

Chapter 87

Language Policy Argumentation and Rhetoric, Pre– and Post–9/11

Janice Snow Rodríguez
Tennessee Foreign Language Institute, USA

ABSTRACT

In the post-9/11 era, the debate on the necessity of an official language has resurfaced. While the historical context for the policy push has changed, have the underlying arguments for official English? To consider this question, the content of legislation, discourse, and media coverage of state-level English language policy debates before and after September 11, 2001 was analyzed. Nearly 2000 texts spanning 1994 through 2008 were examined to return composite scores for 5 overarching semantic features and 35 sub-features. Statistical analyses indicate significant differences between the pre- and post-9/11 legislation in the variable commonality. In the post-9/11 groupings of news stories and opinion pieces, the variable certainty decreased significantly, while realism and the sub-variables denial and blame increased significantly. This study provides an additional perspective on the events of 9/11, examines the role of persuasive argumentation in the policy process, and expands the tools available to the policy analyst.

INTRODUCTION

The events of September 11, 2001 have made an indelible mark on the culture and even the psyche of the United States of America.

Among the sea of American flags, among the memorial displays around the world, amid the developing international crisis, many felt that the United States, and perhaps the world, had entered a new age of terror. “Nothing Will Ever Be the Same” read a full-page headline in a September 11 special edition of the Philadelphia City Paper. The

idea that September 11 had “changed everything” was ubiquitous, the date a dividing line between a “before” and an “after.” (Dudziak, 2003, p. 2)

In reaction, the nation has desired to feel safe: we have created a Department of Homeland Security, and we have also enacted the Patriot Act, which has many questioning what liberties we may be trading for the additional security (Groenewold, 2006, p. 62). Along with these measures came the recognition that within our intelligence communities we have fallen behind in foreign language acquisition. To address the dearth of linguistic

DOI: 10.4018/978-1-4666-8358-7.ch087

expertise in languages of importance to national security, President George W. Bush launched the National Security Language Initiative (U.S. Department of State, 2006), which acknowledges:

An essential component of the U.S. national security in the post-9/11 world is the ability to engage foreign governments and peoples, especially in critical regions, to encourage reform, promote understanding, convey respect for other cultures and provide an opportunity to learn more about our country and its citizens. To do this, we must be able to communicate in other languages, a challenge for which we are unprepared. (U.S. Department of State, 2006, para. 2)

In contrast, during this period, we have also witnessed resurgence in efforts to make English the official language of the U.S in a number of government jurisdictions, from the local to the state-level. Why does this issue appear to be rising on the agenda again? On the national level, language policy in the past 200 years has oscillated between “two opposing extremes...legislative extensions of civil rights principles to language minority groups [and] attempts to restrict such an extension of rights” (Lo Bianco, 1999, p. 54).

Prior to 2001, 26 states had declared English their official language, while at least 12 others had debated or proposed legislation unsuccessfully (Schildkraut, 2001, p. 445). Post 9/11 and through 2008, in the remaining 12 states, legislation has passed in four additional states and was being considered in others.

The following is a list of official English laws and their dates of passage.

- **Pre-9/11/2001**

- Alabama (1990)
- Alaska (1998)
- Arkansas (1987)
- California (1986)
- Colorado (1988)
- Florida (1988)

- Georgia (1986 & 1996)
- Hawaii (1978)
- Illinois (1969)
- Indiana (1984)
- Kentucky (1984)
- Louisiana (1811)
- Massachusetts (1975)
- Mississippi (1987)
- Missouri (1998)
- Montana (1995)
- Nebraska (1920)
- New Hampshire (1995)
- North Carolina (1987)
- North Dakota (1987)
- South Carolina (1987)
- South Dakota (1987)
- Tennessee (1984)
- Utah (2000)
- Virginia (1981 & 1996)
- Wyoming (1996)

- **Post-9/11/2001**

- Arizona (2006)
- Idaho (2007)
- Iowa (2002)
- Kansas (2007)

BACKGROUND

A Perspective on Political Persuasion in the Policy Process

An initial step in making sense of these seemingly incongruous policy directives is to explore why an issue rises and falls on the political agenda. What determines when an idea's time has come? Theories have been postulated which involve the policy making process and influences upon the process, but “as many writers on public policy have lamented, there can be no ‘stages’ model of the political process to provide a simple map because of the multiple sources of causation, feedback, and the sheer complexity of what is going on” (John, 2003, p. 483). Adding to the complexity for policy

21 more pages are available in the full version of this document, which may be purchased using the "Add to Cart" button on the publisher's webpage:

www.igi-global.com/chapter/language-policy-argumentation-and-rhetoric-pre-and-post-911/127932

Related Content

Investigating Factors Influencing Third Sector Social Enterprise Managers' Career Orientations: A Conceptual Framework

Chi Maher (2017). *Handbook of Research on Emerging Business Models and Managerial Strategies in the Nonprofit Sector* (pp. 201-221).

www.irma-international.org/chapter/investigating-factors-influencing-third-sector-social-enterprise-managers-career-orientations/180796

E-Government, M-Government, L-Government: Exploring Future ICT Applications in Public Administration

Alberto Asquer (2015). *Public Affairs and Administration: Concepts, Methodologies, Tools, and Applications* (pp. 2155-2168).

www.irma-international.org/chapter/e-government-m-government-l-government/127959

E-Activism Development and Growth

John G. McNuttand Lauri Goldkind (2019). *Advanced Methodologies and Technologies in Government and Society* (pp. 195-205).

www.irma-international.org/chapter/e-activism-development-and-growth/215863

MCDM for Candidate Selection in E-Voting

Rasim Alguliyev, Ramiz Aliguliyevand Farhad Yusifov (2019). *International Journal of Public Administration in the Digital Age* (pp. 35-48).

www.irma-international.org/article/mcdm-for-candidate-selection-in-e-voting/225797

Exploring Theory for Citizens' Preferences in Health Policy: The Contribution of Health Policy Cultures to Understanding the Roles of Public and Private Health Service Providers

Marika Kylänen, Jari Vuoriand Pauline Allen (2012). *International Journal of Public and Private Healthcare Management and Economics* (pp. 38-57).

www.irma-international.org/article/exploring-theory-citizens-preferences-health/73797