

Representation and Legitimization in Political Discourse: The Campaign against Bilingual Education

Mai Yamagami
University of Wisconsin

James W. Tollefson
International Christian University

In many university reading and discussion classes, students are taught to critically examine logical arguments and the use of evidence in persuasive texts. Although these skills are important in reading and writing, many persuasive texts, including common forms of political discourse, rely on discursive processes that routinely violate the standards of logic and scientific discourse. To analyze such texts, students should develop skills in critical discourse analysis (CDA). This article examines two important processes in CDA: representation and legitimization. Examples from the campaign against bilingual education in the United States demonstrate how analysis of representation and legitimization offers students useful tools for analyzing persuasive texts and for understanding the structure and impact of political discourse.

In an earlier article in *LRB* (Tollefson & Yamagami, 2008), we examined certain limitations of logical arguments in persuasive texts. Focusing specifically on the topic of race and racism, we argued that asking students in reading and discussion classes to analyze the logical and scientific basis for racism is incomplete. Although such analysis helps students develop important skills in writing and argumentation (e.g., recognizing logical fallacies, using appropriate evidence, carefully defining terms), it does not address important discursive processes that often play a powerful role in persuasion. Effective persuasion is not only a result of logical and scientific arguments; it is also a result of identifiable discursive processes such as *representation* and *legitimization*.

These processes are especially important in public discussion and debate about controversial topics of public policy. In emotional and divisive forms of political communication (Kaid, 2004), persuasive texts may routinely violate the standards of logical and scientific discourse. “Straw man” arguments, for example, are frequently and effectively used in political campaigns, despite their fallacy in logic. It is for this reason that college students are often required to learn about the techniques of propaganda (Larson, 1989). Yet in addition to techniques of propaganda, persuasion also functions at the discursive level, and therefore students should develop skills in discourse analysis of persuasive texts, specifically the skill of making explicit the often implicit forms of representation and legitimization that may be central to political persuasion.

In this article, we focus on one example of a controversial topic of public policy: the debate over bilingual education in the United States. We begin by briefly explaining the important concepts of representation and legitimization, which are central to some forms of critical discourse analysis (CDA) (van Dijk, 1993a, 1993b). Then we examine examples of political texts generated by the movement against bilingual education in California. These examples are selected from written and spoken texts produced by Ron Unz, the leader of the largely successful movement to end most bilingual education programs in California’s public schools. In particular, we examine texts from the 1998 campaign for Proposition 227, which

Representation and Legitimization

effectively banned most forms of bilingual education in California. The Proposition 227 campaign is important because it played a major role in reshaping the discourse of language policy in education in the United States; indeed, many of the representations that were central to that campaign have become widely accepted among all sides in the ongoing debates about language policy. Finally, we suggest that analysis of representation and legitimization may be productively incorporated into reading and discussion classes.

Theoretical Framework: Representation and Legitimization

Our analysis of the discourse of the campaign against bilingual education in California draws primarily on representation theory (van Dijk, 1990) and the concept of legitimization (Chilton, 2004). “Representations” are part of “social knowledge” (or “social cognition”), which refers to beliefs and attitudes about the world that are shared by individual members of social groups. Shared representations about race, ethnicity, class, and national identity are especially important in political communication. Some social groups in the United States, for example, are distinguished in part by their shared representations of “American,” “immigrant,” “English,” “Spanish,” “Hispanic,” and other socially salient categories about race, ethnicity, class, and nationality. Within a group sharing a set of representations, individuals understand particular events by drawing on their “knowledge” of these representations. For example, monolingual English speakers in a bar or tavern in the United States may view Spanish speakers in that setting as rude, inconsiderate, or threatening, a judgment based in part on the social representation of Spanish speakers as “refusing to learn or to use English” (a common but empirically inaccurate belief [Rumbaut, Massey, & Bean, 2006]). Many forms of political communication (including campaign debates, newspaper editorials, public speeches, political advertising, and press releases) articulate specific social representations, drawing on the target audience’s shared knowledge of these representations to gain public support for specific policies or candidates, while also spreading these social representations as part of the effort to shape public opinion.

Chilton (2004) argues that political communication includes implicit visions of a national culture that political actors articulate. Articulating such social visions is central to the process of legitimization, which is a crucial component of political communication. *Legitimization* refers to positive self-representations, which seek to “position” political actors in relation to opponents. In the campaign against bilingual education, for example, advocates of California’s Proposition 227 banning most bilingual education represented themselves as the true voice of powerless Spanish-speaking parents and children. It was this representation, in part, that “legitimized” their opposition to bilingual education, by undermining opposition claims that supporters of Proposition 227 were anti-immigrant, anti-Latino, or racist. *Delegitimization*, on the other hand, involves negative representations of others (such as political opponents). Some techniques of delegitimization include “the use of ideas of difference and boundaries, and speech acts of blaming, accusing, insulting, etc.” (Chilton, 2004, p. 46). In the campaign against bilingual education, English for the Children (the leading advocacy group against bilingual education) sought to delegitimize supporters of bilingual education by accusing them of seeking personal financial gain from public funding of bilingual programs.

Legitimization and delegitimization are closely connected with representation. As Chilton (2004) points out, “delegitimization can manifest itself in acts of negative other-[re]presentation,” while legitimization may involve “positive self-[re]presentation” (p. 47).

Representation and Legitimization

Central to the political discourse of the anti-bilingual education campaign has been the successful formation and spread of a complex set of social representations which form a coherent and easily remembered vision of the social world of language in the United States. It is the wide acceptance of this social vision (with its system of social representations of the Spanish and English languages, Spanish speakers and English speakers, immigrants, Americans, bilingual teachers and researchers, and opponents of bilingual education) that underlay the passage of Proposition 227 banning most bilingual education in California. Moreover, this simple but powerful social vision has persisted long after the successful campaign for Proposition 227 ended.

Social Representations in the Campaign against Bilingual Education

This section examines the main social representations implicit in the campaign against bilingual education in California. Examples are drawn from the discourse of English for the Children, especially its leader and major spokesman, Ron Unz. Texts include the 1998 Proposition 227 initiative statement promoted by English for the Children (English for the Children, 1997), published articles authored by Ron Unz, and public interviews. (See the appendix for the list of texts analyzed here.)

The main representations in the Proposition 227 campaign include Spanish-speaking parents (and children); bilingual education programs in California schools; bilingual education teachers and researchers (most of whom supported bilingual education during Proposition 227 debates); and the role of the English language in American society. Based on detailed analysis of selected texts, the major social representations implicit in the campaign against bilingual education may be summarized as a set of claims about these participants (Yamagami, 2008).

Spanish-Speaking Parents Oppose Bilingual Education

In much of the campaign against bilingual education, Latino parents are represented as opposed to bilingual education. This representation played an important role in legitimizing the supporters of Proposition 227, whose self-representation was that they spoke for “voiceless” parents; the theme also delegitimized those who argued that the initiative was racist in nature (Crawford, 1998). A key example of this claim was in the statement of support for the initiative posted on the campaign website of English for the Children:

Sample 1 (from Text 1)

Latino parents want their children to learn English. Last year's survey by the Center for Equal Opportunity showed that Latinos overwhelmingly rate learning English as the top educational goal for their children, and by 4-1 favor their children learning English as soon as possible rather than learning Spanish before English ("bilingual education"). Adult immigrants are also eager to learn English (English courses are the top advertiser on Spanish language TV).

By citing a survey conducted by the Center for Equal Opportunity, the statement gave a sense of authority to the claim that Latino parents oppose bilingual education. Although the Center's name evokes the image of a government agency or a research center, in fact the Center for Equal Opportunity is a conservative organization founded and chaired by Linda Chavez, a

right-wing leader of the movement against bilingual education and affirmative action, former president of the English-only lobbying group U.S. English, and a political appointee during the Reagan and George H. W. Bush administrations. Sample 1 is also noteworthy because it represents “bilingual education” as “learning Spanish before English,” which (though inaccurate) may have helped to mobilize voters who believe that learning English should be the priority for immigrant children.

Bilingual Education has Failed

Although Sample 1 represents bilingual education as teaching Spanish before English, a more common representation in the campaign against bilingual education is that it is an ineffective program that is supposed to teach English. Indeed, a central claim of the Proposition 227 campaign was that bilingual education has failed to teach English. This claim rests on two implicit claims: (a) The goal of bilingual education is that students learn English. (b) Students are not taught English in bilingual programs. These simple claims were a key component of the Proposition 227 campaign strategy of English for the Children, which usually defined the concept of bilingual education as an approach to teaching English. Sample 2, for example, represents the goal of bilingual education as follows: “[immigrant] children becoming fluent and literate in English [...] is the official goal of the current system [i.e., bilingual education].” That is, bilingual education is an approach for English language teaching, rather than a mode of education in which students learn academic subjects and develop competence in two languages.

Sample 2 (from Text 1)

Immigrant education is a complete failure in California. Some 1.3 million California public school children – 23% of the total – are now classified as not proficient in English. Over the past decade, the number of these mostly Latino immigrant children has more than doubled. California's future depends on these children becoming fluent and literate in English, and this is the official goal of the current system, centered on use of native language instruction, with English being introduced to children only in later grades (so-called “bilingual education”). Yet each year only about 5% of school children not proficient in English are found to have gained proficiency in English. Thus, the current system of language education has an annual failure rate of 95%.

Sample 2 also equates bilingual education with “immigrant education,” which suggests that bilingual education is solely for immigrants, thereby excluding non-immigrant children such as those in two-way bilingual programs. The text displays yet another redefinition of bilingual education as a program of giving native language instruction *instead of* English instruction. In 1997, in a *Los Angeles Times* article authored by Ron Unz, bilingual education was defined in yet another way: as a system of “Spanish-only” bilingual education.

After defining bilingual education and its goals, the final part of Sample 2 presents statistical data: “the current system of language education has an annual failure rate of 95%.” The “annual failure rate of 95%” was derived from the Annual Language Census conducted by the California Department of Education (CDE) (2007). The Annual Language Census shows the number and percentage of students redesignated from Limited-English-Proficient (LEP) status to Fluent-English-Proficient (FEP) status since the last census. The

Representation and Legitimization

“redesignation rate” for the year 1996-97 was 6.7%, which included all LEP and FEP students in the state, regardless of the type of program in which they were enrolled. In 1997-1998, only 29.1% of LEP students received bilingual instruction, while the majority of the students received some form of ESL instruction primarily in English or were mainstreamed without any language instruction services. Indeed, because more pupils were in ESL or mainstream English-only classes than in bilingual education, the CDE redesignation rate did not provide any concrete information about the success or failure of bilingual education. Thus in Sample 2, English for the Children actively manipulated statistical data to produce a simple but powerful claim represented as an objective factual statement, namely that “bilingual programs have an annual failure rate of 95%.” The claim of 95% failure was repeatedly presented in the media, such as in Unz’s article in *City Journal* titled “Nonsense in Any Language,” in which he represented bilingual education as teaching primarily in the native language, and he claimed that “only about 5% learn English by year’s end, implying an annual failure rate of 95%” (Text 2).

In sum, four strategies were employed for representing bilingual education as a failure in California: (1) multiple redefinitions of the key concept of bilingual education; (2) highly selective manipulation of information; (3) production of a simple and strong claim represented as a factual statement; and (4) repetitive presentation of the claim in media discourse. In some media texts, all four strategies were employed (e.g., Text 3). In Chilton’s terms, these strategies were an effective effort to delegitimize bilingual education.

Yet because the process of data manipulation was remarkably simple, the potential for rebuttal was significant, especially in a campaign where the opponents of Proposition 227 included many well known researchers in second language acquisition (SLA) and bilingual education who lived and worked in California. In fact, many educational specialists pointed out fraudulent arguments and misleading evidence during the campaign (e.g., Crawford, 1998). Thus the possibility of rebuttal posed a serious threat to the legitimacy of the proponents of Proposition 227. One question facing the anti-bilingual education campaign, therefore, was how to maintain legitimacy when opponents could demonstrate that Proposition 227’s most prominent supporters were deliberately misleading the public. To deal with this problem, the Proposition 227 campaign sought to discredit its opponents.

Bilingual Teachers and Researchers Cannot Be Trusted

Highly negative representations of bilingual educators and SLA researchers can be found throughout the Proposition 227 campaign. Indeed, the central strategy for delegitimizing opponents of the initiative was to accuse them of self-interest. This strategy appeared in many texts, such as Sample 3, authored by Ron Unz, who used the first-person pronoun to refer to his efforts against bilingual education:

Sample 3 (from Text 2)

The teachers and administrators who receive more than \$320 million per year poured into California’s bilingual education programs lobby hard to keep their funding. By contrast, even though public opinion polls have consistently shown that Hispanic parents oppose this system by over 80 percent, most immigrant parents don’t carry much political weight because they don’t vote.

But this year I began a campaign for a ballot initiative that would require that children be taught English as soon as they begin school...

Representation and Legitimization

Reassured by the strong pro-immigrant credentials of the campaign leadership, many Democrats have given our measure enthusiastic support. The only public opposition to the measure has come from trade associations of bilingual educators, a few left-wing Hispanic groups such as MALDEF and MECHA, and some state Republican Party leaders who have denounced the initiative as “divisive” in a frantic and misguided effort to win back immigrant voters driven away by the Golden State GOP’s anti-immigrant stand.

In the first paragraph of Sample 3, the teachers and administrators who work in bilingual education were represented as the beneficiaries of public funding of bilingual programs. The figure of \$320 million was the estimated total state funding for all of bilingual education. That is, Unz claimed that it was the teachers and administrators (not the students) who “receive” that money. Sample 3 also vividly suggests that this money was the primary reason bilingual educators and administrators supported bilingual education. Moreover, the lump sum of \$320 million suggested that bilingual education was not a small and insufficiently funded segment of public education, but a lucrative market where a closed circle of professionals pocket tax money under the guise of working for minority students.

Sample 3 also contains representations of other major actors in the campaign: Latinos, other politicians, and Unz himself. Immigrant parents (presented as interchangeable with “Hispanic parents”) are represented as politically powerless and without public voice (i.e., powerless Latinos). Next Unz himself appears in the text as a subject (“But this year I began a campaign for a ballot initiative that would require that children be taught English”). Here, Unz is represented as the voice of the voiceless. This sentence also contains a significant omission. The phrase “a ballot initiative that would require that children be taught English” conceals the defining feature of the initiative: Proposition 227 would require that children be taught only *in* English. This omission of the preposition ‘in’ makes the statement appear much less controversial and therefore more acceptable to a larger segment of voters than would otherwise be the case. The phrase “the strong pro-immigrant credentials of the campaign leadership” also reinforced the representation of Unz as the voice of powerless Latinos. The mention of “enthusiastic support” from “many Democrats” was another way of legitimizing his position, since support from members of the opposing party reinforced the message that Unz’s initiative was the voice of the people, regardless of their political affiliation.

The two remaining actors represented in Sample 3 (“left wing” Latinos and misguided Republicans) are grouped with self-interested educators and given a marginal status as “the only public opposition to the measure.” Although both MALDEF (Mexican American Legal Defense and Educational Fund) and MEChA (Movimiento Estudiantil Chicano de Aztlán) are nationwide, non-profit advocacy organizations with long histories (since the late 1960’s), in Sample 3 they are represented as minor, self-interested groups who do not support the interests of most Latinos in the state. Again, the implication was that Unz better represented the voice of powerless Latinos than groups who opposed the initiative. The negative description of “some state Republican leaders” served to distinguish Unz from other Republicans, who were widely viewed at the time as anti-immigrant, thereby potentially increasing his legitimacy with a wider range of voters.

The representation of SLA specialists as a closed group of self-interested beneficiaries of taxpayers’ generosity was an effective way of discrediting them and delegitimizing their opposition to the initiative. SLA specialists were not ‘one of us’ but a strange and selfish Other deserving deep suspicion for supporting “ridiculous” “avant-garde pedagogy” in a “bizarre system” based on “academic dogmas with absolutely no basis in reality” (see Text 4

Representation and Legitimization

from the *Los Angeles Times*, October 19, 1997). This negative representation helped to reduce the risk that Unz would be discredited by the accusations made against him for his active manipulation of data. This representation of educators is repeated in many media texts, such as in Sample 4:

Sample 4 (from Text 4)

The real dynamic driving this bizarre system is special government funding. School districts are provided with extra dollars for each child who doesn't know English. This generates the worst sort of perverse incentive, in which administrators are financially rewarded for not teaching English to young children or pretending that they haven't learned the language; schools are annually penalized for each child who becomes fluent in English... And although no one has been able to properly document the total amount of supplemental spending on children limited in English, the annual total for California certainly exceeds \$400 million and may be as much as \$1 billion or more, sums that can buy a tremendous amount of silence or complicity. Unfortunately for its profiteers, "bilingual education" is completely unworkable as well as unsuccessful.

In Sample 4, Unz claims that government funding motivates supporters of bilingual education programs, which he represents as a scheme that gives "the worst sort of perverse incentive" to "profiteers" (educators) for "not teaching English." Moreover, the amount of funding, previously cited as \$320, has been raised to "\$400 million and may be as much as \$1 billion or more." The effort to delegitimize opponents of Proposition 227 reached its zenith in the week before the vote on the Proposition, when the magazine *New Times Los Angeles* published a cover story about the most outspoken opponent of the Proposition, Stephen Krashen of the University of Southern California. Calling Krashen a "movement guru" with "extensive and lucrative contracts" with the State, and claiming that "Not many university professors can afford to live in a cavernous poolside home in Malibu," the article was the most negative representation of Proposition opponents during the campaign (Stewart, 1998).

The Othering of SLA specialists, however, was a double-edged sword: Not only did it attack their credibility, but the implicit strain of anti-intellectualism in the attacks also threatened to cast doubt on the credibility of research in general. Because the success of the Proposition 227 campaign depended in part on voters accepting its supposedly empirical claims about the failure of bilingual education and the effectiveness of "structured English immersion," the representation of English as the language of power and success was crucial.

English is the Language of Power and Success

Unz's *Los Angeles Times* article "Bilingualism vs. bilingual education" (Text 4) represented English as the language of power and success. This commonsense but powerful claim was the last major component in the discourse of the Proposition 227 campaign. In Sample 5, Unz explicitly acknowledges the "practical importance of bilingualism." This acknowledgement is important for his self-representation as a practical and open-minded businessman who understands microchips, fiber-optic cables, and the economic value of language. This self-representation is followed by an impassioned statement about the importance of English in a globalized economy:

Representation and Legitimization

Sample 5 (from Text 4)

As each new microchip and fiber-optic cable shrinks the circumference of our world, more and more Americans recognize the practical importance of bilingualism. Even today, entrepreneurs or employees fluent in Chinese, Japanese, or Spanish have a distinct edge over their English-only peers.

But if other languages such as Chinese or Spanish are of growing world importance, English ranks in a class by itself. Although English is not and never has been America's official national language, over the past 20 years it has rapidly become the entire world's unofficial language, utterly dominating the spheres of science, technology and international business. Fluency in Spanish may provide a significant advantage, but lack of literacy in English represents a crippling, almost fatal disadvantage in our global economy. For this reason, the better public and private schools in Europe, Asia and Latin America all provide as much English as early as possible to young children.

Sample 5 suggests a hierarchy of value with English positioned at its peak; not knowing English is represented as a disease to be cured, “a crippling, almost fatal disadvantage in our global economy.” Elsewhere in this article, Unz reiterated key representations: that bilingual education is unpopular among Latino parents; that bilingual education has failed in California; that the goal of bilingual education should be for the students to learn English; that students are not taught English in bilingual programs; and that SLA specialists and bilingual educators are self-interested and dogmatic. In the concluding paragraph of the article, English becomes the “universal language of advancement and opportunity”:

Sample 6 (from Text 4)

But either way, all of California's immigrant schoolchildren finally will be granted the right to be taught English, the universal language of advancement and opportunity, supplementing their own family languages. Only by ending our failed system of bilingual education can we foster the true growth of bilingualism and the unity and prosperity of our multiethnic society.

It is noteworthy that this text, like the Proposition 227 campaign in general, avoided the representation of English as the language of American identity. In addition, Unz adopted a discourse of language rights: Immigrant children deserve “the right to be taught English.” This discursive twist of language rights is crucial. If Proposition 227 is about granting all children in California “the right to be taught English,” what would be a reason for voting no? Such framing of the issue effectively functioned as deontic legitimization – presenting a moral reason for supporting the initiative that cannot be challenged. Within this discursive framework, to oppose the initiative was to question the practical value of English in American society. Indeed, for those voters who had no experience or knowledge of bilingual education, voting for Proposition 227, framed as a way to support children's right to learn English, was a simple way to acknowledge the obvious practical value of English. According to the *Los Angeles Times* Exit Poll on the day of the vote, among the voters who supported Proposition 227, as many as three out of four explained the reason for their support as pragmatic: “if you live in America, you need to speak English” (Citrin, Kiley, & Pearson, 2003; Crawford, 2007; González, 2007; Roos, 2007).

Discussion

On election day, Proposition 227 passed with a vote of 61%. Contrary to Unz's prediction, however, the majority of Latino voters opposed the initiative, while 67% of white voters supported it (Citrin et al., 2003; also see Baltodano 2004). Lopez (2004) argued that "Proposition 227 was generally perceived by Latinos as a racist attack," like other anti-immigrant measures such as Proposition 187 (the Save Our State initiative), a 1994 ballot initiative that denied undocumented immigrants social services, health care, and public education, and Proposition 209, a 1996 initiative that banned affirmative action programs. Although some attribute the passage of Proposition 227 to the strategic failure of the No on Proposition 227 campaign, it seems undeniable that anti-immigrant and anti-Latino sentiment was an important backdrop to the success of the initiative (Crawford, 2000; Olsen, 1999). One way to understand the support for Proposition 227, therefore, is that it was a symbolic statement affirming the power and status of English and English speakers in U.S. society (Bourdieu, 1991).

Nevertheless, an important characteristic of the discourse of the Proposition 227 campaign was that it did not appeal directly to racist or anti-Latino sentiments. In Unz's discourse, it was SLA specialists, not Latinos, who were represented as a strange Other. Unz was careful to maintain a "pro-immigrant" discourse while leading the campaign, by consistently representing himself as the voice of powerless Latinos, stressing the importance of learning English for economic reasons, and generally steering clear of identity politics. As a result, Unz succeeded in creating an English-only discourse without directly drawing on nativist ideology (Crawford, 2000).

CDA in Class

Instructors and students in reading and discussion classes can perform similar analyses using CDA for texts covering a wide range of issues. Although the precise details of how to incorporate CDA will depend on the topics and texts, we identify four questions that can guide students' critical analyses.

(1) What are the major actors and objects that are represented in the texts under consideration? In our analysis of bilingual education, we identified Spanish-speaking parents (and children); bilingual education programs in California schools; bilingual education teachers and researchers; and the role of the English language in American society.

(2) How do advocates of different points of view represent themselves and their opponents? The key issue here is not to evaluate the arguments using logical or scientific analysis, but instead to clarify the implicit representations in the texts.

(3) How do these representations legitimize or delegitimize advocates of the different points of view? In our example, the attack against the integrity of the opponents of Proposition 227 was quite explicit. In other texts, efforts to delegitimize opponents may be more subtle. For example, in his generally dispassionate and scientific discussion of cloning, Silver (1998) uses different language to describe the concerns of supporters and opponents of cloning: While cloning a sheep "stirred the imagination of billions of people" (p. 219), opponents of cloning were "frightened," "muddled," and "confuse[d]" by the complex science. Such differences legitimize supporters of cloning while undermining the legitimacy of its opponents.

Representation and Legitimization

(4) Is there evidence that the representations in the texts appear elsewhere in texts about related but different topics and issues? For example, we find that the representation of bilingual education as a system for teaching English has been adopted even by many supporters of bilingual education, who argue that such programs offer an effective approach to teaching English (Uriarte, Tun, Lavan, & Diez, 2010). The impact of bilingual education on maintenance of other languages is often absent from their arguments and from public discussion of language policies in education. In this case, the spread and adoption of the systems of representation that were developed during the Proposition 227 campaign suggests that supporters of the Proposition achieved not only an election victory, but also a discursive victory with implications far beyond the immediate issue of bilingual education in California.

Conclusion

Of course, analysis of debates about major social issues such as bilingual education requires careful attention to data-based social scientific research, in addition to discourse analysis. It is worth remembering, however, that analyzing social scientific arguments is fraught with its own set of difficulties. In particular, students and instructors may need to understand complex statistics and procedures for large-scale data analysis, and to gain extensive knowledge about the contexts in which quantitative and qualitative data are gathered (see Gándara & Hopkins, 2010). Because some students and instructors may lack this essential background, discussion of social scientific argumentation can be quite challenging. Nevertheless, even when students and instructors are working within an academic discipline they know well, it remains important to analyze discursive processes such as representation and legitimization, which are essential to most persuasive texts.

References

- Baltodano, M. P. (2004). Latino immigrant parents and the hegemony of Proposition 227. *Latino Studies*, 2 (2), 246.
- Bourdieu, P. (1991). *Language and symbolic power*. Cambridge, UK: Polity Press.
- California Department of Education. (2007). Language Census (R30-LC). Retrieved October 19th, 2007, from <http://www.cde.ca.gov/ds/sd/lc/>.
- Chilton, P. (2004). *Analysing political discourse: Theory and practice*. London: Routledge.
- Citrin, J., Kiley, J., & Pearson, K. (2003). Direct democracy takes on bilingual education: Framing the debate in four state initiatives. Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Political Science Association (99th), Philadelphia, PA.
- Crawford, J. (1998). The ninth street myth: Who speaks for Latino parents? *Hispanic Link Weekly Report*, May 25. Retrieved October 15th, 2007, from <http://www.humnet.ucla.edu/humnet/linguistics/people/grads/macswan/HL3.htm>.
- Crawford, J. (2000). Proposition 227: A new phase of the English only movement. In R. D. González (Ed.), *Language ideologies: Critical perspectives on the Official English Movement*, vol. 1 (pp. 28-61). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Inc.
- Crawford, J. (2007). The decline of bilingual education: How to reverse a troubling trend? *International Multilingual Research Journal*, 1 (1), 33-37.

Representation and Legitimization

- English for the Children. (1997). English for the Children: Let's teach English to all of America's children and end bilingual education nationwide (Official website of English for the Children). Online at <http://onenation.org/>.
- Gándara, P. & Hopkins, M. (Eds.) (2010). *Forbidden language: English learners and restrictive language policies*. New York: Teachers College Press.
- González, J. (2007). It's time to get another horse. *International Multilingual Research Journal*, 1 (1), 39-43.
- Kaid, L. L. (Ed.) (2004). *Handbook of political communication research*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.
- Larsen, C. U. (1989). The techniques of propaganda (selection from *Persuasion: Reception and responsibility* [Belmont, CA: Wadsworth Publishing]). In *The ELP Reader* (pp. 41-54). Tokyo: International Christian University English Language Program, 2007.
- Lopez, D. (2004). Bilingualism and ethnic change in California. In T. Judt, & D. Lacorne (Eds.), *Language, nation, and state: Identity politics in a multilingual age* (pp. 79-101). New York: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Olsen, L. (1999). Reflections on the key role of two-way bilingual immersion programs in this Proposition 227 era. *Multilingual Educator*, February, 30-43.
- Roos, P. D. (2007). Getting back on the horse: Reviving bilingual education – key issues for policymakers. *International Multilingual Research Journal*, 1 (1), 15-31.
- Rumbaut, R. G., Massey, D. S., & Bean, F. D. (2006). Linguistic life expectancies: Immigrant language retention in Southern California. *Population and Development Review*, 32 (3), 447-460.
- Silver, L. M. (1998). Cloning (selection from *Remaking Eden: How genetic engineering and cloning will transform the American family*. [New York: HarperCollins Publishers]). In *The ELP Reader* (pp. 217-251). Tokyo: International Christian University English Language Program, 2007.
- Stewart, J. (1998, May 29). Krashen Burn. *New Times Los Angeles*, Retrieved September 10, 2010, from <http://www.angelfire.com/az/english4thechildren/krashen.html>.
- Tollefson, J. W. & Yamagami, M. (2008). 'Talking race' in university classes: A discourse analytical approach. *Language Research Bulletin*, 23, 1-15.
- Uriarte, M., Tung, R., Lavan, N., & Diez, V. (2010). Impact of restrictive language policies on engagement and academic achievement of English learners in Boston public schools. In P. Gándara & M. Hopkins (Eds.), *Forbidden language: English learners and restrictive language policies* (pp. 65-85). New York: Teachers College Press.
- van Dijk, T. A. (1990). Social cognition and discourse. In G. Giles, & R. P. Robinson (Eds.), *Handbook of social psychology and language* (pp. 163-183). Chichester, Sussex: Wiley.
- van Dijk, T. A. (1993a). Discourse and cognition in society. In D. Crowley, & D. Mitchell (Eds.), *Communication theory today* (pp. 107-126). Oxford: Pergamon Press.
- van Dijk, T. A. (1993b). *Elite discourse and racism*. London: Sage.
- Yamagami, M. (2008). *Talking English-only: A discourse analysis of Ron Unz's Proposition 227 campaign in California*. Unpublished master's thesis, International Christian University, Tokyo.

Appendix

The data samples for analysis were taken from the following materials:

Representation and Legitimization

- Text 1: English for the Children. (1997). *The 1998 California “English for the Children” Initiative*. Retrieved August 16, 2007, from English for the Children Website: <http://www.onenation.org/facts.html>.
- Text 2: Unz, R. (1997). Soundings: Nonsense in any language. *City Journal*, Autumn (7) 4, 8-9.
- Text 3: NewsHour. (1997, September 21). Double talk (Transcript). Retrieved August 10, 2007, from PBS Website: http://www.pbs.org/bb/education/july-dec97/bilingual_9-21.html.
- Text 4: Unz, R. (1997, October 19). Bilingualism vs. bilingual education. *Los Angeles Times*.
- Text 5: Unz, R. (1997, May 21). Letters: English isn't racism. *La Opinión*. Retrieved December 10, 2009, from <http://www.onenation.org/unzletter.html>.
- Text 6: Unz, R. (1994). Immigration or the welfare state: Which is our real enemy? *Policy review* 70, 33-38. Retrieved December 12, 2009, from <http://www.onenation.org/unzprfall94.html>.