minimum number of speakers, the
number of speakers in relation to the concentration in territory, and the possibility of the
language being used in international communication (Patten and Kymlicka 2003:26-27). This
is a more flexible view on tolerance and promotion rights since it allows room for social
change based on factors that are external to the individual's capability of generational
language maintenance.

Norm-and-accommodation rights and Official-languages right refers to language rights in
public institutions. The former approach is the use of one language in public communication
and special arrangements for the use of other languages for the individuals lacking proficiency
in the language of public communication. The latter approach of Official-languages rights
involves granting 'official' status to one or more languages and a consequent relationship of
equality between the languages (Patten and Kymlicka 2003:26-27).

The category of Personality versus Territoriality Rights Regimes is usually used in relation
to official language rights but can be applied to the norm-and-accommodation approach.
Personality rights give citizens the same (official) language rights in all parts of the country.
Territoriality rights entails that the individual's language rights vary according to the region in
a given country, thus dividing the country into linguistic regions. The Territoriality Rights
strategy is problematic since it builds on an assumption that individuals are bound to a
physical geographical area (Patten and Kymlicka 2003:29). It is interesting to note that the
change of social interaction from Gemeinschaft to Gesellschaft and the effects of
globalisation are proof of a certain reduction in the significance of the local to the individual
and therefore decreases the value of granting territorial rights. It is also possible to state that if
one extends this line of thinking to include Anderson's (1991) notion of 'imagined
communities' then it is possible to claim that discussions about official language status in
states are part of a Gemeinschaft idea of one language and territory as coterminous.

Of the three different ways and ideologies in which language policies and rights can be
organised, only one deals explicitly with the private sphere, namely tolerance rights.

Patten and Kymlicka indicate yet another way of organising language policies and rights
in a country, namely to make a choice between individual and collective rights. It is in the
latter category that one can refer to group-differentiated rights which come into effect only
when a certain level of demand has been reached e.g. that is a minimum number of certain
language speakers, whereas individual rights are applicable regardless of that number (Patten
and Kymlicka 2003:30). An example in the US is the requirement under the Voting Rights
Act (Titles II and III), as described by Schmidt, in which if a group speaking another language
made up at least 5 per cent of the voters in the electoral district then the election material such
as ballots, registration forms should be printed in that language (Schmidt 2000:20-21).

Kymlicka defends the notion of group-differentiated rights within a liberal framework (in
the US special status is accorded to American Indians and Puerto Ricans), such as self-
government rights and polyethnic rights, by presenting three arguments for group specific
rights: firstly, the guarantee of equality; secondly, respect of historical agreements – of which
many have been ignored or cancelled; and thirdly, intercultural and intracultural diversity.
Diversity is seen as valuable since it offers new perspectives. He further adds special
representation rights – the right to participate in decision making activities at state level, e.g.
through demands for reservation of seats in the legislature for groups that are marginalised or
disadvantaged – as part of group-differentiated rights alongside self-government and

Self-government rights refer to the demand by minorities for "political autonomy or
territorial jurisdiction, so as to ensure the full and free development of their cultures and the
best interests of their people. At the extreme, nations may wish to secede, if they think their
self-determination is impossible within the larger state" (Kymlicka 1995:27). Polyethnic
rights are of particular interest to this study since they are the rights demanded by immigrant
groups for visibly expressing their culture without suffering the consequences of prejudice or
discrimination. Some demands have included public funding for practicing their culture
within the frame for the state's support of the arts, museums, etc. Self-government rights and polyethnic rights are not seen as temporary rights (Kymlicka 1995:30-32).

Also, Kymlicka claims that there is no conflict between group rights and individualism (as cited in Appiah 2005:122). Kymlicka's view is that individualism benefits from security of group membership and that it is possible to strike a balance between ensuring external rights (the rights of a group in relation to the state and the right to apply for grants), and limiting the internal restrictions that the group may impose on the individual's autonomy. For Kymlicka, the defence of minority rights within the liberal view is based on two claims, namely "that individual freedom is tied in some important way to membership in one's national group; and that group-specific rights can promote equality between the minority and majority" (Kymlicka 1995: 52). Appiah criticises this balance by suggesting that in any case a group may limit the education of its members solely to the language of the minority (Appiah 2005:79-81). Kymlicka (1995) states, however, that group rights can only be attributed with the condition that individual rights are not violated.

For Kymlicka human rights principles need to be complemented with the theory of minority rights since the protection of cultural minorities through traditional human rights doctrines have left them vulnerable to injustice by the majority and open to ethnocultural conflict (Kymlicka 1995:5). In this way, justice in a multicultural state needs to include universal rights that are directed to individuals regardless of their group membership alongside group-differentiated rights or 'special status' for minority cultures. However, the protection by minority rights is conditional to the fact that the groups abide by the principles of liberty of the individual, that the groups are democratic, and that they follow the liberal notions of social justice (Kymlicka 1995:6). According to Kymlicka allocation of collective rights to minority groups does not need to conflict with individual liberty and must exist within the liberal theory (Kymlicka 1995:7). In a study carried out by Coulombe, language rights in the US are not viewed as group rights but rather as linked to "other more fundamental rights such as religion, due process, educational equity – or they are seen as rights possessed by individual adults..." (Coulombe as cited in Schiffman 1996:246).

The problem of essentialism has been brought forward by critics of language rights claiming that the arguments used by proponents of language ecology and linguistic human rights essentialises and fixes minority speakers at a particular historical point and of viewing language and ethnic identity as unavoidably linked. Another critique of language rights is the problem of social mobility. Critics consider that the argument for minority language rights may damage or limit the individual's prospects and possibilities for social mobility. Critics of
minority language rights see majority languages as offering the most instrumental value to the speaker (May 2005). In defence of minority language rights, May (2005) considers that the view of language as a tool leads to an either/or situation, that is, a separation of language as instrumental or as an identity marker. For May, all languages include both identity and instrumentality functions for the speaker. However, he also points out that the difference between languages is the degree to which these functions are forwarded – an aspect that depends on social and political conditions (May 2005). May (2005) uses the term 'mutual accommodation' to refer to the situation in which there is "the possibility of public bilingualism or multilingualism" as a result of the majority language speakers accommodating minority languages in public communication. However, Grin also adds that the cost of language policies for multilingualism are mainly unknown but high estimates have been calculated (Grin 2006:88). Nevertheless, minority language rights are seen by May as offering a pluralistic alternative defending the idea that linguistic identities need not be dichotomised and can instead co-exist in "linguistic complementarity" (May 2005), therefore allowing contextual or situational identities. In contrast, Spolsky states that the "implementation of collective language rights often conflicts with individual linguistic rights: the preservation of the language often entails forcing individuals to learn or use it" (Spolsky 2004:130) which in the case of individuals with membership in minority groups would mean a reduction of choice and/or having to learn at least two languages.

Studying the debate regarding bilingual education and language rights in the United States, Cummins concludes that 'disinformation' can be seen in the argument that bilingual education (which Cummins rephrases as minority empowerment) constitutes an "internal threat". 'Disinformation' is a strategy used, Cummins claims, to manipulate domestic acceptance of the interests of the dominant group. Thus, many of the opponents of the bilingual educational programmes focus on the threat that these programmes pose to the existing social structure expressed in terms of the "American way of life" and entailing a threat to national unity. Nevertheless, since according to the US Constitution, all students have the right to equal opportunity in education, the debate of bilingualism and English-only educational programmes includes views of whether these programmes are in accordance with the equal educational opportunity goals under federal law. Cummins further claims that US international trade and national security can be negatively affected by the emphasis of monolingual education and language shift (Cummins 1995:159-163, 175).

11 a term used in international politics to refer to the "systematic spreading of false information in order to confuse and disorient the opposition" (Cummins 1995:159)
From a historical perspective, racial desegregation in the United States was based on the removal of the system of segregated education for black and white children in the South. Along with the civil rights movement this decision was significant in supporting views of racial equality in United States. Thus the adopted model for racial justice was 'colour-blind laws' which were applied to counteract racism against blacks and national minority groups (Kymlicka 1995:58, 60). The initial demands for recognition and expression in the 1960s of blacks led to awareness by ethnic groups in the country of their own status in the US. During the ethnic revival of the 1960s and 1970s, some immigrant groups that seemed to have previously accepted the view of themselves as ethnic groups rather than national minorities as forming a country built by polyethnic immigration, now demanded the right to 'self-determination', which included the recognition by the state of their mother tongue and support for the separate ethnic institutions. The language used by these groups when referring to their social positioning also changed and integration began to be referred to as a synonym of oppression (Kymlicka 1995:62; Kymlicka 1997:239). Anxiety over a possible fragmentation of the United States led to views that immigrants have a right and an obligation to integrate into the Anglo-adoption model of immigration. The demands made by immigrants during the ethnic revival were counter-argued as being illegitimate, since immigrants had arrived in the country voluntarily and that – as argued for instance by Walzer – the demand for self-determination was groundless as was the rejection of English as the public language. Kymlicka supports this attitude in the view that a difference should be made between immigrants and national minorities and that although voluntary immigrants have certain polyethnic rights they have no claim to national self-government. Kymlicka nevertheless still argues for group-differentiated rights (Kymlicka 1995:7, 61-64; Kymlicka 1997:246).

The complexity of the situation regarding linguistic rights is related to the problem of conflict between the individual's right to their own language and the demand for the state to adopt or fund minority languages (Spolsky 2004:120). In the United States, access to government services by individuals that do not speak English is based on the notion of individual civil rights (Spolsky 2004:122) rather than a group right. The question then arises whether the US should consider granting group-differentiated rights to immigrant populations that exceed a certain number – this can be related to Kloss' (1971:259) proposal that promotion-oriented rights should only be attributed to immigrant groups that show that their language has taken root in the country, namely by the third generation. A point in question is what effect does this have for integration? Another factor related to group rights is the possibility of the US using its in-born multilingual resources as a comparative advantage.
(bearing in mind that funds need to be allocated to foreign language learning schemes and therefore a matter of distribution of limited resources). Furthermore, in the case of the US, territoriality rights, e.g. the granting of rights to Hispanics in the southern states may create hostility to federal legislation in those same states by the dominant English speakers.

Language rights are linked to the possibility that minority individuals are allowed to use the language they identify themselves with in a particular society. The status of that language may determine the inclusion and advancement of the language speaker in that society. Minority group members may feel that their language has low status and therefore may decide to abandon their mother tongue or segregate from the dominant society. Widespread and long-lasting segregation, however, may lead to attitudes of intolerance by the majority and cause estrangement between groups. Since this is linked to the idea of the security of a state based on social cohesion, the next section will look at studies where issues of security are connected to language policies.

4.2.2 Language policy and security
The study of language planning and policy is related to the "study of social forces that influence language change, and the kinds of change motivated by social forces" (Kaplan and Baldauf 1997:x). Due to its positioning in real world problems the study of language planning and policy should include interdisciplinary perspectives. The terms 'planning' and 'policy' have often been used interchangeably but according to Kaplan and Baldauf (1997:xi) language planning is an activity, most visibly undertaken by government (simply because it involves massive changes in a society), intended to promote systematic change in some community of speakers.... A language policy is a body of ideas, laws regulations, rules and practices intended to achieve the planned language change in the society, group or system (Kaplan and Baldauf 1997:xi).

Ager also distinguishes between language planning and language policy. For him, the former refers to unofficial influence on language issues i.e. the conscious attempt by organised communities to affect the language behaviour of individuals in their daily lives and the languages used in institutions, the latter refers to the actions of authorities that carry official influence (Ager 2001:5-7). According to Cooper, language planning refers to the "deliberate efforts to influence the behaviour of others with respect to the acquisition structure or functional allocation of their language codes" (Cooper 1989:45). This definition allows for several actors to be involved as planners including those outside authoritative institutions
Further, Cooper presents language planning as "what actors attempted to influence what behaviours, of which people, for what ends, by what means, and with what results... under what conditions and through what policy making process" (Cooper 1989:97). These definitions can be related to the ubiquitous function of language and the various interdisciplinary research claims connecting language policy making with extra-linguistic factors. Deumert claims that language planning occurs often within or for the attainment of extra-linguistic objectives e.g. socio-economic or national integration goals (Deumert 2000:400). It is difficult to draw a line regarding policy and planning since the former is, as Kaplan and Baldauf (1997) state, a set of rules for intervention of language behaviour, and the latter, i.e. planning refers to an intention and subsequent preparations for the rules to be established in the society. However, it is the view of the present author that power relations should be given more prominence in language policy making and planning definitions – some writings already include this aspect e.g. in Tollefson's (1991:20) approach to language intervention as always including an aspect of power and the interpretation of language policies in relation to struggles of power, and in Cooper's (1989) question regarding which actors are involved in attempting to affect speech behaviour. Assymetrical power relations allow one group of people to assert their will on another group and therefore affect their daily life.

Various parts of a society are affected by language policy, whether at a national, regional or community level. Thus, language policies affect many aspects of an individual's daily life since they are implemented in institutions representing the government as well as some private organisations. The language(s)/language variety(ies) used in institutions, such as hospitals, public signs, courts, churches, businesses, and the educational system (Spolsky 2004:2), and even the mass media, are related to issues of human rights from the perspective of the right to be understood correctly and to understand correctly. This right is already taken up in practical terms in some countries e.g. by supplying an interpreter for court hearings or hospital visits. It is the extent to which language is integrated in the daily lives of people that issues related to intervention regarding the linguistic behaviour of an individual in a given society are significant to the collective and individual securities from a majority and a minority perspective. In view of the possibility of intervening on language behaviour, Schiffman states that language policy is a cultural construct that needs to coincide with the values and the linguistic culture of a language group or its success will be compromised (Schiffman 1996:59).

In the United States, language policy is carried out at the state and local levels. The
different actors involved in policy making means that many of the policies come into conflict with rules, policies or regulations that already have been issued at the federal, state or local levels (Shiffman 1996:3-4, 217). The United States does not have an overt language policy for English but the "fact that English is not legally protected, guaranteed, promoted etc. does not mean automatically that some other language might be able to mount a strong challenge to it…” (Shiffman 1996:14-15).

Since this study deals with immigration, which entails changes in the composition of the population in the United States, it is appropriate at his stage to refer to Cooper's (1989:164) statement to the effect that "social change accompanies language planning is scarcely surprising, in as much as language planning, concerned with the management of change, is itself an instance of social change" (Cooper 1989:164).

Language as an important element for security can be seen in the measures taken by the European Union through the Organisation for Security and Cooperation in Europe (OSCE) whose primary concern is conflict prevention. The organisation focuses on the protection of rights (including linguistic rights) of national minorities for a "comprehensive security" in which military, political, environmental, economical and human rights issues are seen to interrelate (Holt and Packer 2001:99). The organisation attempts to find resolutions before outbreaks of conflict based on ethnic tensions occur. The OSCE puts forward recommendations regarding language tests, the rights of noncitizens, as well as those included in the Hague recommendations of 1996 proclaiming the rights of national minorities for language education, the Oslo recommendations of 1998 for the linguistic rights of national minorities in organisations and businesses, and the Lund recommendations for national minorities to be able to participate effectively in public life (Spolsky 2004:125-126) e.g. in the electoral process (OSCE/ODIHR 2001). The focus on language by the organisation is based on the decision of the first High Commissioner of the OSCE who argued that it was important to implement language rights to reduce the risk of conflict since often minority status was linked to language. It is worth noting that the language rights that are included in international treaties and conventions deal with the protection of the rights of citizens regarding language use but do not however prevent activities by the states towards language shift by minorities for the protection of sovereignty (Spolsky 2004:127-128). The next section will deal specifically with Ager's (2001) study of insecurity in relation to language policy making.
4.2.3 Insecurity as a motive for language policy making

Ager's study of motivation for intervention on language behaviour concluded that policy makers need to view identity as a dynamic construction, based on a constant evaluation of an entity's – individual or state – identity in relation to its environment, as well as the willingness of actors to act in accordance with expectations of 'significant others'. Therefore, although the attitude of an individual, community or state towards a particular action may be positive or negative, or viewed as most appropriate or inappropriate, individual actors or groups will have a greater probability to perform the given action if others that are important to the entity believe that they should carry it out (Ager 2001:142, 198). Thus, Ager concludes that the attitudes of actors do not necessarily predict their actions (Ager 2001:198).

Ager presents twelve motives for decisions on language based on a sequence of stages, namely identity (personal and social), ideology, image, insecurity, maintenance and defence of identity, maintenance and correction of inequality, integration and instrumentality, and despair. Although the main focus of this thesis is on the motive of insecurity, an overview of the other motives follows in order to allow the contextualisation of the motive of insecurity in Ager's study. Therefore, firstly, the entity constructs a personal and social identity using beliefs and values from the social world. Thus the construction of identity is based on a dialogue with the environment, which also entails its dynamic nature. In his study of the definition of identity of collectives, Ager analyses the expression of nationalism in several countries and concludes that cultural, economic and political factors are interrelated in the definition of an entity's identity (Ager 2001:37-39, 136-138). The total world view or ideology of the entity as a distinct identity affects its language behaviour, which itself is based on values and beliefs of status and difference (Ager 2001:52-55, 136-138).

The entity then constructs an ideal image to project to the external world. Individuals and collectives aim to project a favourable image which is based on a perceived worth of the entity rather than a real or actual worth. In the case of policy makers this action would translate into attempting to create a positive perception of their language through spreading knowledge of the language and the culture of the country (Ager 2001:75, 136-138). Debates surrounding the spread of English, e.g. English as an international language and ideas of linguistic imperialism, can be seen as related to the image a state projects.

The identity is then evaluated in relation to the environment. In the case of states, this would entail assessing language behaviour and seeing what may need intervention. At the individual level this may relate to an evaluation of the possible life goals and linguistic ability of the individual for achieving those goals. It is at this stage of evaluation that language policy
making may become motivated by insecurity (Ager 2001:136-138; cf. section 4.1.1 for Buzan's framework of security as a motive for behaviour and section 4.1.2 for Waever's concept of societal security). Language groups may experience insecurity if another language group suddenly increases in size e.g. through migration. Due to the centrality of this motive for this study, a more detailed description of Ager's positioning of the insecurity motive follows.

If insecurity is felt, action may be motivated with the goal of defending and maintaining identity. Action may also be taken towards correcting or maintaining an unequal situation (Ager 2001:136-138). Actions to correct inequality may be taken by authorities as part of a political ideology, but mostly it is linked to groups that experience injustice, have little power and perceive themselves as excluded from the mainstream society. The action to correct inequality may also be taken by people and groups that are not themselves disadvantaged but are guided by humanitarian and altruistic feelings or because they themselves may have once belonged to a disadvantaged group (Ager 2001:88). Government action to change employment practices and advertising that negatively affect certain social groups is an example of correction of inequality through distribution of limited resources. Further actions are the ratification of international covenants to protect language or human rights particularly those of minority groups. Actions for correcting injustice are not seen as being limited to the goal of correcting inequality but include aspects of recognition, state cohesion and economics. A case in point are the motives for the Australian National Languages Policy of 1987 that adopted the following four principles: English and one more language to be available to all, support for minority aboriginal and Torres Strait Island languages and availability of language services. The reasons for this type of language intervention in Australia may be due to an acknowledgement and acceptance of immigrant communities, the creation of unity by guaranteeing the role of English in giving access to power, as well as economic reasons bearing in mind Australia's geographical location (Ager 2001:87-105). In contrast to Ager's notion of language management for the purpose of correcting injustice, Tollefson and Fairclough see any form of language planning as a form of domination (Ager 2001:105). The present author partly agrees with this view from the perspective that if one takes account that there are certain groups that hold a position in a given society that enables them to make decisions that affect others, then any form of planning that impacts on the lives of others will be a form of exercising power. It can be argued that avoidance of domination is difficult but it can be diminished by seeking agreement of those on whom the measures impact.
According to Ager's model, further actions triggered by insecurity are motives of integration and instrumentality. The former is primarily a social motive and the latter is essentially based on economic reasons. Ager claims that these two motives – integration and instrumentality – are related in the sense that what may initially be an instrumental motive e.g. migration due to financial improvement or career advancement may lead to the integrative motive based on a willingness to better acquaint with the host community. In the same way, integration may stimulate an improvement of proficiency in the dominant language as a tool for communication with 'significant others'. The dialogue between these two motives is based on the individual's continuous assessment of themselves in relation to their environment (Ager 2001:124).

However, Ager also states that initial insecurity may result in inaction leading to despair caused by an acknowledgement by the group or its members of discrimination and the almost definite impossibility of maintaining their own minority language. This feeling may ultimately result in language shift or language loss (Ager 2001:136-138). Although despair may be linked to instrumentality due to the acknowledgement by a minority community that their chances will be improved if they take on a new language, Ager believes that the loss of a community language and the process that it entails demands its own title of despair (Ager 2001:139).

In sum, evaluation of the organism in relation to its environment is constant and leads to action based on perceptions of insecurity. Ager further concludes that although all the motives may be mixed and of importance to actors at all levels, decisions based on instrumentality and individual objectives, such as career and social advantages, are mainly significant to individuals whereas communities are more likely to have motives of insecurity leading to actions that maintain identity. In this context, the state is also concerned with defending identity and projecting a positive image abroad. In contrast, powerless communities within states are more concerned with inequality (Ager 2001:197), instrumentality related to the limited functionality of their language in the domains in the society, insecurity linked to the value of the language, defence of identity, and integrative measures mainly derived from despair (Ager 2001:158-193). The insecurity of identity by dominant language speakers cannot be separated from the reasons of insecurity of minority speakers with which they are in contact. For relevance in this study is the idea that the behaviour of one group will cause a reaction in another group. If the majority imposes official English, it is possible that this measure may lead to feelings of despair among minority groups. If official English is not
implemented, members of the majority may express concerns regarding loss of national identity.

The various actors in a society are seen as having different types of goals (Ager 2001). Three goals can be identified for individuals. At one extreme is the decision that the individual takes to maintain their own language or variety and works towards improving their ability in this language. An individual may even retain their language even though in normal circumstances their language or variety would not be used in the situation. The opposite extreme is the adoption of a new language or variety in all situations by the individual. This may be due to the other language or variety having a higher status so that the individual regards the shift as advantageous e.g. for reasons of professional mobility or personal circumstances as in marriage and the resulting need to communicate with their partner's relatives. Reasons may also be due to solidarity with the target community, even in cases of non-status languages or varieties. In the mid-point between these two extremes are various strategies individuals can apply. In most cases, the individual adopts a language repertoire that allows them to switch between the different languages or varieties depending on the situation (Ager 2001:146-147).

As regards collectives, actions taken by minority groups may influence or are the result of actions taken by powerful groups. According to Ager, powerless groups are more likely to have goals of conflict, cooperation and compromise. The conflict goal is related to the overt or covert maintenance of their own identity. Overt political action by powerless groups can lead to open conflict with the dominant group. The cooperation goal is the mid-point between the extremes of conflict and compromise. In this goal, the communities maintain their distinctiveness but are not in conflict with the dominant group. Political objectives may relate to territorial control, political recognition of difference or an attainment of equal advantages similar to other communities within the state in the political, economic and social arenas. It is possible to claim that in the United States there is a degree of recognition of identity by the state expressed in the use of labels such as 'Asians' or 'Afro-Caribbeans' (Ager 2001:160-161) although this can be interpreted as a sign of division through labelling. Ager also states that linguistic objectives by powerless communities may include maintenance of minority language education often as a reaction to pressure towards assimilation by powerful groups. The compromise goal implies the extreme action of integrating or assimilating often in the direction of the more powerful, host community. Early migrants in the beginning of the twentieth century in the US often joined and accepted a shared identity thus losing their
individual group distinctiveness and in this way also avoiding possible conflict (Ager 2001:160-161).

Powerful actors, e.g. states, will identify goals at the internal and external level, in which the former relates to social cohesion, elitism or social mosaicity, and the latter is based on conflict or competition (Ager 2001:195). Since the focus of this thesis is on intrastate relations between groups, a more detailed view of the internal level will follow. According to Ager (2001), a social cohesion goal is based on notions of stability, unity and avoidance of territorial fragmentation. Two extremes on obtainment of cohesion are, on the one hand, the objectives of one language and the declaration of an official language as a means of defending the language from danger, perceived or real, from other languages. Also the state may work towards eliminating diversity within its borders. Another goal, elitism, is related to acquisition or maintenance of power and often ignoring social diversity. No legislation is passed, and citizens have complete freedom to choose what language to use, but all state affairs are performed in a specific language. The aim is the efficient running of the state rather than concern over social cohesion. In the mid-point between these extremes, is a plural state based on the goal of social mosaicity and constituting a harmonious multicultural or multilingual state. The state is often trying to balance out fragmentation tendencies and attempts to establish an ideal of harmony between the groups although this is seldom achieved in reality. It is worth noting that the opposing ideal of maintaining inequality and social division is rarely stated overtly (Ager 2001:177-178).

Ager describes insecurity as "an emotion, not a rational construct. If outsiders misunderstand, fail to see the point, regard the emotion as misguided, insecurity is if anything increased" (Ager 2001:85). This aspect as described by Ager can be related to the concept of 'security dilemma' (see section 4.1). For Ager, language policy motivated by fear and insecurity is founded on an external threat that triggers a response and also depends on the threatened community's own awareness of their situation and identity (Ager 2001:85). Also the threat must be identifiable, and may be political (potential domination of the community), economic (potential loss of income for members of the community), or communicative (lack of an effective affective link between members of the community, coupled with lack of adequate mean (sic) of expression for some domains and particularly for public ones). The ability to meet the threat requires the existence of both a way of identifying the threat and a potential answer, as well as a mechanism for implementing this (Ager 2001:85).
Insecurity may be caused by "fear of the unknown" and doubts cast on the actual/real existence of social cohesion (Ager 2001:77). In this scenario, language is used as an expression of identity symbolising and separating the included from the excluded. Furthermore, the retention of identity by a minority may be seen as posing a threat to the dominant society. The Gypsy community is an example of a community that may be perceived as a threat to the identity of the state due to their own strong sense of distinction marked by a different way of life, distinct culture, language and beliefs. In this way, insecurity can be described as based on fear of the Other (Ager 2001:83, 139). Protection of small or large changes to identity are based on fear of outside influence or domination in the political, cultural, religious and social spheres, loss of territory, and particularly the fear of losing the distinctiveness or the specific identifying characteristic of the society, or rather, to lose what is considered symbolic of the collective identity (Ager 2001:84, Ager 1999:x). In Ager's study of identity in France, it was shown that the French language is regarded as a symbol of the Republic of France and therefore the language that is necessary for all the language groups included in the Republic. Paradoxically, the diversity of these individual collectives is also perceived as a threat to the unity of the country (Ager 1999:11).

Most threats are not seen as originating from linguistic threats but are dependent on extra-linguistic factors (Ager 2001:86) and are often expressed if there is contact between linguistic groups. The expressed attitudes are a consequence of the individual's interaction in the society and their exposure to the dominant (and even minority) values and beliefs in the given society. Social change e.g. due to immigration can contribute to triggering new or dormant beliefs. The next section looks at language attitudes since as Baker states (1992:9) they have an important role in the maintenance, revival, decay or death of a given language. Specifically for this study it is the aspect of attitudes to language maintenance and language shift by immigrants that are of concern.

4.3 Language attitudes

The present study of discourse in the public debate in four American newspapers is adopting the definition of attitude provided by Ajzen, namely that an attitude is "a disposition to respond favourably or unfavourably to an object, person, institution or event" (Ajzen 2005:3).

Language attitude studies serve to explain attitudes which are accessed through external behaviour (Baker 1992:11). The measurement of language attitudes, both at the individual or group/community level is often used to obtain information regarding the status, value and importance given to (a) language (Baker 1992:10). The measurement of attitudes and
language consciousness shows some of the effects of language contact. However, certain measurement strategies may not have high validity. For instance, language statistics, as in census and public opinion surveys, may not be accurate since a multilingual person's linguistic identity is affected by factors such as language loyalty and prestige (Nelde 1997:288) and may vary on the occasions and contexts in which the measurement is taken.

Surveys of attitudes indicate the current or changing beliefs or preferences in a community. Censuses can measure attitudes regarding the position of a language in a country e.g. in the case of Spanish as a minority language and as a second language in the US (Baker 1992:9, 22-23). According to Baker, a way of indirectly measuring attitudes to language varieties is through matched-guise techniques (Baker 1992:22-23). Baker mentions language varieties but attitudes to specific languages can also be included in his description. Matched-guise techniques are experiments to obtain judgments made on spoken language. Romaine describes the test as consisting in a speaker's evaluation of other speakers through their language use referencing perceptions of friendliness, educational level, among others. Questionnaires have also been used to study language attitudes. One of the advantages with this form is large participation and therefore greater material representation. It is also easier to compare results than for instance in open-ended questions. The disadvantages are the lack of control of who answers the questions, misunderstandings on behalf of the respondents as regards the questions, and also, informants may choose answers that they believe are "helpful" or "appropriate". Furthermore, the formulation of questions in the survey may add to the discrepancy between attitudes and behaviour. Attitudes are difficult to establish from question and answer techniques, even in controlled experiments, since the process involves the interpretation of a subjective domain in objective terms. This problem is common to studies involving social categories and judgments based on perceptions (Romaine 1995:289, 302, 318). Furthermore, attitudes do not have a strong influence on behaviour (Ager 2001:141).

The concept of 'attitude' is complex and there is a discrepancy between people’s claims about what they do and their actual behaviour (Romaine 1995:319). Furthermore, following Baker's studies of the decrease of positive attitude with increasing age towards the Welsh language, Romaine describes attitudes as dynamic and liable to change (Romaine 1995:314-315, 319). Results have shown that linguistic affiliation and status connected to a language in a society, colour judgements. Both the members of a dominant group and of a minority group often regard speakers of dominant languages favourably. Stigmatisation of a language is often related to the status of its speakers. The specific language thus acquires the same status as the social identity of its speakers, whether stigmatised or not. The difference of power between
groups is reflected in language variations, as well as in attitudes towards this variation. In this way, language attitude studies can supply information regarding inter-group relations (Romaine 1995:289-290).

Also significant is that minority groups may attribute 'covert prestige' to their variety, although it is stigmatised by the dominant speakers (Romaine 1995:294), allowing for informal use of their language in certain areas of the public space, semi-public space and private space. Romaine further claims that one of the reasons stigmatised varieties survive within minority communities is because they function as markers of group identity (Romaine 1995:294).

Furthermore, Baker (2006) refers to the sociolinguistic key terms, instrumental and integrative orientation, in attitudes to language in which the former reflects pragmatic, utilitarian motives. An instrumental attitude to a language is mostly self-oriented and individualistic. Instrumental attitudes to learning a second language or preserving a minority language might be, for example, for vocational reasons, status, achievement, personal success, self enhancement, self-actualisation, or basic security and survival... An integrative attitude to a language, on the other hand, is mostly social and interpersonal in orientation and represents a desire to be like representative members of the other language community. Thus an integrative attitude to a particular language may concern attachment to, or identification with, a language group and its cultural activities (Baker 2006:214-215).

An example of the instrumental approach is for instance the aim to learn a language in order to get a good job. On the other hand, an example of an integrative attitude is the aim of learning a language in order to speak with people in that language (Baker 2006:214-215) and create a feeling of belonging. These descriptions can be related to Ager's view of integration and instrumentality as motives for language planning and policy in which he concludes that an initial instrumental language acquisition may lead to a will for integration which in turn serves as a stimulation for improving knowledge in the language (Ager 2001:108, 115, 124).

The present author's reading of Baker's (2006) reference to instrumental and integrative attitudes, as well as Ager's (2001:124) view of language behaviour as planned, is that an underlying liberal idea seems to exist, namely that individuals and communities are capable of making rational choices – those that favour them best, including those choices related to language (similar to Spolsky's emphasis on choice as mentioned in section 4.2). This choice-based approach may be questioned since the language/language variety an individual is born into is not based on choice but nevertheless has significant influence on the decisions an individual makes regarding language and his/her life chances.
To study the attitudes expressed in the newspapers in the US regarding the role/position of English, this study will use Fairclough's three-dimensional discourse framework. The choice of using Fairclough's critical discourse analysis perspective is based on Hyrkstedt and Kalaja's (1998) argument for a new methodology in the research of language attitudes, namely the replacement of mentalistic matched-guise techniques based on social psychology, by a social constructivist approach using discourse analysis as method. According to them, this qualitative study provides insights that traditional quantitative methods cannot due to their nature of procedure. Hyrkstedt and Kalaja (1998) apply this view on their discourse-analytic study of newspapers (letters-to-the-Editor) concerning language attitudes among Finns towards the English language and its functions in Finland.

Language attitudes are expressed in discourse whereby features within a discourse are situated in time and space. In a given society, certain aspects are more salient than others. The present investigation follows Wetherell, Taylor and Yates' description of discourse, i.e. the study of representation and meaning creation in social communication to reveal cultural patterns of significations and representations of reality (Wetherell, Taylor and Yates 2001:i). In this study, critical discourse analysis is used to uncover power relations in the debate on official English in relation to immigration. The next section will therefore provide an account of critical discourse analysis (henceforth CDA) as an approach.

4.3.1 Critical discourse analysis
Tollefson (2006) defines the use of the term 'critical' in language policy research as having three interconnected meanings. Firstly, as a critique of the traditional approaches to language policy which focuses on the development of language policies related to solving problems in multilingual situations and increasing socioeconomic opportunities for members of linguistic minorities. The critical approach in contrast "acknowledges that policies often create and sustain various forms of social inequality, and that policy-makers usually promote the interests of dominant social groups" (Tollefson 2006:42-43). In the second meaning to 'critical', Tollefson includes the idea of research aimed at affecting particular societies, in other words, research directed to creating social change based on rectifying inequalities in a given society. Thus, in this sense, research looks at the aspect of inequality in the social, political and economic spheres and attempts to develop policies that reduces social injustice. CDA suggests intervention in social practices in order to empower those that are powerless. In other words, CDA aims to cause change in order to remedy inequality. The third meaning refers to research included in works within critical theory. This area is concerned with
inequality and looks at the processes that are involved in creating and maintaining it – especially ideological processes in which inequality is seen as a natural situation. In this meaning the notion of 'power' is principal for the reproduction of inequality (Tollefson 2006:42-43). For Wodak, 'critical' in CDA refers to an attitude of not taking expressions for granted, and exposing covert structural power relations and ideologies (Wodak 2007). In the same way, Van Leeuwen (1993:193) sees CDA as investigating "discourse as the instrument of power and control as well as discourse as the instrument of the social construction of reality". The role of language is furthermore also significant since according to Blommaert and Bulcaen, CDA deals with relations of inequality and power as demonstrated in language use (Blommaert and Bulcaen 2000:447).

Since CDA includes studies with different theoretical background and uses different data and methodologies, as well as various definitions of the same terms such as 'power', 'ideology', 'critical' and 'discourse', any discussion regarding CDA should also specify the CDA perspective and core research theory used (Wodak 2002). CDA uses an interdisciplinary approach and has particular focus on issues related to language and power (Wodak 2002). Wodak further clarifies that CDA cannot focus on language alone and must take account of extra-linguistic approaches (Wodak 2007a).

Within CDA, language is social practice and should, therefore, be considered in the context of its use (Wodak 2007a). Language as social practice entails a relationship between the discursive event and the situations, institutions and social structures which shape the discursive event. It is a dialectical relationship because the discursive event is seen as shaped by the social as well as shaping the social (Wodak 2006:175).

In this study, security as a social issue caused by immigration is seen as expressed through language. Since, according to Wodak, CDA focuses on social problems such as "racism, identity, and social change" and not solely on linguistic elements (Wodak 2006a), CDA is used as the main framework of analysis in this investigation. The grammatical theory that is partly used to support the text analysis is systemic functional linguistics in line with Fairclough's use of it (Wodak 2007a).

Furthermore, since "core CDA" representatives are generally considered to be Fairclough, Wodak and van Dijk (Blommaert and Bulcaen 2000:454), below is a brief overview of the approaches taken by the latter two in relation to Fairclough's approach.

Wodak uses a discourse-historical approach in CDA which combines theoretical and empirical research applied to large data corpora and ethnography. Fairclough usually focuses on a small data size and does not often do fieldwork himself. Wodak uses textual analysis and
argumentation theory. This can be contrasted with Fairclough's use of mainly functional systemic linguistics for the linguistic analysis (Wodak 2001; 2007). Wodak's approach is described as "multimethodological", which allows for a variety of genres (written, oral and visual texts) and methods (qualitative and quantitative) to be combined in the same study (Wodak 2006:171-174). In this regard, it should be noted that Fairclough also includes written, spoken and visual images in his reference to 'text' (Fairclough 1995a:4).

Van Dijk is the main representative of the socio-cognitive model. His work includes aspects of cognition. His argument is that personal and social cognition mediate discourse structures and social structures. In other words, cognitive structures mediate between discourse and social structures (Wodak 2007a). Memories and mental models are seen to affect discursive practices (Wodak 2002). Also in this view, power is regarded as an abusive, oppressive tool which is imposed on subjects that are passive. Thus subjects are seen as incapable of acting as agents with possibilities for resisting structures. This is in contrast with Fairclough's view of power as negotiated, based on Gramsci's concept of 'hegemony' in which people have, to a certain extent, the possibility of resisting (Jørgensen and Phillips 2002:91). Van Dijk uses a varied methodology but often applies argumentation theory and semantic theories (Wodak 2002).

Fairclough's perspective of CDA offers a more poststructuralist understanding of discourse and the social than other CDA approaches. His view of the constituted and constitutive role of discourse in social change is in contrast to other CDA approaches that have a tendency to see discourse as a reflection of structures and which attribute the main role of discourse as that of social reproduction (Jørgensen and Phillips 2002:91).

According to Wodak (2007), the recent focus on identity politics, language policies, and the use of social theories and linguistic analysis combined, are important advances in CDA. This is in line with Tollefson's (1991:20) claim that it is necessary to interpret language policies in relation to the struggle for power and interests in order to see its role in the organisation of a given society. In light of this, Thompson states that it is important to keep in mind that language planning can both transform and reflect relations of power to the extent that minority languages are adopted in educational, legal, and governmental institutions (Thompson 1991:202) or are excluded from institutional practices.

Criticism to Fairclough's framework of analysis is that it is unclear how to demonstrate empirically the dialectical relationship between discursive and non-discursive elements. In other words, it is difficult to pinpoint the demarcating line between elements that are in dialectical relationship as well as demonstrate exactly where and how the discursive and non-discursive
elements influence each other (Jørgensen and Phillips 2002:89). However, the boundary between discursive and non-discursive elements can be to some extent dealt with by the social theories and analytical choices (Jørgensen and Phillips 2002:90) made by the researcher, which entails another difficulty within CDA regarding the degree of subjectivity of the researcher in the perspective chosen for the study. This fact is brought up by Schegloff (1997:166-167) who refers to the categories or "truths" that are put forward while others are backgrounded. If all characterisations are considered to be equally necessary and legitimate then Schegloff asks: What decides the choice of one truth instead of another? His answer lies in the contextual relevance and the characterisations that humans use for understanding and constructing the sociocultural event and states that:

Widdowson (2002:131, 146) criticises CDA for confusion in distinguishing between discourse in relation to text, and analysis as different from interpretation. Widdowson argues that the link between analysis and interpretation is the political commitment taken in the programme of CDA which may reflect a tendency to replace argument with persuasion. Fairclough's reply to Widdowson is that he makes a distinction between discourse and text in his perspective (Fairclough's 2002:148). It is significant to mention the distinction that Fairclough makes between discourse as an abstract and count noun. The former relates to language use in the wider perspective of social practice and the latter, namely as a count noun in which discourse or discourses refer(s) to ways of "signifying experience from a particular perspective" (Fairclough 1995a:135). Furthermore with regard to Widdowson's point on interpretation, Fairclough (2002:148) points out two senses of interpretation. Firstly, interpretation involves the ordinary activity of finding meaning in language use whether it is spoken or written text (sense 1). The second sense of interpretation refers to the attempts made by the analyst to make connections between the texts and practices of interpretation in sense 1 to a particular context and wider social dimension. Interpretation in sense 2 attempts to see how sense 1 is socially, culturally and ideologically (also referred to as explanation in Fairclough 1992) situated. In effect, according to Fairclough (2002), this is different from Widdowson's critique of CDA favouring certain interpretations, even though practitioners of CDA are politically committed, that is, carrying value judgements that some practices may
have negative effects on certain people and that some alternative practices are better than others. In light of this, Fairclough further questions the implication that the approaches such as those carried out by Widdowson can be said to be impartial and refers to Ashmore, Myers and Potter who state that "a categorical opposition between science (or theory) and ideology cannot be sustained – even the purest of science may work ideologically" (Ashmore, Myers and Potter 1994 as cited in Fairclough 2002:149-153).

A further criticism is that although Fairclough insists that analysis should combine text study with production and consumption practices of texts, the main part of his studies, as well as other forms of critical discourse analysis focus on textual analysis (Jørgensen and Phillips 2002:89-90). Since the main concern in this study is establishing security as an issue for language planning and policy making with regard to language attitudes as expressed in newspapers, it is considered suffice to follow the main part of Fairclough's study and focus on his approach to textual analysis.

### 4.3.2 Fairclough's three-dimensional analytical framework

CDA is based on the examination of texts in order to uncover their underlying ideology. Fairclough's use of CDA as an approach focuses on the link between language use and relations of power, and attempts to explain existing conventions as a result of power struggle and power relations. Language provides a locus for struggle (Fairclough 2001) and is one of the reasons why Fairclough's perspective of CDA is chosen for this study. The other reason is that his approach uses a linguistic perspective to written media texts.

Fairclough's approach is based on textually (linguistically) oriented discourse analysis (TODA) to studies of social and cultural change (Fairclough 1992:5-7). He claims that an integrated approach between linguistically oriented and socially oriented discourse analysis is necessary for a more complete understanding of social change and a movement towards a 'social theory of discourse' (Fairclough 1992:5).

For Fairclough, three types of constraints exist in the interaction between unequal power participants in which the most powerful has the possibility to control various aspects. Firstly, the most powerful can decide the content i.e. what is said and done during an interaction. Secondly, the relations i.e. the social relations taken up during discourse are mainly based on the powerful participant. Thirdly, the subjects/subject positions' occupied by participants are defined e.g. by labels (cf. Appiah 2005), which affect relations between participants. All three constraints overlap and co-occur (Fairclough 2001:38-39).
Also, language, as social behaviour, is seen as closely linked to ideologies since it relies on 'common sense' assumptions (Fairclough 2001:2). Texts have different levels of explicitness and assumptions. Nevertheless, texts often have an overall vision that form part of background assumptions, which are present in several texts in a process of universalisation that forms ideologies (Fairclough 2003:45-46). Thus, the analysis of reproduced and transformed discourses in several texts permits an easier account of how discursive practices are a constitutive part of the social world (Jørgensen and Phillips 2002:89) and is also a reason why this study analyses the available ways of speaking in several newspaper articles.

In Fairclough's model, three dimensions are identified (Fairclough 2001:18-21, 1995b:59) in which the representations of discourse takes place simultaneously (Mesthrie and Deumert 2000:325), namely Discourse as social practice, Discursive practice and Discourse as text (Fairclough 2001:18-21, 1995b:59). Discourse as social practice refers to the widest sphere of social context which determines discourse (Fairclough 2001:23-25). Social identities, social relations and systems of knowledge and meaning are constructed by discourse (Jørgensen and Phillips 2002:67). Thus, underlying conventions determine discourse. 'Orders of discourse' is the term used when these conventions form a network system within a particular social institution and belongs to the level of social practice. The order of discourse is a particular discourse perspective that is made up of discourse types. Thus the order of discourse provides the structure for the discourse types and underlying discourses (Fairclough 2001:23-25) and genres. In other words, the order of discourse is the sum of the discourse types in a social domain/field. The discourse types are made up of discourses (in this study given through the speech acts of societal security) and genres and belong to the level of discursive practice (Jørgensen and Phillips 2002:67-68). Discourse types are quite stable (Fairclough 1995b:66). Discourses are viewpoints which give meaning to experience (Fairclough 1995a:135). A genre is the use of language in a type of activity that is a social practice (Jørgensen and Phillips 2002:67) – and is therefore conventionalised. Genres are particular text types which involve certain processes of production, distribution and consumption. Genres as conventionalised activities can range from processes involved in informal chats, the act of shopping, a television documentary (Fairclough 1992:126) or news genre (Jørgensen and Phillips 2002:67-68). Discourses refer to a particular way of talking about a subject. In this way contents are mediated through discourses, which are constructions of the subject/content. Although certain discourses are more likely to appear in specific genres, they may still be used in other genres (Fairclough 1992:128). For Fairclough (1995a:4) a text is any written, spoken or visual image or a combination of these semiotic forms. A text is thus an instance of
language use that can be analysed. A discursive event refers to a circumstance of language use that can be analysed at all three levels, namely text, discursive practice and social practice (Fairclough 1995a:135). In this study, national security corresponds to social practice as it refers to the wider context of security seen from the state level; societal security corresponds to the order of discourse as one aspect of security that a state contains (thus leaving room for political, military, economic and environmental sectors that can be threatened or constitute a threat); and the texts, with the newspaper articles (including opinion articles) as genre, will be analysed for uncovering the discourse types that constitute societal security discourse as regards language. Following is a more detailed report of the three dimensions in Fairclough's framework.

Discourse as social practice is the view of language as a part of society, namely as constitutive and constituted by society. This entails that language is affected by linguistic and extra-linguistic factors in the society in which it is used. A dialectal relationship is assumed between language and social phenomena in which one aspect reflects and affects the other (Fairclough 2001:18-19). Linguistic phenomena must adhere to the conventions of usage in the given society. Interactions between people are determined by the social relationships that are established by social practices. The individual may enact those relationships in two possible ways, namely either by reproducing or by changing them. More importantly, language is only one part of the social since there are also extra-linguistic phenomena in societies (Fairclough 2001:19-20).

Fairclough views discourse from an ideological perspective in which power relations are engaged in a hegemonic struggle (Fairclough 1992:86). Ideologies are seen as representations or constructions of reality i.e. the ways in which reality – made up of the physical world, the social relations that are enacted, and the social identities that are available – is signified (Fairclough 1992:87) through meanings expressed in discursive practices resulting in the maintenance or change of power relations. Ideologies become part of discursive practices and their repetition, prevalence and the consequent acceptance of these practices as natural, can lead to the conflation of ideologies and 'common sense' practices. Not all discourses, however, carry ideological significations to the same degree, some discourses have more ideological imprint than others (Fairclough 1992:88, 91). Thus, language use and implicit common-sense assumptions existing in conventions "regulate" linguistic practice in social interactions. Common-sense assumptions of language use are regarded as unconscious and naturalise authority and hierarchy. The link that exists between language, power relations and ideology is significant since ideologies permit legitimisation of social relations and unequal relations of
power by repetition and familiarity of behaviour, wherein language is the most common (Fairclough 2001) means of performance. Power struggle is also a struggle for which ideology is to become the prevalent one in a society and subsequently lead to the transformation of what is considered as 'common sense' (Fairclough 1992:88, 91). Fairclough also draws on Gramsci's concept of 'hegemony' as significant for analysing social practice and power relations since it sees the practice of power through a process of consent or agreement and is thus, not imposed by force. This means that domination and naturalisation is realised through agreement about the ways in which the social world is represented (Fairclough 1995a, 2001).

The social practice (also called social-cultural practice) may have several levels of abstraction ranging from the immediate context of the communicative event to the wider context of institutional practices, as well as to the even wider scope of society and culture. Three aspects are distinguishable in a critical discourse analysis of the social practice of context, namely the economic, the political dealing with issues of power and ideology, and the cultural dealing with issues of value and identity (Fairclough 1995b:62). The interpretation of Fairclough's view in this study includes that these three aspects are applicable at the production and consumption levels of a text. Fairclough further states that an analysis of the social practice in a text would aim at answering why the discourse practice is the way it is – bearing in mind the constitutive effects of discourse, and specifying the effect the discourse practice has on the social practice (Fairclough 1992:237). Thus the communicative event is analysed in terms of whether it reproduces or contributes to transforming the social practice. A focus on systems of knowledge and beliefs, social relations, and social identities are useful to reveal the ideological and political effects of the discourse (Fairclough 1992:238). Fairclough uses discourse instead of the term 'ideational function' to emphasise its constitutive role and to signal that systems of beliefs and knowledge enter the texts in a constituted form (Fairclough 1992:128), and in this way may indicate a reading of legitimised power and/or resistance to it.

Furthermore, Fairclough uses the Foucaultian term 'orders of discourse' to refer to the totality of discursive practices in an institution or a society (Fairclough 1992:69). Orders of discourse are quite stable but nevertheless liable to change (Fairclough 2003:220) and indicate discursive aspects of social practices (Fairclough 1992:71). In other words, orders of discourse as a part of social practice constrain the transforming possibilities of the text and provide the frames into which the text is expected to create its meaning. The discursive practices within the orders of discourse are viewed as reproducing relations of power
(Fairclough 1995b:67-68). The representations or constructions of reality are signified through discursive practices (Fairclough 1992:87). Furthermore the way in which different discourse types are related to each other and the extent to which they are kept apart or mixed together, is another struggle over language. This connects back to… orders of discourse: the way in which an order of discourse is structured – the relationships between constituent discourse types – is determined by power relations, and therefore contested in power struggles (Fairclough 2001:84).

The above quote can be related to the new framework for security introduced by Buzan (1991 in section 4.1.1) and the further development of societal security by Waever (1993 in section 4.1.2). This study hopes to consolidate the position of language within societal security.

The dimension of discursive practice refers to the processes of production, distribution and consumption, which are specific to social contexts (Fairclough 1992:78). In addition, discursive practice mediates between the macro dimensions of social practice and the micro dimensions of text analysis (Fairclough 1992:86). The production and consumption of texts are constrained by 'members' resources', which include internalised social structures, norms and conventions and which, in turn, constrain the production and consumption processes (Fairclough 1992:80). In this study, discursive practice will focus on the discourse types that exist in the newspaper articles following Mesthrie and Deumert's statement that it is common to use media texts in critical discourse analysis studies (Mesthrie and Deumert 2000:326).

From within the dimension of discursive practice, the production of texts can include other texts on its surface creating 'chains of intertextuality' that are actually networks of distribution of prior texts. Throughout these chains, the text may undergo transformations to accommodate the genre it is integrated into, as is the case when a political speech is used in news reporting (Fairclough 1992:84-85). Fairclough further explains that at the level of consumption, the interpretation of the text is affected by the other texts that the consumer accesses during the interpretation process which the consumer uses to form presuppositions (Fairclough 1992:84-85). Also, already at a first stage, the genre of a text e.g. newspaper article or interview (Fairclough 1992:126) raises certain expectations and assumptions by the consumer regarding the content and layout. The property of intertextuality of a text may lead to the continuing reproduction of existing conventions or to new ways of using previous texts. These creative processes are characterised as discursive change, which may indicate change of a wider social significance above the level of the text (Fairclough 1992:85).
Fairclough distinguishes 'manifest intertextuality' from 'constitutive intertextuality' or 'interdiscursivity' (the latter term 'interdiscursivity' will be used in this study henceforth). Manifest intertextuality is the explicit presence of other texts in the text e.g. by usage of "quotation marks" (Fairclough 1992:104). Interdiscursivity refers to the inclusion of elements that are usually part of other discourses (Fairclough 1992:85). In other words, analysing interdiscursivity involves looking to see what external discourse elements are present in the text and how they are used (Fairclough 1992:232). Metaphors may reveal instances of interdiscursivity since they are tools for constructing reality and therefore form part of our systems of knowledge. The way a "domain of experience is metaphorised is one of the stakes in the struggle within the discourse practices" (Fairclough 1992:194-195). Bearing in mind the focus of this study it is worth mentioning the conceptual metaphor presented by Lakoff and Johnson, namely argument is war, which is claimed to be used in a range of expressions in everyday life. It reflects a structure of the actions that are performed by individuals when arguing; in which the argument is conceptualised as a physical conflict (Lakoff and Johnson 1980:4). The metaphor argument is war can be viewed as an element of interdiscursivity.

The third dimension in Fairclough's model is Discourse as Text. The 'text' is a part of discourse and the outcome of the 'process of production' and a resource in the 'process of interpretation'. The production process involves the inclusion of 'traces', which are then taken up to some extent as 'cues' in the process of interpretation. The productive and interpretative processes involve the features in the text and the 'members' resources' i.e. a bank of previous experience – knowledge of language and representations – formed by values, beliefs and assumptions the individual has accumulated of the natural and social reality (Fairclough 2001:20).

Therefore, at the macro level of social practice, this study will proceed by uncovering the discourse types and speech acts of societal security, based on Waever's (1993) definition of the concept, and their relation to Ager's (2001) study of motivation in language policy making, particularly his motive of insecurity. The focus is on the views given by individuals and organisations that are in favour or against the establishment of English as an official language in the US. As mentioned earlier, the analysis in this investigation will depart from the following perspectives: national security is seen as the social practice for its state-level qualification and also that national security is constituted by an interrelation between various aspects in a state, namely military, economic, political and environmental securities as well as societal security which has its focus on identity; societal security represents the order of discourse since it is one of the many security aspects that can be/is perceived as threatened in
a state. The study will then proceed to uncover the discourse types of societal security bearing in mind Mesthrie and Deumert's (2000:344) statement that "favoured patterns of language (style, discourse, accents) are conceived of as symbolic assets which can receive different values depending on the market in which they are offered". Since the focus of this study is based on intrastate relations due to migration, societal security will serve as the analytical lens by which the data is approached. Thus, the study assumes a power relationship existing between language, identity and immigration. The notion of 'societal security' contains the idea that immigration can destabilise a collective identity wherein societal security is the maintenance of essential characteristics under changing circumstances of real or perceived threats. Waever describes it as: "More specifically, it is about sustainability, within acceptable conditions for evolution, of traditional patterns of language, culture, association, and religious and national identity and custom" (Waever 1993:23). The link between language and identity has been established by several independent studies some of which are mentioned in section 3 of this work and therefore needs no further development here. The connection between language-identity and immigration is seen here from the point that since the link between language and identity is established in studies and literature, movement of people and the subsequent contact between different language speakers may be said to entail what will be referred to here as a realignment and/or renegotiation of language and identity.

Following the CDA tradition, the study also assumes the presence of conflict in the texts expressed in established ways of defining and dividing the experience of the world and the new ways that challenge these and lead to social change. Thus the possibility of (social) change is a strong perspective considered in this work. From the micro perspective, a linguistic analysis is carried out to uncover the ideologies of societal security in relation to the link between language and immigration within the context of the US. Thus conflict in the texts is assumed since the study is focused on expressions of real or perceived threats. In order to carry out an analysis of the texts, a systemic functional approach to language, as applied by Fairclough, is used.

Halliday's systemic functional approach to language provides tools for facilitating a microanalysis of language in relation to the context of use. Halliday identifies three metafunctions that can be paralleled to Fairclough's model of discourse. Firstly, the ideational metafunction is equivalent to the dimension of discourse as social practice and its influence on the constraints of content in a communicative event, i.e. what is said and done. Therefore the clause is seen as a means of representation of the discourse in the text identifying the construction of the systems of knowledge and beliefs. Secondly, the interpersonal
metadata is connected to Fairclough's view of discourse constraints on social relations and social identities. At this level, discourse constructs social relationships through enactment. In other words, social identities and positions are negotiated and established. Finally, the textual metafunction is equivalent to Fairclough's Discourse as text dimension (Fairclough 1995b:57-58, 64-65). The clause is thus seen as a carrier of messages at different levels. Fairclough extends Halliday's functional relationships at clause level to include functional relationships between sentences (Fairclough 1992:175). Therefore departing from Fairclough's critical discourse analysis framework, aspects of Halliday's Systemic Functional Grammar will be used to support the analysis of the surface of the texts. Halliday's grammar focuses on the choice of words in the construction of text and the text's relation to the context, and will thus serve as a supporting tool to the CDA approach adopted here for uncovering ideologies and relations of power in the data. Below is a description of the Hallidayan tools that are used in this study.

4.3.3 Hallidayan functional linguistics
In Functional Grammar, the text, as an instance of language, is viewed as an object or artefact in which meaning is context dependent. Language is also viewed as an instrument or specimen in which the linguistic system is in focus. Both perspectives are seen as complementary and necessary for explaining a text (Halliday 2004:3, 5) and exist in a dialectal relationship of context-language. Language is regarded as a resource for 'semiosis' – a tool for the creation and understanding of meaning (Halliday 2004:4, 5). Systemic functional grammar sees the components of language, grammar and vocabulary, as inseparable parts of the same continuum, i.e. 'lexicogrammar' (Halliday 2004:7). By studying the different levels of meanings that are mapped onto the clause (Halliday 2004:10), systemic functional grammar provides a method for approaching language in use.

Within functional grammar, five dimensions are distinguished to describe language as a system of meaning (Halliday 2004:20) and which represent different intensities of relation to the extra-linguistic sphere. The dimensions of syntagmatic and paradigmatic orders include tools available for the study of language as a self-contained entity. The dimension of stratification "realises" (an adaption of Halliday's 'realization' concept referring to the process of linking between strata) the link between the wider context – the extra-linguistic world – and language. The remaining two dimensions that is, the instantiation of text and metafunctions serve as the outward expression within a specific context of the possibilities provided by the previous dimensions (Halliday 2004).
The first dimension, the structure or syntagmatic order expresses what goes together and how grammar is functionally organised in compositional layers in a relation of parts to create meaning at different levels (Halliday 2004:20). These levels of parts/layers are the morpheme-word-group or phrase-clause.

The second dimension, the system or paradigmatic order expresses the choices that are made along a system network of subcategories that give rise to meaning formed through "systemic patterns of choice" (Halliday 2004:23). Alternative choices are seen to reflect meaning potential (Halliday 2004:23) and can therefore be significant in exposing aspects of ideology in the official English debate in the US. In Halliday's approach, the meaningful choices in a text represent the system network of Transitivity, Mood and Theme/Rheme (Halliday 2004). The systems of Transitivity and Mood will be described in more detail below since they are used in the data analysis. The view of the present author is that the Theme/Rheme system is seen as more suitable for investigations where the whole text is analysed with regards to its internal construction and therefore is not included in this study since the focus here is to view the ways of speaking of societal security as expressed across several texts. Jørgensen and Phillips state that “it is easier to show how dynamic discursive practices take part in constituting and changing the social world when analysing the reproduction and transformation of discourses across a range of texts” (Jørgensen and Phillips 2002:88-89).

The third dimension is stratification. Language is viewed as a stratified system in which the mode – writing or speech – is separate from the stratum of content, which expands into two further strata, namely semantics and lexicogrammar (Halliday 2004:24). At the stratum of content, grammar transforms and reinterprets the experience of the world (located in the ideational metafunction) and the enactment of social relations (located in the interpersonal metafunction), into meaning, i.e. the stratum of semantics (Halliday 2004:25). This meaning is then transformed into wording within the stratum of lexicogrammar contained in a continuum/cline of lexis and grammar where the paradigmatic and the syntagmatic patterns occur. These steps are from the perspectives of the speaker/writer. The reverse procedure is valid from the listener/reader perspectives (Halliday 2004:25, 45).

The fourth dimension refers to the communicative event in which language is 'instantiated' as text. The system of a language (as a meaning potential resource existing in a context of culture) is instantiated in a text within a context (Halliday 2004:26-28). It is at this stage that the result of the stratification dimension is expressed, since the semantic stratum functions as
an interface between the extra-linguistic (experience of the world and social relations) and the linguistic spheres (Halliday 2004:26-28).

Finally, the fifth dimension viz. the metafunctional principle will be explained in more detail due to its application to the data in this study. Three metafunctions are recognised namely the ideational metafunction involving the identification of processes that interpret human experience. The interpersonal metafunction involves the perspective of language analysis in order to reveal the production or reproduction of social relationships between humans by means of the social identities assumed and the attitudes expressed. Lastly, the textual metafunction is the construction and organisation of the text that enables the other two functions to be expressed through discourse in textual form (Halliday 19-30). The term 'metafunction' is used to emphasise that function is a fundamental part of language (Halliday 2004:31).

Moreover, three main systems are distinguished for analysing the clause in a text in the fifth dimension, namely Transitivity, Mood and Theme corresponding to the ideational, interpersonal and textual metafunctions. Elements surrounding the clause are also significant for contextual aspects e.g. the lexicogrammatical resources of cohesion, namely conjunction, reference, and lexical cohesion – repetitions and synonyms (Halliday 2004:532-535).

A description of the ideational metafunction, namely its experiential component, and the interpersonal metafunction, namely the modality type, will follow. The experiential component is represented by the Transitivity system, which interprets the world by placing each experience of (event in) the world into a process type in order to make it manageable. Six process types (major clauses) are distinguished: the material process of 'doing', 'acting', 'creating', 'changing', and 'happening/being created'; the relational process of 'having an attribute/identity', and 'symbolising'; the verbal process of saying; the mental process of 'thinking', 'feeling' and 'seeing'; the behavioural process of 'behaving'; and the existential process of 'existing' (Halliday 2004:172). The analysis of Transitivity in this study will relate to what process types are used in a sentence; the expression of agency as well as the attribution of responsibility; and the circumstantial elements of time "when", space "where", manner "how", and cause "why" (Halliday 2004:259-263).

The ideational metafunction does not indicate the attitudes and relations between the identities. The enactment of social relations falls within Halliday’s interpersonal metafunction (Fairclough 1992:160). The interpersonal metafunction is the location where personal and social relations are enacted and in which the speaker expresses their appraisal and attitude towards the people addressed and the topic (Halliday 2004:29).
The notion of the clause as an exchange is represented by the grammatical system of Mood (Halliday 2004:135). Within the system network of Mood, the indicative clause is divided into the Indicative Type and the Modal Deixis (in which the Modality Type is a subtype). The Indicative Type is further divided into declarative or interrogative clauses, and the Modality Type is further divided into expressions of probability, usuality, obligation and inclination (Halliday 2004:135). Both the Indicative Type and the Modality Types indicate the attitudes of the speakers. Of particular interest for this study are the modalities used in the discussion of official English issues since relations of power between the social identities are indicated by modality. Therefore modality will be particularly focused on in this investigation. Modalities show the degree of commitment involved, i.e. modality reveals the intermediate meaning possibilities between the yes and no. Thus, the degree of commitment involved is less determined than those expressed by categorical assertions (Halliday 2004:618). The analysis of the data will also use lexicogrammatical resources of cohesion that allow a clause level study to be transcended. This study will thus approach the texts through the systems of Transitivity (main verbs) and Mood (modal verbs) as well as taking account of elements around the clause as defined by Halliday, i.e. the lexicogrammatical resources of cohesion, namely conjunction, reference, and lexical cohesion (repetitions and synonyms) in order to identify ideological aspects in the texts (Halliday 2004:532-535, 570-576). The lexical cohesion resources are also the starting point of analysis as these are viewed as key elements in the construction of ways of speaking that dominate in a particular society (see Fairclough 1992:88, 91).
5 Method and Material

This study consists of data collected from four newspapers in the United States between April 2006 and December 2007. The criteria for the choice of newspapers are based on their size and regional association. The newspapers selected for the study are: *USA Today*, *The New York Times*, *Los Angeles Times*, and *San Francisco Chronicle*. According to the Audit Bureau of Circulation listing of March 2009, *USA Today* has the largest circulation with 2,113,725 number of copies distributed on average daily. *The New York Times* is third on the list (following the *Wall Street Journal* of the weekdays and weekend issues – a newspaper that is too specialised in business and financial news for inclusion in this study) with an average of 1,451,233 issues on Sunday and 965,471 and 1,039,031 for Saturday and Monday to Friday respectively. The *Los Angeles Times* is placed fourth on the list for its Sunday issue at 1,019,388 and occupies positions 7 with 799,369 issues for Saturday, and 10 with 723,181 issues Monday to Friday. The *San Francisco Chronicle* is the smallest newspaper in the data ranked 54th on the list with an average of 354,752 issues on Sunday, and 312,408 (ranked 67th) and 312,118 (ranked 69th) for Saturday and weekdays respectively (see Table 1 below).

Table 1. Audit Bureau of Circulation listing of newspapers in the US. March 2009

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Newspaper</th>
<th>Circulation (average)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><em>USA Today</em></td>
<td>daily distribution: 2,113,725</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Saturday: 965,471</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Monday-Friday: 1,039,031</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Los Angeles Times</em></td>
<td>Sunday: 1,019,388</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Saturday: 799,369</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Monday-Friday: 723,181</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>San Francisco Chronicle</em></td>
<td>Sunday: 354,752</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Saturday: 312,408</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Monday-Friday: 312,118</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The *USA Today* and *The New York Times* are selected as part of this study because they are two of the three largest newspapers in the US. The *Los Angeles Times* and *San Francisco Chronicle* are chosen on the basis of their distribution being mainly directed to a geographical area that has a large number of Spanish speaking immigrants, both legal and illegal. In other words, the *Los Angeles Times* represents one of the largest newspapers in the country and
targets a particular region and the *San Francisco Chronicle* represents an even more "localised" group of readers. Both newspapers are located in the southwest coast of the United States. The US Census Bureau (2005) indicates that California is the most populated state in the country and Estimates of 2009 (US Bureau 2009) indicates that the area of Los Angeles is the second most populated metropolitan after the metropolitan area of New York.

The types of articles used as data are from the news and opinion sections. The reason for combining news articles with opinion articles is to avoid a skewed view on available speech acts and discourse types since news articles are written by journalists that are often employed by the newspaper for which they write. It is, therefore, possible that journalists may reflect the ideology of the newspaper – or for that matter their own beliefs – in the choices they make regarding the construction of their content – even though they are expected to reflect both sides of a debate by allowing opposing views in their final news product. On the other hand, opinion articles are often one-sided and written in a persuasive manner. It must be noted that opinions are also present in articles written by journalists because there is a conscious attempt to depict reality "objectively" and thus allow different sources to express their attitudes towards a particular issue.

Fairclough (1995b:33; see also section 4.3.2 for Fairclough's view of textual hybridity) states that most texts contain a mixture of discourses and genres. Fairclough also makes a distinction between explicitly expressed texts – 'manifest intertextuality', and links between types of discourse – 'interdiscursivity' (Fairclough 1992:21). Based on the establishment of this difference by Fairclough, this study approaches the topic in question with the notion that it is possible to focus on discourse types obtained through word choices without making detailed comments on the genre obtained through instances of manifest intertextuality. Interdiscursivity in this study is identified by the use of words from different spheres/sectors such as political, economic, environmental or military. These sectors, along with societal sector (societal security forms the underlying principle of this study), are based on Buzan's (1991) new framework for security analysis as well as Waever's (1993) concept of 'societal security'. Thus, the specification of the sectors for identification of interdiscursivity is based on the theoretical background used in this study (see section 4.1.1 for Buzan's five-sector security framework and section 4.1.2 for Waever's concept of 'societal security'). Fairclough (1992:118) also states that "interdiscursivity is a matter of how a discourse type is constituted through a combination of elements of orders of discourse". Interdiscursivity is thus identified when the ways of speaking from the other domains (Buzan's other four sectors) are found integrated in the data. Furthermore, since metaphors are the mapping of a source domain onto
a target domain with which it is less associated to (so that the target domain is understood based on the concepts of the source), interdiscursivity is also seen to exist in this study when metaphoric expressions are present in the data e.g. Lakoff and Johnson's (1987:4-6) conceptual metaphor of argument is war, which will be used to look at the debate on immigration in the US. The view of the present author is also that similes can be seen as elements of interdiscursivity by their function of comparing two entities that may belong to different domains.

Consequently, by combining these two types of articles (news articles and opinion articles) in this study, there is an attempt to obtain an overview of the discourse types that appear regarding the debate for official English in the United States. A straightforward comparison for similarities and differences between the discourse types, and at a more specific level of the speech acts resulting from the text analysis, in the different types of articles has not been made since the aim of this study is not to investigate where these similarities and differences lie between the newspapers. The goals of this study is instead to uncover the discourse types and speech acts regarding immigration and language issues in societal security that are available in the debate in general.

The data is approached with the notion that there exists a conflict of views – more specifically expressed in speech acts of securitisation – between official English supporters and those that are against the measure. Views in the data by other individuals such as that of a resident in the region in question or an expert regarding language use in daily interaction are also taken into account. The analysis departs from the perspectives of national security as the social practice for its state-level qualification (see section 4.1.1 for Buzan's model and section 4.1.2 for Waever's separation of societal sector from the model to bring forward the notion of 'societal security'). According to the model presented by Waever (1993), the collective-national level is seen as containing the conceptual focus of sovereignty for the state and identity for societal security. From Waever and Buzan's perspective, security is constituted by an interdependency of various sectors in a state, namely military, economic, political and environmental securities as well as societal security. In this investigation, societal security represents the order of discourse since it is one of the many security aspects that is – or can be perceived as – threatened in a state. Since the study focuses on societal security issues related to the maintenance of a collective 'we' identity in relation to language, only articles that explicitly deal with immigration and its association to language are included in the analysis. Also, because it is assumed that in many instances the data would not show explicit reference to security, the selection of the material for analysis is also based on the definition of security...
as related to real or perceived threat. Thus, the data is restricted to the parts of the articles that refer to societal security or aspects of an existing threat where language is used as a speech act for constructing a situation concerning societal security. This is intended also to limit the scope and maintain the focus of the thesis to language policy related issues, since the topic under study is very extensive due to its interdisciplinary character. Therefore, all the newspaper articles included in the data deal with the English language and the representation of immigrants (as carriers of a home language) and/or an American national identity – aspects that are significant for societal security. Bearing in mind issues regarding intersubjectivity and in order to reduce subjective interpretation in qualitative data analysis, the choice of examples is based on the explicit presence of the words "English" and "language" (or closely related references e.g. "bilingualism", "communicate" – if in direct link to the capacity to communicate through a specific language). Since the study is concerned with societal security, group/individual representations of immigrants are also noted. In this way, words such as "immigrant" and "immigration" or ethnic group labels e.g. Hispanics, Americans, and the qualifying linguistic items surrounding these words are also considered.

The data collected is from the time period April 2006 to December 2007. The reason for the choice of this period is because the Senate in the United States passed an amendment in May 2006 sponsored by Oklahoma's Republican Senator Inhofe that declared English as the national language. The amendment was to the Comprehensive Immigration Reform Act (bill S. 2611). The proposal for English as the national language established that government officials would not need to provide services in other languages unless specified by law. In practice, according to the present author, the amendment is more related to English acquiring an official status and not a symbolic status as a national language. Another relevant event affecting the choice of the period for the data is that on May 1, 2006 a protest march A Day Without an Immigrant – May Day boycott was organised nationwide. This demonstration aimed to show that immigrants are needed for the US economy and was a reaction to discussions on the immigration reform bill in the Senate. The demonstrators demanded amnesty for the illegal immigrants in the country. The protest was manifested in a strike from work and people were advised to not buy anything on that day. The intention in this study is to look at the public debate in the period leading up to these events, more particularly those related to the status of English, in the hope that the debate is most intensive during that time. The reason for extending the period to December 2007 is based on the fact that English was approved as a national language by the Senate, and also the debate had reached low intensity by the end of 2007 seen by the number of articles that resulted from searching the respective
newspapers. Only online versions of newspapers were used which also means that not all material published on this topic may have been available for this study since newspapers may have not made them available online at the time of collection.

The online archives of the four abovementioned newspapers are used to find articles pertinent to the study, namely those dealing with immigration, the English language and an aspect of societal security through threat. Out of 50 articles (the sum of articles that dealt with issues of language and immigration), 24 news and opinion articles (six from each newspaper) were selected. The selection process of the 24 articles is random. All the 50 articles are printed and piled. Then six articles from each of the four newspapers are chosen randomly from the pile. Some articles deal exclusively with the language debate while other articles include language as an issue among others. A criterion for the selection is that all the articles in this study have to deal with both immigration and language in order to allow a societal security approach to the data. As a second step, extracts of the articles are selected and organised according to explicit arguments in related to the official English debate. All references, totalling 156, except for 14, from the 24 articles that explicitly deal with language are included in the study under the data analysis section in the speech acts related to language (sections 6.1.1 - 6.1.5 and section 6.2.1 - 6.2.4). Out of the 14 references to language that are not part of the analysis: six name the different communities that had passed measures affecting the status of English without a specific argument except that they may be short-lived since board members will change, that the proposals died for lack of support, or had references to statistics of monolinguals and non-English speakers (inside articles 4, 8 and 10); three references describe the amendment added by Senator Inhofe or by Senator Tancredo (inside articles 10, 23 and 24) A direct quote from the amendment is part of example (12) of the speech act of Obligation; one reference describes issues of unintelligibility of the English spoken by customer-service in outsourced businesses (inside article 11); two references in article 20 deal with keeping English pure but do not appear in any other article; one reference deals with the significance of presidential candidates having commonsense rather than the languages they speak (inside article 22); lastly, one reference explains that the link between official English and illegal immigrants is clear in the English-only ballot initiatives presented in Arizona (article 9). The distribution of the references from the articles in the data analysis section referring to the English language is given in Table 2 below. The speech acts regarding representations of immigrants and immigration (see sections 6.1.6 - 6.1.11 and 6.2.5) are not included in Table 2 since they are a complement to the main focus of this study, namely the issue of language status in relation to national identity. The column "Examples" refers to the
references from the articles that are analysed linguistically. The column "Links" refers to references that are related to the example either as support or in contrast to the content in the example in question, and are therefore taken up in the analysis.

*Table 2. Distribution of the references from the articles*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Speech acts (SA)</th>
<th>Examples</th>
<th>Links</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SA of Time</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SA of Obligation</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SA of Willingness</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SA to Help</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SA of English as Unifier</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SA of English-Optional Services</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SA of Multilingualism as Cost</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SA of Health and Safety</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SA of Opportunity</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>95</strong></td>
<td><strong>62</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes are made of the representation of immigrants based on group boundaries that are demarcated through signifiers representing collectives. Nouns and pronouns have been the initial only primary focus for group representation but as the analysis has proceeded, the role of metaphors and similes has become apparent and relevant for the study since they depict how groups are identified or perceived.

The extracts are analysed using linguistic tools in which the criterion of repetition (including synonyms and topics) is used as a basis for organising the material into categories giving discourse types. Repetition is taken as a departing point for uncovering naturalised states that form ways of speaking about a particular topic. In this way, synonyms play an important role in identifying multiple ways of referring to similar things. It must be noted that synonyms are seen as giving rise to similar expressions containing differences of meaning. This is based on the interpretation in this investigation of Saussure's (1972:113) view of the system of language as built on a system of similarities and differences where no true synonyms can be identified. Examples of these from the data are main verbs such as "encourage" and "urge", modal verbs such as "should" and "must" and nouns describing immigrant groups or the "American" individual. Although the approach is to depart from

---

12 The total number of examples analysed in this study are 140, wherein 95 are speech acts concerning the English language and 45 are speech acts of immigrants and immigration (sections 6.1.6-6.1.11 and 6.2.5).
these aspects as a guide, this does not however mean that other grammatical aspects such as adverbs and pronouns have been excluded since the aim is to discover ways of speaking that reveal themselves in the analysis. In sum, repetition serves as a means for uncovering ideology. Also the choice of repetition as a basis for identifying speech acts limits the risk of subjectivity in interpretation and the selection of examples.

The analysis focuses on the type of main verb used in the extract to indicate the process used for action or state; modal verbs are analysed to look for intermediate positions of categorical positions between yes and no of attitudes as well as the reflection of power relations between the groups/individuals in the extract; and conjunctions are analysed for the establishment of links between clauses or words indicating relationships of meaning. The initial idea has been to take adverbs of place because of the ethnolinguistic localised contact but it soon became evident from the data on an initial analysis that adverbs of time are dominant and are thus focused on. Other linguistic features are referred to if they are necessary to support the analysis.

Some extracts coincide partly in content. In order not to affect the representation of the discourse types and speech acts in the data, the sections that overlap are placed in accordance with the speech act category to which they relate. This entails that the same extract may appear in different linguistic categories if it contains multiple perspectives.

Since the aim of this study is to uncover ideological discourses related to societal security in which language policy is associated to migration issues with the assistance of Fairclough's framework (1992), the study proceeds in several stages – similar to the levels of analysis presented by Wodak (2006:177-176) of "middle range theories" and "grand theories". Merton (1957:107-109) describes middle range theories as limited scope theories that involve abstraction (by linking a certain number of facts regarding the functions and structure of social constellations) but are nevertheless close to the observation of data and not as broad as a grand theory which aims to explain all aspects of social life, i.e. wide-ranging explanations of the social as a whole system. Middle range theories can be said to be intermediate stages to more comprehensive theories. An example of a middle range theory is that of social mobility, communication, and the formation of norms (Merton 1957:107-109). In light of the above and in the attempt to draw closer together the levels of social practice to the textual analysis, the examples are first viewed with regard to the linguistic and extra-linguistic theories and concepts in section 3 relating to discursive practice through the notion of middle range theories. This is followed by an association to the wider theories and concepts of 'security' and language policy in sections 4.1 and 4.2. In other words, this investigation first carries out a
linguistic analysis on the language in the relevant extracts from the articles. This procedure is followed by linking the textual analysis to the discourse theory by categorising the speech acts and discourse types available in the data. In the third and fourth stages, the data is linked to linguistic and extra-linguistic theories and concepts.

More concretely, the study begins with the investigation of discourse as text using the Hallidayan ideational, interpersonal, and textual metafunctions, corresponding respectively to the experiential, modal, and lexical components. Using Fairclough's approach to textual analysis, the data is analysed for explicit, surface, grammatical elements and their meanings such as verbs indicating processes, modals indicating interpersonal relations and nouns for representations of collectives and individuals. As a result, certain patterns are visible in the discussion of the topic of official English. These patterns have given rise to two discourse types i.e. Loyalty and Efficiency. The construction of social identities and 'we/them' relations are analysed with the help of not only modality but also metaphors and similes. Interdiscursivity related to immigrant and immigration representations by means of metaphors are also included in the discourse types of Loyalty and Efficiency. The results are then viewed in relation to societal security and human security as well as language policy making.

Before proceeding with the findings of this study in section 6, a brief presentation is given below of models that can explain why the topic of official English has been included in the newspapers in the US.

5.1 Newsworthiness and the official English debate in the US
Shoemaker, Chang and Brendinger (as cited in Häger 2009) present a model for news value in which the higher the deviance of the event the more value it has for news. Nevertheless, an event that has low level of deviance can still constitute a news item and may still warrant reporting if its social value due to proximity in time and space is significant enough. Prakke's (as cited in Häger 2009) model attempts to explain newsworthiness in relation to an event's distance from the reader. According to Prakke, the further away the event is from the reader the lesser its news interest. This distance is "measured" by three factors namely space, time and culture. Space ranges from areas that are closest, in the surroundings or in the periphery of the reader. Time is divided into the present, past and the perfect tenses. Cultural distance is determined by commitment/involvement or active engagement by the reader giving the most news value, followed by interest, and finally knowledge in the subject as the furthest point. An event has most news value when it is closest in space, present in time and the reader is culturally involved or active in the issue and can be said to be personally affected. In the same
way, it has the least newsworthiness if the event is in the periphery of the reader's surroundings, it requires the perfect tense to report it and the reader is only related to the event through having knowledge rather than experience linked to it. As regards this study, the debate on official English is seen as having news value due to its proximity. Following this thought, it may also be assumed that newspapers in regions that have greatest number of immigrants are likely to give greater news value to articles related to immigration and the role of the English language.

5.1.1 Newspapers in the US

During the colonial period, the need for news, information and provision of education gave rise to the appearance of newspapers and books in America. These media were controlled by colonial authorities located in Britain which had established a licensing system as a way of restricting and maintaining an overview of the information flow in the United States. During the eighteenth century, newspapers were active in fighting the license requirements and attempted to respond to an increasing population as well as strove to influence political happenings. The social importance of the press as a source of information was significant during the expansion towards the west by the colonisers. During the War of Independence they informed the population of events taking place in other parts of the country and even gained reputation among Americans as supporters of their struggle against the British. Once independence had been achieved, courts strengthened the freedom of the press which was guaranteed in the 1791 First Amendment of the Bill of Rights (Mauk and Oakland 2005:281-282). The First Amendment does not allow Congress to pass laws that control or punish the press before nor after publication of material although exceptions occur such as in time of war (Sreberny 2004:91). By the turn of the century, approximately twenty daily newspapers and approximately a thousand local weekly newspapers were in circulation. During the nineteenth century, newspapers were owned by powerful individuals and were circulated widely at a low price. The New York Times (1851), New York Herald (1835), and New York Tribune (1841) are examples of papers that reached a large readership. The owners of these newspapers developed news gathering methods and newspaper structures. In 1889, the first chain of newspapers was founded by E.W. Scripps. This event marked the beginning of twentieth century large organisations owned by one person. However, newspapers were later also owned by companies and today the press is mainly the property of multimedia conglomerates (Mauk and Oakland 2005:281-284). The media system in the US can be described as privately-based and dependent on profit making and advertising (Sreberny 2004:88).
In 2003, approximately 1,457 daily newspapers had a circulation of about 55 million. The United States is often referred to as not having a national press that is based in one city nor does it have newspapers that are issued at the same time in the whole country. This is mainly seen as a consequence of its size, the time zones it covers and issues of local identification. Many newspapers tend to focus on local matters (Hallenberg 1998:119; Mauk and Oakland 2005:286) and thus have not attained mass readership at a national level (Sreberny 2004:88). Sreberny (2004:84) states that although the media are effective in bringing together different parts of society – in the case of this study, the American society – to create and maintain a feeling of national culture, local cultural groups still survive. Also, a local newspaper can help to revive the local community and create a sense of belonging to the locality. There are however three newspapers that have countrywide distribution namely USA Today, which is characterised by short articles and a popular style, the Wall Street Journal, a business-oriented newspaper which also contains political analysis, and The New York Times, a metropolitan newspaper which is one of the main newspapers in the world. These newspapers along with the Washington Post and the Los Angeles Times have national influence and international repute (Hallenberg 1998:119; Mauk and Oakland 2005:286).

According to the Editor and Publisher International Yearbook, 2002, the average circulation of the main daily newspapers during that year ranked the USA Today (2,136,068) with the most circulation, followed by the Wall Street Journal (1,800,607), The New York Times (1,113,000), and the Los Angeles Times (925,135). Of the above newspapers, only the Wall Street Journal is not included in this study due to its specific content. A fourth newspaper is also part of this study – the San Francisco Chronicle for its local focus (Mauk and Oakland 2005:286). Based on the statistics presented by the Audit Bureau of Circulation listing of March 2009, the positions of the circulation of the three largest newspapers (not including the San Francisco Chronicle) are similar to those of the Yearbook 2002, implying that their influence was relatively the same during the period 2006-2007, which is the time frame in focus in this study.

Newspapers in the US have experienced a decline in their sales which has led to reduced competition and a diminishing of the variety of publications. Media conglomerates now dominate the market making up approximately 75 per cent of the daily newspapers. The concentration of ownership has advantages e.g. maximising efficiency and profits but also risks the presentation of similar content and ideology and contributes to the reduction of space for non-mainstream views (Sreberny 2004:92; Mauk and Oakland 2005:287). Furthermore as regards content, although individual journalists still gather news for most newspapers,
especially the large newspapers, the trend is for an increased reliance on US-based news agencies that are independently owned namely the Associated Press (AP) and United Press International (UPI). These organisations sell national and international news to the media – including newspapers (Mauk and Oakland 2005:287-288). Private groups constantly work towards influencing the content in the press, in some cases suggesting measures of censorship (Sreberny 2004:91), but some view that as a result of the need to compete with television, newspapers have attempted to make their content as objective as possible (Mauk and Oakland 2005:287-288). Since the media sets the agenda of what is newsworthy, the study of the opinions and views reflected in newspapers become interesting for investigation despite goals of objectivity through self-censorship and the presentation of the different sides to a case (Mauk and Oakland 2005:296). The next section provides an analysis of the content of four US online newspapers regarding attitudes in the debate concerning official English.
6 Discourse of immigrant language as a threat to societal security

The analysis of the data is based on sentences in which the words "English", "language" "immigrant" and "immigration", including related forms such as "bilingualism" and "Hispanics", are mentioned in newspaper articles. The newspapers from which the articles are taken are: USA Today, The New York Times, Los Angeles Times (LA Times), and the San Francisco Chronicle. All the articles deal with the debate regarding the status of English during the period April 2006 to December 2007. At least one of the abovementioned words needs to be present in the sentences for the extract to be included as data. The reason for extracts to be taken from the articles is because many articles also include aspects that are not directly related to language, the representation of immigrants or the immigration debate as regards English. Since this study focuses on aspects surrounding the status of English in the US, it is considered unnecessary to include those other aspects for a close linguistic analysis although the context in which the extract is placed is often mentioned.

As a result, different speech acts of security are distinguished namely Time, Obligation, Willingness, Help, English as Unifier, English-Optional Services, Multilingualism as Cost, Health and Safety, and Opportunity as regards the role of English in the US. Immigrants are found to be represented as Criminals, Large Quantities of Water, Harmful, and as a Labour Resource. Additionally, immigration is portrayed as a Sovereignty Issue and the debate regarding immigration as Racial and as War. The resulting speech acts of security are presented below. They are arranged under two larger categories namely the discourse types of Loyalty and Efficiency.

Apart from Halliday's Systemic Functional Linguistics (2004), the following grammar books and dictionary are consulted in order to carry out the analysis of the texts: A Comprehensive Grammar of the English Language (Quirk, Svartvik, Greenbaum, Leech and Crystal 1985), Cobluild English Grammar (Sinclair et al. 1990), A Practical English Grammar (Thomson and Martinet 1986) and the Oxford Advanced Learner's Dictionary of Current English (Hornby, Crowther, Kavanagh and Ashby 1995). At the end of each of these analyses, a summary is presented to contextualise the individual speech acts and discourse types within an interdisciplinary perspective using linguistic and extra-linguistic concepts and theories.
6.1 Discourse type of Loyalty

6.1.1 Speech act of Time

The speech act of Time is mainly characterised by adverbs which create an emotion of urgency. Example (1) from article 8 "Push for 'official' English heats up" published in the USA Today indicates an appeal to immediate action:

(1) If immigrants don't learn the language soon after arrival, he says, many never will.

The adverb of time soon indicates urgency. The use of the adverb of time never indicating frequency and soon in combination with the conditional clause beginning with if using the present tense has the implication of a warning of a certainty regarding future developments indicated by will. The Sayer is Rob Toonkel, a representative of U.S. English which is a group that is in favour of English as an official language. The verb learn (also as ellipsis after will) indicates the process that is to be accomplished. The society is further implicitly divided into immigrants and non-immigrants by the noun immigrants.

Example (2), in opinion article 18 titled "The pursuit of happiness – in English" in which the Sayer is in favour of the movement for official English expresses the same need for immediate action although more directly by suggesting actions:

(2) Among the ways we can do this as quickly as possible is to replace bilingual education programs in our public schools with intensive English instruction and abolish the federal mandates requiring multilingual ballots and government documents.

The use of the adverb quickly expresses a sense of urgency to the current situation – similar to soon in example (1) above. The use of the modal can in this case may indicate both a possibility as a suggestion for future action or as an ability for a solution that is within grasp. The conjunction and ties the suggested actions replace and abolish entailing that one action cannot be done without the other and are of equal importance. In this way bilingual education is tied to multilingual ballots and government documents. The adjective intensive in its meaning of concentration of effort or hard work serves to put more emphasis on the time factor. The pronoun we is used here in opposition to "new Americans" introduced earlier in the article.

The next example (3) from the same article 18 also emphasises urgency:
These multilingual documents discourage immigrants from learning English as rapidly as possible, limiting their ability to engage in a truly common political culture.

The use of the adverb rapidly expresses a sense of urgency to the current situation implying that "a here and now" solution is necessary. The documents in question are governmental and therefore based on federal rules. The author specifically refers to ballots earlier in the paragraph.

Example (4) from an LA Times news article 14 "Immigrants' children grow fluent in English, study says" is a statement made by an individual that is described as an expert due to his professional position and who supports restrictions on immigration. The aspect of urgency is present indirectly by reference to problems:

"The Pew study points to some long-term problems," said Mark Krikorian, executive director of the Center for Immigration Studies, which favors conservative immigration policies. "One in eight American-born children of immigrants doesn't speak English well...And even the grandchildren of immigrants who arrived decades ago, 6% of them still don't speak English well. That's pretty bad news."

The issue of time decades not resolving proficiency – defined vaguely with an adverb of degree well – is emphasised by the adjectival use of long-term before the negative noun problems serving as a warning at the beginning of the quote. It is also interesting to note that in opinion article 23 in the San Francisco Chronicle, the Sayer refers to several Republican and Democratic Senators' opinion that becoming fluent in English should be a condition to live in these United States, in which the progressive form becoming and the adjective fluent indicate the highest degree of language acquisition over a period of time. The reference to time in decades ago, in example (4) above from article 14, is also used as a reference point for the adverb still indicating the Sayer's position in favour of the official English movement. The adverb even accentuates the Sayers argument since it makes prominent something unexpected.

The information of delay in learning English given in example (4) particularly through even, still and decades ago is also reflected more directly as urgent in example (5) from opinion article 20, titled "English as the official language?" in the San Francisco Chronicle:
The proponents behind the measure [anaphoric reference to make English the official language] contend that newcomers to the United States aren’t learning English as quickly as previous groups.

The use of the adverb quickly – denoting that learning English is not supposed to take the time it presently takes – is used in comparison to historical patterns of language learning through the prepositional phrase indicated by as...as. The use of the adverb quickly entails a power relationship between the groups since one group may be able to define the time period for acquisition of English (this can also be linked to the use of newcomers). The Sayer in this extract is against the declaration of English as an official language but is referring to the opinion of those that are in favour of official English. The writer of the article is further described as Professor in Latin American and Latino Culture at Amherst College as well as an author of several books.

The example below (6) from article 14 also gives the statement of an expert UC Irvine sociology professor, but adds to the debate by arguing the opposite of what the official English proponents suggest, namely that language shift is taking place faster than before:

(6) "People get very upset about 'Press 2 for Spanish,'” said Rubén G. Rumbaut, a UC Irvine sociology professor who has done his own research on the language issue.

But "there is no way English is being threatened by immigrants...The switch to English is taking place perhaps more rapidly than it has ever in American history.

The adverb rapidly states that the shift is actually happening at a fast rate, although no specific time interval is given. It indicates that the action is occurring over a short time, moving or acting quickly. The degree adverb more in combination with the comparative than indicates an increase in a historical pattern regarding time before or up to the moment of speaking by the use of the adverb ever. The Sayer reduces a categorical viewpoint and responsibility by inserting the adverb perhaps indicating an opinion that is not firm. References to the Sayer's professional title characterises his opinion as that of an expert and also containing objective value.

The next two examples (7) and (8), respectively, from news article 14 in the LA Times confirm that language shift takes place:
Similar studies have also concluded that immigrants' native languages recede over generations.

The material verbal processes indicate a happening recede in the present tense thus implying a general state of affairs that occur over a longer period of time generations and which, in this case, are related to language shift issues. The Sayers are presented as experts that have presented finalised statements in the noun studies. In example (8), the verbal process verb reports carries neutrality due to the source of information being presented as an expert organisation Research Center. The centre is later described in the article as a nonpartisan research organization that does not advocate immigration policy:

A study released Thursday by the Pew Hispanic Center, reports that in families like the Peredas, for whom Spanish is the dominant language among immigrant parents, English fluency increases across generations. By the third generation, Spanish has essentially faded into the background.

The emphasis is on time as the factor for language shift indicated in the use of the adjective and noun Immigrant parents and the prepositional phrase By the third generation indicating the specified time in which language shift occurs. Moreover, the preposition across in front of the noun generations emphasises time. The verb fade also indicates something that occurs over time, in this case as a gradual change towards reduction. In a similar way, article 7 from the USA Today refers to a report by the Lewis Mumford Center (given as experts) that 92% of second-generation Hispanics speak English "well". Article 7 is written by a Sayer that works for an organisation that is against the Inhofe amendment and who also refers to studies in general confirming acquisition of English taking place as quickly as our immigrant forebears.

A further interesting aspect is the dichotomising of existence, that is the "either/or" situation for the possibility of acquiring the languages namely that an increase in English fluency implies a reduction of competence in Spanish. This perspective is also present in example (9) from the opinion article 24 in the USA Today titled "Press 2 for pointless":

In practice, English already is the national language, even among the children of immigrants: 93% of second-generation Hispanic Americans are bilingual or speak primarily English, according to a 2002 national survey by the Pew Hispanic Center and the Kaiser Family. By the third generation, hardly anyone speaks only Spanish, and just 22% of Latinos are bilingual.
The prepositional phrase *By the third generation* indicates a shift in language knowledge over a long period of time. Although the adverbial *already* shows a relation to the present referring to a time before, an indication of the present situation is given by the relational process verb *is*. The Sayer, who is also the author of the article, later expresses the view that he/she is against legislating a "national language". It is also possible to position the Sayer since he/she claims that language shift is taking place without legislation. The view of language shift is also taken up in article 8 in relation to a study by a professor in sociology, Ruben Rumbaut, which showed that few Americans were fluent in their mother tongue by the third generation. He further claims that Spanish is threatened and not English.

The final example (10) in this section is taken from article 14, *LA Times*, and gives the point of view in indirect speech of a 20 year old second generation Hispanic immigrant, described as *U.S.-born*. The content of this example can be seen as a confirmation of the claims of language shift made in the examples above:

(10) *She values her bilingualism but said growing up in the U.S. has made her more articulate in English than in Spanish*

The material process verb *growing up* indicates a durative process resulting in a change of the person in question implying a possible prediction of language shift due to the specification of the location *in the U.S.*, although not originating in a conscious action. The material verb with auxiliary verb *has made* may also be seen as indicating a process that has taken place over a period of time. The mental process verb *values* indicates positive emotion which is contrasted in the next clause by the conjunction *but*. The use of the conjunction *but* indicates a contrasting clause containing information regarding generational language shift towards the dominant language *English* and away from bilingual proficiency in English and Spanish.

**Summary and further considerations: speech act of Time**

Two different perspectives can be explicitly distinguished in the speech act of Time, namely those that are in favour of implementing official English or stricter immigration policies, and those that provide “neutral” descriptions of reality such as expert studies. The stance that is against the measure is not directly available from the quotes in the examples but may be deduced from the content in the overall article. An additional source is provided by the bilingual individual of Spanish descendent.
In relation to the general attitude as regards time it is possible to state that those promoting
official English claim urgency in the need for immigrants to learn English by using adverbs
such as soon, quickly and rapidly as in examples (1-3), and (5-6). In example (5), the author
refers to the position of the proponents as regards the time in which immigrants should learn
English, but positions himself in the overall article as against the measure. The expert
commentator in example (6) refers to an increase in the speed of language shift in relation to
previous generations. The "neutral" or expert sources in example (6) implicitly and examples
(7-9) mainly indicate a long-term tendency of language shift towards English in terms of
decades or generations. The Spanish descendent in example (10), confirms language shift by
referring to the process of growing up, with all its implications of socialisation.

Combining the different views presented through the speech act of Time there seems to be
a general naturalised acceptance of language shift towards English among all the Sayers in the
above quotes, which indicates a model of assimilation in Giddens' (2001) terms rather than
the models of the melting pot or pluralism since the expressions do not relate to the value of
integrating or recognising immigrant cultures as equal, in this case immigrant languages. This
finding can be linked to Schmidt's (2002) work on racialisation discourse in which
assimilationists claim that bilingualism is an obstacle to an inclusive, equal society. The data
further shows a focus on language shift which carries a meaning of abandoning the previous
main language in favour of another in a zero-sum situation thus also leaving open possible
strengthening of hierarchy between languages due to functionality and status acquired by the
number of speakers that undergo the process of language shift. Further, the attitudes of
language shift indicates a tendency to contradict Salzmann's (1993:194) statement – in this
case in relation to different languages – that individuals can participate in several speech
communities by adjusting their speech since overlapping social activities entail overlapping
speech communities. This is evident from Mendoza-Denton's study in that bilingualism is
widespread among US Latinos (Mendoza-Denton 1999) but which may be interpreted as
temporary based on the results of this study. The findings indicate a difference between
attitudes and the actual language use in the US. This is valid at least in what concerns
language skills. This also entails a relation of power between the groups reproducing the
historic placing of English as naturalised and hegemonic which, as Fairclough (1992:67)
describes, is an agreement on how the social world is represented. Galindo's (1997) claim is
also significant to the findings in this study by which assimilation through language loss is
presented as an unavoidable process towards becoming “an American”. The attitude of
language shift as a must can be further linked to Schmid (2001:10) who writes that the
allowance of diversity within existing notions of national identity and security is often adopted as a short term policy with the objective of assimilation. The discussion of the length of time for learning a language and language shift may be seen as reflecting power relations through Fishman's (1972) view that patterns of shifts between languages reflect tolerance levels towards practices of linguistic pluralism in a society as a whole.

The assimilation model and notions regarding language maintenance are most clearly exemplified in examples (2) and (3), in which changes towards English monolingualism in educational and political participation as well as informative practices are argued for, and therefore encroach on human security (CHS 2002-2003; UNHDR 1994). The monolingual tendencies by the supporters of official English may be based on an idea similar to Kloss' (as cited in Mesthrie and Leap 2000:253) view that language maintenance is linked to social usage. Also, examples (2) and (3) can be seen as a rejection of the 1968 Bilingual Education Act, which albeit expired in 2002, and the 1972 amendments to the Voting Rights Act of 1965. Both laws were inspired by the Civil Rights Act and took account of the needs of linguistic minority groups (Spolsky 2004:99; Schildkraut 2005:12).

The focus of time pressure in relation to assimilation, through negative references and consequences for not assimilating and specifically, what may be interpreted as discriminating measures suggested in examples (2) and (3), can be related to 'cultural racism' (Giddens 2001:252) in which differences of culture and criticism for not assimilating are used as a base for marginalisation. Kymlicka (2002:353-355) claims that fair integration is a long-term process that provides services in immigrants' mother tongue and that their identities and practices are respected by the majority. The pull towards assimilation, as shown in examples (2) and (3), results in an implicit coerciveness denying immigrants the maintenance of their own language. These attitudes however can be interpreted more favourably if one takes account of May's (2005) study in which the instrumental use of a language permits identification between its speakers. In this case, this belief would benefit the pro-official English supporters. Thus, it may be claimed that the process of forced language shift due to monolingualism in institutions will bring about a shift of identification of immigrants towards the dominant group by removing the immigrants' ability to communicate in their L1 with the same institutions. The purpose of language shift in the data may thus lead to a redefinition of the individual's identity due to social interaction as described in Taylor (1994a:32). Example (10) can be connected to this aspect namely by the individual's easier articulation in English than in Spanish as a result of having grown up in the US. Her situation can be related to
Fishman's (1966) process of de-ethnicisation, in which language loss takes place at a faster rate than cultural loss, signalled by the emotional quality of the verb *values*.

Furthermore, it is worth relating the issue of the urgency to learn English and the idea of removing bilingualism/multilingualism in public institutions and government documents such as those in example (2), to the notion of 'nonrecognition', rendering invisible the language of minorities (Kymlicka 2002:332) in the long term. Similarly, references to assimilation through learning the language indicates that Taylor's suggestion for multiculturalism and identity through recognition of one's own needs (Taylor 1994a) is not evident in the speech act of *Time*, although Taylor, possibly contradictorily, leaves open the discussion of what carries value and also states that communication needs a common language.

Example (4) links the low level of proficiency with time by referring to immigrants and their descendants. This view may be connected to Bourdieu's notion of the 'linguistic market'. In this case, English is seen as the valued variety and linguistic capital exemplified by the adverbs *well, still, even* entailing an exclusion of immigrants across generations from the legitimate market place. Examples (8) and (9) referring to the generational language shift may indicate an agreement with Veltman's (1983:213) claim that the shift is now closer to the second generation rather than the third.

Generational shift can also be related to the issue of loyalty in Connor's (2007:77) perspective of contractual loyalty being a weaker form of loyalty that needs to be proven. Thus language shift and even the need for conditional citizenship based on language (although this may be more linked to democracy and the efficient functioning of a state) are related to the emotion of loyalty. In the context of the US, language loyalty to L1 may then be seen as an indication of ethnic loyalty which Niculescu (1996:716) states is associated to language maintenance, rather than civic loyalty or in Connor's (2007) term 'contractual loyalty', in this case, to the US. Therefore, the attitudes expressed in the data in favour of language shift by the supporters of official English may be seen as linked to desires for expressions of contractual loyalty by immigrants.

Finally, an interesting aspect is that Spanish is mentioned explicitly in the some of the quotes in examples (6), (8), and (9), although not in the quotes of proponents of official English and although immigrants or newcomers are mentioned in examples (1) and (3-5), the individual perspective that is included as an example of generational language shift belongs to a person of Hispanic descent – example (10).
6.1.2 Speech act of Obligation

The speech act of Obligation reflects power relations between groups, particularly of those that are in favour of official English and how immigrants are included in their arguments.

Example (11) from news article 21 "Protests could cause political problems for backers of balanced approach" published in the San Francisco Chronicle shows the function of a modal of obligation regarding a national symbol:

(11) Richardson, the New Mexico Democratic governor, who is of Mexican heritage...Richardson also agreed that the anthem should be sung in English.

The use of the modal should indicates an obligation of right and wrong, in this case related to the national anthem. Also, it is clarified that the Sayer is of Spanish speaking origin and refers to a demonstration in which the participants sang the national anthem in Spanish. The verb agreed as well as the adverb also imply that there are others that hold the same opinion. The Sayer, Richardson, is in favour of a "comprehensive immigration reform". A similar wording is attributed to a Republican Senator Lamar Alexander in the same article 21: The national anthem should be sung in English, "not French, German, Russian, Hindi or Chinese, the second most widely spoken foreign language after Spanish, or Spanish". Senator Alexander further links the issue of singing the national anthem in English to unity of the country by using the pronoun one to emphasise the amount in let's sing it together as one American nation in our common language in which "let" in combination with "us" can be seen as either a polite suggestion or instruction (see also examples in the section speech act of English as Unifier). Article 21 also refers to President Bush as having stated strongly that English should be used to sing the national anthem (see example (58) in the speech act of English as Unifier) as a contrast to the Secretary of State Condoleezza Rice's statement that the national anthem has been sung in many different ways e.g. rap, country, and classical, and who refers to this phenomenon as [t]he individualization of the American national anthem is quite under way.

The issue of the national anthem in this example can be related to the English Language and Patriot Reaffirmation Ordinance proposed in article 4 in The New York Times for the declaration of English as the official language of the community Pahrump in Nye County, and which also proposed an imposition that would forbid individuals to fly foreign flags without an accompanying American flag. A critic of this measure and Town board member described
this ordinance as: It's unconstitutional, it's unenforceable and I don't think it reflects how most people here think.

The following example (12) from article 18 also refers to the support for official English by another speaker in a different newspaper, namely the LA Times, in which the modal of obligation is incorporated in arguments to benefit the newcomers through the use of the noun opportunity. There is also a proposal for removal of bilingual education with the help of the preposition rather than indicating preference for something:

(12) As part of any comprehensive immigration reform, we should renew our commitment to making sure that all new immigrants have the opportunity to learn English. In public schools children should have intensive English instruction rather than bilingual classes.

The use of the modal should of obligation implies value judgement of right and wrong or recommendation. The identities of 'us' and 'them' place the should as an obligation enhanced by a material process to guarantee that a particular result is certain making sure, carried by the conjunction that. The example indicates a relationship of power due to the existence of a we that is in a position of defining an obligation to be imposed on others. The Sayer is the author of an opinion article and is in favour of an immigration reform.

Example (13) below from opinion article 2 published in The New York Times is also a statement made by a Sayer who is in favour of an immigration bill but who is also against the amendment proposed by Sen. Inhofe for declaring English as the country's national language. It is worth noting that although Sen. Inhofe's amendment is referred to as a demand for English as a national language, which is mainly a symbolic role; his description in the proposal of an amendment to the bill is actually the description of an official language in the definitions of language policy literature. This difference is pointed out in some articles but in other articles where the Inhofe amendment is mentioned an explanation of the difference is sometimes absent, thus risking a fading between the terms e.g. articles 10 and 20 in this study.

(13) But nobody favoring the Senate bill wants automatic amnesty. It imposes a long and difficult path to citizenship. Illegal immigrants must have a clean record and a job, speak English and pay a big fine.

The modal of obligation must indicates the position of subordination of the illegal immigrants. This can also be seen as an attempt to emphasise the dominant group's identity
value. The negative compound pronoun nobody with the conjunction But implies a united group of individuals. The message therefore can be read as: in order to become part of our group, you need to become worthy by acquiring certain requisites. Also, the use of the categorical imposes in the present tense gives the sentence a factual quality. The material process verb imposes carries inherent power relations in its meaning of placing a penalty officially on someone, or to make someone endure something that is not welcomed or wanted. In relation to the importance of learning English in example (13) above, the Sayer in opinion article 23, when referring to a research report (Pew report) showing that that 20% of Latinos were found to be bilingual in comparison to 80% for whom English was the dominant language, sarcastically putts forward that the former will ...be able to tell their elders in their native tongue to either learn English or get the hell out of the land of opportunity....

The following example (14) from opinion article 10 written by Sen. James Inhofe, the senator who proposed that English be declared the national language, in the USA Today also uses the modality must in relation to the topics of language and citizenship:

(14) This nation decided long ago that you must know English to become a citizen. Thus there is no reason to offer government's citizen services in foreign languages.

The use of the modal must indicates an obligation that it is necessary that something happens. It also carries an implication of insistence that immigrants need to learn English for acquiring citizenship. There is an appeal to history with the adverb ago in combination with the mental verbal process decided attributed to nation entailing that the decision was taken collectively by a group of ‘we' that formed the nation at that time. The noun nation is given the capacity to decide. This can be related to news article 9, namely to a comment made by Arizona state Rep. Russell Pearce of Mesa who says that the official English measure is part of us doing our job to help (immigrants) learn to communicate. Government has an obligation to promote and enhance English...to help people assimilate.

In the next example (15) from article 8, "Push for 'official' English heats up" in the USA Today, learning English is linked to personal identity achieved through assimilation:

(15) "This is the most action we've seen in about 10 years", says Rob Toonkel of U.S. English, a group promoting English as the official language. "People are split on immigration. But on matters of assimilation, they agree immigrants should be on the road to learning English."
The use of the modal *should* indicates power relations and obligation related to issues of right or wrong, in other words of appropriate behaviour. The pronoun *they*, in anaphoric reference to *People*, implicitly creates a relationship of ‘us’ and ‘them’ i.e. non-immigrants as the *People* and *they* in relation to *immigrants*. Language is expressed as a compulsory factor towards assimilation as a means that *People* agree on; although this collective ‘we’ allows room for an open membership by a variety of readers since it is undefined as regards its content. The Sayer, Rob Toonkel is in favour of official English. It is also interesting to note that in opinion article 23 in the *San Francisco Chronicle*, the Sayer refers to several Republican and Democratic Senators’ opinion that *becoming fluent in English should be a condition to live in these United States*, in which the modal *should* as an obligation is reaffirmed by the noun *condition* with fluency as part of the condition.

The following example (16) from opinion article 23 "Crime! Terrorism! Foreign languages" in the *San Francisco Chronicle* accumulates several conditions for membership in the society. There is no explicit statement in this opinion article regarding the position of the author (and Sayer in this example) in the debate of official English and it is difficult to interpret his position due to the tone used:

> (16) So it turns out it’s muy important that immigrants, legal and illegal, *learn English as a condition of citizenship, guest-worker status, indentured servitude, whatever.* President Bush even said last week that *they* [anaphoric reference to immigrants] *should* *sing the National Anthem in English so we don’t “lose our national soul”*. Forget terrorism. Pundits and politicians insist that the greatest security threat to the United States is the influx of Spanish speakers from across the border with Mexico.

The reported speech of obligation is directly attributed to a figure of authority and is carried through with a modal *should*. Also, the noun *condition* indicates a necessary thing for something else to be possible, in this case citizenship, and thus constituting an obligation. While example (16) above attempts to describe the situation of immigrants as employed *guest-worker, indentured servitude*, example (17) below from *USA Today* gives the perspective of an American citizen:

> (17) *Those [responses to Steve’s campaign against McDonald’s advertising in a language other than English] he saved included a note written on a*
The use of the pronouns *I* and *their* indicates group boundaries. Also, the combination of the modal and verb *need not be subjected* indicates a previous imposition of requirement from the speaker's perspective. Interestingly, the speaker belongs to the dominant/majority group, and the feeling of *subjected* is often linked to minority, powerless groups. Thus, the presence of a new language in a society and its acquisition by the host community members is regarded as negative and representing coerciveness or imposition on the majority and subsequently a loss of power. The person that the pronouns *he* and *you* refer to is the Republican mayor of Bogota, N.J. Steve Lonegan who is in favour of making English the official language of the town.

Example (18) in news article 14 in the *LA Times* refers to changes in the actual workplaces, which can be linked to the attitude expressed in example (17) above regarding the use of English in the society:

(18) *In Congress, legislators recently sparred over sanctions against employers who require workers to speak only English*  

The use of the verbal process verb *require* implies an order or demand for something, especially from a position of authority. Also, the use of the verbal process verb indicating conflict *sparred* is used in relation to an obligation *require* to use English and no other language in the workplace. The word *spar* indicates differences of opinion among figures of authority in its meaning to argue with somebody, most often in a friendly way. In this case it is the employers that are putting forward the obligation. The Sayer is a journalist and a staff writer for the *LA Times*.

Example (19) from article 9 in *USA Today*, titled "English as official language gains support at local levels", brings another perspective that can be contrasted to the goodwill portrayed in example (12) in this section (SA of Obligation) in which learning English is explained in terms of *commitment* and *opportunity*. Thus, in the following example, the material process verbs *punish* ...*taking away* in combination with the verbal process verb *demand* indicates power relations of obligation carrying the meaning of asking for something very strongly as if one has the right to do so. Moreover, the Sayer is referred to earlier in the
article as a figure of authority, Arizona State Rep. Kyrsten Sinema of Phoenix, and as an opponent of Proposition 103 to make English the official language of the state of Arizona:

(19) "To punish people by taking away funding to learn English, and at the same time demand people learn English, makes no sense at all," Sinema says.

Example (20), from opinion article 20 in the San Francisco Chronicle, is different from the previous examples since it deals with obligation duty in relation to the status of language and links it to freedom of speech. This link places at the centre the balance needed in creating an imaginary community and interpretations of fundamental rights, namely free speech in relation to having a right to a (minority) language:

(20) The word "official", in its adjectival function, is defined by the Oxford English Dictionary as "relating to duty." Duty to speak one language and not another? Isn't the approach an infraction against free speech.

In the above example (20), the use of the noun duty meaning a moral or legal obligation is connected to the definition of 'duty' to official English by use of a respected source namely the Oxford English Dictionary. The author further explains in the article: I can't think of anything less appealing that [sic] dutifulness in language. The Sayer of this extract is also the writer of this opinion article and has positioned himself against declaring English the official language.

Example (21) from article 11, titled "Survey finds service communication gap" in USA Today, has the implication that it is customer pressure that is forcing businesses to use Spanish (which can be linked to the imposition implied in example (17) above with need not be subjected):

(21) Rob Toonkel, spokesman for U.S. English, a group that wants to preserve English because they say it plays a unifying role, says he doesn't object to private businesses serving customers in Spanish, but that in a nation where 300 languages are spoken, customers should not expect or demand any language except English. "It underscores the importance of learning English," he says.

The use of the excluding preposition except and the emphasising material process verb underscores carries the underlying meaning that access to services in languages other than English is unacceptable (also implied by the use of the modal should). The Sayer Rob Toonkel
as described by the writer of the article also states that it is the customers that are forcing the use of other languages in the modal *should* carrying implications of right and wrong, as well as in the use of *demand*. In this way, business owners’ bilingual initiatives are backgrounded. Power relations are present in the imposition of what particular groups (speakers of languages other than English, particularly Spanish speakers) are not entitled to and is indicated by the mental and verbal processes of *expect* and *demand*. An interesting aspect is the role of businesses in affecting the position of English by catering to foreign language speakers.

The discussion regarding rights and language status is more clearly taken up in the following extract from article 5 "Press One for English", example (22), published in *The New York Times*:

(22) "Unless otherwise authorized or provided by law," the Inhofe amendment says, "no person has a right, entitlement or claim to have the government of the United States or any of its officials or representatives act, communicate, perform or provide services or materials in any other language other than English." It goes on to *insist* that new citizens be tested for knowledge of English and of certain pillars of American civics....

The use of the verb *has* indicates possession. In this case it is combined with the negative determiner and the indefinite all inclusive noun phrase *no person* in categorical usage which also extends its negative meaning to the lack of possibility of all individuals to require services in foreign languages even though mitigated by the conjunction *Unless*. The conjunction *Unless* indicates that what follows is an extra idea that works as a condition that can change the real situation. Simultaneously, there is an explicit removal of obligation on the part of government representatives to supply multilingual services. Also the verbal process *insist* indicates a demand put forward in the amendment implying also not accepting a refusal or an alternative. Thus the amendment does two things: one is removal of rights for multilingual services; and the other is the imposition of obligation to learn English among other conditions. The Sayer has taken this example as a direct quotation from a proposal to declare English the national language suggested as an amendment to an immigration bill. The abovementioned verb *has* belongs to the text of the amendment as given by the author of the amendment, but the verb *insist* belongs to the writer of this opinion article. Example (23), from opinion article 22 "A divisive declaration of official English" in the *San Francisco Chronicle* continues the debate of official English in obligatory terms with the usage of
should and require in what the author claims to be two separate issues, namely official English and immigration. It is also possible to add learning English as a third issue:

(23) Wolf Blitzer wanted to know if any of the candidates believed that English should be the official language of the United States. He posed that question after a series of others on immigration and framed it as "related" to that issue.

It isn't. You might argue that language is part of the debate because Congress is considering whether to require illegal immigrants to learn English on the road to earned legal status. But that wasn't the question. Declaring English the country's official language has absolutely nothing to do with immigration policy.

The author uses the modals of obligation should and require indicating power relations and further emphasises the truth of the statement by using the factuality It isn't and the adverb absolutely – in contradiction to the hypothesis presented by the modal of possibility might. The modal should also increases the importance of the issue by its indication of what is considered appropriate or right in the circumstances. Also, the modal should is given by the author of this opinion article as the wording used by Wolf Blitzer (although this cannot be taken for granted) whereas the verb require is more clearly presented as the author's own wording. In this extract, the author claims that the issues of immigration policy and official English are not "related", although they are spoken of as such by Wolf Blitzer, also strengthened by the use of wanted to know indicating an assumption of a connection that the author of the article claims exists. The author's standpoint in the issue regarding official English is unclear but he does make explicit that he views that the debate regarding language status should not be tied to immigration policy. This is in contrast to the view held by Manny Madriaga, a naturalised American citizen living in San Jose, in example (24), article 13 "Listening To Legal Immigrants", San Francisco Chronicle:

(24) I believe that people who want to become a citizen ought to learn English and they ought to learn to sing the national anthem in English.

The use of the modal ought indicates importance and the notion that what is being said is the right thing to do, thus containing the implication of morally correct behaviour. Example (25) from the same article, 13, emphasises the adaptation previous immigrants have had to make to become citizens. This article is in reaction to a proposed amnesty to illegal immigrants, revised guest-worker programs and open borders as described by the author, a
writer for the newspaper, who opposes the amnesty by claiming to *trying to keep U.S. citizenship and sovereignty* intact:

(25) *I have my own story to share: My mother is a legal immigrant. Originally from Australia, she went through the long and arduous process of becoming first a permanent resident and then a citizen. She *had to* pass written tests, *prove* she could speak English.*

The material process verb *prove* includes the meaning that the presentation of evidence indicates that something is true, which may also imply the fulfilment of an underlying obligation namely that it is necessary for today's immigrants to show proof of their ability in English. The modal replacement *had to* indicates that something is necessary i.e. an obligation placed on the individual for obtainment of citizenship. The author also refers in the same article to organisations made up of legal immigrants that want to curtail current immigration e.g. Yeh Ling-Ling, who is a naturalised citizen and the executive director of a nonprofit organisation Diversity Alliance for a Sustainable America which aims to *limit both illegal and legal immigration*. The organisation in question is run by minorities and immigrants. Article 9 in *USA Today* also describes Hispanic support for official English with the verb *garnering* which carries the meaning of collecting something in order to use it. The same article states that 48% of Hispanics supported the English-only proposal in Arizona. This support emphasises the role this group has in promoting measures regarding the role of English and the heterogeneity of goals within the Hispanic group often collectively referred to as unsettled and lacking knowledge of English.

Example (26), from opinion article 24, in the *USA Today* uses the terminology that Sen. Inhofe suggested in his amendment proposal regarding language status:

(26) *So should English be designated the USA's "national language"? Sixty-three senators have voted to make it so.*

The obligation *should* indicates the opinion of *sixty-three senators* of what is considered appropriate action, thus inferring a possibility of distinguishing what is right, in this case, taking action to change the present status instead of no action. It is important to note that the question was answered with reference to figures of authority *sixty-three senators*. The question is posed by the author of an opinion article who positions himself/herself against legislating for a national language. The modal is integrated in a question which the author of this opinion article uses to argue against the Inhofe amendment.
Finally example (27) from article 24 *USA Today* and example (28) from article 4 *The New York Times* can be related to examples (18) and (21) in this section:

(27) *To be sure, employers shouldn't put people who barely speak English into customer service positions.*

The modal of obligation *should* is used to refer to advised actions for employers when offering services. The negative adverb contraction *n't* indicates inappropriate action due to its combination with the modal. The use of the phrase *to be sure* adds factuality and naturalises the information in the following clause by its meaning of something that cannot be denied – thus already preparing the truth of what follows. Also, the level of proficiency is relatively indicated in the adverb *barely*, which although meaning only just, leaves open subjective evaluations of the capacity of English of others. The author of this opinion article positions himself/herself against legislating for a national language.

In example (28) from article 4, Spanish is in focus:

(28) *Lee Rowland, a lawyer with the American Civil Liberties Union of Nevada, said students had been harassed by school officials for speaking Spanish in private conversations.*

The material verb *harassed* means to trouble or annoy someone continually or to make repeated attacks on an enemy thus indicating a dichotomisation of groups in which language is the cause of separation. Also the agents *school officials*, as institutional representatives, and their intervention in the *private conversations* of students indicate a degree of power relations and level of intolerance to the use of Spanish in the school environment. The reference to public and private spheres is in relation to the circumstances within the example, i.e. the authority that public officials have that allows them to demand certain features in private exchanges in which they are not one of the participants. No explicit information is given in the article if Lee Rowland or the organisation he works for is in favour or against the official English measure but the use of the verb *harrassed* may give some indication.

**Summary and further considerations: speech act of Obligation**

The conclusions that can be drawn by combining the results above are that two main aspects related to language are put forward, namely symbolic and instrumental aspects. The former includes attitudes concerning the language in which the national anthem should be sung –
implying that it has been sung in languages other than English in examples (11), (24), or the
declaration of a national language as in example (26), and an instrumental requirement of
English for the obtainment of citizenship or legal status in examples (13-14), (16), and (22-
25). The relationship to language held by some employers in examples (18) and (27) also falls
within the instrumental category.

Other aspects brought up are those regarding the removal of bilingual education in
example (12), linguistic assimilation in example (15) – implicitly in example (28), and an
experience of coerciveness by foreigners on speakers of English in examples (17) and (21).
An interesting aspect is also the reference made in the notes regarding example (11), in which
the Secretary of State Condoleeza Rice refers to different manifestations of the national
anthem as _individualization_ of it, pushing forward a liberal ideology placing the individual in
focus and making an implicit link to freedom of expression.

The symbolic issue of singing the anthem in English as acceptable to Hispanics is
exemplified by the reference to an authoritative figure marked by his ancestry of the ethnic
group. Thus, in example (11) the individual's authenticity of origin gives credibility to his
views and falls to some extent within left-liberal multiculturalism in the US as described by
McLaren (1994:51-52) in which authority is allocated to the voices that are close by origin to
the group in question. This is related to the social construction of the ethnic and linguistic
identities based on situated relations of group identity and loyalty, which according to
Fishman (1999:154) can change. In the case of this study, this would concern identity and
loyalty of speakers of Spanish on the basis of their knowledge of English.

The notion of 'assimilation' is brought up in the obligation to learn English, thus tying
these two processes together as shown in example (15). This attitude may result from the view
that "new" immigrants are not very positive to learning English as claimed by Gonzalez and
Melis (2001:47). The model of assimilation in a multiethnic society entails an abandonment
of the immigrants' original culture (Giddens 2001:256) and its replacement by the idea of
becoming an American through English language acquisition. Assimilative ideas as those
described in example (15) may be connected to Romaine's (1995:316) warning that ideas of
assimilation may in fact strengthen expressions of difference between groups. In the data the
issue regarding the language in which the national anthem is sung is one such example.

Example (28) refers to intolerance to other languages in public institutions which may
have consequences for what languages have most linguistic capital – similar to those shown in
Galindo's (1997) study. Also, the boundaries between private and public language seem to
overlap in the data i.e. in example (28). This is also one of the concerns voiced by the anti-
official English campaigners as written in Crystal (1997:117-128). The normative question in example (26) regarding the establishment of a national language can be related to the discussion about the link between official language and immigration policy in example (23). Both these examples (23 and 26) are status and prestige issues and relate to the official establishment of what Clyne calls asymmetrical multilingualism (Clyne 1997:306).

Moreover, by singing the anthem in a language other than English, particularly in Spanish, the individuals may be said to be outwardly expressing their identity which is transferred to a symbol that is used in the representation of patriotism as stated in Connor (2007:77). The language in which the anthem is sung becomes important in the construction of the speech community as given by Morgan, namely through its representation and naturalisation by unmarked repetition (Morgan 2006:5). This can be related to social change in the US since by not singing the anthem in English, the immigrants are not following the rules of usage (Hymes 1974:120) expected in the community. Thus in light of Duranti's (1997:76-78) notion of 'speech community', the groups in the data are presenting an alternative norm as resistance and thus constructing social and ethnic identities that exist parallel to the dominant community. However, the implication of patriotism still remains since the demonstrators sang the American Anthem – although in a language other than English. In this way, they are actively constructing alternative expressions of American patriotism – a factor that implies the construction of alternative expressions of an American identity. The use of obligation terms regarding the anthem as a symbol of patriotism indicates a concurrence with Smolicz's (1995:236-237) term of language as a core value for the two parties involved namely, those singing the anthem in a language other than English as well as those – which include some Spanish speakers – putting forward normative views in favour of the dominant role of English in the United States. The involvement of some Hispanics in the normative views for English as the language of national symbols contradicts the perception of the general public in the 1990 poll in Schmid (2001) on core characteristics of six groups in which the Hispanics were seen to be incapable of acquiring American values. This may further be an indication of Freindreis and Tatalovich's (1997) conclusion that the issue of core values will gain significance and that conflict of values will increase. This claim may also be indirectly linked to the notion of 'trust', that is, by breaking the consensus as defined in Morgan (2006:5) and singing the anthem in a language other than English, a level of uncertainty is created between the dominant group and those presenting an alternative representation of the anthem. According to Seligman (1997:6-7, 16-22), uncertainty can affect trust which in turn affects the society. This view echoes Nicolau and Validivieso's (1992:317-318) claims that pro-official
English supporters lack trust in Hispanics. In this case, there may be a further indication of social change by means of a possible negotiation of roles related to the domains and functions of the languages in question, since this affects the position of the speakers in the society.

The language requirements for citizenship in several examples in the data above contribute to the construction of asymmetrical multilingualism. This may lead to language shift due to the instrumentality of English in relation to other languages making it, in Bourdieu's terms, the cultural capital (Bourdieu 1991:14, 30) necessary for participation in the American society. Imposing English as a condition for citizenship as evident in some of the findings can also be regarded as a form of acquiring/forcing contractual loyalty (Wolff 1968; Connor 2007) and defending against what Mendoza-Denton's (1999:381) study revealed, namely the perception of lasting language loyalty of new immigrants to their mother tongue. Example (18), exemplifies the establishment of cultural capital and legitimate competence. The use of the word opportunity in example (12) reaffirms the position of English as the legitimate cultural capital. Using Bourdieu's (1991) view that acquisition of capital in one field can increase capital acquisition in another field, knowledge of English can be linked to future accessibility of, for instance, economic capital. The emphasis in the data by the supporters of a common shared language and elimination of foreign languages is in line with the conservative multiculturalist view in the US as presented in McLaren (1994:45). In a wider perspective, the situation in the United States may be related to Phillipson's criticism of some of the European nation-states in which there is often a disregard for the sociolinguistic landscape within the countries (Phillipson 2003:41-42).

In sum, the non-recognition of minority languages, particularly Spanish, is an issue in the speech act of Obligation – directed towards the acquisition of English and mainly expressed through loyalty and symbolic aspects. There is also reference to the acquisition of cultural capital in an instrumental perspective for political inclusion through citizenship or participation in the job market.

6.1.3 Speech act of Willingness

The speech act of Willingness is mainly marked by a view that sees usage of a language other than English as a matter of choice. This tendency can be seen in example (29) from article 11 in USA Today:

(29) Today, AT&T has identified 2 million U.S. customers who prefer Spanish. When they call, AT&T's computers identify their phone
numbers and automatically route them to a customer-service representative who answers in Spanish

The use of prefer, a mental process verb, indicates choice by Spanish speakers. The example shows that a company AT&T is making special arrangements for a particular language group. The journalist in this extract is referring to information given by AT&T in the article, an example of a business that has begun to provide services in Spanish since Spanish speaking customers were frustrated and angered about not being understood or not able to understand when they contacted the company with complaints. It is also stated in the article that the company has not lost English-only proponents as customers. According to the same article all the six offices of the nationwide company Better Business Bureaus that were contacted had hired Spanish speaking staff because of population changes. Example (30) from the same article also deals indirectly with choice from the customer given by the mental verb expect but also includes the aim of the group U.S. English with wants:

(30) Rob Toonkel, spokesman for U.S. English, a group that wants to preserve English because they say it plays a unifying role, says he doesn't object to private businesses serving customers in Spanish, but that in a nation where 300 languages are spoken, customers should not expect or demand any language except English

The mental process verb want indicates a will or desire. The use of preserve indicates a risk of change from an original position. Also, the Sayer Rob Toonkel (as portrayed by the writer of the article) suggests that customers may be forcing businesses to use a language other than English in the negative forms of the verbs not expect or demand. Example (31) from article 12 "Migrate, then integrate" in the LA Times also focuses on choice, but from an organisation's actions:

(31) For example, rather than expanding its appeal to U.S.-born, English-speaking Latinos, local public television station KCET chose to put a Spanish-language program on the air.

The mental process verb chose indicates a conscious action by the company towards favouring Spanish. The Sayer also acknowledges the presence of Latinos that speak English and are born in the United States. When referring to the action by newspapers: Likewise, even as many newspapers began to publish Spanish-language editions, their commitment to including English-dominant Latinos in their staffs and stories flagged. The reference to
Latinos is interesting since some of the individuals may be American citizens by birth, thus indicating one of the possible ways in which identity is constructed in the country. The author (and Sayer in this example) of this opinion article calls for a shift of focus from immigration to integration with, as he states: cross-ethnic ties over group-specific appeals. Furthermore, article 19 also refers to one of the country's main accounting firms airing adverts on Spanish-language radio.

Example (32) in news article 3 "In a New Jersey Town, an Immigration Fight Pits Brother Against Brother", The New York Times, the issue of choice is marked towards assimilation and an implication of language shift:

(32) "Trying to make English the official language – what does it say to immigrant families?" [question posed by Bryan a prominent lawyer who is against making official English, and brother to Steve Lonegan]  
"It says assimilate", Steve maintained, noting that his grandparents would not speak Italian at home... [The Sayer is Steven Lonegan, a Republican mayor of Bogota, N.J. who is in favour of official English].

The use of modal verb would in combination with the negative not indicates wish, insistence or refusal. The use of an implicit imperative It says assimilate, shows power relations and obligation in the form of an order. Furthermore, the verbal process maintained indicates confidence, authority, and moves the responsibility and truth of the sentence away from the journalist. The use of immigrant families indicates a group that is not part of the collective American 'we'. The Sayers are brothers with prominent careers but holding different views on the need for an official English policy. Steven Lonegan's answer indicates asymmetrical use of power since his only answer involves an abandonment of the minority culture in the word assimilate.

In example (33), article 6, The New York Times, titled "Bush Suggests Immigrants Learn English", the journalist uses the verb urged when describing the President's speech in favour of his immigration bill proposal:

(33) President Bush urged immigrants on Wednesday to learn English and history and civics with the goal of "helping us remain one nation under God."

The verbal process urged carries the meaning of trying hard to persuade somebody to do something and implies that immigrants need to be convinced or encouraged to learn English.
The use of the suasive verb "urge" as an indirect directive has the implication of the intention to bring about change in the future and reduces the explicitness of asymmetrical power relations of the participants President Bush and immigrants. Also, the use of urge holds implicit that there is a lack of will and not a problem of ability or resources for the immigrants to learn English.

Example (34) from article 21 in the San Francisco Chronicle "Protest could cause political problems for backers of balanced approach" also reinforces the idea of individual choice by relating it to the will to assimilate:

(34) Miguel Cruz, who came to the United States from Peru at age 9 and works for the Social Security Administration, said Monday's demonstrators "are demonstrating that they really are not immigrants. They don't act like immigrants. They don't behave like immigrants. Immigrants are those who came here legally and those who remain here legally.... Immigrants are proud to be here and eager to learn English, eager to assimilate and acculturate. Real immigrants will embrace and obey the laws of America."

The extract carries the implication that legal immigrants described with the adjective Real have a certain type of behaviour which includes adjectives of emotion proud, eager as well as the mental process verb embrace as in accept or believe also indicating emotion. The material process obey indicates doing what one is told or is required to do.

The emphasis of differences between the groups of immigrants especially since this is a Latino referring to other immigrants entails that the boundaries and categorisation of the Latino groups are fuzzy and their respective attitudes to adjustment into the host community and each other differs. Thus, it is possible to state that the groups under the label of immigrants do not see themselves as forming a homogeneous group. The Sayer refers to the behaviour of other people i.e. of demonstrators waving Mexican flags and singing a Spanish version of the Star-Spangled Banner which is dealt with throughout the article. The Sayer is an immigrant from Peru, an adult indicated by this employment. One can thus assume with approximation that he has lived a minimum of 10 years in the US. His reference to legality also implies that he may have arrived in the US as a legal immigrant. In a related way, the Peredas from article 14, LA Times, reflect the attitude mentioned in example (34) when they say that they are: ...determined to keep practicing. "I am not thinking of leaving this country," Rosa said, "so it's better that I understand the native language."
Example (35) from article 17 "House Leaders Intensify Debate on Immigration", *LA Times*, deals with language use as a possible choice:

(35) *A session set for July 26 is to examine the role of the English language in U.S. society and whether the Senate measure would undermine efforts to promote its use by immigrants.*

The use of the material process verb *promote* implies helping the progress of something, to encourage or support something. The underlying meaning is that immigrants need encouragement entailing that the usage of English is a matter of choice by the immigrant. The modality *would* brings into focus the aspect of consequences of the measure indicated in the rest of the sentence *undermine...immigrants*. The use of the verb *examine* in relation to the noun *role* implies an acknowledgement of social change. The journalist of this news article is also the Sayer in this example. The following extract, example (36) from article 14, *LA Times*, connects language use with emotion and social change in a part of the public space, semi-public space and private space, namely where Hispanic individuals have the possibility of using Spanish:

(36) *Still, despite more than three decades in the United States, they feel more comfortable in their native language, often speaking Spanish at home, at work and while doing errands in their Huntington Park neighborhood.*

In the above example there is an indication of time *three decades* related to language maintenance. Also, the use of a mental verb process indicating emotion *feel* enhanced by the comparative *more than, more* and the adjective *comfortable* indicates a positive feeling free from difficulty and worry or unpleasantness. The use of the adverb of frequency *often* indicating many times, at short intervals or frequently, together with the positive emotions towards the native language, implies a voluntary choice of Spanish by the individuals. The Sayer in this extract is the journalist of this news article although the content may be considered as a report of the information given by the Mexican couple, referred to as *they*, during her interview with them. This couple is portrayed in the article as actively trying to learn English.

In example (37), article 12, *LA Times*, emotion is indirectly connected to segregation:
As has happened throughout U.S. history, late-20th century immigrants sought to recreate the sounds and smells and networks of home in their new land. The once highly homogeneous City of Angels became increasingly divided along not just racial but cultural and linguistic lines.

The material process verb sought indicates a purposeful action by immigrants for minority cultural and linguistic maintenance in the new country. The act of seeking entails looking for something or trying to find or get something, which indicates a choice available to immigrants as well as the image of immigrants as actively creating or choosing a situation. The Sayer in this extract is also the writer of the opinion article from which the extract was taken and calls for more emphasis to be paid on integration rather than immigration. In contrast to example (37), the author of opinion article 20 in the San Francisco Chronicle claims a deep connection to the American language by immigrants: In fact, often the passion non-natives develop for American English is more powerful, or at least more evident, than that of native speakers. The author here uses the noun expression In fact to introduce the following sentence as a truth strengthening the meaning of the emotion implied by the noun passion to the new language – American English.

The Sayer in the next example (38), is the author of opinion article 18, LA Times and his argument for official English may imply a suggestion for solving segregation issues:

These multilingual documents discourage immigrants from learning English as rapidly as possible, limiting their ability to engage in a truly common political culture. Rather than expanding opportunities for new Americans, these mandates help limit them.

The use of a mental process verb discourage indicates that the issue of immigrants not learning English is a matter of will. The absence or diminishing of interest in learning English is caused by the accessibility to multilingual documents, justifying the argument for monolingualism in documents.

Example (39) in article 14 develops the issue of preference with an implication for language shift:

Rumbaut co-wrote a study released last year that Mexicans and Central Americans retain their language longer than Asians and white Europeans but that even among Mexicans, 96% of the third generation prefer to speak English at home.
The mental process verb *prefer* indicates choice by the majority of third generation Mexicans. This preference is also an indication of possible language shift since this figure relates to the home environment (the private sphere). The Sayer is referred to as an expert and is introduced elsewhere in the text as a *UC Irvine sociology professor*. In example (40) from the news article 21, *San Francisco Chronicle*, assimilation is implied and is seen as voluntary, although there is no reference to language shift:

(40) *Richardson, the New Mexico Democratic governor, who is of Mexican heritage...Richardson also agreed that the anthem should be sung in English. "Most immigrants want to become American," he said. "They want to learn English. They want to be part of the American mainstream. They wear NFL jerseys."

The repetition of the mental process verb *want* indicates that the knowledge of English is related to will or desire. The Sayer in this extract holds a position of authority and is in favour of a comprehensive immigration reform.

Example (41) is from opinion article 18 in the *LA Times* and relates *opportunity* to language – similar to example (12) in the section of speech act of Obligation:

(41) *And just as opportunity is the birthright of all native-born Americans, it becomes the inheritance of all new Americans. But this is nothing more than a nice sentiment if we don't encourage and help new Americans learn English.*

The use of the verb *becomes* indicates a change of status. The copula verb "become" describes *opportunity* as a quality that *native-born Americans* have and which is transmittable to newcomers. The combination of *becomes* with the processes *encourage* as giving support, confidence or hope and *help* implies power relations towards those the actions are directed to and presents the actions as a matter of will. The Sayer in this extract is also the writer of the opinion article. The Sayer argues for official English.

The Sayer in article 23 from *USA Today*, is against the proposed Inhofe amendment to make English the national language of the country, and describes the interest of immigrants to learn English in the sentence: *[T]here are long waits for English classes*, in which the combination *There are* indicates a fact given by the noun *waits* qualified by the adjective *long* indicating interest by immigrants and a discrepancy between supply and demand. In a similar
vein, example (42) below from opinion article 5, *The New York Times*, includes the willingness of immigrants to learn English with the use of *overwhelmed*:

(42) People who **struggle** with the language don't need to be told how important English fluency is in America. If Mr. Inhofe wanted to lavish federal money on English-language classes, now **overwhelmed** with immigrants on waiting lists, such a step would do more to advance the cause of English and assimilation than any xenophobic amendment.

Both of the above extracts (from articles 5, and 23) are in contrast to some of the previous examples in which immigrants are represented as needing encouragement to learn English. The *amendment* referred to here was approved by the Senate (May 2006) onto the immigration bill in which English was declared the "national language of the United States".

The use of the material process verb *struggle* carrying the meaning of trying to achieve something that is difficult and *overwhelmed* indicating extremely large numbers together with *immigrants* states a willingness by the immigrants to learn English. Also, the use of *and* linking *English* and *assimilation* indicates that the goal to strive for is the maintenance of English in its current dominant position and its use as a tool for assimilation. The use of the modal *would* lays claim to a degree of certainty of outcome, namely that investment in English classes would favour the position of English and assimilation. The Sayer is the writer of an opinion article and is against actions that change the status of English to that of an official language in the US. Example (43) below in the *San Francisco Chronicle*, titled "English as official language" from article 20, explicitly leaves room for bilingualism:

(43) In 1988, a referendum in Florida added these lines to the state constitution: "English is the official language of Florida...." Has anything changed since then though? Cubans **have learned** English, but **haven't sacrificed** their native tongue. The state is richer, more global, than ever.

The auxiliary *have* lays ground for the actions linked to the acquisition of English given by the main verb *learned* and also *sacrificed* with the meaning to lose or give something up for the sake of something more important and valuable. This construction contradicts the ideological views of either/or in the society but maintains the implication of a hegemonic positioning of English. This is emphasised by the conjunction *but* indicating contrast. The immigrants, i.e. Cubans (singled out among Hispanics) become bilingual rather than experiencing language shift.
The presence of English alongside another language is categorically described by the use of the present tense of the relational process verb *is* in a positive adjective *richer* and a comparative adverb *more* steering the interpretation of the adjective *global*. The use of the adverb of time *ever* (with the comparative *more...than*) indicates a new situation i.e. a social change process through comparison to a time before the moment of writing. This extract is part of an opinion article in which the author is against official English measures.

Example (44), article 13, *San Francisco Chronicle*, is another example of the willingness and the possibility of new Hispanic citizens maintaining Spanish but at the same time learning English, although the Sayer's identity inclination is towards English:

(44) *I speak Spanish still and am proud of it. But English is my language now, the Stars and Stripes is my flag and the United States is my country.*

The use of the conjunction *But* indicates a contrast that although the speaker is bilingual indicated by the adverb of time *still*, only one national loyalty and identity is possible in the use of the time adverb *now* combined with the possessive determiner *my*. The Sayer is Ed Lucha a legal immigrant in the US since the age of 12 having arrived 42 years ago in the country. His comment is included in an opinion article in which views sent by legal immigrants were included. Ed Lucha is described as a person *whose embrace of his new homeland and service to his country speak volumes about the meaning of true citizenship*. The author of this article called for a stop on illegal immigration and criticises the *May Day boycott*.

**Summary and further considerations: speech act of Willingness**

The speech act of Willingness is related to issues of identification, primarily as a conscious and voluntary act towards group identification and demonstrations of contractual loyalty. Multilingualism and concerns about language acquisition patterns dealing with the relationships between groups by the expressions of willingness to learn English or the effect of societal structures on language acquisition are visible. The possibility of using a language other than English in the economy is also included. In this speech act the usage of a particular language is marked by a notion of choice (cf. Spolsky's (2004) emphasis on individual choice).
Examples (34) and (40) indicate group identification in line with Le Page and Tabouret-Keller's (1985) view, which in the case of these examples, is a voluntary cultural and language shift towards assimilation by certain immigrants given in words such as *eager* and *want*. However, this aspect is contrasted with the negative views of supporters of the movement for Americanisation in Gonzalez and Melis' (2001:47) and Tollefson's (1991:110) studies. The pro-official English supporters in these studies claim that new immigrants are not keen on learning English. This factor can be related to Weber's idea of the 'nation' as pathos expressed by a shared language or other common unifying features (Weber 1997:26) which allow identification and links to loyalty. The possibility of desiring to assimilate or becoming an *American* in these examples also relates to Fishman's (1999:154) notion of linguistic identity being constructed and that in situations of conflict – in this study, the threat of Spanish – this identity may have varying degrees of intensity since languages are used to express loyalty through uniting 'us' against 'them'. In example (34) there is a reference to Otherness by making distinctions between immigrant groups based on their desire to assimilate. Departing from Petersson (2003:6), the 'them' are portrayed in a dichotomising relationship and positioned as enemies and through which, using Dixon and Simpson's meaning, identification of loyalty expressed through language as a boundary marker may lead to conflict (Dixon and Simpson 1994:1959) between groups. Thus language is linked to what an American is, as concluded in Schildkraut's (2005:4-5) study. Examples (34) and (40) are ways of transferring or redirecting the negative stereotypes of immigrants to specific groups e.g. by emphasising the difference between legal and illegal immigrants, which also indicates an attempt to negotiate representation in what Appiah (2005:66) describes as available labels of identities. The different uses of *immigrants* and *new Americans* in examples (32-33), (35), (37-38), and (40-42) are in contrast to the specificity by implication of example (34) distinguishing the type of legality of the immigrant in relation to their will to assimilate, and in examples (36), (39), and (43-44) referring to the Hispanic origin of the immigrant – although example (39) also mentions other groups. This may be related to McLaren's (1994:55-58) portrayal of the struggles of power in critical multiculturalism and the notion that signs and significations are unstable, although in this case, the primary term creating the hierarchy of dependence is stable and distinguished by desirability, namely the notion of being an 'American' by means of the English language.

Example (39) further reflects Fishman's (1972) description of language shift in which the individual substitutes the original language in which they socialise in the private sphere, moving completely away from bilingualism – in this case, the shift is towards English. This is
in contrast with the choice by customers in example (29) to use Spanish and the supply by companies of services in a language other than English – also present in example (31). In examples (43-44) an intrinsic value to language is implied by using the verb *sacrificed* and the adjective *proud* in combination with the adverb of time *still* and the present indication of possession *is my*. The relational verb *is* indicates a static condition. Thus, although language acquisition takes place, a static situation of linguistic identity is perceived by the individual. Moreover, example (44) indicates the possibility of a shift in the emotional adherence of the immigrant towards the host country, and is thus a membership based on a bilingual individual's own identification as suggested by Moerman's (1965) term 'emic'. Example (44) reflects a change in the identity allegiance of the bilingual individual, which is in accordance with Appiah's (2005:64) study where allegiances of identification are claimed as constructed.

Example (36) carries the implication of ethnic affinity expressed through 'pathos' (Weber 1997:18 – although it is not used in this example at a national level) to a speech community in a preference to use Spanish in the Hispanic couple's neighbourhood. This is also present in example (37) in the reconstruction of the immigrants' home country. The use of their first language may be perceived by the majority speakers of English as a demonstration of language loyalty (see also Mendoza-Denton 1999:381) to their minority language and a perception of absence of loyalty to the US in a dichotomised understanding of loyalty. Bolinger's notion of security may characterise the behaviour of preference to use Spanish in examples (36-37). Examples (36), (39-40) and (44) regarding preferences, however, need to be interpreted with regard to the difference between language attitude and language behaviour if one bears in mind Nelde's (1997:288) view that perceptions of language loyalty and prestige may affect answers to surveys and interviews whether conscious or unconscious.

The relationship between the use of Spanish in the economic market and the existence of a community that is functioning in Spanish in examples (29), (31) and (36-37) can be related Edwards' (1985:49) statement that the fate of a language and its speakers is linked to the situation of the speakers in the particular society. In the case of the Spanish speakers, these may be seen as established in the United States by virtue of their large numbers. The appearance of separate speech communities causes fears of fragmentation which are expressed in views that coincide with MacKaye's (1990) study of the notion of English as a bond (see also Crystal 1997:122-130).

Furthermore, examples (34) and (40), and to a certain degree example (44), demonstrate expressions of what Wolff (1968) and Connor (2007) define as contractual loyalty to the nation, thereby loyalty needs to be outwardly visible and provides a basis for defining the
Other. Thus those that are loyal make prominent their acquisition of the necessary cultural capital and the legitimate competence. The idea of assimilation expressed in examples (34) and indirectly in (40), as well as access to opportunities in examples (38) and (41) links cultural capital to the attainment of social capital, as defined by Bourdieu (1991:14, 30, 56; see also Mesthrie and Deumert 2000:343), through language which allows the possibility of creating relationships with others e.g. through participation in a common political culture or belonging to the mainstream thus forming part of Anderson's (1991:6-7) notion of an 'imagined community'.

Examples (33) and (35) indicate a possibility of choice among immigrants to either learn or not learn English which to a certain extent differs from what Kymlicka describes as the expectation that immigrants will integrate into the target country and learn the language for citizenship (Kymlicka 2002:353-355). Although example (42) confirms the adherence of immigrants to the expectations of learning English, it also adds the aspect of fluency, which is linked to Bourdieu's (1991:17) concept of the 'linguistic market', in the sense that, in a multilingual society, it may not be sufficient to acquire the language but once acquired one then enters the issue of linguistic and communicative competence of the individual to produce valued expressions in particular linguistic markets.

There is further an indication that asymmetrical multilingualism as defined by Clyne (1997:306) exists in examples (38) and (41-42). The hegemonic position of English is however, challenged in two ways. Firstly, in the direction of domain sharing in the public space, semi-public space and private space as evidenced in examples (29), (31) and, (36), and secondly, there is a need to emphasise the perception of willingness of immigrants to choose to learn English as visible in examples (33) and (35). The verbal process urged in example (33), and also examples (34) and (40) emphasising assimilation, are further linked to Hymes' (1974:120) notion of 'speech community' expressed in the speech event, in this case that the speech event, following certain rules of use and repertoires of ways of speaking, takes place within a contextual perception that certain immigrants are not voluntarily acquiring English and that their presence is creating new rules of use. Thus, there is an expansion of the domains in which the immigrants' language is used, in this case mainly Spanish, and also creating what Duranti (1997:76-78) refers to as alternative norms of resistance to the official variety and constructing parallel identities based on a language as a symbol of ethnic identity. Example (43) adds the global dimension to the local market. Further, example (43) also expresses Salzmann's (1993:194) possibility of the individual belonging to several speech communities.
The example allows for bilingualism as a positive alternative to the ideals of assimilation and language shift in the country.

The above focus of language acquisition based on individual choice is in line with the liberal view of multiculturalism (cf. Spolsky 2004). However, example (38) may be said to reflect a view of the individual as a product of the environment and social practices, which can be seen as an argument that underlies many of the reasons for establishing official English.

Finally, threat scenarios based on uncertainty (Nelde 1987:607) are presented in examples (33) and (38) expressing the prospect of a possible loss of cohesion and participation caused by immigrants not acquiring English. These threats may also be associated to Taylor's politics of recognition (Taylor 1994a), although applied to the majority. In other words, examples (33) and (38) make an appeal for recognition of values that give them a sense of identity and belonging. Thus the immigrant speakers are seen to be in a position to alter their behaviour – especially in example (33) – and "recognise" the culture of the dominant host society. However a further threat may exist if one takes account of Dixon and Simpson's (1994:1957) view that one language variety – or language – is put forward as the only means of social mobility, as expressed in the use of *opportunities* and *opportunity* in examples (38) and (41). The larger minority groups may choose to resist this linguistic domination – an action which may lead to the expansion of the functions of their immigrant language in the society, as in examples (29), (31) and (36), but also result in a political language conflict whereby the issue of immigration is vocalised as dependent on the establishment of official English (cf. example (23) in the section speech act of Obligation).

### 6.1.4 Speech act of Help

The speech act of Help is mainly characterised by power relations of givers and receivers. Nearly all examples in this section involve some form of the verb *help*.

Example (45) from opinion article 18, in the *LA Times*, reflects the above relations:

\[(45) \text{And just as opportunity is the birthright of all native-born Americans, it becomes the inheritance of all new Americans. But this is nothing more than a nice sentiment if we don’t encourage and help new Americans learn English.}\]

The use of the verb *help* implies power relations towards those the actions are directed to. The verb is used in the meaning of assisting a group *new Americans*. Also, the use of *we*
creates proximity between the reader and the author of the article and unites both in the proposal put forward. The adjective new indicates a boundary since it carries the implicature of the existence of "old" Americans. The Sayer of this extract is also the author of the opinion article from which it was taken. The Sayer is in favour of official English measures. This example can be linked by implicature to the message given by President Bush in article 6 published in The New York Times in which he describes that for a fair and orderly immigration system it is necessary to: reach out and help people assimilate into our country... That means learn the values and history and language of America.

The Sayer of the next example (46) from opinion article 7 in USA Today, is also the author of the article – Lisa Navarrete, vice president of the National Council of La Raza, an organisation she describes as deeply engaged in the process of integrating immigrants into American society. The organisation opposes Sen. Inhofe's amendment to make English the national language. It is interesting that although campaigning for different ends, she also uses the verb help:

(46) There is no question that English is the language of this nation and that we must do everything we can to help immigrants make the adjustment to English

The material process verb help indicates power relations in between those that "give" and constitute the we – a group that includes the reader and Sayer – and those that receive, namely immigrants. The use of help carries positive connotations in the sense of assisting immigrants or making circumstances easier for them. The connotations of power related to the giver are further accentuated by the modal can which indicates ability. The use of the adverb There in combination with the verb "be" in the present form is, as well as the idiom no question indicating no possibility, may contribute to naturalising the notion of only one language being permissible in the country. This is also emphasised by the relational process verb is and the definite article in English is the, even though it may be argued that this is not the aim of the speaker, since she is part of an organisation that is against the Inhofe amendment. Example (47) is from the same article as extract (46):

(47) ...but those of us who work every day to help immigrants learn English believe his amendment is bad public policy, and should never become law
The position of immigrants as receivers in the material process *help* places power in relation to the *us* who are in the position of givers. In this sense the word *help* is used to assist, make easier the acquisition of English. The adjective *bad* indicates the direction of emotion and value judgment of the Sayer foregrounded by the modal *should*. The Sayer is Lisa Navarrete an opponent of the amendment declaring English the national language.

Example (48), news article 913, “English as official language gains support at local levels” is part of the lead/introduction of the article and is in a statement made by two pro-official supporters referred to as *Backers*, which to the reader may signal more than two individuals:

(48) *Backers say laws* **help** *immigrants to communicate, avoid self-segregation*

The use of the material verb process *help...to communicate* implies immigrants as receivers and incapable of using language to send out messages and therefore requiring assistance. It is possible to assume that the verb process is not used in terms of making something easier, if the act of being able to communicate and – even segregation – are absolute conditions. It is not possible to state that there is explicit reference to whether *helping to communicate* would *avoid self-segregation* over time or whether these events would occur simultaneously based on the act of helping. This is the lead/introduction in a news article by a reporter who has combined quotes from two different sources namely that of Councilman Paul Chamberlain who says that making English official in Taneytown will not make great differences since the town does not supply services in Spanish. He says: *We will be helping immigrants learn the English language and not segregate into different communities.* This quote is combined with the following statement made by Arizona State Rep. Russell Pearce of Mesa who says that official English is *part of us doing our job to help (immigrants) learn to communicate. Government has an obligation to promote and enhance English...to help people assimilate.* These two quotes are further commented below. Example (49) below from the same article as example (48) shows one of the quotes that form the lead/introduction in article 9:

---

13 Example (48) is included due to the presence of the verb *communicate* which implies the presence of a language.
(49) Councilman Paul Chamberlain..."We will be helping immigrants learn the English language and not segregate into different communities," he says.

The use of the material process helping...learn places immigrants in the role of receivers and We as agents – thus doers. The use of help here is less absolute than in the previous example and allows room for the ability to communicate and may therefore also mean to make something easier. The focus is on two goals in which the first goal – learning English – allows the second goal – no segregation. The Sayer occupies a position of authority and there is indication that he is in favour of official English since he is also reported to have said in the same article that the law will make "no practical change" because Taneytown does not provide services in Spanish. The idea of a lack of a shared language forming an obstacle for intergroup relations is also taken up in article 16 in which the LA Times journalist describes black American and Latino day labourers: Blacks mingled with blacks, Latinos with Latinos -- a social segregation that is mostly the result of the language barrier. The function of language as a barrier is further qualified in article 9 as an either/or situation for communication in which power relations are taken up using our in opposition to immigrants in combination with help as an act of responsibility connected to duty expressed in job in the extract: Arizona State Rep, Russell Pearce of Mesa calls official English "part of us doing our job to help (immigrants) learn to communicate."

In example (50) from article 8 in USA Today "Push for 'official' English heats up" there is an implication that the English-only ordinance is for the benefit of non-English speaking individuals in the country:

(50) "We make it easy for people to come (to the USA) and never speak English", says Lois Barletta, mayor of Hazleton, Pa., which passed an English-only ordinance last month. "We think we're helping them, but we're not."

The use of the material process helping places immigrants as passive and We as agents, thus doers. The action itself may be seen as the goal in this extract. The present continuous indicates an ongoing situation. Also the implication is that English-only is the way to support immigrants. The Sayer is in favour of official English and is further reported as saying that the measures are not anti-immigrant. The view of benefiting immigrants by establishing English-only is also taken up in article 4, published in The New York Times in which a town board
member, Mr Miralgia described his proposal for an English-only ordinance as a measure that: only benefits people who come here to learn English because they want to be part of the community. If you and I were speaking, how would we communicate if we didn't have a common language? And our common language is English.

The risk of fragmentation due to societal multilingualism is present in the following example (51) from article 6 in The New York Times. Examples (48) and (49) above from articles 7 and 9 respectively also deal with the possibility of division, namely segregation which can be related to President Bush's appeal in the example below:

(51) President Bush urged immigrants on Wednesday to learn English and history and civics with the goal of "helping us remain one nation under God."

The use of the present continuous helping indicates an ongoing situation and applies pressure on immigrants since if they do not fulfil or take on the recommendations of the President, they may be classified as uncooperative or unwilling to accept help. The use of help here puts more pressure on the end result – to make something happen, namely to keep a form of unity. This may be significant for ideological reasons since it may affect the attitudes of the citizens in the US as regards their tolerance of immigrants. The Sayer has behind him the authority and trustworthiness that comes with holding the post of President. A concrete example of immigrants as receivers is further given in this article in which President Bush is described as meeting immigrants in a Catholic Charity organisation, Juan Diego Center that provides assistance e.g. business loans to immigrants that are learning English. President Bush used this visit to: ...feature immigrant business owners and further clarifies: When you hear people like me talking about assimilation...that's what we're talking about.... President Bush thus explicitly links assimilation to language learning which in turn is vital for eligibility for a business loan. The idea of immigrants not learning English is also taken up in article 14, LA Times, where experts are included to confirm that traditional patterns of assimilation are still valid, although there is widespread perception that Latino immigrants do not assimilate and that their large numbers are a threat to the English language.

Example (52) in opinion article 10 "Our language unites us" in the USA Today has the same implication of social advancement:

(52) Unite America behind our proud national language, help new immigrants advance by learning it....
The use of the imperative mood and a material process verb help...advance place immigrants as receivers and serves as a call, characterised by an underlying patriotism in the use of the collective our proud national and the imperative Unite. Also, advancement is tied to the national language as well as positioned as a result of the assistance received. There are distinctions between immigrants with an implication that there are "old" immigrants as a result of the use of the adjective new to describe immigrants. The Sayer is Sen. Inhofe that has pushed forward an amendment to the immigration bill under discussion in the Senate proposing the declaration of English as the national language of the country. In article 22, Democrat Senator Hilary Clinton defined the difference between English as a national language and as an official language and declared that she supports the former. In the same article, a French-English bilingual former Senator reaffirmed that English is the language of the country. Democrat Sen. Obama, also in article 22, claimed that the question regarding which language status intervention to support was intended to divide the American people and saw the issue as separate from the immigration debate. These references in opinion article 22 are in reported speech and therefore may not reflect the exact words used by the politicians.

Example (53) in article 24 shows the consequences of the national language amendment and is in contrast to the results proposed in examples (50) and (52):

(53) Asked the measure's impact, an Inhofe aide offered this example: The White House website would no longer have to translate presidential speeches into Spanish. Quips about President Bush's command of English aside, leaving newcomers in the dark about presidential pronouncements is hardly a way to help them learn more about their adopted home

The modal would indicates the probability of a consequence of an event that has not yet occurred i.e. the Senate measure sponsored by Sen. Inhofe, R-Okla., declaring that all federal services can only be given in English unless otherwise stated by law. The use of the material process verb help is part of the opinion of the author of the article as a reaction to the comment made by the aide. The implication given by the author is that it is necessary to use foreign languages in order to supply information about the US to immigrants. The explicit reference to Spanish indicates its significance in the country. The Sayers in this extract are two, the aide that is in favour of declaring English as a national language since he works for the senator who proposed the amendment, and the Sayer who is the author of the opinion.
article in question and who is not in favour of the measure proposed. The speech act of Help was used by the author of the article.

**Summary and further considerations: speech act of Help**

The speech act of Help has a focus on the integration of immigrants into the nation. Of significance is that only one verb in its different forms is present in this section and was therefore included as a separate section since it fulfils the criteria of repetition (see section 5). The use of the verb "to help" carries an implication of power relations between the groups, i.e. immigrants as receivers of help and the dominant group as establishing the conditions of the help to be imposed.

As regards integration into the state, examples (48-50) may be interpreted as a criticism of those not assimilating, in line with new racism through an indirect negative reference to the formation of separate communities as a form of segregation. This may be related to May's (2005) claim that a shared language permits the capacity to identify with others speaking the same language, in this case English, the language of the dominant group. The inclusion of the verb help lends a positive implication, thus allowing room for the criticism of those who are seen to choose not to accept this support. Examples (51-52) indicate a tendency to see language as significant for the maintenance of a united country. In a similar way, MacKaye (1990) states that the view of English as a common bond is held by both proponents and opponents of Proposition 63 – aimed to make English the official language of California. Examples (51-52) are in line with nationalisms based on rationalist approaches in which language has a central role for identity building rather than ethnicity (example (51) further claims assimilation in the remainder of the article, which as a process involves other factors alongside language acquisition). Thus, the English language represents in this case "the American", and it also forms a core value, using Smolicz's (1995) term, for the identity of the multilingual community. This is similar to Gonzalez and Melis' (2001:47) findings indicating an implied underlying link between acquisition of English and the process of Americanisation. English in the country serves as an identity marker, and to some extent as a communication tool, that prevents fragmentation as indicated in examples (46), (48-49), and (51-52). The identifying role of English in the United States, in the above examples may be said to be similar to the views of conservative multiculturalists, as given by McLaren (1994), with their focus on a common culture based on euro-American norms and the role of English as the official language, in this case, also as the national language of the country. The use of
the verb help in these examples places the immigrant as either a friend or an enemy of the state, in the sense that if the immigrant does not learn English and accept the assistance provided in the form proposed, then they will contribute to the fragmentation of the state.

Assimilation is the underlying ideology, implicitly expressed in example (46) focusing on the adjustment of immigrants, example (50) with its reference to the English-only ordinance, example (51) on the maintenance of one nation based implicitly on the nineteenth century model of monolingualism, and example (53), which excludes those that do not know English from political participation and, which according to Skutnabb-Kangas, Phillipson and Rannut (1995:3), is a step towards linguistic and cultural assimilation by not granting minority rights.

The focus of using English as a communicative tool to avoid segregation in examples (48-49) may be seen as attempts to form a single speech community as defined by Mesthrie (2000:38), namely frequent contact between same language speakers who share ways of interpreting language usage. Also, the inclusion of new groups in the communicative activities allows for a dynamic view of speech communities. Example (53) may be a way of enforcing a speech community by motivating people to learn English for security reasons since they are excluded from political information, presidential announcements and consequently political participation, which may affect them (Bolinger 1975:333 also refers to security as a motive for group formations) in their everyday life. The use of the verb help in this example is a criticism of the monolingual measure and also allows room for an active role for the immigrant.

In addition, there is an expression of loyalty linked to the use of the verb help in example (46) in which national loyalty may be implicitly linked to a common language, among other factors (Connor 2007:77). The expression of loyalty is made possible by the existence of the immigrant as the Other (Connor 2007) and their need for help in learning the language for maintenance of what Anderson terms the 'imagined community' (Anderson 1991:6-7), in this case, of the United States.

Furthermore, examples (48-49) include the assumption that the acquisition of English as a cultural capital will be converted to social capital as defined by Bourdieu (1991:14, 30; see also Mesthrie and Deumert 2000:343) which in turn will avoid fragmentation into segregated communities as perceived by attitudes in the aforementioned examples. The use of the verb help may also be seen as a sign of the central role of English in the American society. However, the fact that it is combined with segregation activities also implies a threat of change in the circumstances of its hegemonic position. This means that the cultural and social capital within these communities may be provided by a language other than English, a
situation which carries an indication of social change. This social change is particularly visible in example (50), in which the use of help may be questioned as regards to whether it is the dominant group that needs assistance to avoid a change in the language situation.

An interesting factor is the reference to the recency of immigrants in examples (45) and (52-53) as a way of distinguishing the group of individuals in need of help. Using Appiah's perspective on identity through available labels, it is possible to say that the other examples include an implication of stereotyping all immigrants as responsible for creating segregated communities (Appiah 2005:66-69). This can also be linked to Mendoza-Denton's (1999:381) study in which new immigrants are perceived as having considerable language loyalty to their native language.

In sum, it is possible to state that the speech act of Help reinforces the recognition that English is the dominant language in the country. The repetition of "help" indicates power relations between groups and a particular moral frame from which these relations are approached. However, although acquisition of English is emphasised, there is also an underlying implication that immigrants are not learning the language as expected and that separate communities are being formed by them.

6.1.5 Speech act of English as Unifier

The speech act of English as Unifier focuses on the construction of a nation. Language is portrayed as a feature that maintains the country's characteristics and at the same time allows for national cohesion to be strengthened and reconstructed through immigrant English language acquisition. Example (54) from opinion article 18, LA times refers to language as the upholder of the country:

(54) More important, it is the language of our national unity and political discourse

The relational clause serves to identify English, through the use of anaphoric it, as having a unique characteristic among other languages in the country namely that of representing national unity. The relational process verb is suggests a present characteristic that by virtue of belonging in a relational clause indicates a static condition. Also, the use of the possessive determiner our creates proximity between the writer and reader and the adverbial phrase more important steers the reader to the same view of the author. The Sayer of this extract is in favour of the official English measure and is also the author of the opinion article in which
this example is written. In comparison, the Sayer in opinion article 23 uses a sarcastic tone to refer to the claimed need to enforce English-only as a way of maintaining the idea of the nation: *Who knew that we – meaning the great melting pot nation of America – have been living on borrowed time for the past few centuries by not strictly enforcing an English-only rule.* Example (55) is the headline of article 10 in *USA Today* and gives language the role of maintainer of essential characteristics:

(55) *Our language unites us*

Language as a unifying factor is presented in the headline as a general truth using the simple present in the use of the material process verb *unites*. Also, the use of the plural personal pronoun *us* enhances the perception of group belonging created by the possessive determiner *our*. In this extract *language* is presented as capable of agency, namely of uniting. The Sayer is Sen. Inhofe who is responsible for proposing the amendment to declare English as the national language.

Example (56) in the same opinion article as example (55) above in this section gives language the role of solidifier of the country; therefore language is capable of making the idea of nation stronger, fixed and unlikely to change. In other words language can reconstruct the country by strengthening its cohesion:

(56) *This nation decided long ago that you must know English to become a citizen. Thus there is no reason to offer government's citizen services in foreign languages.*

In the same way the Pledge of Allegiance and the National Anthem *bring this nation together*. English is something *we share* and should promote. Yet Senate liberals voted against English as our national language and against the will of our constituents.

The material process verb and the adverb in the combination *bring...together* and the lexical choices *Allegiance, National, we share* refer to unity. The modality of obligation *should* indicates the subjective attitude, which the speaker is including as part of the opinion of the collective 'we', thus representing the voice of the group which is characterised by *will* representing the wishes of the American people. Sen. Inhofe is the Sayer of this extract and the author of the opinion article from which this example is taken. Sen. Inhofe is in favour of English as a national language. An opposing view is given in article 20 where the author
refers to the absence of the word "official" in the Constitution and says that America has managed to thrive as a united frame of mind for millions of people with roots everywhere on the globe – thus invoking a continuation of American unity that exists beyond declaring English as the official language. The author in article 20 further calls the movement and the arguments that include the view of language as ours, an attempt for seal of ownership.

Example (57) below from article 10 is another indication of the perception of the active role of language for maintaining and creating state cohesion:

(57) *Unite America behind our proud national language*

The imperative form *Unite* indicates power relations and a naturalisation of the relation between language and country carried by the collective *our* with underlying implications of patriotism, presupposed by the adjective *proud* used to modify *national language*. Sen. Inhofe is the Sayer in this example and is a proponent of English as a national language amendment to be attached to the immigration bill. Article 6 in *The New York Times* gives a description of the bill making explicit the difference between declaring a national or official language, although not providing details how they differ in implementation: *...the Senate bill that directs the federal government to "preserve and enhance the role of English as the national language"....It falls short of the goals of a more controversial movement to make English the official language.*

Article 23 "Crime! Terrorism! Foreign languages", example (58) relates as intrinsically linked a symbolic feature of nation state, namely the *National Anthem* to language:

(58) *President Bush even said last week that they [anaphoric reference to immigrants] should sing the National Anthem in English so we don't "lose our national soul"....Forget terrorism. Pundits and politicians insist that the greatest security threat to the United States is the influx of Spanish speakers from across the border with Mexico*

The negative purpose clause with *so* marks the identity of the collective's *soul* as dependent on the language in which the *National Anthem* is sung, thus possibly creating a dependency to the relationship one nation–one language, in which the former is dependent on the latter. The opinion writer of this article refers to the need for a symbol of national identity and he indicates that English should take that role since most people speak it and ambiguously adds that *it's probably pretty close to what "American" would sound like if we hadn't been British colonies originally.* The aspect of English as important for unity is also taken up in
article 21 in which Republican Senator Alexander, reacting to the release of the Star Spangled Banner in Spanish, put forward a bill proposing ...to make the national anthem and other "statements of national unity" officially English.

The cohesion marker they and the relational clause is in example (58) describe the threat as particularly related to Spanish speakers. The reported speech markers are directly attributed to figures of authority and, in the case of President Bush, the modal of obligation should is used. The link between the modal should indicating what is right and wrong is closely tied to an existential threat lose our national soul through the use of the consequence conjunction so (with ellipsis of that to introduce the next following clause). The reference of language to the national soul is attributed to President Bush but the example is integrated in an opinion article in which it is difficult to discern whether the author is for or against declaring English the official language of the country due to the tone of the article.

The following example (59) from opinion article 20, also deals with the presence of immigrants but presents two roles for language. Firstly, language is represented as having a cohesive agency. Secondly, language is presented as a proof of citizenship, i.e. if you are an American you are successfully assimilated through language. This second view allows for new individuals – with different languages – to be included in the country thus changing its composition but at the same claiming that nothing has changed because they have learnt the language and are therefore now Americans:

(59) The proponents behind the measure contend that ...newcomers to the United States aren't learning English as quickly as previous groups. The result, they believe, is a fracture in the collective identity, that threatens to Balkanize the nation. They invoke the words of Theodore Roosevelt, a kind of superhero to President Bush, who famously stated: "We have one language here, and that is the English language, and we intend to see that the [assimilation] crucible turns our people out as Americans."

The role of English and the measure to make it official are presented as necessary to guarantee the process of Americanisation of the immigrants in which the crucible (a pot in which metals are melted thus holding implications to the notion of the melting pot) is indicated as a means of assimilation through language. Also, the crucible indicates that the possibility of becoming an American is not described as an intrinsic factor but rather as something socially constructed through language. The threat to unity is indicated in the noun fracture and the material process verbs threatens to balkanize. The Sayers in this extract are the proponents of official English (given by the proponents, they), President Roosevelt and by
indirect reference President Bush. Several groups of words have been emphasised in this extract since they constitute the different repetitions of the same message in a very short text, namely that of unity. The author of the article uses this reference to build up his argument against official English. The Sayer, Mr. Miralgia, who is a board member of the town of Pahrump and therefore may been seen as a figure of authority, in example (60) below from article 4 "Stars and Strife: Flag Rule Splits Town" in The New York Times, uses the same argument that the author of example (59) above refers critically to:

(60) Mr Miralgia said that the English Language and Patriot Reaffirmation Ordinance, as he called it, was intended to bring the community together under a common language and custom.

The use of the material process verb and the adverb bring...together indicates the uniting role of English for the community. Also, the coordinator and interchangeably links English with the Patriot Reaffirmation Ordinance and custom in the sentence. The constructive capacity given to language is again referred to in example (61), article 5 "Press One for English", The New York Times:

(61) Senator Ken Salazar, Democrat of Colorado, offered an amendment asserting, nonbindingly, that English is the language that unites us all.

The relational process verb is implies a static condition, and the present tense in the verbs is and unites imply factuality. The use of the material process verb unites in combination with the personal pronoun us and the indefinite pronoun all indicates an inclusion of all the language groups in the US. This may be ideologically significant since the categorical use of is implies a naturalised condition of English as dominant and an implication that it is actively viewed as such by the use of the present tense unites and that it is accepted by all language groups in the country. The Sayer is Sen. Salazar but it should be noted that the extract is in reported speech and not his exact words.

Example (62) from article 1 "Immigration Bill Backed in Senate, Setting up Clash" in The New York Times shows the measures that can be taken to strengthen the position of a language in a country:

(62) Under the Senate agreement, illegal immigrants who have lived in the United States for five years or more, about seven million people, would eventually be granted citizenship if they remained employed, passed
background checks, paid fines and back taxes, and enrolled in English classes.

The use of the conditional *if* indicates *English classes* used as a means for obtaining citizenship. Also, power relationships between the groups are reinforced by the verb choice *be granted*, carrying a relational process reinforced by the conditional *if*. The link between citizenship and language indicates the role of English for membership into the state thus making it a base for communication between citizens. Article 6 in *The New York Times* also gives a description of the Senate measure for granting illegal immigrants citizenship in the terms: *...so long as they work, pay taxes and learn English.*

However, in example (62) above, the use of the modality of probability *would* in combination with *eventually* increases the uncertainty for the illegal immigrants implying that even if they did meet the requirements of the Senate agreement there is still no guarantee of citizenship. This is emphasised by the indefinite length of time connected to their acquisition of citizenship and thus entailing power relations. The category "illegal immigrants" covered by the Senate agreement is narrowed by the use of the relative pronoun *who* to those that have lived in the US for a certain number of years. The agent is partly hidden in the construction of the sentence and responsibility for the agreement is given to the political collective entity, *the Senate*. In this extract, the content is not in quotation marks and therefore the choice of words can be attributed to the journalist.

Example (63) from article 20, confirms the view given by the proponents of official English in many of the examples above, namely that English is the language of the country by referring to its essential role *foundation*. It is worth noting that the Sayer in the extract is the author of this opinion article and is against official English measures:

(63) *I've never come across an immigrant, recently arrived or in the United States for decades, who doesn't perceive English as the foundation for life in America.*

The use of the noun *foundation* refers to a principle, an idea or a fact on which something – in this case *life in America* – is based on. Also, the adverb of time indicating frequency *never* in combination with the phrasal verb *come across* emphasises the perception of the significance of English in the country as factual.

The attitudes of the immigrants as accepting the position of English in the US is generalised as representing the whole group through elaboration by referring to the duration
of time in the US, recently and for decades since the author uses the negative adverb never thus eliminating the threat posed by immigrants. The use of the mental verb perceive as regards immigrants empowers them as a group. There is an indication of the indisputable and exclusive role of English in the society, thus indicating a hegemonic status in relation to other languages. In this case, the English language is represented as a fact in the construction of English as the foundation for life in America. Example (64) below from opinion article 7 published in the USA Today links the view of language to patriotism with the use of the oppositional prefix anti- indicating a dichotomising attitude strengthened by the verb assert that can be extended to loyalty to the country:

(64) Sen. James Inhofe, T-Okla., asserted that those who oppose his amendment to make English the national language are somehow anti-English

The verb assert contributes to naturalise the notion of dichotomy since it indicates confidence and firm belief, and may function to indicate common sense. It is unclear whether the noun English following the prefix anti- refers to the language itself or whether there is a wider implication towards Anglo-Saxon dominance. The Sayer is Lisa Navarrete, vice president of the National Council of La Raza. The organisation opposes the Inhofe amendment.

Summary and further considerations: speech act of English as Unifier
The speech act of English as Unifier is based on the importance of English for the unity of the country and is mainly referred to as a carrying feature of the construction of what Anderson (1991:6-7) calls the 'imagined community'. In these examples, attitudes to language can be related to Pavlenko and Blackledge's (2003:2; see also MacKaye 1990) statement that language is used to mark national identity and also takes the function of symbolic capital. A further aspect is the relation of unity to loyalty and trust based on a negotiation of values in an unequal situation, in which demonstrations and judgments of trust are based on dominant cultures expectations of immigrant identification to the host country.

The projection of an image (Ager 2001:74-75) of English as the only possible means of uniting the country and as such, a fundamental part of what Kymlicka refers to as the nation building process and the creation of a societal culture (Kymlicka 2002:344-347), is put forward in two ways. The first is an approach in which language is presented as the central identifying feature, mainly in examples (54-55) and (61), as well as indirectly in example
(62), rather than related to processes of assimilation, ethnicity and homogeneity (Ager 2001). The second approach relies on symbols of patriotic expressions as visible in examples (56-58), (60) and indirectly in examples (59) and (64) – i.e. the reference of becoming Americans and with the use of anti-English – in which, as McKay and Crystal state, language is a guarantor to the continuation of the state due to its unifying strength (MacKaye 1990; Crystal 1997:122-130). Together the visions naturalise the existence of asymmetrical multilingualism as described by Clyne (1997:306) and the construction of linguistic consent to public homogeneousness which can by extension be related to Phillipson's (2003:58) claim that cultural and linguistic homogeneity is a non-existent characteristic of a state. Example (59) indicates the threat of fragmentation and also carries the implication that attributing minority rights is dangerous to the unity of the country. There is also an element of interdiscursivity in the use of the term Balkanize. Example (63) indicates English as a base of the country and carries the assumption that it is the only language that can fulfil that function due to the figurative link to the field of construction in foundation. Example (64) is also linked to example (63), in which patriotism is given as only possible through dichotomisation. This can be directly linked to Gonzalez and Melis' (2001:47) study which demonstrates that English is connected to notions of Americanisation.

English is thus presented as a core value in Smolicz's (Smolicz 1995:236-237; as cited in Clyne 1997:310) terms since it is placed as equivalent to the maintenance of unity, although there are views against this in the comments of the links to examples (54 and 56). The unity of the country is therefore created by usage of one language to express belonging and thus avoid fragmentation. Power relations are evident in that implications for possible language shift and intrinsic value are expressed only in relation to the movement towards English and do not take account of the immigrants' first language.

Power relations between the groups are evident in the use of laws for guaranteeing unity by means of official English and maintaining English language domination in examples (56) and (59-61), as well as in relation to granting citizenship in examples (56) and (62). The demand for language shift based on the assertion of identity of the country through English is linked to demands of loyalty in examples (56-58) and (60) in the expressions of Allegiance, national language, National Anthem and the Patriot Reaffirmation Ordinance. In other words, the reference to the Pledge of Allegiance and the National Anthem in relation to English in example (56) is present in examples (57-58) and (60) with references to national language, National Anthem, national soul and the Patriot Reaffirmation Ordinance, which in Connor's (2007) description are expressions of loyalty. Example (64) can also be connected to Connor's
notion of loyalty since it links opposition to national language to notions of anti-English, which, from a historical perspective of colonial domination, positions English as the de facto language of the country. Also, contractual loyalty is concretely expressed through citizenship in example (56). In this example, language is intimately associated to other expressions of loyalty to the state, which together carry a feeling of belonging (Connor 2007) or 'imagined community' (Anderson 1992:6-7). The requirements of the Pledge of Allegiance in example (56) and the Patriot Reaffirmation Ordinance in example (60) are also examples of eliminating uncertainty of action, which is a significant factor for trust to exist in a society and for the civil society to function according to Seligman (1997:6). This may by implication be interpreted as a lack of trust in the loyalty and intentions of those that do not know English.

In these examples the speech community is identified as a unifying factor for monolingual expression and includes what Morgan (2006:5) describes as its recognition and consequent naturalisation through the repetition of topics and values regarding the role of English in the US. The fact that these are brought up in the public debate may be an indication of social change or the "degree to which speech communities are in crisis" (Morgan 2006:5).

Finally, the Sayers in the examples are all in favour of official English except for example (58) in which the writer refers to the Sayer President Bush's link of English to the national soul, example (59) where reference is made to President Roosevelt in a different context, and example (64) where the Sayer works for an organisation that is against declaring English as the national language but refers to Sen. Inhofe's amendment for English as the national language.

6.1.6 Speech act of Immigrants as Criminals

The speech act of Immigrants as Criminals can be seen as constructing a fixed representation of immigrants as constantly breaking the law since their criminality is portrayed at different levels in the society, namely their illegal presence in the country (related to issues of state borders), and their negative effects on the everyday life in the society, e.g. in example (65) below from article 3 in The New York Times:

(65) There are some people who trash Main Street, and they seem to be foreign born

The material verb trash indicates an action to destroy or damage. The immigrants are described vaguely as foreign born. The Sayer is Steven Lonegan, the Republican mayor for
Bogota, N.J. who is campaigning for English as the town's official language. The same individual has described his stand against illegal immigrants in the same article as: *I'll stand up for legal immigrants instead of abandoning our principles to let illegal aliens in the country shoot people in the head.* In his utterance, Lonegan presents three groups as distinct, non-immigrants, legal immigrants, and illegal immigrants – the last grouped as criminals capable of killing others.

Example (66) taken from the *LA Times*, article 17 explicitly links illegal workers to criminality in general:

(66) *Legislation in the House passed in December would tighten enforcement along the border and at the workplace, adding a 700-mile wall along the southern frontier with Mexico and making illegal presence a felony*

The modal *would* indicates certainty in a sequence of actions resulting from legislation. The use of the noun *felony* to describe illegal presence equates illegal immigrants as individuals that have acted against the law in crossing the state border without permission with individuals that have committed a serious crime comparable to murder or arson.

The immigrants in this example are specified as *illegal*. The extract is descriptive of the legislation and written by a journalist. The representation of illegal workers and other criminals as composing the same group through the word *felony* is linked to procedures related to criminality such as *arrest* in example (67) article 2, *The New York Times*:

(67) *It wants to wall off Mexico, turn 11 million or so illegal immigrants into an Ohio-size nation of felons and then pick them off through arrests, deportation....*

The group in question is described as *illegal immigrants* becoming transformed through legislation into *felons*, and thus viewed as those that have committed a serious crime.

The Sayer, the author of an opinion article, claims that the Senate is the only hope for real reform. There is also further indication that the author is not against an immigration bill since he/she states: *A good immigration bill must honor the nation's values....* The aspect of criminalisation is also noted in opinion article 2, *The New York Times*, in which the author writes: *Another profound shortcoming of the bill is its harsh criminal-justice provisions. It greatly expands the types of immigration-related offenses that constitute "aggravated felonies" and thus grounds for detention and deportation.*
Example (68) published in *The New York Times*, article 4, identifies Hispanics as the group that should be punished. The group in question is referred to as *illegal immigrants*, particularly those of Hispanic origin and is described through the material process verb to "break" the law – and also strengthened by the modal *should* indicating obligation linked to what is right or wrong:

(68) "These people are *breaking the law,*" he said of the *illegal immigrants* here, most of whom are *Hispanic,* "and they should be prosecuted somehow."

The Sayer is Mr Miralgia, a board member of the town of Pahrump. Mr Miralgia has also put forward a proposal to make English the town's official language.

Example (69) in article 1, *The New York Times* indicates the debate in which a change in status given through law, also involves a new representation as a legitimised point of reference, i.e. the illegal immigrant as equal in status to other criminals. The use of the future modal *would* in combination with the verb *criminalize* indicates a change in the construction of the immigrant. The journalist uses her own words to indicate the content of the border security bill passed by the House:

(69) *In December, the House defied Mr. Bush's call for a guest worker program and passed a border security bill that would criminalize illegal immigrants' presence in the country.*

**Summary and further considerations: speech act of Immigrants as Criminals**

The identification of illegality as the signifier to describe immigrants positions them in the periphery of the American society or even outside as well as in opposition to the society (see Santa Ana 2002:67, 99; see also Suárez-Orozco and Suárez-Orozco 1995:13 for negative descriptions in the 1880s of immigrants). The possibility of integrating them is not the first option particularly in examples (66-67) and (69). Example (65) is the only one in which illegality is not mentioned even though Otherness is created by differences from the 'we' that are not destroying the town. The construction of 'us' and 'them' can be seen from Saussure's (1972:113-114) system of meaning creation through similarities and differences. Furthermore, in relation to Said's (1978:26) claim of the construction of negative images of Arabs in the US, the construction of meaning in the data of this study relies on negative images of the Other based on cultural stereotypes and racism. From this perspective, example (65) includes
all immigrants as criminals, including those that are legally in the country, thus extending the problem of 'us' and 'them' to larger groups without distinctions in the term foreign born. Example (68) singles out a specific group, the Hispanics, as constituting the majority of illegal immigrants. The negative signification of illegality is carried in the construction of the word through the negative prefix *il*-. The examples further criminalise the individuals by reference to *law, arrests*.

The Sayers in examples (66-67) and (69) indicate a change in the representation of the illegal immigrant towards a higher grade of criminality. The Sayers are journalists or writers in editorial pages, as in example (67). The Sayers in examples (65) and (68) are individuals that have presented proposals for official English and describe the foreign born and the illegal immigrants as a fixed situation by using the present tense of the verb "to be".

Thus, some immigrants are represented as serious criminals in a definition of "criminals" that varies from the general to the more specific as well as ranging its references to include all immigrants or to refer specifically to a particular group, e.g. as in the mention of illegal Hispanics. The reference to criminality in the data allows for Petterson's (2003:6) view of the 'them' to be portrayed as an enemy and in opposition to the 'us' – a position in which identities are dichotomised. The construction of the bad, in this case based on criminality, entails that there is an oppositional good. Consequently if immigrants are bad – with special reference to illegal immigrants, non-immigrants are good, which in the case of the US constitutes the perceived dominant group. The negative construction of immigrants and their effect on the social order may also lead to the impossibility of establishing trust between the groups in Seligman's (1997:7, 13, 37-38, 172) sense, since there is no "open space" for role negotiation and role expectations that would lead to building trust in social interactions.

### 6.1.7 Speech act of Immigrants as Large Quantities of Water
The speech act of Immigrants as Large Quantities of Water is a collective metaphor in which the individual is nonexistent. Examples (70) and (71) from article 1 in *The New York Times* and article 14 in the *LA Times*, portray the arrival of immigrants as intervals of water mass:

(70) *The effort to limit the tide of illegal immigration...*

The noun *tide* refers to the regular rise and fall of the level of the sea. The extract is based on the journalist's choice of words.
Though the findings echo the history of immigration waves in the U.S....

The noun waves carries the meaning of a moving ridge of water, especially in the sea. In this case, it is unclear from the text whether the choices of the words are the journalist's or whether the journalist is reporting what experts have said. The image of waves of water may be seen as extending to other items that are linked to immigration as is the case of cities and states in news article 8 in the USA Today: Rising concern over immigration has prompted a wave of cities and states this year to try to make English the official language.

Example (72) from article 16, LA Times, maintains the same notion of intervals of arrival but with intensification surge indicating force and is written with the journalist's choice of words:

Indeed, long before the Southern labor landscape was transformed by a tidal surge of Latin American immigrants....

In this example, although the adjective tidal and the noun surge carry the meaning to move forward like waves or to increase suddenly and intensely, they do not directly imply something negative as in example (70) with the verb limit. Example (73), from article 5 in The New York Times, can also be said to have a negative implication in the usage of overwhelmed since it can mean defeat because of larger numbers. However if used in relation to water, it can mean to cover something quickly and completely thus by implication shows immigrant interest in learning English:

If Mr. Inhofe wanted to lavish federal money on English-language classes, now overwhelmed with immigrants on waiting lists...

This extract is taken from an opinion article and thus reflects the view of the writer who positions himself/herself against the Inhofe amendment to the immigration bill which declares English as the national language. The above example (73) is a criticism of the amendment.

Summary and further considerations: speech act of Immigrants as Large Quantities of Water

Immigrants are described as uncontrollable quantities of water, thus focusing on them as a collectivity which is in line with Santa Ana's (2002:60-77) study in which the individual is lost in a collective view of immigrants. The examples indicate similarities in the reference to
movements of different groups of immigrants thus entailing the application of the same meaning and attitudes to all these separate groups. There is therefore a perception of these collectives constituting an undifferentiated whole through application of the same signifier (see Saussure 1972:113-114). As a consequence, the identities of immigrants as individuals and as more specific groups become lost in the larger collective idea of a formless mass of water. The opposition between 'us' and 'them' is constructed in the interpretation of immigrants against those that are not immigrants. There is a construction of identity that is flexible and contextual since groups that originally (approximately over 200 years ago) were immigrants in the country, and now form part of the dominating group of English speaking citizens, are not included in the description of immigrants – except in example (71). It is further possible to link the representation of immigrants as water to the Rio Grande which is the river separating Mexico from the United States, more specifically, the southern state of Texas and part of New Mexico. With this in mind, the connection of immigrants to water therefore, indicates a dehumanising perception and ideology regarding them which is in line with findings by Said (1978:26) and Santa Ana (2002) regarding Arab and Hispanic immigrants in the US. Furthermore, the description of immigrants as water is an example of interdiscursivity.

More specifically, in example (70), reference is made to groups of people through their illegality. Examples (71) and (73) are the most generalised and refer to all immigrants, whereas example (72) specifies the immigrant group as Latin American immigrants.

All the examples above, except for example (73), are written by journalists or with reference to an expert, thus representing a descriptive stance of reality. The Sayer in example (73) is against the measure for a national language and the example is taken from an opinion article.

6.1.8 Speech act of Immigrants as Harmful

The speech act of Immigrants as Harmful contains different representations of immigrants as capable of destruction. Example (74) from article 2 in The New York Times describes immigrants as harmful insects/animals:

(74) That spirit of wishful hunkering has infected the Senate, where Democrats and moderate Republicans have had to struggle against the obstinacy of those who join their counterparts in the House in seeing immigration entirely as a pest-control
The indirect reference to immigrants (via the process of immigration) as pest-control entails that they are seen as insects or animals that destroy plants and food. In this case the author of this opinion article is referring to the view of some members in the House of Representatives, i.e. of individuals with positions of authority. The Sayer positions himself in favour of a good immigration bill and claims that the Senate bill is already weakened by compromise but calls the version proposed by the House as deplorable. The Sayer in the following example (75), opinion article 20 in the San Francisco Chronicle, is against declaring official English and contains an example of attitudes from the colonial period and the values of the time regarding human beings:

(75) Since the early days of the republic, there have been cries against the "uncivilized nature" of immigrants, in whose mouth "Shakespeare's tongue gets polluted."

The relational process verb gets indicates an attribute polluted that is a result of a transformation in this case indicating that something has become dirty or no longer pure especially by adding harmful or unpleasant things to it.

Example (76), from article 13 in the San Francisco Chronicle, approaches the issue of immigration by describing immigrant groups as being in conflict with each other or having opposing interests:

(76) Today, Yeh is the executive director of the Oakland-based Diversity Alliance for a Sustainable America, a nonprofit organization that seeks to limit both illegal and legal immigration. What makes it unique is that DASA is led by minorities, including immigrants, American Indians and African Americans. As they put it in their mission statement, "Current rates of immigration...hurt minorities and earlier immigrants the most."

The material process verb hurt carrying the meaning of causing pain gives agency to the phenomenon of immigration as capable of causing pain. This extract is part of an opinion article showing support among legal immigrants to stop illegal immigration – in the case of the above Sayer, and the organisation DASA, whose goal is also to stop legal immigration.

It is possible to see a similarity to the speech act of Immigration Debate as Racial in example (77) from article 15 "More than just Latinos-next-door", LA Times, in the sense that minority communities are in conflict:
Feelings that blacks, and black communities, are under siege

This example specifies which communities feel directly affected by immigrants, namely black communities. The noun siege refers to a military operation of surrounding and capturing, carrying a negative meaning. In this opinion article, it is the perspective of the black communities that is portrayed as having the feeling of being surrounded by Latinos since it is written by a person who identifies himself as belonging to an African-American neighbourhood. Example (78) below from article 4 in The New York Times portrays the same conflict as in example (77) of this section but the conflict is between a minority and a majority group:

"They come in here, they take the jobs, they take away the services that belong to real Americans and they don't respect our flag," said Mr. Harvard, who was born in Nevada. "It's not right."

The material process verbs come, take and take away indicate some groups as actively taking possession of things. The dichotomy between groups is described through opposition to real Americans, the adjective indicating an idea of something true or genuine. A further aspect is the collective use of they to refer to the immigrant group which is placed in a relation of difference to our, and the notion of real Americans. Also, the reference to our flag strengthens the notion of national identity through patriotism and emphasises dichotomisations of 'us' and 'them'. The context in which this statement is made is in connection to the increasing number of Hispanics (legal and illegal) in the town of Pahrump, and the extract is said by Fred Harvard, 61 who has supported the English Language and Patriot Reaffirmation Ordinance put forward by Mr Miralga, a board member of the town of Pahrump, which declares English the official language of the town.

Summary and further considerations: speech act of Immigrants as Harmful

The above examples show the view of the immigrant as something harmful. In their study, Suárez-Orozco and Suárez-Orozco (1995:191-197) use a psychological approach and also conclude that immigrants in the public discourse for Proposition 187 in California (declared as unconstitutional and would have denied a variety of public benefits to illegal immigrants) were represented metaphorically as parasites and criminals. The construction of the immigrant as the Other, according to these authors, is seen as a projection of "primitive psychological
needs in times of social upheaval and anxiety" (Suárez-Orozco and Suárez-Orozco 1995:196). The images of the immigrant include racist and dehumanising ideologies in agreement with Said's (1978:26) and Santa Ana's (2002:99) findings. Example (74) is an example of interdiscursivity in which immigrants are described as insects/animals via the immigration process and pest-control measures. Example (75), in particular, deals with Anglo-cultural hegemony and its considered superiority. All examples, except for example (77), refer to immigrants as a collective entity which can be related to Santa Ana's (2002:84-85) study in which the individual is not considered. Also the data shows that there is little distinction within the group of "immigrants" by use of different terms, although in example (76) immigrants are qualified through association to time, namely by means of the adjectives current and earlier. Example (76) refers to historical aspects and example (77) indicates the minority that is affected by the arrival of immigrants, with special reference to Latinos in the remainder of article.

All four Sayers have different views regarding the issue of immigration. Example (74) is part of an editorial in which the author is in favour of an immigration bill that is "good" and "just" to immigrants. The Sayer in this example refers to the view of others on the issue of immigration. Example (75) is part of an opinion article in which the author expresses a stand against the measure for official English. Example (76) refers to an organisation that is against immigration at the rate it is taking place. Example (77) delivers the view of a member of the black community in an opinion article. Lastly, the Sayer in example (78) is a 61 year-old man who supported an English-only ordinance the town of Pahrump, (60 miles west of Las Vegas), with 35,000 inhabitants. The ordinance in question contained: a proposal for a declaration of English as the official language, the denial of certain town benefits to illegal individuals, and a statement that all foreign flag flying must be accompanied by an American flag.

6.1.9 Speech act of Immigration as a Sovereignty Issue

The speech act of Immigration as a Sovereignty Issue is defined by threat. In example (79) from article 17 "House Leaders Intensify Debate on Immigration" in the LA Times, threat is directly related to immigration but there is no detailed explanation of how immigrants can cause security threats:

(79) The House conducted hearings last week in San Diego and Laredo, Texas, that focused on security threats posed by lax enforcement of
They've put us in a stronger position to craft a responsible bill that secures our borders and strictly enforces our immigration laws," Boehner said.

Security is used as an adjective characterising the type of threat. The threat is not due to the absence of laws but to the perception that implementation is not strict or severe enough and is described by usage of the adjective lax. Moreover, the Other is constructed generally and refers to all immigrants. The use of the material process verb secures emphasises the boundaries between 'us' and 'them' as demanding necessary action. The verb secures also carries the meaning of making safe thus entailing maintenance rather than change. The journalist gives an account in her own words of the hearings in Texas but also includes the views of House Majority Leader John A. Boehner (R-Ohio) on the issue although it is not possible to see his position on immigration. There is indication that some House leaders are against aspects of the immigration bill as given in the article: the hearing was intended to counter criticisms of its bill, which House leaders oppose in large part because it includes a path to citizenship for undocumented immigrants. Article 21 in the San Francisco Chronicle criticises the support by some politicians of the demonstration "Day without Immigrants" as amounting to a reckless endorsements of policies that make our nation and our borders less secure. The link between the demonstration in support of granting citizenship to illegal immigrants to national security brings forward aspects of freedom to demonstrate and aspects of loyalty symbolised by the words our nation.

In example (80) from the same article 17, the Sayer, given by He, is Commerce Secretary Carlos M. Gutierrez, who is in favour of the immigration bill passed by the Senate which allowed for citizenship to be granted to illegal immigrants already in the country. The bill was at the time of Mr. Gutierrez's statement under consideration in the House:

(80) He said that the more the immigration debate veered toward the House's "enforcement only" approach, the more these immigrants would be driven "farther and father [sic] underground. What we want for our national security is to drive them above the shadows, so we know who they are."

The issue of security is brought to the collective level by the use of the adjective national. Also, security is constructed in an 'us' and 'them' relationship since immigrants, specified by the demonstrative these are the focus of the approach by the House of Representatives. There are several references to illegality through the metaphoric use of underground and shadows.
reinforcing the issue of security. The modal would indicates an imagined consequence and is thus a projection of the future if certain conditions are met – in this case the author is criticising the House's action.

Examples (81) and (82) below from article 1 "Immigration Bill Backed in Senate, Setting up Clash", show a primary focus on enforcement measures. Example (82) also links the speech act of Immigration as a Sovereignty Issue to the speech act of Immigrants as Criminals:

(81) The effort to limit the tide of illegal immigration and deal with those illegal immigrants who are already in the United States will then move to negotiation between the Senate and the House, which has passed legislation that focuses on bolstering border security and offers no provision for citizenship.

The verb bolstering carries the meaning of the need to support or strengthen already existing measures that are related to border security and illegal immigration. The extract is given in the reporter's own words.

(82) In December, the House defied Mr. Bush's call for a guest worker program and passed a border security bill that would criminalize illegal immigrants' presence in the country.

Representative Tom Tancredo, Republican of Colorado, said Wednesday that he and other House conservatives remained steadfast in "support for a security-first approach to immigration."

The focus on security-first places the threat at a level of urgency and relates it directly to the issue of immigration in general. The reference to border indicating the type of bill indicates the area of action necessary for prioritisation. The use of would indicates a consequence of the border bill. There are two Sayers in this extract, the first is the journalist in her reporting of the event; the second is Representative Tom Tancredo, Republican of Colorado who, along with other House conservatives, is against the immigration bill passed by the Senate.

Example (83) from article 13 in the San Francisco Chronicle dichotomises the options available to preserve sovereignty. Thus, the action against illegal immigration is divided in which the adjectives open and intact are two possible extremes available as regards border and sovereignty respectively:
For several months, Americans have been embroiled in a national debate over illegal immigration. On one side you have those pushing for guest-worker programs, amnesty and open borders. On the other are those trying to keep U.S. citizenship and sovereignty intact.

The Sayer is the author of this opinion article which contains comments from legal immigrants who support her views that illegal immigration must be stopped. The Sayer positions herself against amnesty to illegal immigrants already in the United States.

Example (84) from article 1, The New York Times, links the issues of securing borders and foreign guest workers to designating English as the national language with the conjunction and, thus placing all these at the same level in the proposed amendment to the immigration bill:

Critics of the bill did gain some notable victories. They won passage on amendments that call for 370 miles of fencing along the border with Mexico, designate English as the national language and reduce the number of foreign guest workers to be admitted annually to 200,000 a year from 320,000.

The inclusion of the status of English as an amendment to an immigration bill may create a precondition for the two matters to always be tied in future discussions and thus naturalises a link between the issues. The Sayer of this extract is the news article's journalist. The idea of fencing for guaranteeing impermeable borders is also present in article 2 from The New York Times in: It wants to wall off Mexico (It refers to the House of Representatives). Example (85) also from article 1 explicitly links citizenship to English in which the material verb enroll does not contain the need to "know" English:

Under the Senate agreement, illegal immigrants who have lived in the United States for five years or more, about seven million people, would eventually be granted citizenship if they remained employed, passed background checks, paid fines and back taxes, and enrolled in English classes.

The author of opinion article 20 in the San Francisco Chronicle also makes the connection between citizenship and language by claiming that citizenship is given as an excluding measure, i.e. the granting of citizenship constructs in-groups and out-groups by defining those who know English and those that do not have knowledge of the language. This can be contrasted to the viewpoint of opinion writer of article 22 in the San Francisco Chronicle who
claims that issues of immigration regarding border security, costs related to illegal immigrants, and their status as illegal are not affected one way or another by whatever language newcomers speak. The immigration debate, according to this Sayer, is a xenophobic concern over cultural change due to a growing Latino population and that the debate regarding language and the agreement to pass the amendment for English as a national language is a detour from the immigration debate. The Sayer also refers to Sen. Obama’s view in reported speech that the immigration debate is being sidetracked into a discussion of language and that there is a need to refocus on an immigration policy. Furthermore, the Sayer in opinion article 23, links the idea of having literacy tests for immigrants to the hard work his grandfather put in trying to support his family by taking manual labor jobs e.g. quarrying rock or digging basements when he arrived as an Italian immigrant, and therefore never took the time to learn English and states sarcastically: …because I speak no Italian… and he spoke no English…, I was never able to communicate effectively to him just how un-American he was.

Example (86) from article 1 is similar to example (80) above in which the border security of the country is in focus through citizenship of illegal immigrants using a metaphoric image of a road and its implication of a journey that stretches over time path:

(86) A compromise Senate bill that would toughen border security and put most illegal immigrants on a path to citizenship emerged intact…

Example (86) can also be related to the reference in article 21 from the San Francisco Chronicle in which entrance into the category of citizenship is explicitly related to attitude by the verbs allow and prod as well as the noun chance denoting power relations: …to prod Congress to allow the nation’s 12 million illegal immigrants a chance to become citizens.

Summary and further conclusions: speech act of Immigration as a Sovereignty Issue

The word security is used in a variety of meanings i.e. from the action of controlling the borders to placing notions of sovereignty in opposition to immigration as in example (83). Example (80) does not refer to borders explicitly but the reference to national security carries the idea of sovereignty and the idea of a state with a political border. Examples (79), (81-82) and (86) refer to the strengthening of existing border controls, and example (84) links immigration issues to language status.

The extracts referring explicitly or directly to issues of security are worded by journalists or those actively against illegal immigration. Example (83) specifically refers to the threat of
6.1.10 Speech act of Immigration Debate as Racial

The speech act of Immigration Debate as Racial brings forward group dynamics between majority and minority groups as well as between minority groups based on race-related expressions which become legitimised and strengthened by proposals related to language use in the society. Example (87) from article 4 "Stars and Strife: Flag Rule Splits Town" in *The New York Times* shows that it is enough for a proposal on language (with regard to immigration) to be put forward in the democratic process for individuals to legitimise power through race-related expressions directed to all individuals that are stereotyped as having a particular set of racial characteristics:

(87) Some Hispanic residents have said that since Mr. Miralgia's proposals were introduced people in passing cars have yelled racial slurs at them

The use of the adjective *racial* defines the negativity and the type of the accusation or statement carried by the noun *slurs*. The content in this extract is given by the reporter and it is unclear who specifically his sources were apart from the indefinite indication given by Some Hispanic residents. Example (88) from the same article 4 relates the issue of group discriminatory action to the right of freedom to demonstrate:

(88) But Mr. Romero said he did not think that the board's attitude reflected that of most of Pahrump, even though one of his restaurants was painted with anti-Mexican slurs on May 1, when he closed them in observance of the national "Day Without An Immigrant" protests

The negative prefix *anti-* is attached to the ethnic origin of the person, possibly defined through nationality, which qualifies the negative noun *slur*. The Sayer for which the content is attributed in indirect speech by the journalist is Mr Romero, 36 who is the owner of two restaurants and a convenience store in the town of Pahrump.

In contrast to examples (87) and (88) in this section from article 4 that dealt with the relations between members of the majority (implicit) and minority (explicit) groups, example (89) from article 16 "A Southern accent on day laborers" in the *LA Times* brings another
perspective, namely the relations between two competing minority groups that have had
different settlement histories in the country:

(89) The black laborers speak of their Latino competitors with a mix of
resentment, resignation and tolerance. Many reckon that tougher
immigration laws would mean more work for them. But they also suspect
that some old, familiar prejudices are energizing the anti-illegal-
immigrant movement.

The use of the term prejudices refers to negative opinions and attitudes that may not be
based on the individual's own experience – but are built on a shared notion of stereotypes. The
fact that the sources that refer to old familiar prejudices are also described as black laborers
implies that these make a link between the debate as it is discussed now and previous race-
based attitudes. There is also an indication that although the black laborers are not linked to
the immigration debate they may still suffer from its effects as racial prejudices that are
directed to immigrants may also be applied to them. The modal would is used to indicate
probability in the description of consequence of an imagined situation. The same uncertainty
is given in the verb reckon. The use of a term to describe skin colour black laborers indicates
a way of expressing based on the traditional definition of race. The terms Latinos and black
also indicate non-differentiation within these two groups thus implying that these groups are
homogeneously composed. The journalist of this news article reports in his own words the
information obtained from the black labourers.

Example (90) also from article 16 expresses more explicitly a possible conflict between
the minority groups:

(90) But when Curtis was asked whether he supported a crackdown on illegal
immigration, his voice softened. "That's a hard thing to say," he said.
"You may say that, you're on a racial-type mind-set. All I'm looking for
is equal opportunity."

The adjective racial-type implies a negative perception in its use in the society. The use of
type indicates a set of features that are connected to a "racial mind-set". Also the noun mind-
set carries the meaning of a set of attitudes that are previously formed. The combination
implies a shared knowledge between speaker and listener. The Sayer Curtis, a black labourer,
is earlier part of the description given by the journalist as Frustration over the Latino
presence was palpable in the loud, strained voice of Anthony Curtis, 42, a burly man in an orange parka. "They pick up the majority of the work," he said....

Awareness of outer group labelling and stereotypes held by the majority with regard to the minority groups is shown in example (91) in the same article:

(91) The unregulated labor market runs on familiar principles. Jobs tend to go to low bidders, to workers with valued skills and to workers who are hungry enough to get to the trucks first. But **racial stereotypes** also exert an influence. Everyone agrees that it's better to be brown than to be black.

The use of the adjective *racial* is used in combination with *stereotypes* describing more specifically the type of group simplification that is prevalent in the community. The journalist is seen as having chosen the words in this extract. In the other parts of this article, illegal Latino day labourers also offer the explanation that they are chosen by employers because according to them, African-Americans do not like to work. This reference can be linked to the idea of Hispanics as hard working in the speech act of Immigrants as a Labour Resource (section 6.2.5). The journalist attributes skin colour references *black* and *brown* denoting African-Americans and Hispanics respectively to members of the minority groups.

In example (92) from opinion article 22 "A divisive declaration of official English" in the *San Francisco Chronicle*, the speaker, President Bush, humanises Hispanics by using the noun *humanity* referring to humans as a group to which Hispanics are included in a listing of three qualities among which hard work is mentioned. This is linked through the conjunction *and* repeated twice in a list of three where common usage would have been to include a comma between the first and second elements. However, it must be noted that this example refers to an interview situation which may have facilitated the use of the conjunction. Nevertheless, the conjunction emphasises the content through repetition. The need to refer to the *humanity* of the Spanish speakers indicates that it might not be a naturalised perception in the general society and therefore can be linked to race-related notions:

(92) *In an interview with McClatchy Newspapers, Bush said, that growing up in Texas, he learned to "recognize the decency and hard work and humanity of Hispanics."*

The text is part of an opinion article arguing that immigration policy should not be linked to declaring English the official language. The information is taken from an earlier interview
given by President Bush in which according to the article writer, Bush claimed that the resistance to a bipartisan Senate compromise on immigration was driven by a fear of diversity.

In Example (93) below from opinion article 2, in which the writer is in favour of a good immigration bill, published in The New York Times, the amendment for declaring the status of English is implicitly linked to race-related issues through a description of xenophobia which is rewritten in the combination hostility to immigrants. The use of the definite article at the beginning The Xenophobia Problem establishes it as known fact:

(93) The Xenophobia Problem. The Senate’s debate has laid bare a hostility to immigrants that is depressing in its spitefulness and vigor. From Senator James Inhofe’s amendment declaring English the national language to....

Summary and further conclusions: speech act of Immigration Debate as Racial

The adjective racial indicates that race is mostly used as a qualifier to describe something else. It also indicates that "race" is a significant factor in the construction of the relations between 'us' and 'them'. The specificity of the group is narrowed in example (88) to a particular group of Latin Americans, the Mexicans. In this context, it is worth mentioning Schmidt's (2002) CDA study that shows a perceived linkage between the English language and the "whiteness" of the speaker. Thus, Otherness is defined by not being of European origin and not speaking English.

All the examples, except examples (92-93) represent the perspective of a member of a minority group even though some are in reported speech. Also, group differentiation is made at different levels i.e. there is a distinction between the dominant majority group and the minorities (Latinos/Hispanics/Mexicans and African-Americans), as well as between the different minority groups namely in the differentiation carried by reference to the signifiers brown/black. This line of thought rests on Saussure's (1972:113-114) system of differences and similarities. The use of the choice humanity in example (92) makes prominent the attitudes of difference held by the dominant group.

Examples (87-88) refer to the experiences of settled Hispanics and both belong to the same article i.e. article 4. Examples (89-91) are from article 16 and also give a perspective as seen by a minority member. Example (90) uses the direct wording of an African-American individual. Examples (89) and (91) are reworded by the journalist to represent the view of the black labourers and also that of the Latino group. Example (92) gives the words of President
Bush mainly regarding Hispanics. Example (93) portrays immigrants as an undifferentiated group and is part of the editorial of the newspaper.

Thus, in some of the examples the point of view belongs to the Other i.e. the minority and their opinion regarding the perception of the majority of them as a minority. This factor can be related to Du Bois' (2006) concept of 'double consciousness' of blacks in the US regarding their own identity and their awareness of the dominant group's view of them. Their positioning in the data is provided by references to "race" and "race-related" actions, even though the groups are labelled differently in America, namely, as Kymlicka (2002:360-361; see also Appiah 2005:11, 66 for available identity labels in a society) states, through race for the African-American group and by means of language for the Hispanic group. The joining of these groups under race indicates the possibility of constructing contextualised representations of groups with the effect of maintaining what Said (1978:7) refers to as the flexible positional superiority of the dominant group as the norm provider.

6.1.11 Speech act of Immigration Debate as War

Below are words and expressions in the data regarding the immigration debate. Several words and expressions related to war provide evidence of how the debate is described or talked about. Example (94), from article 1, in The New York Times, shows the words used by the journalist when reporting on the immigration bill:

(94) Defeated, oppose, fight to prevent, fended off, efforts to kill it; victory, defied, compromise, coalition, showdown, bipartisan support, beleaguered Border Patrol agents, contingent of up to 6,000 National Guard troops, deployed, opposed

Apart from mostly negative words, some words with positive connotations were also employed e.g. the noun allies used by the Senators that were opposed to the bill to refer to the Representatives in the House that were also against the Senate immigration bill. Another noun that the reporter attributed to her sources is compromise in the context that Mr. McCain says that Representative Michael N. Castle, a Republican from Delaware, told him that several of his colleagues were interested in supporting a compromise. The word allies was also used by the opinion writer of article 5 in The New York Times, when referring to those supporting Sen. Inhofe's amendment. The author of article 5 is against the amendment proposed by Sen. Inhofe to declare English as the national language of the country.
Example (95) from opinion article 2, also published in *The New York Times* describes the discussion surrounding the immigration bill also in mainly negative words. The author of the article claims to be in favour of "a good immigration bill":

(95) survive the hostile attentions; coalition, fatally, fended off, sabotage, danger, struggle, amnesty, blow up.

In the following example (96) from article 17, *LA Times*, the journalist describes the discussions in the Senate and the House regarding the immigration bill by using verbs:

(96) oppose; counter

Also *dueling* as an adjective to *hearings* was used by the Judiciary Committee Chairman Arlen Specter (R-Pa.) given in direct speech, when referring to the parallel hearings held in the Senate and the House regarding the bill.

Example (97) from opinion article 20 in the *San Francisco Chronicle*, contains terms that link to the conflict in the Former Yugoslavia during the 1990s:

(97) threatens to Balkanize the nation; verbal cleansing.

According to the author, fragmentation expressed by *Balkanize* reflects the belief of the proponents of official English. The expression *verbal cleansing* is the article writer's own view of the consequences of declaring an official language and believes that such an action will create a perverse form of exclusivity around the concept of citizenship. The author is against the measure to declare English as the official language.

Example (98) from article 21 continues to describe the debate on the immigration bill in conflict terms:

(98) foes, bipartisan coalition, defensive; amnesty; reconquista

The word *danger* is used by the journalist to describe the concern politicians have over the cost to votes that *expanding legal immigration* may have in the short term. However, politicians are also described as seeing that they might win Latino votes from the new citizens in the long term. Bush's opposition to the "Day without an immigrant" walkout/boycott is described using *opposed.* Another word that indicates conflict is *amnesty* used by Marshall
Wittman, a political analyst with the centrist Democratic Progressive Policy Institute, when referring to the possibility of legalising illegal immigrants saying that: *Those who lean toward amnesty are playing right into the hands of the conservative right.* An interesting aspect is the use of *reconquista* by the Latino organisation "You Don't Speak for Me", who is against granting amnesty to illegal immigrants, claiming that the proposal to grant citizenship to illegal immigrants is unfair and warned against a "reconquista" of the United States by illegal Mexican immigrants.

Example (99) from article 4, in *The New York Times* uses war terminology for describing the process involving proposals:

(99) **defeated another proposal**

The proposal in question was put forward by Mr Miralgia, a member of the town board of Pahrump that would require a $200 fee from illegal immigrants and also that they give the names of any relatives they might have in the United States. This proposal was turned down by the board. Another example in the same article deals with a more explicit case of influencing personal relations by authorities in which school officials were said to have *harassed* students by forbidding them to use Spanish in private conversations. The choice of the word *harassed* in the description of the event was used by a lawyer working for the American Civil Liberties Union of Nevada, Lee Rowland.

**Summary and further considerations: speech act of Immigration Debate as War**

The speech act of Immigration Debate as War is linked to Lakoff and Johnson's (1980:4) argument is war metaphor. This metaphor is present in the debate indicated by the above lexical items that are related to war situations and the meaning of the term 'debate' as a formal argument. There is therefore an indication of interdiscursivity evidenced in the metaphoric links to war.

Examples (94), (96), and (98-99) have words falling within the metaphor argument is war used by the journalist of the respective newspapers, whereas the other examples are either from critics against official English, examples (97) and (99), or include views that are against the formulation of the immigration bill as drawn up, examples (95) and (98). Example (96) also includes the words used by the Republican Judiciary Committee Chairman, although there is no explicit information regarding Chairman Specter’s position on the issue.
6.2 Discourse type of Efficiency

6.2.1 Speech act of English-Optional Services

The speech act of English-Optional Services refers to the effects of market forces. In example (100) from news article 14 "Immigrants' children grow fluent in English, study says", in the LA Times, the issue is about availability of services and widespread usage of Spanish:

(100) ...the Pew report's finding that 71% of Mexican immigrants say they speak English just a little or not at all is reason for concern. It suggests that people don't need to learn English because they can access any service they need "In many ways, we have become an English-optional society" he said

The main verb need in don't need and the modal can are placed in oppositional relationship in which the absence of obligation to learn English is due to the possibility can of using Spanish (present by implication from Mexican immigrants) in everyday circumstances.

The relational process have become indicates a change in the American society towards using English as an option as problematic by implication of concern being a credible, acceptable or valid emotion in which justification is provided in the phrase reason for. The languages in question in this example are Spanish and English. The Sayer is Rob Toonkel spokesman for U.S. English Inc., supporting official English. In a similar way, opinion article 10 in USA Today, written by Sen. Inhofe gives an example of what entitlements his proposal for English as the national language aims to target: In 2001, the Supreme Court ruled that Martha Sandoval, who had lived in America for 10 years without learning English, could not sue Alabama because it didn't offer foreign-language driver's license tests. The aspects that are emphasised are the length of time she had been living in the US, added as a relative non-defining clause identified by commas, and the expectations that non-English speakers have for services in English. The use of a non-defining clause could be seen as indicating that the information is not needed to identify the person – in this case Martha Sandoval – but which the author includes as additional information to further strengthen his case for the need for establishing English as the national language. These views contradict the findings of the Pew report as given in article 14 – the same report referred to in example (100) above – in which it also states that by the third generation, 94% of Latinos say they can speak English very well. Dominance of English as having taken place in 80% of Latinos by the third generation – based on an interpretation of the Pew report – is also taken up in opinion article 23 in the San Francisco Chronicle, which states that the remaining 20% are bilinguals. Opinion article 24
gives similar information when referring to the Pew report but whereas in article 23 the number of third generation Spanish speakers was given as a zero, the author of article 24 gives a more cautious reference with an adverb hardly giving an indefinite number and qualifying the indefinite pronoun anyone.

Example (101) below from article 3 in The New York Times shows the perspective of Steven Lonegan, Republican mayor of Bogota, N.J, who is campaigning for official English:

(101) In a book that he is soon to publish himself, he writes, "McDonald's should realize that in promulgating bilingualism, they are empowering the left wing that sees bilingualism as one more arrow to the heart of our democracy."

The use of as marks a simile of bilingualism as harmful to the ideology of democracy of the United States. Thus, bilingualism in advertising is portrayed as a threat to democracy.

This is accentuated by are empowering as a material process, involving a "doing" verb and establishing the responsibility of agency to McDonald's and further linking these actions to the goals of the left wing, namely, to harm democracy via bilingualism. McDonald's is also given agency through the modal of obligation should. Thus interdiscursivity, based on crossing of domains, is present in the use of the political implications of empowerment in relation to a business. Interdiscursivity is also present in the metaphor arrow to the heart of our democracy in the use of arrow and the attribution of a heart to a political ideology. Furthermore, the use of the possessive our distinguishes whose democracy and creates a collective feeling of 'us' in the state, implying also monolingualism as linked to democracy in the United States. Moreover, the article begins with a verb indicating an attempt of exercising asymmetrical power relations demanded by the mayor of the town: Steven Lonegan, the Republican mayor of Bogota, N.J., who demanded last year that McDonald's remove a billboard written in Spanish and who then pushed to make English the town's official language. According to the author of opinion article 19, several different organisations advertise in Spanish such as accounting firms, the US Army, Air Force, Navy, Marines, and even producers of construction equipment include instructions in Spanish in their supplies. The author further claims that almost all consumer appliances or products have instructions in Spanish and English. From a different perspective, the author of opinion article 24 in USA Today claims that the Senate measure sponsored by Sen. Inhofe – if legislated – may
discourage immigrants from paying taxes because the IRS would not continue their Spanish website.

The public domains in which Spanish is used in the US is further criticised in example (102), article 14 in the LA Times:

(102) Groups that support controls on immigration and English-only initiatives say the federal government and U.S. companies are making it easy for Latino immigrants to continue to speak Spanish.

Language maintenance is referred to in the material process verbs continue to speak. The Groups in question are specifically those that are in favour of immigration control and English-only measures indicated by the conjunction and, which also indicates that these same groups share a common view, namely that the coexistence of languages is unacceptable in the explicit use of English-only and implied criticism that organisations are facilitating language maintenance. English-only initiatives are described as focusing on: language battles…fought over school tests, storefront signs and local ballots…sanctions against employers who require workers to speak only English. This information is given in the paragraph directly before this extract and reflected in the journalist's own choice of words. Also, in example (102) the reference to Latino immigrants in the material process by the agents federal government and U.S companies singles them out as the group in question. This section is written by the journalist. In comparison, the author of opinion article 20 can be seen as having an opposing view to the English-only proponents (described by the use of the verb continue in example (102) above) since he states that making English the official language does not entail that Spanish will disappear.

The difference between official English and national language is blurred in example (103) from article 5 "Press One for English", The New York Times, since offering services in Spanish "Oprima número dos" would not be restricted if the amendment would only be symbolic, i.e. English would only be declared a national language:

(103) By a vote of 63 to 34, the Senate tacked onto its immigration bill an amendment from Senator James Inhofe of Oklahoma that declares English to be "the national language of the United States." If you thought otherwise, or weren't sure, well now you know: We speak English here. None of that "Oprima número dos."

14 Translated by the present author as "Press number two"
The author uses irony to refer to the impact of the amendment in relation to societal multilingualism implying an intention of monolingualism in the society by Senator Inhofe with the idiom *None of* indicating a refusal of acceptance of Spanish. Thus it can be stated that the Inhofe amendment for a declaration of a national language attempts to impose measures that are associated to official language status. This extract is written by the author of an opinion article that is against the amendment.

Example (104) from article 24 in *USA Today* gives some areas where consumers can use Spanish:

(104) *Sometimes it may seem that English is under attack*. Dial a credit card company, and you're greeted in two languages. Order coffee at a convenience store, and the clerk might not understand you. Hit the wrong button at the ATM, and the screen flashes Spanish.

The material process verb *attack* indicates an attempt to hurt, overcome or defeat. Also, the use of the present tense *is* combined with the preposition *under* indicates the present condition or state. The Spanish language is specifically referred to in the extract, thus it may be deduced that it is the principal threat to English expressed through *attack*. This extract is part of an opinion article and reflects the word choice of the author who does not favour the Inhofe amendment. The author in article 23 also refers to ATM users being encountered with a language other than English. Furthermore, the experience described by the Sayer in example (104) can be related to a Mexican couple's view in article 14 in the *LA Times*, that: "It's changed," Manuel said. "Now Spanish is spoken wherever" when explaining that they can get by with their Spanish.

Example (105) from article 12 in the *LA Times* indicates that it is not only private businesses that are supplying services in Spanish but that social service agencies are also facilitating contact in other languages indicated by the adjective *foreign-born* as well as contributing to difference in the adjective-noun combination *distinct "communities"*:

(105) *To navigate this amazing diversity*, entities from social service agencies to bank marketing divisions developed separate, linguistically and culturally unique appeals targeting an array of distinct "communities". The target audience within those communities was generally foreign-born householders who had arrived in the U.S. within a decade or two.
The verb targeting indicates a conscious action, enhanced by the verb navigate, and is a consequence of the existence of various groups in the society described by the adverbs and adjectives linguistically and culturally unique and distinct (carried by the noun array indicating a series in an array of distinct "communities") and by the noun diversity. The Sayer of this extract is in favour of creating an integration that includes difference rather than segregates and is critical of programmes that target specific language and cultural groups. This can be related to opinion article 15 which puts forward a situation at a school meeting of black and Latino parents in which a black American father protests that school staff do not speak English. The children of English speaking Americans living in the community are forced to shift language or learn a new language if they attend the local school – in this case in South LA. In this case, English is not the first language of the majority of the students: But the meeting took a detour when a black father stood up to express concern about the administrative staff at his kids' school not speaking English. This example offers a different perspective and presents a consequence to the circumstances of specific group targeting described and criticised in example (105). In opinion article 15, the minority community brings forward a change in the community service, i.e. the language used in school, which consequently affects the everyday of the individuals attending that particular public school.

**Summary and further considerations: speech act of English-Optional Services**

The dominating sentiment underlying these examples is the discussion that bilingualism has negative effects, and poses a threat to the identity of the state by the use of languages other than English for supplying services to customers and citizens. The extracts thus indicate an emphasis on a monolingual rather than a multilingual American identity. This can be linked to questions posed by Watson (2000:38-39) namely whether the American identity has any room for equality between different groups with a basis on multiculturalism or whether attainment of homogeneity should be the goal of the society. This can be further linked to Valdes' (as cited in Gonzalez and Melis 2001:47) study that showed that multilingualism was connected to concepts of un-American. In the data, the agents that are pointed out as the main contributors to bilingualism or multilingualism are the government through multilingual entitlements, and companies in providing services and directing adverts to non-English speakers. Furthermore, Spanish speakers are referred to as Latino immigrants, Mexican immigrants and foreign-born householders, indicating the various available labels that are attributed to the identities of non-native English speakers (see Appiah 2005:66 on available
The rationalist approach to nationalism stated in Ager (2001:19) in which language is central to a society is present in examples (100) and (104) in the explicit criticism of the presence of other languages, most particularly Spanish, in the semi-public space. Example (103) also indicates the provision of services in Spanish. An explicit warning is presented in example (101) in the notion of the state, characterised by a kind of democracy, being threatened. In examples (100-101) the Sayers present an involuntary change in the semi-public space and place English as a core value, a term connected to Smolicz (1995:236-237) and even to Mertz’s (1982) idea that certain American values can only be referred to through English – as implied in example (101). Example (105) can be seen as implying that the supply of services in different languages increases segregation and is therefore an indirect argument for official English, even though the author writes in favour of an inclusive integration. The use of other languages in the society indicates a diminishing of what Pavlenko and Blackledge (2003:2) identify as social control and an implication of the need to impose the English language on the minority groups.

Examples (100) and (103-104) indicate a rejection of bilingualism in public domains. Example (105) refers to segregation created by the contribution of services in creating separate communities. There is also an indication in example (104) that English may be insufficient in certain semi-public spaces e.g. convenience stores. This is similar to Crystal’s (1997:122-130) description of pro-official English concerns, namely that non-immigrants are sometimes required to have bilingual skills to participate in the labour market and in schools.

The examples reflect a rejection of bilingualism and a degree of expressed intolerance in the society. According to Fishman (1972), language maintenance is more linked to tolerance levels in a host society than to the degrees of possible language loyalty among immigrants. Example (103) is an example of intolerance and criticism for not assimilating put into practice in discriminatory actions included as an amendment. Examples (100) and (102) imply that the removal of multilingual services in the society will drive immigrants to learn English out of necessity. In connection to this, Barker et al (2001) show that the language vitality of minority groups cause fear regarding the weakening of English in the respective society, which consequently leads to actions to limit the opportunities of linguistic minorities.

Examples (100) and (102-104), and to some extent example (105), indicate that immigrant groups are not learning the English language and therefore not following the expectation by
the dominant group of striving towards integration into the target culture through language acquisition. These examples are an indication of a challenge to the societal culture of the United States as a speech community characterised by the use of English. Interestingly, this challenge is feared despite the reinforcement of laws requiring that children learn English and the conditions of knowledge of English for government employment, entering the country and obtaining citizenship (Kymlicka 2002:344-347; Mesthrie 2000:38). Also, examples (100-102) and (104) imply a change in the asymmetrical relations of power reflected in the concern by some members of the dominant group over the presence of diverse languages in the public domain which may lead to Clyne's (1997:306) definition of symmetrical multilingualism. The reference to companies using languages other than English in the society indicates that businesses and social service agencies see non-English speaking groups as potential customers and who form what Duranti (1997:76-78) defines as a parallel social and ethnic identity group, making their minority languages into what Bourdieu calls 'cultural capital' (Bourdieu 1991:14, Mesthrie and Deumert 2000:343) for businesses. In light of Morgan's (2006) view that language domain is linked to social change and crisis, it is possible to state that the examples imply that the economy can be said to attribute value to certain languages. This may indicate that the US as an English-based speech community may be in crisis since there is a lack of consensus of the domains in which the different languages should function in the society. Thus, although the immigrants are not portrayed as actively mobilising for recognition expressed in the reversal of language shift – in the manner described by Spolsky (2004:130-131) – the economy is seen as influencing language shift patterns in examples (100), (102), and (104-105) in the choice of using immigrant languages to reach customers. The effect on the domains in which these languages are used may lead to conflict between some of the different minority language speakers and English speakers. This may be seen as slightly differing from Dixon and Simpson's (1994:1957) statement that language conflicts are likely to arise if one language group has more advantages than others. In the case of the examples in this study, conflict arises due to the fact that another language, namely that of the minority group, is competing for the public space and the semi-public space in the American society. It is possible to link this conflict to Freidreis and Tatalovich's (1997) conclusion that there will be an increased focus on core values in public debates in the future.

Finally, the Sayers in examples (100-102) are for official English, sometimes included in reported speech, and refer to the effects of businesses on English. The Sayer in example (103) opposes the Inhofe amendment. In example (104), the Sayer expresses their position in an editorial article as against legislation for a national language as possibly harmful since in
practice it is already a national language. The Sayer in example (105) does not refer to the official English debate but instead criticises businesses and government agencies for supplying services to non-English speakers and ignoring other groups such as English-dominant Latinos or ethnic Americans and argues that this has negative effects on integration.

6.2.2 Speech act of Multilingualism as Cost

The speech act of Multilingualism as Cost focuses mainly on the distribution of state funds. Example (106) from opinion article 10 "Our language unites us" in USA Today adds cost to the argument of cohesion:

(106) Multilingual entitlements distress American unity and cost billions....

The use of the material process verb cost with the meaning of an expense is a demand for reconsideration of allocation of money in the country. The negative meaning of cost is enhanced by the use of a negative mental emotional process verb distress to describe the negative effects of multilingualism. Moreover, reference to entitlements places the discussion in the sphere of language rights to groups. This is a part of an opinion article written by Senator Inhofe who proposed an amendment for English as a national language which in practice would extend the suggested symbolic value to affect the function of English in the society. The same author is more specific in describing costs in the next example (107) from the same article:

(107) Unite America behind our proud national language, help new immigrants advance by learning it and save taxpayer dollars, by making English the national language.

The use of the material process verb save implies that by making English the national language, money will not be wasted. The preposition by shows the means by which the saving of money can be achieved i.e. through appointment of a national language. However, it is the appointment of an official language that affects government expenditure on multilingual services. In other words, establishing a language as the national language is a symbolic gesture and therefore does not carry the same significance in government provision of services in other languages as the appointment of an official language might. This extract is also part of the same article mentioned in example (106) in this section and is written by Sen. Inhofe. Examples (106-107) above can be linked to the statement made by Mr Miralgia in
article 4, who proposed an English-only ordinance saying that: *People can still speak their own language on their own, but we just wanted to establish English as the language for the town of Pahrump so we don't have to publish everything in 7 or 10 different languages.* The interesting aspect in Mr Miralgia's statement is that the article specifically mentions that the number of Hispanics has increased but the claim above is in relation to 7 or 10 languages.

Example (108) from article 3 in *The New York Times* gives a concrete scenario in which money can be saved, namely the school system. The argument of illegal rental units can be interpreted as superfluous to the information given in the rest of the paragraph. However, the statements are linked by the conjunction *and* and may be seen as preparing the reader to think negatively and also to relate criminality of illegal renting practices to the illegal students:

(108) *But illegal rental units have popped up, he warned, and "the cost to taxpayers of running our school system, if you throw in a couple of illegal students at $15,000, $16,000 a student, that adds up."*

The use of the noun *cost* carries a negative meaning which is enhanced by its being preceded by the verbal process verb *warned*. The implication is that it is expensive to provide classes of English to illegal students.

Further, the verbal process verb *warned* indicates the presence of danger explained by the use of the adversative conjunction *But* introducing an irregular situation of the appearance of illegal rental units and having as consequence an increase in cost by the anaphoric *that* in the phrase *that adds up*. Also, the use of the conditional clause *if* followed by the material process verbs *throw* and *adds* in the present tense implies an automatic result of higher cost on the latter verb. The Sayer is Steve Lonegan, the Republican mayor of Bogota, who put forward a suggestion to make English the official language of the town. It is also interesting to note the view taken up by Jose Esparza, a supporter of the official English initiative and vice chairman of the Arizona Latino Republican Association (article 9, *USA Today*), who also sees "an irony" in voters' decision to deny state funding for English education. He refers to this as *conflicting measures* and explains that it is because people, including Hispanics, want the government to do something about illegal immigration. In contrast to the Sayers from articles 3 and 9, the author of opinion article 18 in the *LA Times* claims that English-first proponents believe that English should be the official language of the government but that other languages can exist in the community, and also that: *in supporting English instruction for immigrants demonstrates our confidence in their ability to pursue happiness here and*
contribute to their families, communities and new country. The use of the verb support is not followed by details of whether this help involves funding or if it is encouragement without financial aid but in a separate paragraph the Sayer suggests a model of paid English instruction.

**Summary and further conclusions: speech act of Multilingualism as Cost**

The speech act of Multilingualism as Cost is based on threats related to taxes and expenses incurred on citizens specifically concerning the presence of immigrants and the provision of multilingual rights and education in English. Thus the arguments are from the point of view of distribution of resources as studied in Grin and Vaillancourt (1999:10) and Crystal (1997:122-130). The justification for removal of multilingual rights based on cost (Grin 2006:88) is explicit in example (106). Examples (107-108) make implicit relations to reduction of costs and the presence of immigrants by linking these to the establishment of a national language and the maintenance of the educational system. Example (108) presents concrete figures without a qualifier indicating a fact of the cost although the certainty of the information is reduced by the presentation of two figures for the same phenomenon thus indicating an approximation, possibly subjective, rather than a precise, objective figure. The discussion of removal of multilingual services e.g. example (106), can also be linked to human security (CHS 2003-2003; UNHDR 1994) if legal immigrants and (naturalised) American citizens become affected by these cost-related measures. Also, all the Sayers in the extracts are in favour of official English.

**6.2.3 Speech act of Health and Safety**

In the speech act of Health and Safety the discussion is mainly in connection to government services and may also be linked to human rights issues of personal security. Example (109) from article 7 is part of an opinion article written by Lisa Navarrete, who is vice president of the National Council mentioned in the extract. The Sayer is against the official English proposal, which Sen. Inhofe refers to as making English the national language. It is worth noting the reference to official language in this article:

(109) *National Council La Raza and its network of affiliates, which are deeply engaged in the process of integrating immigrants in the American society, opposed the Inhofe amendment to make English the official language...because it would make it more difficult for government agencies to communicate with people who speak other languages. This is more than symbolism; it is misguided and even dangerous legislation.*
Agencies such as the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention and the Federal Emergency Management Agency would face new obstacles when attempting to reach immigrant communities in the event of natural disasters, pandemics or other threats to public health and safety.

The adjectives difficult, misguided and dangerous as well as the noun obstacles indicate a negative effect in crisis situations if legislation for official language status takes place. Also the use of the modal would implies a certainty that problems will arise in the future as a consequence of intervention on language status. The relational process verb is indicates a categorical characterisation of the action to legislate as defined by the negative adjectives mentioned above. In example (110) in the news article 8 from USA Today there is a distinction made between the different government institutions. One implication is that election materials would not be available in different languages or even the implication that bilingual education or English language education may not be supplied in public schools:

(110) Proposals vary but generally say government business must be conducted in English, with exceptions for emergency services.

The noun exceptions implies the centrality of multilingual services to the society. Also, it is unclear what is included in emergency services but it nevertheless carries the meaning of situations that need immediate action and are often temporary. The use of the modal must indicates obligation or necessity that something happens.

The next example (111) from opinion article 24 in USA Today, in which the writer is critical of the immigration bill and the Inhofe amendment passed in the Senate, links the issue of multilingual entitlements to individual security and therefore indirectly to human rights:

(111) Look at Miami-Dade County, which adopted an ordinance in 1980 that barred the county from doing business in any language other than English. Thirteen years later, the county commission unanimously repealed it. According to news accounts, public hospitals couldn’t give written instructions in Spanish on how patients should take medications, and the county couldn’t print some warning signs in Spanish.

The negative implications for health and safety are a result of the imposition of the ordinance described here using the modal couldn’t. This indicates a lack of ability or possibility for health and safety institutions to carry out one of their core tasks, namely that of
recommending or giving advice, through the use of the modal *should*, over medication. The Spanish language is specifically pointed out, indicating therefore, its significance in the country. The Sayer also explicitly states in the article that *Legislating a "national language" is, at best, meaningless, at worst harmful.* In article 8, a Sayer who is against official English measures states (in reported speech): …*they deprive people of the right to information about things as prenatal classes and patient billing records in a language they understand.* The link between multilingual services and rights with regard to health is emphasised by the use of the material process verb *deprive* which indicates power relations between individuals promoting official-English – and who very likely have good knowledge of English – and individuals that do not know English or who have limited knowledge of English.

Example (112), from article 14 in the *LA Times*, shows the experience of a Mexican couple when contacting health and government services in the adverbs *almost always*:

(112) *The Peredas say life now, compared to when they arrived in the U.S., is much more accommodating to Spanish speakers. Except at some medical and government offices, a Spanish-speaking employee can almost always be found, they said.*

"*It's changed," Manuel said. "Now Spanish is spoken wherever."

Manuel's usage of the verb *changed* and the conjunction *wherever*, along with the adverbs *almost always*, can be related to some of the concerns expressed in the examples taken up in the speech act of English-Optional Services (section 6.2.1).

**Summary and further considerations: speech act of Health and Safety**

The examples in the speech act of Health and Safety fall within the scope of external type of rights to protect minorities against decisions taken in the larger society as discussed in Kymlicka (2002:341-342). The examples indicate that the liberal ideology of nation building of common membership and equal accessibility in the society and its institutions through a shared language affects minorities negatively (Kymlicka 2002:344-347). The denial of language rights for minority interaction with public institutions in these examples indicates decided measures towards Skutnabb-Kangas, Phillipson and Rannut's (1995:3) description of the linguistic and cultural assimilation of minorities, although example (112) also indicates a social change in the linguistic landscape. The examples show a resistance to the reinforcement and reproduction of cultural hegemony, and thus may indicate, from Morgan's (2006)
perspective, a degree of instability of the English-based speech community in certain regions of the United States.

The issue of health and safety brings forward the existence of parallel monolingual groups that do not participate in the speech community that defines America as a state. Bloomfield's (1993:42) study points out that there are non-English speaking groups in the US which from the examples in the speech act of Health and Safety are related to issues of security. Examples (111-112) indicate a particular language group, namely speakers of Spanish. Examples (109-110) refer to the ability to communicate to other non-English speakers signalling an absence of social cohesion through a common shared language and therefore not qualifying for the definition of speech community as suggested by Mesthrie (2000:37).

Example (111) shows that coercion by removing access to other languages does not lead individuals to shift language for purposes of health and safety, thus creating difficulties at least in the short term, for public hospitals and the country as a whole. This also implies that Bolinger's (1975:333) view that motives for the formation of speech communities can be based on security does not apply to issues related to health. The threats to public safety in examples (110-111) relate to individual security as an issue concerning state institutions and practices, whereas example (109) refers to the threat in situations of community or state-level emergencies. It is not possible to claim from the extracts whether the existence of parallel communities especially Spanish is a sign of resistance to the official language in Duranti's (1997:76-78) way of thinking or just an involuntary consequence of the changes taking place in the society due to the size of immigrant groups and/or the replenishment of new immigrants from neighbouring countries – in Buzan's terms also described as a change in the physical base of a state (Buzan 1991).

Example (111) is an indication of an unsuccessful action to deal with establishing more significantly the position of English due to the presence of multilingualism. However, the revocation of the decision for English-only is also a recognition of the difficulty of dealing with the problem through prohibition and the need for the American society to guarantee the health and safety of individuals and the state as in example (109).

The examples of the speech act of Health and Safety indicate that immigrants lack the dominant cultural capital as defined by Bourdieu (1991:14, 30; 56; see also Mesthrie and Deumert 2000:343). These examples are further a demonstration of symbolic dominance in which the imposition of monolingual norms regarding the legitimate competence in the formal market has the capacity to threaten the safety of those that have not acquired that capital.
6.2.4 Speech act of Opportunity

The speech act of Opportunity deals with the view of language as a tool for advancement by different social agents. In example (113), from news article 14 in the LA Times, the group singled out is Latinos:

(113) Latinos see the language as the key to success

There is a specification of the identity of immigrants concerned Latinos marking them as a given homogeneous entity that can be isolated from other groups. The mental process verb see is used with the meaning to understand and perceive the importance of something, in this case language for advancement. Also, the simile characterises language as well as gives the opinion of the Senser. The source to example (113) is indicated by the following words: Pew research shows. Example (114) from the same article 14 identifies a couple Manuel and Rosa Pereda, who have studied English for many years while working at the same time:

(114) The more English the couple learned, they assumed, the better jobs they could get and the more money they could send home to their families in Mexico.

The view of language as a tool for economic progress is indicated by the adjective better and the indefinite determiner more for jobs and money respectively. The use of the mental process verb assumed indicates ideology in its meaning of accepting something as true before having proof that it is so. This must be weighed against the fact that the extract is in reported speech. The carrier of the mental process of the assumption, as given by the journalist, is a couple with relatives in Mexico, thus indicating their affiliation to the Spanish language. The extract is in the journalist's own wording. In example (115) of article 14, the names of two specific individuals are given and their views on the usefulness of their mother tongue in the US:

(115) For Rosa and Manuel Pereda, Spanish is essential at work. Rosa sells cemetery plots to Spanish-speaking families and Manuel, a school bus driver, speaks English to the teachers and children but Spanish to parents.
The adjective essential in the relational process is marked by the static implication of is to describe the role of Spanish at work as established. The conjunction but indicates the use of Spanish as necessary when communicating with certain groups. The couple is indicated as knowing Spanish and the choice of words is given by the journalist.

Example (116), from article 8 "Push for 'official' English heats up" published in the USA Today has the perspective of a person that is the president of an organisation that has inside knowledge of the views of immigrants. The Sayer positions himself against the movement to declare English the official language of the country:

(116) "People know the key to getting ahead in this country is learning English," says John Trasvío, interim president of the Mexican American Legal Defense and Education Fund, which opposes the official-English measures.

The instrumental use of English is indicated in the use of key as a tool and the material process verb "get" in the phrasal verb getting ahead indicating progress and is accentuated by the relational process verb is indicating a static relation characterising English. The reference to social mobility achieved with knowledge of English as a tool is given by a Sayer that opposes the official English movement and who belongs to an organisation that is against the movement to make English official.

The source for the information given in the next example (117) from article 14 in the LA Times is described as included in the results obtained in a Pew research study and therefore containing expert knowledge. The organisation that has carried out this research is given in the article as not supporting the immigration bill although at the same time it is described as a nonpartisan organisation:

(117) Latinos recognize that learning English is key to economic success, according to the study, which was based on survey data collected between 2002 and 2007.

In this example, Latinos are specified as a group of concern. The mental process verb recognize indicates cognition of something already known. Also, there is metaphoric characterisation of language as a tool through a relational process verb is implying a static identification of the position of English in the society. Moreover there is reference to an expert source which later in the article is presented as against the official English movement.
Example (118) below from the same article 14 includes the view of one of the writers in the organisation. In the utterance, the Sayer D’Vera Cohn does not include information on whether he is also representing the views held by immigrants in contrast with example (117) above:

(118)  "The ability to speak English is a crucial skill for getting a good job and integrating into the wider society," said D’Vera Cohn, a senior writer at the research center, a non partisan research organization that does not advocate immigration policy. "Language is a vehicle for assimilation."

In the example above there is a reference to language as a skill, i.e. a means for achieving certain ends e.g. a good job (with the adjectival use of good to indicate a value judgment), in a relational process indicated by is. The Sayer is given as a neutral expert but working for a centre that is later described in the article as against the official English measure. Reference to language by use of the noun vehicle indicates it is a means for a goal in this case assimilation through language. Also, the coordination of the clauses by and linking job to integrating serves to keep them as separate but linked events in the society, while indicating that they have equal importance.

Example (119) from article 24 "Press 2 for pointless" in the USA Today uses the same verb recognize as example (117):

(119)  As in earlier generations, today's immigrants recognize that speaking English is their ticket to a better life

The metaphoric use of the noun ticket with its implication of a right to travel or enter a journey by means of a transport vehicle implies the reference to English as a tool or vehicle for progress indicated by the positive adjective better. The author in this opinion article is against the proposed amendment by Sen. Inhofe to limit the supply of federal services and information to the English language. Example (116) from article 8 above uses the verb know to indicate the same perception by immigrants. Opinion article 18 from a supporter for official English explains: They deserve the opportunity to pursue happiness in the U.S. that comes with speaking English.

Example (120), from article 14 in the LA Times, can be compared to example (115) above from the same article since the latter refers to the role Spanish for a Hispanic couple's working
possibilities in the US. Example (120) – given below – gives the view of another Hispanic individual regarding the link between English and economic advancement:

(120) Though Mancia said he has learned enough in the last six years to communicate with some employers, he believes he could get more and higher-paying work if he were fluent. “I have lost job opportunities because I don't speak English,” he said.

The view of high level proficiency in English as a necessity for advancement is introduced by the concessive conjunction Though contrasted with a clause of possibility in the modal could enhanced by the hypothetical meaning of were and conditional if.

Moreover, the reporting clauses, Mancia said, he said distances the journalist from the information. There is a lack of clarity regarding the individual's self report on his proficiency gliding from the adverb enough to a hypothetical notion of lack of fluency to not speaking English at all I don't speak, which may also indicate problems related to the reliability of results from census studies or interviews. The Sayer, Mancia, is an immigrant day laborer from Salvador who says that he wakes up every day at 5 a.m. in the morning to study English before going to look for work as a construction worker. In the same article, Rodriguez, a 27-year-old El Salvadorian, says that he felt his parents encountered disadvantages because they couldn't speak English.

In the following example (121) from article 9 in USA Today, the Sayer is Jose Esparza, vice chairman of the Arizona Latino Republican Association. He is also later described in the article as having supported the official English initiative. Esparza states that there are conflicting measures being passed such as denial of state funding for learning English and explains: ...the public, including Hispanics, is frustrated that illegal immigration continues to be a problem and they want the federal government to take action. The Hispanics being referred to in this extract are those that have a legal status in the US and most of them may be citizens. This can be compared to the organisation DASA-Diversity Alliance for a Sustainable America which aims to limit both illegal and legal immigration. This organisation is run by minorities and immigrants (also mentioned in example (25), article 13 in the speech act of Obligation). Below in example (121) is a quote from Jose Esparza:

(121) Hispanic support is a sign that "the majority of Hispanics believe that the key to success in America is to learn the language of the land, learn English,"

233
English is indirectly metaphorically referred to as a tool key to success. The use of the definite article *the* indicates an understanding that a certain key exists which in this case is English. Since there is no indication that there are other keys, it is possible to infer that English is the sole occupant of this role. The use of *Hispanics* implies an us/them distinction between Hispanics and non-Hispanics. *Hispanics* are Seners in this example indicated in the use of the mental process verb *believe*. In the same article, 9, an opponent to the English-only measure in Arizona that is described as having received 48% of Hispanic support, says that these Hispanic supporters do not identify with the immigrant situation since they have lived in the US for generations. In a similar train of thought, the authors of articles 18 and 23 give scenarios in which they take up residence in different countries. The author of article 18 is in favour of the official English initiative, and says that if he moved to Spain he would learn Spanish because it would provide him with opportunities. It is not possible to position the Sayer of article 23 as regards the debate for official English due to his use of irony, but there are indications that he is against literacy tests for immigrants. His example is if he moved to Australia he would definitely learn to speak Australian but also refers to his grandfather who instead of focusing on learning English, worked to support his family in the US. Although the American society has changed since the arrival of the author's grandfather, this reference brings into focus the difference between learning a language for advancement and the need to use a language for survival in the job market. Article 18 does not refer to the choice of priorities many immigrants have to make, namely to focus on language learning or to earn a living as the first priority.

Example (122), opinion article 10 "Our language unites us", *USA Today*, is written by Sen. Inhofe who proposed an amendment to the immigration bill declaring English the national language but in which the content indicated domain restrictions on other languages.

(122) *Speaking English well enough for everyday life is a guaranteed way for new immigrants to increase their earning potential, lift academic achievement and enhance career options. That's the clear, compassionate message we need to send.*

The relational process verb *is* indicates a static characterisation of English as a means to economic improvement along with academic and career progress. Also, proficiency in English is described vaguely by adverbs *well* and *enough* leaving the assessment open to relative judgment.
The pointing out of new immigrants excludes those that are "old immigrants" indicating a boundary between those that have newly arrived and those that are seen as established, although it is noteworthy that the boundaries between "old" and new immigrants may vary. The establishment of this boundary is likely to carry power implications. The Sayer in example (123) below from article 18 is in favour of official English and implies that the measure for official English is only for the benefit of immigrants – similar to the use of compassionate in example (122) before:

(123) *These multilingual documents discourage immigrants from learning English as rapidly as possible, limiting their ability to engage in a truly common political culture. Rather than expanding opportunities for new Americans, these mandates help limit them.*

The link between knowledge of English and opportunities is given as natural; in this case the reference is to participation in a culture that is modified by common political indicating shared interests and beliefs and a form of collective entity. It remains unclear whether it is participation in the society as a whole that is at stake or whether the implication is only referred to those related to the sphere of politics. Another example of the argument of advancement through English by an official English supporter is given in *LA Times* opinion article 18 in which English is described as the *language of economic success and upward mobility*. The statement carries an implicit consequence thinking, namely that if you learn English, you will succeed financially. The author, however, clarifies that he is an English First supporter and not an English-only supporter and thus is only in favour of English being used by the government (allowing other languages to be used in communities and commerce). He further describes English-only intentions as wanting to outlaw other languages. In relation to the anti-official English measure the author of opinion article 20 in the *San Francisco Chronicle* asks if there is any point in making English official based on the description of the goals of English First since other languages will still be used in the country.

Examples (124-125) below from article 16 in the *LA Times* refer to the competition between two minority groups and indicate that language is just one of the possible aspects at stake:

(124) *Stereotypes, language skills and the lowest price come into play as black Americans and Latino immigrants compete on an Atlanta street...Outside the Home Depot in Ponce de Leon Avenue, no one*
engages in theoretical debates about whether illegal immigrants are competing for jobs with Americans.

Here, the competition unfolds whenever a truck pulls into the parking lot, its driver looking for day laborers

Language is listed as a means for permitting the possessor of the skill to enter into the job market described in the material process verbs compete, competing and the noun competition. The choice and repetition of the different forms of compete indicates a win-lose situation between the social groups i.e. black Americans and Latino immigrants (the latter are also indirectly linked to illegal immigrants). Although no reference is made to particular working skills in this paragraph, the article also refers to Latinos as being able to offer specialised skills e.g. as dry wall finisher.

The use of the coordinator and places all the items in the listing as holding equal importance. Based on this aspect, the order of the items could have been rearranged with the assumption that no change to the level of importance and grammatical hierarchy would occur. Moreover, the reference to the location Atlanta street adds specificity and familiarity. However, the indefinite article an may indicate an everyday occurrence implying that this competition is taking place everywhere so the actual name of the street is unnecessary since the situation is implied to be a general phenomenon. The extract is written by the journalist of the article. Example (125) below from the same article 16 explains the competition in more detail:

(125) The men said there were times when it helped to be a black American. Some employers refused to hire illegal immigrants, and some jobs required a native speaker's command of English.

English is referred to as a necessary tool for employment indicated by the modal verb required for obligation. The extract above is written using the journalist's words reporting from the sources. It is interesting to note the reference to the level of proficiency required and the implied uniform view of all language varieties of English as equal in value. The text however refers earlier to the possession of a Caribbean lilt as an advantage for work since Jamaicans are seen to manage three jobs, and the need to avoid speaking all alley --- if you can't talk right --- if your vocabulary messed up, they'll probably be like, 'Oh, he's been to prison,'" he said. It is significant that the negative modal can't indicates ability in the sense of acquired knowledge or skill, therefore allowing for a dynamic view of language skills.
Example (126) in opinion article 19, titled "Immigrant paradox", published in the *San Francisco Chronicle* indicates two perspectives. Firstly, that it is taken for granted that learning English will help people advance. Secondly, the content of the extract is witness to the supply and demand forces, namely that immigrants are willing to pay to take courses in English and that companies supplying services – in English language learning – are trying to reach them through advertisements:

(126) *And yes, Spanish-language TV does brim with commercials from companies that, for a price, will teach you English. These ads always encourage folks to learn English – in order to get a job and earn more money, and probably pay more taxes.*

English is indicated as a means – signalled by the idiom *in order to* marking an intention – of attaining economic benefits. The emphasis is on an abundance of adverts targeting Spanish speakers with promises of future social mobility. The advertisements indicate a sequence of events, namely if you learn English you will *get a job and earn more money*. The use of the verb *brim* indicates a large quantity of commercials thus referring to a widespread phenomenon. This opinion article does not indicate explicitly the position of the author as regards initiatives for official English. The extract indicates that there are enough Spanish speakers in the society to make them attractive as a target group to advertisers.

As in example (126) above, examples (127-128) below from article 19 give further examples of how the presence of immigrants has benefited certain areas of employment and business:

(127) *Since the 2001 attacks [terrorist attacks in the United States], federal immigration officials have naturalized 24,745 military service members. More than 10,000 scored well enough to use their foreign-language skills in military operations, allowing for a "linguistically more competent military," said David Chu, undersecretary of defense for personnel and readiness, also quoted in the AP story.*

The use of the material process verb *allowing* implies a conscious action of letting an increase in language competence take place and thus indicating a desire for bilingual speakers in the military. However, there is usage of indeterminacy or vagueness characterised by positive qualifiers *more than, well enough, and more competent*. The Sayer is the same as in example (126), and encourages newspapers to show more diverse information regarding the
issue of immigrants and language in the society noting that English is not the only language the citizens are exposed to in their daily life. Societal bilingualism is visible in example (128) below:

(128) The Sears store ...just outside Washington, has store signs hanging from the ceiling in English and Spanish. Bethesda is one of the richest suburbs in the country. But store managers know that many of their customers also speak Spanish and they want them to be able to shop with ease. U.S. businesses know that immigrants have money to spend and they want it.

The mental process verb want in combination with the anaphoric reference to money through it serves as an explanation for the use of Spanish and English in advertising by the store. Spanish speakers are regarded as desirable targets for companies. Also, the superlative adjective richest referring to a particular community describes, by extension, the buying potential of these customers. Again the Sayer is the same as the two examples above and does not indicate clearly his position as regards the issue but instead describes the situation in the country.

In example (129) from article 22, the Sayer, Sen. Dodd, a Democrat from Connecticut, puts forward the value of promoting multilingualism for global participation. This view can be compared to examples (126) and (128) above in which the effect of multilingualism was seen in relation to the domestic arena, i.e. within the US:

(129) Dodd agreed that the question was divisive and – noting that he spoke Spanish – made a pitch for more language training. "We have too few of our people in our country that can understand second languages," he said. Sounding a lot like President Bush, Dodd insisted that because we live in a global economy, "we need to encourage more diversity" instead of wasting energy arguing about whether we should designate one official language in this country.

The importance of second language knowledge for comparative advantage in the global economy can be inferred by the use of the adverb too in front of the indefinite pronoun few emphasising a negative situation combined with the modal of ability can. The extract also describes an implied tendency towards monolingualism in the United States. The auxiliary combination need to indicates an obligation through inference of necessity as a consequence or reason, indicated by the conjunction because, of the global economy. The positive view of
diversity in this example can be compared to the criticism directed by residents in Pahrump, Nye County, to the English-only ordinance proposed by a town board member in article 4 in *The New York Times* who claim that: “[t]he language ordinance also has burnished an image of Pahrump as an Old West backwater….Census data shows it is one of the fastest-growing communities in the nation.

Also, group identification in example (129) is indicated by the use of *we* and *our* although leaving unclear who precisely is included in the reference to *our people*, that is, it is left open if first, second and third generation immigrants are included. Nevertheless, the reader and the speaker – Sen. Dodd – are assumed to form part of a shared collective referred to by the use of possessive *our* and the collective *we*. The speaker is given authority by extension through the reference to his similarity to President Bush. The viewpoint of the speaker is indicated in the material process verb *wasting*.

The image of immigrants as active and contributing members in the US is taken up in example (130), article 19, published in the *LA Times*:

(130) **Immigrants earn a great deal of money and they pay taxes on that money. That’s why when you call** the Jackson-Hewitt 800 **number, you can hear the information in English or en español.**

The role of immigrants in general as consumers for the companies is based on their capacity to *earn* as workers. The Spanish language *español* is specifically mentioned alongside English as part of the tax service provided by the *Jackson-Hewitt 800 number*. The modal *can* may be read as indicating a possibility of access as well as describing a typical state. This extract is part of an opinion article encouraging newspapers to show more diversity as regards the linguistic and immigrant situation in the country.

**Summary and further considerations: speech act of Opportunity**
The speech act of Opportunity can be seen as divided into four issues. The first refers to English as a tool for opportunity in the labour market, as also mentioned in MacKaye (1990) and Crystal (1997:122-130). The second issue refers to the use of languages other than English in the labour market. Thirdly, companies are given as using Spanish in their advertising in order to attract customers. Lastly, the view of Spanish as a resource in the global market appears in one of the examples and also appears in Crystal's (1997:117-128) work on justifications given by the anti-official English advocates.
The expressions of English as providing opportunities for advancement implies that sharing a common language does not automatically need to include sharing a feeling of national identity. The reasons for learning the language are instrumental and attached to social mobility and not to create a feeling of belonging in the community as would be the case if the immigrant was positive towards assimilation. This is in line with Hymes' view that sharing the same linguistic knowledge does not imply unity and that distinction should be made between participating in a speech community and being a member of it (Hymes 1974:47, 50-51). Instead, this speech act indicates the guarantee of the position of English as dominant through the necessity to learn it for advancement. This is in line with Clyne's (1997:308) view that long-term use of languages depends on the needs of individuals. Using Clyne's (1997:306) definition of language hierarchies, an asymmetrical multilingual situation in the United States favouring English is indicated in examples (113-114), (116-120), (122-123) and (125-126). Further, the link of English to social mobility positions it as the legitimate competence in accordance with Bourdieu's (1991:14, 30, 54; see also Mesthrie and Deumert 2000:343) terms. As a legitimate competence it can also guarantee the conversion of an individual's cultural capital into economic capital. This can be related to Grin's (2006:80-81) findings that Hispanics that spoke English in the southern states earned more than those that did not. However, their income was nonetheless lower than that of the white population.

The modal can in example (130) may further indicate a de facto change in the linguistic landscape in which the availability of Spanish alongside English may be described as a typical state. Examples (115) and (127-130) indicate that Spanish and other languages are becoming established as cultural capital in certain markets, from the perspective of Bourdieu's (1991:14-19; see also Mesthrie and Deumert 2000:343) approach. This phenomenon may indicate social change in the symbolic domination of English and the advantages experienced automatically by English speakers in the labour market and as targets of advertisements. The establishment of Spanish in these public arenas may contribute to language maintenance patterns described in Mesthrie and Leap (2000:253) in which language maintenance takes place when less powerful languages compete for the social space with languages that have regional and social dominance. This may even lead to language conflict due to the new languages acquiring more domains of use. Barker et al (2001) state that although the Spanish-language group is increasing, they do not present a challenge to English speaking groups since they still have limited economic and political influence as well as lack competitive educational levels – a view that may be questioned based on examples (127-130).
Example (115) indicates the value of Spanish for the individual in the labour market. Examples (128) and (130) demonstrate the interest that companies/services have in reaching Spanish speakers as consumers. The situations in these two examples contribute towards promoting social change and increasing the value of Spanish as well as challenging what is described by Giddens (2001:256) as the hegemonic spread of 'Anglo' culture in the country throughout its history. These events may stimulate what Valdes (as cited in Gonzalez and Melis 2001:9) describes as multilingualism being linked to notions of what is un-American. Following Hymes' ideas of a speech community as an agreement of rules of grammar and usage, the examples in this study show that the economic sector can create deviation from the rules of usage of language in a community. Economy can also be said to affect what Ager (2001) calls the image of the country as representing a unified speech community based on the English language. In other words, economic activities can instead help the development of alternative communicative activities which may lead, in view of Duranti's (1997:82) focus on the effect of communicative activities, to the construction of a parallel speech community. However, the repetition of the value of English for opportunity in the examples helps sustain the cultural hegemony of English which falls into Morgan's view of a speech community involving an agreement of values attached to it but a lack of consensus about its implementation (Morgan 2006:5), which in the data is shown by the occurrence of Spanish in the semi-public space. Moreover, interdiscursivity is present in the similes and metaphoric use of English as an instrument, i.e. as a key in examples (113), (116-117) and (121), as a vehicle in example (118), and as a ticket in example (119).

Furthermore, examples (124-125) can be related to Appiah's (2005:66) view of available labels that construct the identities of the individuals that are in competition in the labour market, namely black Americans, identified by race, Latinos and illegal immigrants. There is also reference to the proficiency of a native speaker. The use of race to distinguish 'black' Americans indicates further that Fishman's de-ethnicisation process related to culture and language (Fishman 1966:399) can include a process of de-racialisation in which language loss is evident but racial identity is still maintained. A possible question is why de-ethnicisation or de-racialisation e.g in example (125) is not followed by the removal of labels positioning individuals in their minority group – which also constitutes the same group from which they have linguistically distanced themselves? Thus, parallel social identities are constructed in the examples with maintenance of minority boundaries through the use of 'us' and 'them' even though full linguistic assimilation has taken place, as in the case of racial boundaries of African-Americans. In light of Ager's (2001:74-75) view of an image based on a projection of
worth that is perceived, the situation of black Americans in the data indicates that the actual worth of English as a unifying language may be different from the perceived and projected worth it carries for the individuals and groups outside the dominant group. The marginalisation, stigmatisation and non-recognition (see Taylor 1994a:32-34) of these assimilated groups are thus linked to their socio-economic status and their socio-cultural identity (see Kymlicka 2002:329).

Moreover, examples (125) and (127) refer to the levels of proficiency in language that are viewed as skills by certain employers. In the case of examples (127) and (129), languages other than English are elevated to the level of resources for the purposes of use in the international sphere (cf. Crystal 1997:117-128). In a wider perspective, these may be related to aspects of establishing trust in intercultural communication as mentioned by Gumperz through avoidance of situations causing misunderstandings in communications (Gumperz 1982:7-8). Interestingly, according to some individuals from the minority groups, their employability is sometimes based on the employer's prejudices in such a way that advantages of knowing English are undermined by racial prejudices as in example (124) by the comma and the conjunction and separating stereotypes, language skills and price.

In sum, the speech act of Opportunity applies to the economic sector and includes those that know English and those that know Spanish. In some cases, as in the case of examples (127) and (129), languages other than English may be seen as resources e.g. in the military or global economy. The increase in the value of languages other than English in the different domains, in the long term, may be linked to future expressions of inter-ethnolinguistic conflicts based on Stavenhagen's (1990) claim that conflicts between ethnic groups are often caused by groups contending for resources and power.

### 6.2.5 Speech act of Immigrants as a Labour Resource

The speech act of Immigrants as a Labour Resource indicates the complexity of "pull" factors in the job market. In example (131) from article 4 "Stars and Strife: Flag Rule Splits Town", The New York Times, the Sayer does not consider that there are employers behind each immigrant that is hired, thus the material verb take used in the extract could also be replaced by "give" or "offer" forming the sentences "they are given jobs..." and "they are offered jobs...":

![Image] 

(131) "They come in here, they take the jobs, they take away the services that belong to real Americans and they don't respect our flag," said Mr. Harvard, who was born in Nevada. "It's not right."
The use of *take* is further interesting from the fact that there is no specification as to whether the Sayer is only referring to illegal Hispanic immigrants or whether he is including all Hispanic individuals, even the naturalised ones and legal guest-workers (this latter group would be paying taxes and thus entitled to the same *services* mentioned by the Sayer). The example above establishes the perception of immigrants as part of the labour force. This example is included in the context of the growth of Hispanics in the town of Pahrump. Thus, it is possible to state that the *they* refers specifically to Hispanics (legal and illegal) placed in opposition to *real Americans*. The Sayer is described as one of the *old-timers* who is *unnerved* by the *apparent growth* of Hispanics e.g. seen in the student population of the four local elementary schools in the town of Pahrump. In this town, a board member, Mr Miralgia, moved to declare English the official language of the town in an ordinance called the *English Language and Patriot Reaffirmation Ordinance* that also governed rules for flying the national flag. The idea of immigrants taking away jobs is more explicit in article 16 where a black labourer, Anthony Curtis 42, expresses his frustration over Latino presence at a day labourer's depot in Atlanta in the following way: "*They pick up the majority of work*" and "*They dominate the corner*".

In example (132) from article 2 "An Immigration bottom Line" in *The New York Times*, the Sayer generalises the negative conditions of the workplaces available to illegal immigrants and also to newcomers (and indirectly includes guest-workers that are legally in the country):

(132) *It [anaphoric reference to an immigration bill] must not create a servant class of "guest workers" shackled to their employers.....It must impose enforcement of labor laws, so unscrupulous employers cannot exploit workers.*

Immigrants are implicitly described as belonging to a lower class of workers that are prisoners or that have no freedom. It is also worth mentioning that employers are constructed as exploiters that need to be regulated by law. The use of the modal can in *cannot* implies that without legislation a silent permission is given to exploitation. Thus, the modal can, *cannot*, may also be interpreted as regarding an ability to exploit. The extract is in an editorial in which the author wants a "good" and just immigration bill. The verb *shackled* is used interdiscursively since it is a term more associated to prisoners. In this case it is the assumption that illegal immigrants do not voluntarily offer their services but are instead "caught" or imprisoned and denied freedom. The description of employers in this example can
be related to an implied lack of trustworthiness of a possible employer in opinion article 23: though I hope you'll be more careful in checking out the government contractors than you were with your personal ones, to make sure they aren't using illegal immigrants to pour concrete. The reference to personal is given in opposition to government, which is used in combination with an anaphoric reference to the noun contractors to avoid repetition: The Sayer in this extract directs a comment to Republican Representative Tom Tancredo, who is responsible for introducing a proposal of an amendment to the Constitution to declare English the official language and who also supports the building of a wall between Mexico and the US.

Example (133) from article 4 in The New York Times contains the words of an American who although he is not against immigration from Mexico, provides a description of immigrants as a labour force that does not represent them as equal to other Americans:

(133) "...I do not see the Mexican immigrants as a burden on me or my community at all. I see them as trying to feed their families and doing jobs other Americans don't want to do"

The immigrants are specified as Mexicans and as capable of performing undesirable jobs. The use of the indefinite determiner other in front of Americans brings doubt to whether the Mexican immigrants are themselves also Americans and not illegal immigrants. The Sayer is a white individual of immigrant background Mr Tamburrino, 59, who protested against the Patriot Ordinance that set rules for flying foreign flags and which also included a declaration of English as the town's official language. Mr and Mrs Tamburrino had eggs thrown at their house when they protested against the Ordinance by flying Italian and Polish flags to represent Mr Tamburrino's ancestry.

The information in example (134) from article art 16, adds new information to the qualities of immigrants as labourers:

(134) Gibbs backed away. The Latinos began negotiating with the driver, who hired one of them for $12 an hour.

"Drywall finisher – that's a speciality," Gibbs muttered as he walked back to his spot on the sidewalk near a Dunkin' Donuts. "Plus, he was only paying $9 an hour."
This extract gives an alternative portrayal of Latinos as offering specialised work at a low price. The speaker, Sam Gibbs, 47, is an African-American and a day labourer who is described in the following: One chilly afternoon, Gibbs, 47, sprinted like a teenager toward a red pickup, hawking his services to two black men inside shouting "Take a brother with you!" Gibbs pleaded. "I'm from South Carolina!" He had beaten out a sizeable group of Latinos who surrounded the truck. The contractors needed on this occasion a drywall finisher as shown in the extract. Example (135) below from the same article 16, makes explicit the "pull" factor that has attracted Mexicans to the US labour market:

(135) Lester Jackson noted that the going rate for an unskilled job out here was $10 an hour. "For a Mexican, that's a big deal," he said. "You only make $3 a week in Mexico.... They're going to work 10 times harder than an American will."

The group specified in this example are Mexicans. They are also described as hard workers. The speaker is a 53 year old African-American and a day labourer, who further states (given in reported speech) that the hustle of the Latino workers reminded him of his father's attitude when opportunities for blacks began to expand after the demise of Jim Crow laws. His father, he said, was thrilled to have a chance to get a decent-paying job, even if it wasn't a particularly glamorous one.15

From another perspective, example (136), article 19, refers to citizenship acquisition and can be linked to example (127) in the speech act of Opportunity:

(136) However, the armed forces of the United States actively recruit people that some call aliens. That's right. You don't have to be a U.S. citizen to fight and die for this country. The U.S. Army, Navy, Air Force and Marines simply require that you are legally in the United States

The perception of who is included under the term aliens seems to vary since the word in this example can be seen as including legal immigrants although it is often used in relation to illegal immigrants. The extract is part of an opinion article in which the writer is not against

---

15 The Jim Crow laws were a part of segregationist and discriminatory legislation. The US Supreme Court declared that according to the Constitution, it was allowed to have "separate but equal" facilities for blacks and whites. In the South, this was extended to laws that made it difficult for the black population to vote. After the second World War several measures weakened the Jim Crow laws but it was in 1968, as a result of several initiatives including the Civil rights Act, 1964, the Voting Rights Act, 1965, and finally the Fair Housing Act, 1968 that "officially ended the ability of any state to discriminate, disenfranchise, or otherwise restrict any individual on the basis of race" (The Eleanor Roosevelt Papers 2003).
immigrant presence in the country but has written this article with the intention of drawing
attention to the diversity in the country and the degree to which immigrants participate in the
US. The author further writes that Newspapers owe it to their readers to bring more light than
heat to this issue that is literally changing the face of our communities.

Example (137) from article 22 in the San Francisco Chronicle further characterises Hispanics:

(137) In an interview with McClatchy Newspapers, Bush said, that growing up in Texas, he learned to "recognize the decency and hard work and humanity of Hispanics."

The Sayer, President Bush, refers to Hispanics as hard workers. The mental process recognize pushes forward/implies an already existing fact namely that Hispanics constitute a hard-working group, which is further strengthened by the trustworthiness acquired from the political position of the Sayer i.e. President Bush. Examples (138) and (139) from articles 4 and 2 respectively, published in The New York Times further qualifies immigrants as workers:

(138) "There's an immigration problem in the whole country," Mr. Romero said, "but as far as them taking other people's jobs in Pahrump, I guarantee you business would hire the most qualified and legalized people if they were available."

The statement begins with a categorical truth that establishes immigration as a problem in the use of There's which is transformed by the contrasting clause beginning with the conjunction but justifying the requirement for immigrants not only as labour but qualified, and filling a locally existing (indicated by condition if) labour/skill gap. This is further strengthened by the use of the modal would of certainty describing an imaginary situation. This example brings up the status of immigrants as necessary for businesses. The Sayer is a Mexican male 36, owner of two Mexican restaurants and a convenience store in a town called Pahrump, whose mayor proposed an official English ordinance. In a similar way, news article 21 in the San Francisco Chronicle also indicates the value immigrants have for employers in different sectors. This is emphasised by the informal noun raft indicating a large number followed by a listing with from...to to put forward the reasoning behind the demonstration/walkout of a "Day without Immigrants" in which the organisers hoped would show Americans how dependent they are on immigrant labor in a raft of industries, from restaurants, hotels and nursing homes to meatpacking, farms and construction. Example
(139) below however, gives a negative image of the relationship between employers and immigrants:

(139) The value of illegal immigrants to many employers is their fearful willingness to work for low pay in bad conditions.

The combination of using the noun value describing the worth of something that can be exchanged with the material verb work indicates the view held of illegal immigrants as a particular kind of resource, namely exchanging their labour for low pay in bad conditions. There is contradiction in the negative use of value in this example in relation to its positive meaning as something of worth that can be used in exchange. The Sayer of this extract is the author of the opinion article from which it is taken and claims to be in favour of a good immigration bill which he/she qualifies in the following way: must honor the nation's values and be sensible enough to work.

Example (140) from news article 4 in The New York Times shows the use of workers with limited proficiency in English affecting their ability to communicate:

(140) When Michael Miralgia retired and moved to this booming bedroom community last year, he found that the builders and landscapers working on his new home spoke so little English that he was unable to communicate with them.

So after his appointment this year to fill a vacancy on the town board, Mr Miralgia, 67, proposed an ordinance declaring English the official language of Pahrump.

The use of the adjective unable in combination with the verb "be" in the past tense was indicates a dichotomised situation that took place i.e. that no understanding was possible. The ability to communicate was removed as indicated by the prefix un-. Although the sentence also allows that the individuals spoke English, the emphasising adverb so with the indefinite determiner little indirectly justifies a scenario with existing impossibility of communication. It is significant to point out that the use of little permits room for subjective interpretation of degree i.e. what is necessary to understand and communicate, therefore, allowing a wide readership to empathise with this situation. Finally, the act of proposing the ordinance is presented as a direct consequence of the Sayer's personal experience with a group of low proficiency speakers. There is no reference in the article as to whether the workers were competent in their building and landscaping skills.
Summary and further considerations: speech act of Immigrants as a Labour Resource

Immigrants in the data are represented as a labour resource. In some examples they are seen as possessing qualities indicating their lower status (see also Santa Ana 2002:73; Said 1978:26), mainly through their willingness to perform hard work or tasks that are undesirable to those individuals established in the country. The Sayers of these attitudes are mainly those that do not oppose immigration, as in examples (132-133), (137) and (139). In examples (132) and (139), the Sayer (same article, same Sayer), states explicitly that it has to be a "good immigration bill". Example (138) establishes immigrants as possessing qualifications that cannot be found from the residents and thus elevates their status. The speaker in example (138) is a male restaurateur of Mexican origin. The group in focus is referred to as guest workers in example (132), although it is possible to assume an implicit reference to illegal workers. More specific reference to Mexicans and Hispanics is given in examples (133) and (137) respectively. Furthermore, an element of interdiscursivity is present in example (132) in the description of immigrant workers as prisoners and bereft of freedom, as the term shackled is usually associated to circumstances related to law or war. Example (136) refers to aliens in relation to legality as the central point of discussion. Example (139) refers only to illegal immigrants but in example (140) the group of workers are specified as builders and landscapers that speak very little English. The community affected by the appearance of immigrants in the job market, i.e. black Americans – in examples (134-135) – mainly refer to the cheap labour and hard work of the immigrants, the latter example includes a specific reference to Mexicans. In example (137), the Sayer that refers to or that "re-presents" (although a mental process verb is used recognize) the humanity of the Hispanics and their quality as hard working is President Bush. The reference to humanity can be related to Santa Ana's (2002) study which showed a tendency for dehumanisation of immigrants in the US.

Finally, while the other examples refer to the composition of the groups in question from the general based on legality to the more regional specific, example (131) adds an implicature of a set of features that exist to distinguish who is perceived as a real American. The different labels given to the groups in the examples of this section can be related to Appiah's (2005) study on available labels. This can also be linked to Saussure's (1972:113-114) view on language as a system of relationships of similarities and differences, in this case, expressed in terms of possession of certain characteristics. Example (131) also positions the immigrants (more specifically Hispanics in the article) as active agents in the labour market (the absence of the role of employers in this statement is interesting). Examples (134), (138) and (140)
show that immigrants have specific skills that are in demand. In contrast, example (139) makes explicit the interests of the employers and illegal immigrants that serve as factors for cooperation. This view of immigrants as cheap labour can be linked to Grin and Vaillancourt's study of the US in the 1990s, in which Hispanics that lived in states that had a large number of Spanish speakers such as Arizona, California, New York, earned 14% less than the white population in the area. The income gap to the white population was noted as even greater (24%) if the Hispanic individual did not know English (Grin and Vaillancourt 1999:16).

6.3 Summary of the discourse types of Loyalty and Efficiency

Bearing in mind the speech acts that were revealed from the text analysis, two discourse types can be distinguished namely the discourse type of Loyalty and the discourse type of Efficiency.

The discourse type of Loyalty is marked by integrative motivations and with collective concerns of national identity. Baker (2006:214-215) defines integrative language attitudes as a desire to communicate and be similar to the members of the target community, and are mainly concerned with identification. The discourse type of Loyalty contains 11 speech acts, namely Time, Obligation, Willingness, Help and English as Unifier. Also included are the speech acts connected to representations of the Other, namely Immigrants as Criminals, Immigrants as Large Quantities of Water, Immigrants as Harmful, Immigration as a Sovereignty Issue, Immigration Debate as Racial, and Immigration Debate as War. These representations indicate the means by which the Other is constructed and can be related to Connor's (2007) statement that loyalty in group formations cannot exist without identification of the Other.

The discourse type of Efficiency is mainly marked by instrumental reasons. Baker (2006:214-215) defines instrumental language attitudes as mainly individualistic and may be motivated by self-advancement or basic security. The discourse type of Efficiency contains five speech acts, namely English-Optional Services, Multilingualism as Cost, Health and Safety, and Opportunity. Moreover, immigrants are represented as a Labour Resource.

Although both discourse types refer to language as a tool to attain certain goals, they nevertheless differ. In the discourse type of Loyalty, language is a means for constructing a particular kind of national identity, whereas in the discourse type of Efficiency, the instrumental view of language is maintained since its function in the American society is also the goal. The discourse types indicate a tension between collective, integrative attitudes and more individualistic, instrumental attitudes to language which can be related to the individual and collective levels in Waever's (1993:25-26) societal security model.
6.4 Societal security and language policies

The issue of societal security and the language policies that are implemented on societies are significant in defining inter-group relations caused by what Hesler and Layton-Henry (1993:149), among others, call transnational migration. The discourse types of Loyalty and Efficiency indicate the attitudes in the public debate in the United States concerning the role of the English language in relation to societal security.

Societal security in the United States can be seen as having its starting point in Ager's (2001:75) concept of the 'image' of a country – in this case a country that has English as its main language of communication but which regards itself and is regarded, as described in Giddens (2001:256), as a "nation of immigrants". However, the speech acts of societal security expressed in the discourse types of Loyalty and Efficiency make apparent the perception of threat that English speakers in the United States have regarding the presence of large non-English speaking immigrant groups.

The speech acts that make up the discourse type of Loyalty are focused on the maintenance of national identity characterised through a common language and can be related to May (2005) in which communicating in a specific language activates identification with co-speakers. Insecurity by the dominant group in the data is established by the notion that the essential character of the state based on a shared language is under threat – a perception which is associated to Waever's (1993:23) description of societal security. The speech acts reflect the means by which the construction of the linguistic 'we' is expected to be maintained.

Furthermore, the results indicate that loyalty, in its different expressions, is an important factor in defining the situation of insecurity when groups are faced with large migrant collectives. Wolfe (1998:133) claims that patriotism is viewed as an American moral value, which may link manifestations of loyalty as qualifying characteristics for being considered "an American". Moreover, members' loyalties are triggered by arguments that the 'we' identity is threatened (see Buzan, Waever and de Wilde 1998:123) as shown in the data. The results further show that the emotion of loyalty is itself used in reproducing the collective 'we' through utilisation of hegemonic expressions which serve to reconstruct identity. There are indications of the view of loyalty as constructed in societal security issues taking on what Buzan, Waever and de Wilde (1998:139) call loyalty on the basis of Tönnies' Gesellschaft or association. In other words, by acquiring the English language and by performing certain acts in English as described in the data, the immigrant may be included into the in-group, thus possibly reinforcing an assimilative ideology for language policy making. This can be further
related to Cobarrubias' (1983:63-64) statement in which assimilation is one of four possible ideologies for language planning. These results are also linked to Ricento's (2000b:4) statement that the ideology of monolingualism in the US is related to notions of linguistic assimilation. The integrative/assimilative language attitudes in the data indicate a belief in incompatibility, in Buzan's (1993:43-44) terms, namely that there is a view of contesting identities in which the individual cannot hold two identities. In the findings, the American identity based on the English language is mainly given as mutually incompatible with any other linguistic identity brought by the immigrant. This collective, state-level image can be contrasted with the individualistic, instrumental approach (in this study, companies are included in this category) which supports Salzmann's (1993:194) claim that an individual can belong to several speech communities – therefore implying an absence of incompatibility between identities expressed through different languages.

Furthermore, the representations of the immigrant in the findings are negative therefore strengthening the boundaries between 'us' and 'them'. The speech acts representing the Other focus on threats related to border security and illegal presence. The speech acts deal with the need for more severe actions. The main referent group causing the threat are the illegal individuals with specific reference to Latin Americans. The dehumanising references to immigrants in the present data (cf. Santa Ana 2002), and the enhancement of immigrants' inferiority may serve as tools for creating a stronger societal security through solidarity. These factors may also provide a base for the justification of denial of minority or group-differentiated rights as defined by Kymlicka (1995:108-123) since these groups, by extension of their negative representation, are viewed as having what Van Evera (1994) calls malign intentions or even considered as non-humans (Santa Ana 2002; Said 1978) and as such, not entitled to rights. According to Romaine (1995:289-290), a change of language status e.g. through recognition, can affect attitudes towards the speakers of the language. It is possible to reverse Romaine's view based on the results of this study, and state that a negative perception of a particular group affects attitudes towards the languages spoken by the group as regards tolerance towards group members when they publicly express their cultural and linguistic difference, and the possible use of the particular language as a resource for the country.

Metaphors regarding immigrants and the immigration debate imply a negative force, often representing the immigrant as dehumanised or inferior and as something that needs to be contained since he/she is capable of destruction. Said's (1978:35-41) and Santa Ana's (2002:68-77) studies have also established the dehumanisation of immigrants in the US. In Mehan's study, the immigrant is regarded as an enemy and was used as a justification to
ignore human rights in California's approval of Proposition 187 for the exclusion of undocumented children from schools and medical assistance (Mehan 1997:249; see also Petterson 2003:6). This study also shows that the boundaries between the groups are constructed through the different signifiers if one bases on Saussure's (1972) network of relationships to create difference of meaning. The negative labelling of immigrants in the data through interdiscursive representations, for instance related to insects or water, may enhance justification for discriminatory measures. The immigrants are mainly represented as large collectives with little differentiation within the group identified as "immigrants". Also, as Santa Ana (2002) found in his study, the examples here show a dominating absence of reference to individuals.

Furthermore, the boundaries between 'us' and 'them' constructed in the contributions of immigrants that know English and are members of the American society, confirms to some extent Schmid's (2001:172) claim regarding the exclusive use of English in the society as a demonstration of loyalty to America. According to this investigation, knowledge of English is a factor that intensifies the friction between those that are established English-speaking citizens and the citizens or immigrants that do not know English. The data shows a dichotomising situation in which the majority/dominant group sees English as the only means for establishing a secure identity. The failure to demonstrate a contractual loyalty, as defined by Connor (2007), through language acquisition creates uncertainty among dominant English language speakers as regards the intentions of newcomers, which in turn makes difficult the recourse to trust for bridging group boundaries.

The speech acts of loyalty demonstrate aspects of Waever's view of identity as dynamic (Waever 1993:22) and as constituted by hierarchical relationships which change. This study has demonstrated that although many immigrants shift towards the attainment of English as their main language, cultural expressions of separateness, either in the formation of specific communities or in an increase of minority language presence in the public space and semi-public space may lead to intolerance. This is in line with Buzan's (1993:43, 45) claim that the size of the immigrant population and their impact in the social and political spheres may cause a change in tolerance levels of the dominant group regarding multiculturalism (see also Fishman 1972 regarding tolerance in a given society and language shift). Thus, although the findings indicate specific attitudes in favour of language shift and actual language shift taking place by the third generation, individual goals may affect the pattern of shift in the future if opportunity in the public space and semi-public space becomes possible in a language other than English.
One area that may influence language shift tendencies is business, which can be related to the efficient working of the capitalist market as taken up by Buzan (1993:51-55) under the concept of 'societal security'. The efficient working of multilingualism — in areas such as the provision of services by companies based on the notion of the free-market in which immigrants are seen as either a resource for cheap labour or as consumers, entails that separate communities may arise. Within these enclaves, it is possible to use a language other than English, in this case Spanish, as part of everyday communication in the public space, semi-public space and the private space. Thus, the Spanish community may be seen as moving towards what Buzan (1993) and Waever (1993) define as societies, namely large-scale self-supporting distinct groups. This is also in line with Ager's (2001:110-111) study of the motive of insecurity in which decisions of individuals are instrumentally based (see also Baker 2006) — which includes businesses in the findings of this study as these are focused on obtaining profits at the individual/single organisation level. These decisions create a change in circumstances so that some of the activities in some communities in the US require knowledge of Spanish rather than English or alternatively both languages. Thus, the active role that businesses take in using the free market for advancing their own interests may not always be compatible with the idea of forming a national identity based on a common language, and consequently may, as Buzan (1993:52-53) claims, result in governments taking political measures to reduce the effects of the market in order to strengthen the national identity of its citizens. This consequence is evident in the attempts by some government representatives to make English the official language in the United States.

Møller (2005:119-120) states that the achievement of security at one level may diminish security at another level. In the case of the US, the ideology of benign neglect on language issues, applied in certain periods, has mainly favoured English and its speakers, but can now be said to be questioned since Spanish speakers, as reflected in the data, are perceived as maintaining their language and not undergoing language shift. In a related approach, Lagerspetz (1998), who takes the autonomy of the individual as the basis for his argument, claims that the state must be active in choosing an official language and not leave it to the market forces since it is related to citizen participation in a democracy. As shown in this study, there is an indication of interdiscursivity in this matter, since democracy and other political issues related to national identity are transferred to form part of the responsibility of companies active within the liberal market. The illegal immigrant worker is also interdiscursively referred to as a prisoner of employers.
A further aspect is the tendency by members of the dominant group to view themselves at a disadvantage and in a position of being coerced by the minority groups to learn the language of these smaller groups – an emotion that is usually attached to minority communities in studies of language group contact. Grin (2006:84) writes that "a person's language learning (or non-learning) behaviour affects the value of another person's language skills". In the data this is shown by concerns of the Spanish language sharing the public space and the semi-public space that has been dominated by English. The speech acts in the discourse type of Efficiency, particularly those of Multilingualism as Cost, indicate an inclination away from mixed policy provisions (wherein only certain types of information are supplied in the minority languages). This aspect in the data reflects the opposing views held by Kloss (1971; as cited in Wiley 2000) of tolerance in US language policies and Wiley's (2000) view of US tendencies to monolingualism.

Individual interests for learning a language based on ambitions for social mobility or obtainment of citizenship may be seen as contributing to social cohesion since they entail the possible consequent maintenance of the role of English in the American society, and as such, can be said to affect societal security. This is in line with the idea of empowerment in the concept of 'human security' (CHS 2002-2003) as regards the possibility of participation and access to opportunity by the individual. Nevertheless, the data also shows that it is relevant to consider the actions taken by some members of the majority to push forward political measures that, if passed by the government, can negatively affect the targeted minority group as regards the categories of health, political and community security, as taken up in the UNHDR (1994:24-33). The situation as reflected in the data in this study is problematic since some of the immigrants are illegally in the country. The question of human security, however, still remains for both legal and illegal non-English speaking immigrants for instance in the speech act of Health and Safety. This factor may be significant if it is related to Paris' (2001:90) claim that the breadth of the human security concept allows nations to decide the threshold for minimum human security.

As indicated in the findings, granting minority rights e.g. in the provision of multilingual services, may lead to demands for a stronger expression of national identity by members of the dominant group. From this perspective, the demands to remove rights directly affecting the immigrant individual e.g. in their interaction with government officials, are argued as a means of enhancing the role of the English language in the society and strengthening the national identity as shown in the speech act of English as Unifier as well as reducing costs as in the case of the speech act of Multilingualism as Cost. This entails that the notion of human
security is related to Wæver, Buzan, Kelstrup and Lemaitre's (1993) view that social and economic issues can affect the security of a society. Seen from the perspective of those in favor of official English, increasing human security for immigrants is a contributing factor in (de)stabilising societal security (Tadjbakhsh 2005:2, 6; Tadjbakhsh 2009; Møller 2005:82, 102). However, this does not mean that this study claims that the individual, via human security, should be the main referent for security since the data also demonstrates that the collective identity is significant for societal security and is therefore also in agreement with Buzan, Wæver and de Wilde's (1998:35) claim of the state-level as a possible referent of security (large societal groups are also possible referents of security in this model) – established by perceptions of 'us' in relation to 'them', i.e. a division based on groups and collectivities rather than individuals. The identification of group belonging in this study is mainly expressed through the use of terms like Latinos, Hispanics, and (illegal) immigrants, which are contrasted to the notion of what an "American" is.

The findings show that there is tension between individual pursuits and collective motives formed by national identity. The expressions connected to human security, such as concerning the speech act of Health and Safety and the speech act of Opportunity, are linked to the well-being and advancement of the individual in his/her everyday life. This supports Tadjbakhsh's (2009) view that security should be redefined to take into consideration the individual's subjective experience of security in their everyday life both from the point of view of the majority and the minority group member. In contrast, those speech acts based on the maintenance of English for national identification are associated to a more abstract notion, namely what Buzan (1991:70) calls the idea of state. In the data, this view is expressed by members of the dominant group that identify with the use of the English language in the American society. Consequently, the study shows that demands by the dominant group for expressions of loyalty on behalf of immigrant populations to guarantee societal security may affect the security of newcomers, this is shown particularly in the speech act of Health and Safety. Of significance in this context are Articles 1-3 of the 1948 Universal Declaration of Human Rights (UDHR) in which "All human beings are born free and equal in dignity and rights" (Article 1); and "Everyone is entitled to all the rights and freedoms set forth in this Declaration, without distinction of any kind, such as race, colour, sex, language, religion, political or other opinion, national or social origin, property, birth or other status" (Article 2), as well as Article 3 of the same declaration stating that "Everyone has the right to life, liberty and security of person". It is therefore suggested from the data that the discourses of societal
security need to be considered in relation to human rights (see Skutnabb-Kangas, Phillipson and Rannut 1995:2 for defence of implementation of linguistic human rights as basic rights).

Additionally, actions to strengthen sovereignty through securing impermeable borders are significant for security studies focusing on language since ineffective measures in this area may contribute to perceptions of threat due to growing numbers of immigrants that speak a different language, particularly Hispanics as shown in the data, which is also in line with Buzan's (1991:106; Buzan 1993:43, 45) studies. Hispanics may be perceived as particularly threatening since they speak a language that is dominant in most of the countries on the US southern border. The study indicates that human security, as a motivation of migration, constitutes a significant part in societal security in a country that is affected today by voluntary or involuntary migration.

Finally, the different speech acts and discourse types from this study may be seen as a guide for language policy makers and aims to complement Ager's (2001) study describing individuals' and collectivities' motives, attitudes and goals towards language(s) by focusing on the speech acts that can be seen as constituting Ager's motive of insecurity. The results from this study indicate that at the level of insecurity two discourse types, namely that of Loyalty and Efficiency, have significant similarities to – and features of – ideologies singled out by Cobarrubias (1983) namely assimilation and pluralism and are also in line with Ager's motives of integration as a social phenomenon or instrumentality as primarily an economic issue (Ager 2001:124) but to which issues of health and safety can be added.

The different speech acts resulting from this study indicate attitudes that can be related to Kaplan and Baldauf's (1997:216) results in which languages are seen as competing or co-existing based on their use, function and status. In general terms, it is possible to state that the discourse type of Loyalty is mainly marked by competition due to integrative motives affecting language status and ideas of a zero-sum situation between languages. Thus, attitudes related to status are mainly identifiable within the discourse type of Loyalty due to a hegemonic monolingual view of the US, particularly in public language usage. Furthermore, the debate surrounding the use of a language other than English to sing the national anthem indicates the hegemonic position of English for expressions of loyalty. In this case, language policy makers also need to take into account societal security and its relation to dual identity or hyphenated identities held by immigrants.

The discourse type of Efficiency is marked by attitudes based on use and function e.g. social mobility, cost, or as action taken by companies to use Spanish as an effective tool for obtaining Spanish speaking customers. The motives of immigrant individuals for learning
English are mainly located in the speech act of Opportunity and can be related to Ager's study in which status influences choices of language shift based on professional advancement (Ager 2001:146-147). The maintenance of the mother tongue especially by those groups constituting first generation immigrants may be based on the possibility of using their first language in the job market within their speech community, especially Spanish speaking communities, due to their numbers, as shown in the findings. In this respect, Crystal points out the views held by pro-official English supporters who state that it is difficult to decide when official status should be attributed based on numbers and that for this reason only English should have official status in the US (Crystal 1997:122-130). Further, those favouring official English in the data are focused on goals of defending identity which according to Ager (2001:136-138) are reflections of insecurity.

Arguments of costs by the dominant group in the findings can be linked to Grin and Vaillancourt's (1999:10) point of departure for language policies in which states, like firms, are faced with making choices of distributing limited resources. According to Ager, the goals of powerful communities are of social cohesion and in some cases the efficient running of the state by ignoring social diversity (Ager 2001:177-178). Similar attitudes are evident in the speech act of Multilingualism as Cost. The discourse type of Loyalty shows that some pro-official English supporters do not recognise societal multilingualism as an option. The interests of the minority – as seen from the majority – are put forward as mainly concerned with issues of rights related to information and safety or integration in the direction of the powerful, host community.

The discourse types thus indicate that several of Ager's motives come into play at the level of insecurity and that these are guided by arguments of loyalty or efficiency in the face of a threatening picture. In addition, the findings show that the motive of insecurity needs to include the actions of companies operating in the liberal market as their interests may conflict with the goals of cultural communities that have, what Smolicz (1995:236-237) defines as language as a core value, and may also lead to what Ricento (2000a; 2000b) calls social and economic gate keeping actions through language policy, which may, in turn, give rise to lessened human security.

These results are important for language policy makers, if one takes account of Spolsky's (2004:5, 9) model in which language policy makers have to take into consideration language use and the linguistic choices made by the individual, as well as the beliefs, ideologies and practices that exist in a community for a policy to be successful. The impact of instrumental aspects from the perspective of individuals (including companies) on societal security as
shown in the discourse type of Efficiency indicates its importance in issues of social cohesion and group identity by its contribution in establishing new communities. These aspects are particularly significant since they affect the everyday life of individuals in the public space and the semi-public space and are one of the most visible effects related to group formations, and as such, have a prominent role in forming perceptions. Also, the influence of instrumental use of language in creating communities and in individuals changing affiliation to the dominant community as demonstrated in the data, reinforces the view held by Waever (1995) and Buzan, Waever and de Wilde (1998; Buzan 1991) of identity as a social construct in security studies.

The discourse types also reflect issues of rights and bring forward the question whether minority immigrant groups in the US should have the same rights as indigenous groups if they reach a defined minimum number of speakers. In this context, it is worth bearing in mind that some of the individuals are in the country illegally, which entails that estimates of numbers of language speakers will inevitably be inaccurate and under the actual level. According to Patten and Kymlicka (2003:30), group-differentiated rights only come into effect when a group has a certain number of speakers. The 1994 United Nations Human Rights Committee includes immigrants and refugees in their definition of the rights of minority groups to enjoy, profess and use their minority language (UNHRC as cited in Spolsky 2004:120-121). The data in this study does not indicate that Spanish speakers – as the group with the most reference as regards the issue of official English in the United States – are demanding polyethnic rights, as defined by Kymlicka (1995:30-31), by virtue of their ethnolinguistic identity and the requirement of visible expression of their culture without discrimination. However, the speech acts of the discourse type of Loyalty nevertheless indicate a tendency to refer to Spanish and the knowledge or lack of knowledge of English as boundary-markers distinguishing 'us' from 'them'. A further tendency is the suggestion for assimilation accomplished by a proposal for removal or rejection of norm-and-accommodation rights as revealed in the speech acts of the discourse type of Efficiency e.g. as argued through costs and health and safety risks. These suggested measures may also be seen as being in opposition to the 1948 United Nations Universal Declaration of Human Rights, namely Article 3 "Everyone has the right to life liberty and security of person" and Article 25:

(25/1) Everyone has the right to a standard of living adequate for the health and well-being of himself and of his family, including food, clothing, housing and medical care and necessary social services, and the right to security in the event of unemployment, sickness,
disability, widowhood, old age or other lack of livelihood in circumstances beyond his control. 

(25/2) Motherhood and childhood are entitled to special care and assistance. All children, whether born in or out of wedlock, shall enjoy the same social protection (UDHR 1948).

In sum, the discourse types of Loyalty and Efficiency indicate the beliefs regarding the role of English and other languages in the United States and their relation to societal security. The discourse types are mainly securitising moves since they are speech acts in which immigrants, and the effect their presence has on the role of English in the US, are constructed as existential threats. The discourse type of Loyalty makes evident those perceptions related to the means of attaining and defending the national identity of the United States. The discourse type of Efficiency carries the view of language as a tool for the state to communicate with individuals within its borders, as a means of achieving better economic conditions for individuals and businesses, as well as the possibility of resources of foreign language competence for state and government agencies operating in international arenas. Both discourse types mark ongoing social changes reflected in issues of language use. Language policy makers need to be able to consider the attitudes as securitising moves expressed in the discourse types and take account of their relation to societal security for successful policy implementation in the face of transnational migration.
7 Concluding remarks

The main purpose of this investigation has been to study how societal security is present in the attitudes expressed in the newspaper debate regarding official English in the United States. The perception of threat constitutes the focal point and approach to the data. The investigation of the speech acts of societal security in relation to language and immigration (including the representation of immigrants), and the establishment of discourse types related to societal security are the overarching goals of this study. The results from the study are aimed at contributing with tools by which to approach language issues in societal security decisions.

The aim has not been to generalise the observations to all cases of contact between different language communities, but rather to indicate a point of departure for interdisciplinary studies of the same kind, mainly of attitudes, on other countries. In other words, future studies (qualitative and quantitative) can use the discourse types (securitising moves constructing existential threats through speech acts) from this investigation as a point from which to approach the issue of societal security as regards language status in other countries. The choice of the United States as the case study is due to its multicultural/multilingual composition and the dominant role of the English language in the country as well as the fact that the immigration debate is taking place in this environment. A further reason for choosing the United States is the position of English as a global language and, as such, considered by many as constituting a threat to smaller languages rather than itself being threatened.

The study has shown that two discourse types dominate the debate, namely the discourse type of Loyalty and the discourse type of Efficiency. Each of these discourse types include speech acts related to the role of English in the American society, the available representations of the immigrant Other, and the immigration phenomenon. The discourse types constitute securitising moves. Both discourse types use language as a tool for attaining different goals. In the discourse type of Loyalty, language is a means related to securing national identity carrying integrative motives, whereas in the discourse type of Efficiency, language is a means for obtaining a functional end, that is, the efficient use of language as a communicating instrument. These discourse types can serve as tools for language policy makers to take account of the beliefs (cf. Spolsky 2004) that are prevalent in the US as these are significant for achieving a successful language policy implementation.

A further result is that the speech acts also relate to intervention in the functioning of the liberal marketplace. Businesses are seen to contribute to preventing the interest of learning
English by supplying services in other languages, particularly Spanish. Also, the labour market is further identified as employing Latinos, which if based on "push" and "pull" factors (Ager 2001), contributes to a flow of immigration, including illegal immigration. Finally, the Spanish speakers are seen as forming parallel speech communities in which English is not a requirement for participation due to the establishment of Spanish as a new cultural capital, and as such, constituting a legitimate competence.

The influence of the economic sector on language acquisition processes entails that policy makers need to not only take account of the speech acts in the discourse type of Loyalty but also those of Efficiency. These two discourse types may work in opposition to each other as regards social cohesion at a state level since the idea of choice, according to Grin and Vaillancourt (1999:10), relies on utility maximisation by individuals or groups. Further studies may serve to establish if the indication from this study is present in other societal security investigations as regards the role of language in ethnolinguistic contact situations.

A further aspect is the notion that multilingualism is portrayed as incompatible to the maintenance of national identity with language as a core value. The dominating implication from the newspaper articles included in this study is that there is a zero-sum situation, rather than the view that Spanish as a large international language in combination with English may contribute to a stronger United States (although this aspect is taken up in a few of the examples). In relation to this, a comparison can be made to countries adopting English as an official language or its increasing usage in different domains in those countries, and the attitudes concerning Spanish in the US. In other words, while knowledge of English is viewed as a comparative advantage in the outer circle and expanding circle countries (Kachru 1992:356-358) for global participation, in the US, knowledge of Spanish is not perceived by some as offering advantages to larger markets in South America. Instead, the Spanish language is interpreted as a sign of threat and lack of loyalty of immigrants to the United States by pro-official English supporters. The case of the southern states is particularly interesting since they are geographically connected to Mexico and therefore the region may be seen as containing potential economic markets. This is in line with Cummins (1995) claim that the focus on education towards monolingualism and language shift in the US compromises the country's national security and international trade possibilities.

Based on the results obtained, it is argued here that in light of the current transmigration numbers and the compression of time for global communication, language policy makers need to depart from the point of sustainability of multilingual societies rather than assuming traditional trends of linguistic assimilation. Thus, due to a successful policy of national
identity during the last 200 hundred years based on monolingualism as normality and multilingualism as an exception for countries due to unavoidability, public justifications for granting language rights must focus on instrumentality as both discourse types show that language is seen as a means to attain goals. This is in line with Lagerspetz's (1998) argument that instrumental value of language for the individual is sufficient to establish grounds for language rights. Thus, language policy makers should try to combine societal security, namely collective identity, with human security interests since the data shows that instrumental objectives can create parallel communities. The American case further demonstrates that it is not possible to eliminate the use of new languages in the public space and the semi-public space when linked to mass migration. A further aspect is that if the numbers of a specific language group are significant, and in circumstances where both continual replenishment takes place either through temporary or permanent migration, seasonal visits or through telecommunications, a community may develop in which the immigrant language is dominant for social interactions even though the members of this community may still want to belong to the United States. An important factor from this perspective is therefore that language policy making should take into account the effects of a free market ideology.

Also, the American case specifically shows that identity is constructible so that most immigrants through time and participation take on an American identity or consider the US as their permanent residence. It is necessary to point out that this American identity may find new ways of manifestation e.g. as in the case of singing the national anthem in Spanish or native language maintenance in spite of a long term intention to remain in the country. Nevertheless, language shift towards English may continue to occur and can be linked to Schmid's (2001:10) statement that the allowance of linguistic variability is the immediate policy of a culturally pluralistic society that has assimilation as a goal in the long term. Therefore, it is suggested that in the American context sentiments of symbolic belonging, i.e. of identity as intrinsic, are in fact a consequence of instrumental use of language which through long-term participation and interaction allows the individual inclusion into specific communities.

Furthermore, it is argued that societal security is an emotion that needs to be confirmed by demonstrations of loyalty. Arguments for a particular cause e.g. in this case, the role of English in the US, become a concern of the collective 'we' through repetition – constructed in the present debate or with a basis on historical practices – to ultimately create, as Fairclough (2001) states, an ideological condition. The diversity of the backgrounds of the individuals repeating the ideology strengthens both the cause and the trustworthiness of those that put
forward opinions through a notion of a heterogeneous collectivity. Alternative views become undermined or unacceptable by their invisibility or almost non-existence in the discussion e.g. such as the general absence of the attitudes of those that participated in singing the American national anthem in Spanish in the data, an action that can indicate an expression of alternative American patriotism. Visibility and repetition are important for acceptance of an argument as a security issue in the public debate and provide the basis of securitisation through ideological securitising moves. Therefore, although societal security is not an aggregative of the security of individuals, it is at the micro level of individuals' repetition and expressed acceptance that manifestations of belonging to a collective identity, as forwarded in the attitudes in the data, become an ideology which when challenged becomes securitised. It is at this point that language as an instrument for social participation, and as an important tool for the security of the individual and relations of power, becomes significant and, through collective repetitive practice and belief, a core value.

Finally bearing in mind the above statements, it is suggested that language policy makers need to relate to four factors, namely societal security as identified through collective identity, individual/human security; human rights and their relation to language rights or in Skutnabb-Kangas, Phillipson and Rannut's (1995:1-2) term, LHR, for inclusion in basic human rights; and changing linguistic demography. This will be further discussed below from the findings of this study namely on issues of language shift, assimilation and singing the American national anthem in a language other than English. Although some aspects can be applied to indigenous peoples' rights, this will not be discussed here since the focus of this study is on the discussion regarding the status of English due to the presence of immigrant languages in the US.

First, a few considerations will be put forward in order to contextualise the arguments in a theoretical basis. Based on previous studies (e.g. Fishman 1966, 1991; Pavlenko and Blackledge 2003), it is possible to state a link between language and the identity of an individual. Further, individuals are socialised into the rules and conventions that are practiced in the community to which each individual is born (cf. Réaume 1994). These rules are transmitted through language and allow the individual membership in the group, therefore, in Bolinger's (1975) words, also offering them security. In consequence, it is possible to link access to a first language to Articles 2 and 3 of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights (1948). The aspect of universality in this line of thinking entails that all humans are entitled to a language, all have equal right to a language and these rights, once obtained are inalienable in accordance to the preamble of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights. The speech act
of Time brings forward an issue for language policy makers, namely the idea of language shift. Furthermore, the presence of notions of assimilation for instance in the speech acts of Obligation, Willingness, English as Unifier, and Opportunity are problematic from a rights perspective. If a right is universal and based on the above arguments of the link between language, society, security and identity, every individual has a right to their first language. Thus some of the attitudes expressed in the data demand, imply or assume something that is not morally acceptable from a rights perspective, namely that individuals are expected or required to assimilate or shift languages.

In connection to the United States and the official English debate in this study, it is possible to deduce that the citizens in the country have a universal right to use English within its territory. In the findings of the data this translates particularly into the speech acts of Obligation and Help (awarded towards immigrants to learn English), as well as the fear forwarded in the speech act of English-Optional Services. These speech acts bring into consideration that immigrants entering a sovereign territory where inhabitants speak a different language have a duty to learn the language of the country, since the citizens of that country have a right to continue to speak their language, in this case, English. It is possible to nevertheless decide to waive knowledge of English to certain groups but this would then be a concession of a privilege within the US territory. To some extent this may even be applied to the privilege of using public financing for education in immigrant minority languages. It is necessary to point out that this does not deal with whether immigrants have the right to learn their mother tongue or to have basic education in it, rather the argument here is mainly focused on the inalienable right the individual has to his/her identity given through their mother tongue.

A language policy maker further needs to deal with the problem of citizenship and the issue of the language in which the national anthem should be sung in. Once the individual has acquired American citizenship, do they not then own the right to express their patriotism to their new country in their bilingual capacity? The findings in the data indicate that some attitudes expressed that the anthem is only to be sung in English. However, these new citizens also have inalienable rights to their first language if one accepts the argument put forward regarding identity, security and society and thus have the right to sing the anthem in Spanish, given that they own a right to express patriotism based on their new citizenship. An argument against this standpoint is that the anthem is a collective "property" and represents an English speaking state. This argument would however presuppose that once the anthem is sung in Spanish it cannot be sung in English, therefore also assuming a zero-sum thinking. Another
aspect is that it assumes society and collective identity as fixed. One of the main aspects of societal security, as defined by Waever (1993), is that it is perceived as fixed but due to its constructed nature it is also changing and changeable.

Therefore, in light of the considerations above, it is suggested that language policy makers in the US take into consideration the relationship between societal security, individual/human security, human rights and changing linguistic demography.

A possible weakness in the present study is that the analysis of data was carried out across several articles without considering the articles as single whole units. Thus comments related to how the articles are built up internally have not been accounted for in this study. Instead, the focus has been on trying to distinguish patterns of speaking which may be evident in texts written by different authors and incorporated in different newspapers. A point that could have increased the validity of the results is to have increased the time span of the period from which the articles were selected. In other words, several short periods would have contributed to establishing a historical perspective to the speech acts and discourse types. However, these factors can be taken into consideration in future studies. Further studies can also try to combine different sources of data e.g., interviews and surveys to see if the same speech acts appear both in the United States and other countries. Also, an analysis of Spanish language or other minority language newspapers in the US may indicate further factors regarding societal security in the United States due to the different language target audience.

An interesting aspect for further investigation would be to compare the speech acts and discourse types of societal security in countries in which English has different functions and status such as India and Sweden since national identity construction in relation to language may be different in these countries. In addition, due to the results indicating the influence of economy on societal security in relation to language acquisition by immigrants of the language of the host country, it would be interesting to analyse the speech acts directly related to the formation of separate immigrant communities e.g. in Germany and France, in which language and economy are taken as contributing and inter-related factors. Connected to this, it is also of significance to investigate the role of the discourse types of Loyalty and Efficiency in countries that are experiencing or have experienced ethnic conflicts. These studies would give further insight into understanding the mechanisms of language as an issue in societal security investigations and serve as a guide for language policy makers.

Finally, taking into account Grin's (2006:88) statement that the cost of using several languages in a given country is largely unknown, a study in the area of costs of societal multilingualism would contribute to determining the possible value of actions regarding
maintenance, reduction or elimination of language diversity in a state. Therefore, a future study of a situation in which multilingualism is a win-win situation rather than a zero-sum situation – as shown in this thesis – both as an investigation of the actual state of affairs in a country or as perceived and given through attitudes, would be interesting for establishing the viability of successful societal multilingualism. This suggestion is based on the view of languages as resources for inter-cultural communication which can benefit not only relations of peace but also contribute to economic benefits for individuals, communities and states.
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