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Engelske sprogkundskabers betydning i forbindelse med integrationen af mexicanske immigranter i USA

Denne afhandling behandler det engelske sprogs betydning i forbindelse med integrationen af mexicanske immigranter i USA og undersøger, om sproget er af afgørende betydning for den kulturelle, økonomiske og samfundsborgerlige integration af denne immigrantgruppe. Afhandlingen vil dog overvejende fokusere på den kulturelle integration, nærmere betegnet sproglig assimilation. Denne tilgang begrundes med, at kulturel integration er en forudsætning for, hvorvidt dybere integrering kan finde sted.

I forsøget på at behandle integrationsproblematikken i USA, vil afhandlingen tage udgangspunkt i de tilsyneladende modsætningsfyldte integrationsparadigmer, assimilation og transnationalisme og de to politiske ideologier nativisme og multikulturalisme, der tilsammen former landets historiske og nutidige tilgang til immigranter og integration. For at afdække denne vinkel vil afhandlingen tage udgangspunkt i den amerikanske immigrations- og integrationshistorie og derefter tage afsæt i de omstændigheder, hvormed mexicanske immigranter bliver integreret i det amerikanske samfund. Den ovennævnte fremgangsmåde har den fordel, at afhandlingen dermed kan be- eller afkræfte vigtigheden af engelsk kundskaber i forbindelse med integration. Ydermere problematiserer ovennævnte fremgangsmåde den nuværende tilgang til integration, hvor det forventes, at immigranterne hurtigt assimilerer ind i det amerikanske samfund, hvilket indebærer, at immigranterne helt efterlader deres kulturelle baggrund. Derudover forsøger afhandlingen at illustrere, at de føromtalte paradigmer og ideologier ikke nødvendigvis udelukker hinanden, men at der i stedet opstår et komplekst forhold mellem disse, som resulterer i, at modsætninger mødes og supplerer hinanden.

Historiske set, har USA altid været ambivalent i forhold til fremmedsprog. Den mere restriktive tilgang til sproglig integration blev indført efter ”the Great Migration Wave” (1880-1924), der er karakteriseret ved, en stigende og konstant tilstrømning af immigrantgrupper, der kulturelt set afveg fra den gængse amerikanske befolkning. Som en reaktion mod denne sproglige mangfoldighed, opstod en politisk modpol, som i

Set i lyset af den amerikanske integrationshistorie samt afhandlingens analyseafsnit understreges vigtigheden af det engelske sprog i integrationsprocessen. Dog påpeges det, at assimilation alene ikke fremmer integrationen men nærmere resulterer i en modvillighed mod tilegnelsen af de amerikanske værdier og dermed det engelske sprog.
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1. Introduction: A Nation of Immigrants

The US is home to a wide variety of ethnic groups, which, aside from the relatively small percentage of Native Americans, have ancestors who immigrated to the country within the last five centuries. Since its founding, immigration has been a significant catalyst for the population growth.

Immigration has been an essential component in forming the US as a country, but it has not always been perceived as a positive phenomenon. The joining of different ethnicities and cultures has created unease and anxiety in the American society, especially among the white Native-born population, and led to more restrictive measures in relation to immigration and the integration of newcomers (Sanchez, 1997). Before the Great Migration Wave, the US had been regarded as a multicultural society where the immigrants were able to maintain their culture of origin and speak their native language, while gradually assimilating into American society. This perception changed during the Great Migration Wave. Consequently, language testing became part of the naturalization process and eventually monolingualism in English became a constitutive aspect of the American national identity (Pavlenko, 2001).

In modern times, the enforcement of the 1965 Immigration and Naturalization Act and the changing economic dynamics of the late twentieth century have contributed to a radical transformation of the immigration structure in the US. Consequently, European immigrants were replaced by immigrants from developing countries such as Mexico and other Latin American countries. It is especially the economic distance, which exists between the industrialized north and the developing south that has been the catalyst behind the inexhaustible flows, in which Mexicans represent the largest source of immigration into the US¹ (Massey, 1995).

¹ According to the Migration Information Source (MPI), in March 2002, there were 9.8 million legal and 5.3 illegal Mexican immigrants in the United States
The ethnic shifts in immigration coupled with higher birth rates among Latin Americans have led to a pronounced demographic transition and according to the 2000 US Census Bureau the Latino population has already surpassed African Americans (Sánchez, 1997). In 2003, more than one in every fourteen US resident traced their ancestry to Mexico (Sánchez; 1997). Today Mexican immigrants constitute the largest minority group in the US (Vigdor, 2008). This does not only complicate the general integration process but it also strongly influences the process of linguistic assimilation of this particular ethnic group.

As the number of Latin American immigrants has grown, so has the resistance towards this ethnic group because a majority of these immigrants are unskilled workers. Consequently, nativist sentiments have experienced a new awakening (Sanchez; 1997). The increasing resistance is based on the belief that Latin American immigrants, and especially Mexicans, do not wish to assimilate into the American society (Huntington, 2004). This is reflected in the maintenance of cultural traits such as the Spanish language and traditions, which ultimately leads to a negation of the American national identity and a possible division of the US into two peoples with two cultures and two languages (Huntington, 2004). This lack of assimilation has not only resulted in a majority of Mexican immigrants with limited English skills but also in Mexican immigrants being the ethnic group in the US with least school attendance. This is fatal for the integration because educational attainment fosters English language skills and is a prerequisite for socioeconomic advancement among immigrants (Zhou, 1997).

What makes the role of English language skills interesting in connection with the integration of Mexican immigrants is the fact that, formally, the US does not have an official national language and the American Constitution does not make any reference to English as being the country’s official language (Pavlenko, 2001). However, the Great Migration Wave led to the emergence of a hegemonic discourse, which resulted in immigrants having to renounce their native language and become English monolinguals to fully integrate into American society.
Today, the increasing immigration of Mexicans in the US and the retention of Spanish among this ethnic group, has led to the belief that in a foreseeable future the Spanish language might obtain the same status as the English language. By retaining the cultural traits of the country of origin, the Mexican immigrants engage in transnational practises. Due to the geographical placement, Mexican immigrants are able to live in a transnational milieu, where they remain closely connected with their homeland (Citrin et. al., 2007). The transnational phenomenon has, according to nativists, become possible because elites in the US have embraced a multicultural ideology, which impedes assimilation especially by acknowledging bilingualism. Nativists thereby believe that if the normative pressure to identify as an American is reduced then so is the immigrants’ effort to assimilate (Citrin et. al, 2007).

1.1 Purpose of the dissertation

Language skills are often used as a measurement of integration and therefore the main focus of the dissertation will revolve around the role of English language skills in relation to the integration of Mexican immigrants.

In reference to the hegemonic discourse of English monolingualism initiated by the Great Migration Wave, this dissertation is based on the hypothesis that when immigrants, who live in the US, acquire English language skills then not only do they become better equipped to experience social mobility but as a consequence of their improving language skills they also become more successfully integrated into society as a whole.

The dissertation will examine in which ways English language skills are perceived to be a catalyst for integration and in that connection explore the development in language skills throughout different generations of Mexican immigrants as well as its affect on the immigrants’ socioeconomic status. The purpose of the dissertation will be to:
• Analyze the question of whether English language skills are a catalyst for the integration of Mexican immigrants into the American society.

The role of English language skills will be examined through the two political ideologies, nativism and multiculturalism as well as the two integration paradigms, assimilation and transnationalism. The dissertation will operate on two levels when addressing the issue of language and integration paradigms:

1. The linguistic assimilation of Mexican immigrants in the US
2. The interconnectedness between the integration paradigms, assimilation and transnationalism and its affect on linguistic assimilation.

In that connection, the role of English language skills and its importance for the integration process will be addressed by answering the following three research questions, which all take a theoretical starting point.

1. Traditionally, nativist scholars criticize transnational practises for having a negative affect on the intergenerational rate of linguistic assimilation, which reduces the general assimilation process and increases the support for bilingualism.

   • Are negative patterns of assimilation caused by bilingualism?

2. Throughout US immigration history, the integration paradigm assimilation has continuously been preferred in the attempt to integrate immigrants into American society. This means that from a classical assimilation perspective any kind of transnational ties to the country of origin must be excluded.

   • Is integration a one way street or is it fostered by an interplay between the two integration paradigms, assimilation and transnationalism?
If research question number two can be verified, then the two paradigms rather than exclude actually influence each other.

3. In that regard, it would be relevant to study the interconnectedness between the integration paradigms and its affect on the process of linguistic assimilation.

- *If there exists an interconnectedness between the integration paradigms, assimilation and transnationalism, will it then ease the process of integration or will it complicate the intergenerational rate of linguistic assimilation?*
2. Theory and Method

2.1 Theory

This subsection will provide a short description of the theories applied throughout the dissertation. For the sake of overview, the theories have been divided into three categories:

- Political ideologies
- Integration Paradigms
- Language Policies

2.1.1 Political Ideologies

I. Nativism

Definition: “The attitude, practice, or policy of protecting the interests of native-born or existing inhabitants against those of immigrants”\(^2\)

Nativism is a political ideology, which originated in US politics as an opposition to immigration. The ideology has roots in the country’s historic role as a melting pot. Though an opposition to immigration is common in many countries with high immigration rates, the term nativism has a specific meaning in the US. Strictly speaking, the American interpretation of nativism distinguishes between Americans who are born in the US and individuals who have immigrated to the US, such as first generation immigrants. Furthermore, nativism in American politics has become a general term for the opposition of immigration based on fears such as the disintegration of American values (Anbinder, 2006). In other words, nativism embraces cultural homogenization, which refers to the creation of

a modern, integrated society through the application of for instance a common language and common cosmopolitan behavior (Nemetz and Christensen, 1996). Well-known political parties founded on a nativist approach are the Know Nothing Party (the later American Party) and the Immigration Restriction League. In today’s politics it has been argued that nativism has remained a potent ideology of the Republicans’ appeal (Albinder, 2006).

II. Multiculturalism

Definition: “The characteristics of a multicultural society - the policy or process whereby the distinctive identities of the cultural groups within such a society are maintained or supported”

Multiculturalism celebrates racial, cultural and ethnic diversity and therefore refers to the fact that a country ought to have room for diversity and that no race, culture or language in a state should have a unique superior status (Citrin et. al., 1994). Today, many countries have official or de jure policies of multiculturalism that are aimed at recognizing, celebrating and maintaining the different cultures or cultural identities within the society to promote social cohesion. In the US, multiculturalism can be seen as a specific aspect of the broader movement of “political correctness” (Spencer, 1994). In terms of being political correct, multiculturalism embraces cultural pluralism, which makes it possible for minority groups to retain a sense of identity with their minority-culture group while adopting behaviors and norms from the majority culture (Spencer, 1994).

Multiculturalists often tend to support loose immigration controls and programs, which offer certain privileges to minority groups. Therefore, American policies of multiculturalism are often associated with language diversity and the embrace of, for instance, bilingualism. Furthermore, multiculturalists believe that immigrants actively shape their own lives rather than exist passively as beneficiaries or

3 Oxford English dictionary: http://dictionary.oed.com/cgi/entry/00318023?single=1&query_type=word&queryword=multiculturalism&first=1&max_to_show=10
victims of ineluctable Americanization forces (Zhou, 1997). For the reason described above, multiculturalists are supporters of transnationalism and do not see pre-migration cultural attributes inherent to ethnicity such as the immigrant’s language of origin as inferior traits which should be absorbed by the culture of the host country. On the contrary, they believe that these pre-migration characteristics constantly interact with the host society to reshape and reinvent themselves (Zhou, 1997).

2.1.2 Integration Paradigms

I. Melting Pot

**Definition:** “A country, place, or area in which immigrants of various nationalities and races are assimilated”\(^4\)

The melting pot symbolizes how immigrants deriving from different historic, cultural and ethnic backgrounds melted together into a new amalgam. This amalgam combined the cultural and ethnic variables of the immigrants and brought to life a new strengthened and homogeneous America (Laubeová, 2000). As briefly mentioned in the subsection 2.1.1 Political Ideologies, the melting pot was the original integration paradigm in the US. In many ways, the symbol of the melting pot puts emphasis on the Americanization of immigrants, which refers to a process of Anglo conformity where immigrants are encouraged to learn English and discard their foreign ways (Hirschman, 1983). On these grounds, the melting pot became the stepping-stone to the classical approach to integration, assimilation. Due to the fact that the melting pot is only provided as a historical front-runner to the development of the assimilation paradigm, this subsection will not contain any further explanation of this approach to integration.

II. Assimilation

**Definition:** “The creation of greater homogeneity through the attenuation of ethnic differences”

(Citrin et. al., 2007)

Assimilation entails the articulation of national identity and fundamentally concerns the preservation of the sense of continuity and homogeneity of a nation (Olneck, 2006). The problematic nature of assimilation arises particularly in those nations that accept many immigrants because assimilation often leads to a generic problem concerning the cultural and political reproduction of any nation (Olneck, 2006).

There are several branches of assimilation. Cultural assimilation is however, according to Milton Gordon, the primary catalyst for further integration of the immigrants. Acculturation, which includes the decline and at its endpoint the disappearance of ethnic and racial distinction is referred to as a classical approach to assimilation (Olneck, 2006). In the US, this notion of assimilation is closely connected to the WASP culture and the Anglo-Protestant values, which include the preservation of the American national identity, which, among other things, is predicated on the common English language.

III. Transnationalism

**Definition:** “Extending or having interests extending beyond national bounds or frontiers; multinational”

Transnationalism is a social phenomenon which has grown out of the heightened global interconnectivity between people. This has been fostered by the

---

5 Oxford English Dictionary: http://dictionary.oed.com/cgi/entry/50256426/50256426se2?single=1&query_type=word&queryword=transnationalism&first=1&max_to_show=10&hilit=50256426se2
development in communication and transportation technology and the disappearance of boundaries between countries. It is the emergence of a social process in which migrants establish social fields that cross geographic, cultural, and political borders. Therefore, the multiplicity of migrant’s involvements in both the home and host societies is a central element of transnationalism (Weber, 1999).

Today, transnationalism has become an important aspect of social science and since the early 1990s research on transnational dimensions of the immigrant experience has expanded (Vertovec, 2003). Transnationalism is, however, not a new phenomenon. Despite the slow or non-existing forms of communication, transnationalism also existed among immigrants from the early 20th century. The difference between previous and contemporary immigrant groups is that today the maintenance of transnational ties has been facilitated by easier access to technology, which eventually has fostered immigration (Weber, 1999).

2.1.3 Language Policies

I. Monolingualism

**Definition:** “The condition of knowing or using only one language; the ability to speak only one language”\(^6\)

II. Bilingualism

**Definition:** “A policy or system which promotes the use of two languages among a community or population”\(^7\)

---

\(^6\) Oxford English Dictionary: [http://dictionary.oed.com/cgi/entry/00314681?single=1&query_type=word&queryword=monolingualism&first=1&max_to_show=10](http://dictionary.oed.com/cgi/entry/00314681?single=1&query_type=word&queryword=monolingualism&first=1&max_to_show=10)
Language policies are usually created to promote a country’s official language. In this respect, the US is unique because of its lack of an official language. As stated in chapter 1 Introduction: A Nation of Immigrants, the American Constitution does not make any reference to English as the official language. Nevertheless, monolingualism in English has been embedded in the American national identity since the early twentieth century (Pavlenko, 2001). This monolingualistic approach has been challenged during the last couple of decades due to the increasing flows of Latin American immigrants, who compared to other immigrant groups have showed low rates of linguistic assimilation. More importantly, bilingualism has become a widespread phenomenon among this ethnic group.

2.1.4 Bibliographic Commentary

Common for the articles in the bibliography, is the fact that they represent the essential findings conducted by scholars who are leaders within the field of migration. The articles are often based on books and sum up key points of the research conducted. During the writing process, it became evident that the various scholars made use of each other’s academic work to review and refine their own research projects. This approach has made it possible to gain an overview of the development of the various theories as well as updated research.

The literature used in this dissertation takes its focal point in the integration of Mexican immigrants, which is seen in the light of immigration history as well as more specific integration processes by Mexican immigrants in the US. Throughout, the dissertation is referring to central scholars who have contributed to the immigration debate in the US. Some of the most widely used are Jack Citrin, Douglas Massey, Silvia Giorguli Saucedo, Richard Alba, José Itzigsohn, Aneta Pavlenko, William S. Bernard, Min Zhou, Samuel P. Huntington, Arthur M. Schlesinger Jr. and Milton Gordon.

---

7 Oxford English Dictionary: http://dictionary.oed.com/cgi/entry/50022041?single=1&query_type=word&queryword=bilingualism&first=1&max_to_show=10
In her work, *Language and Identity in the US* (2001), Aneta Pavlenko more specifically discusses the consequences and historiography behind the process of making the US a monolingual nation. Her research has been important to the subject of this dissertation because it illustrates the process with which monolingualism has become one of the most important pillars of being and becoming American. Thus, when Spanish-speaking immigrants preserve their language of origin, the likelihood of being accepted in the American society is reduced. Her findings have been essential because they emphasize how the acceptance of immigrants mainly takes place through linguistic assimilation.

In the article *The Integration of Immigrants in the United States* (1967), William S. Bernard first of all provides an overview of integration throughout US history. Secondly and more importantly, Bernard’s research supports one of the main points which are that the maintenance of an immigrant’s cultural traits is a supportive tool in the integration process.

The research conducted by the scholars Jack Citrin, Douglas Massey and Richard Alba have all treated immigration from Mexico from various angles and their contributions to the subject of Mexican immigration has been applied in order to gain a cultural and historical understanding of Mexican migration and their incorporation into the American society:


To illustrate the continuing support for the political ideology nativism and the classical approach to integration in American society, references will be made to Harvard professor Samuel P. Huntington and his article *The Hispanic Challenge* (2004). Huntington has been very critical towards the lack of integration by Mexican immigrants. He believes that Mexican immigrants differ from previous immigrant groups because they have not assimilated into American mainstream culture but instead have formed their own political and linguistic enclaves. Huntington acknowledges the fact that immigration forms the basis of the making of the American society. Nevertheless, he is a strong supporter of the classical integration paradigm, assimilation and believes that cultural and social assimilation are necessary means in the process of becoming American. Though, Huntington constitutes the main reference in relation to nativism and assimilation, other scholars are equally important. The justification for basing a large part of the argumentation on the views of Huntington is that his work is recent and highly relevant because it has been developed as a critical reaction towards Mexican immigration. Furthermore, several scholars such as Citrin and Massey have critically reviewed Huntington’s work. Consequently, the two viewpoints, multiculturalism and nativism form the basis for the debate on how to approach Mexican integration.

To support Huntington’s argumentation on the integration of Mexican immigrants and the opposition towards multiculturalism, references to Harvard historian Arthur M. Schlesinger Jr. will be made. In his book *The Disuniting of America* (1992), Schlesinger argues that multiculturalism and bilingualism will contribute to a further disuniting of the American society.
As a general support to the integration paradigm assimilation, the theory of Milton Gordon will be applied to describe the development of the classical approach assimilation. In his book *Assimilation in American Life* (1964), Gordon works with seven steps in the process of assimilation\(^8\), where the first step is acculturation to the receiving country’s core values, beliefs and behaviors. Cultural assimilation is, according to Gordon, the most vital step as it is used as a stepping-stone to the remaining steps of assimilation. Consequently, Gordon acknowledges the importance of acquiring English language skills in order to become part of the American society.

The classic work of Gordon is acknowledged in the field of assimilation studies. This is also supported by the fact that various scholars such as Min Zhou use his work as a starting point for their own research.

In the process of clarifying the paradigms and ideologies that revolve around integration we have pointed out central scholars who have not only provided an elaboration of transnationalism and assimilation as individual entities, but who have also provided alternative ways with which to approach the complex subject of integration. Thus, in their research *Immigrants Incorporation and Sociocultural Transnationalism* (2002), Silvia Giorguli Saucedo and José Itzigsohn illustrate the interconnectedness between assimilation and transnationalism, one of the focal points of this dissertation.

In addition, in her article *Segmented Assimilation: Issues Controversies, and Recent Research on the New Second Generation* (1997), Min Zhou studies the theory of segmented assimilation, which has been applied to the issue of language and how the acceptance of the preservation of Spanish among Mexican immigrants might prompt incorporation of Mexican immigrants in the long run.

Finally, section 5.3 *Measuring Assimilation among Mexican and Vietnamese Immigrants* is solely based on Jacob L. Vigdor’s study *Measuring Immigrant Assimilation in the United States* (2008). Vigdor’s study is useful because his three-dimensional division of the concept of assimilation is up-to-date and

---

\(^8\) The seven steps are: cultural, structural, marital, identificational, attitude-receptional, behavior-receptional and civic assimilation.
therefore applicable to present immigration in the US. Furthermore, his study was essential in the process of determining which immigrant group to focus on because it demonstrates how Mexican immigrants differ from other immigrant groups.

2.2 Method

It would be incorrect to claim that a lack of English language skills among immigrants is the only obstacle to integrating successfully into the American society because other factors such as educational attainment, socioeconomic status, labour market integration and a low degree of naturalization among Mexican immigrants often are barriers to integration too. Furthermore, external factors such as the changing economic structure in the US also have an affect on the integration process of Mexican immigrants. This is owed to an expansion of the hourglass economy, which impedes the socioeconomic mobility among immigrants (Zhou, 2004). However, due to the focus on English language skills, this dissertation is only going to touch briefly upon the above mentioned barriers to integration and only to the extent that it adds to the understanding of the importance of English language skills by Spanish-speaking immigrants.

2.2.1 Delimitation of the subject

Even though language skills and national identity are closely linked issues, their interconnectedness and how these two entities correlate with and influence each other is not in scope. For the same reasons, an economic interpretation of migration such as economic incentives to migrate and how migration affects the US economy has also been deselected from the dissertation. Consequently, this dissertation only includes a discussion of the economic consequences in terms of language skills in relation to the educational attainment among Spanish-speaking immigrants and how it affects patterns of social mobility.

Finally, the differentiation between undocumented and documented immigrants will only be discussed to a limited degree. The justification for this choice is that
the separation between the two is not relevant because the Spanish language is present among both undocumented and documented Mexican immigrants.

2.2.2 Merging Theory with Empirical and Quantitative Data

The research conducted on the subject of Mexican migration and more specifically the role of language skills, is based on empirical findings which makes it challenging to separate theory and empirical data. For this reason, it has been necessary to merge theory and empirical data. As an example, in order to measure how Mexican immigrants integrate, the dissertation has applied the integration paradigms, assimilation and transnationalism. This method has been adopted to provide a theoretical basis for an empirical discussion of how Mexican immigrants are integrating into the American society. In order to support both theoretical and empirical findings, quantitative data has been included.

To the degree possible the dissertation has maintained theory as a starting point followed by a discussion which includes both empirical and theoretical considerations relevant to the integration of Mexican immigrants in the US.

2.2.3 Quantitative data

Mexican migration is a hot topic in the US and the political convictions of various organizations and think tanks are constantly trying to influence the opinion of the man in the street. Information from various research centers such as the Pew Hispanic Center, the Center for Immigration Studies, the US Census Bureau and the Udall Center of the University of Arizona has been gathered to support the theoretical and empirical findings. However, when applying this research, it has been important to keep in mind that these organizations and think tanks are politically biased. Nevertheless, among the various American organizations, the below have conducted the most comprehensive surveys published to date in the field of immigration.

Some of the research has been noted below:
2.2.4 The interconnectedness between the political ideologies and the integration paradigms

It has been necessary to create a specific categorization of the political ideologies, integration paradigms and language policies applied in the dissertation. This is due to the fact that these concepts operate on different levels:

- Scientific level
- Political /ideological level
- Social level

The concepts are all ambiguous and can be categorized as both scientific and political. This ambiguity can be illustrated through Harvard professor Samuel P. Huntington because even though he is an academic scholar who conducts research his work can also be associated with the political ideology nativism.

Due to the methodological challenge, this subsection is going to explain how the interconnectedness between the different political ideologies, integration paradigms and language policies are incorporated in the attempt to address the role of English language skills.
The dissertation works with the conviction that the political ideology nativism is closely interconnected with the integration paradigm assimilation. This is based on the argument that both concepts ultimately share the same interpretation of how to address the issue of immigration. The ideology of nativism seeks to protect the cultural interests of Native-born Americans against those of immigrants. This is done to preserve the American national identity through cultural homogeneity.

The assimilation approach to integration reflects the same view by emphasising that the acculturation of immigrants will preserve a sense of continuity and homogeneity of the nation. Through a historical perspective, it can be argued that nativism has always been present in American society, which among other things is reflected in the Naturalization law of 1790 that was not repealed until 1952. The law states that people of color did not belong in the republic nor could they be accepted as full-fledged members, but rather had to be expelled, segregated, or subordinated. This kind of restriction was also aimed at other nationalities like Irish, Southern- and Eastern European immigrants who were perceived to be inimical to the nation’s well-being (Olneck, 2006). This rather racial aspect of nativism was later combined with more inclusive notions of the American national identity to produce and legitimatize the integration paradigm the melting pot, which, as stated earlier, was the stepping-stone for assimilation (Olneck, 2006).

Assimilation is generally a symbolic and normative loaded word, which has been used to describe the ways in which newcomers were to be included in the American society and how some Native-born Americans have ordered, perceived and judged population diversity (Olneck, 2006). In this dissertation however, assimilation will not be applied from a normative perspective but instead mainly function as an analytical tool when addressing the issue of linguistic integration. Due to these obvious similarities, nativism and assimilation represent one side of the immigration debate, which, as previously mentioned in chapter 2 Theory and Method, is represented by scholars such as Samuel P. Huntington, Arthur M. Schlesinger and Milton Gordon.

The same interconnectedness is found between the political ideology multiculturalism and the transnational approach to integration. These two concepts
share the same liberal views on immigration and integration and both work to assure the preservation of immigrant cultures and distinct identities in the process of integration. From a multicultural perspective, the acknowledgement of racial, cultural and ethnic diversity is combined with transnationalism, which supports the immigrants’ ties to their country of origin. This interpretation of immigration and the process of integration represent the other spectrum of the immigration debate in the dissertation and are supported by social scientists such as Jack Citrin, Douglas Massey, Richard Alba, Silvia Giorguli Saucedo and José Itzigsohn.

When studying the issue of linguistic assimilation among Mexican immigrants in the US the two language policies, monolingualism and bilingualism are very much applicable to the above mentioned ideologies and paradigms. As previously mentioned in chapter 1 Introduction: A Nation of Immigrants, since the Great Migration Wave monolingualism in English has been a constitutive part of the American national identity (Pavlenko, 2001). In addition, the US has no official language and various political movements such as the English-Only Movement have tried to implement English as the official language and worked towards banning bilingual programs from American public schools. Consequently, the ethno-cultural conceptions of American national identity have been responsible for two major campaigns for immigrant assimilation, the Americanization movement of the first quarter of the twentieth century and the Official English campaigns, which have been present in the US for the last two decades (Olneck, 2006). This restrictiveness towards linguistic diversity is also present in both nativism and assimilation and explains why this branch of language policy is interconnected with both nativism and assimilation throughout the dissertation.

In return, multiculturalism favours all levels of cultural diversity, which also includes linguistic diversity such as bilingualism. Furthermore, living in a transnational milieu may also foster the need for bilingualism in the attempt to maintain for instance social relations with people in the country of origin. As a result, multiculturalism and transnationalism will constitute the pillars of linguistic diversity.
Table 1 – Theoretical Subdivision

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Concept 1</th>
<th>Concept 2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Political Ideologies</strong></td>
<td>Nativism</td>
<td>Multiculturalism</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Integration Paradigms</strong></td>
<td>Assimilation</td>
<td>Transnationalism</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Language Policy</strong></td>
<td>Monolingualism</td>
<td>Bilingualism</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Despite the distinct categorization of the different policies, ideologies and integration paradigms as illustrated in table 1, considerations have been given to the fact that there are alternative ways of merging the concepts. However, in the attempt to clarify the two general opposing concepts of integration, this classification has been applied consistently throughout the dissertation. This method also reflects the general approach used in various academic articles.

### 2.2.5 Outline of Dissertation

The dissertation has been divided into three parts.

- Theory and Method: chapter 2
- History: chapter 3 to 5.
- Discussion and analysis: chapter 6 and 7.

In continuation of chapter 2 *Theory and Method*, which, among other things, provides an overview of the theories as well as an explanation of the classification of the ideologies, paradigms and policies, chapter 3 *Integration Paradigms* will present a further explanation of the theories presented in chapter 2 and thereby provide a nuanced discussion of the interconnectedness between the theories in relation to the integration of Mexican immigrants.

As history forms an understanding of the continuing paradigmatic quarrel between the approach of transnationalism and assimilation, chapter 3 to 5 will accentuate how past events have shaped present conditions for contemporary immigrants.
Hence, chapter 4 *Mexican Immigration to the US* will address some of the most important historical events that have shaped Mexican immigration to the US. Even though this chapter does not directly treat the role of English language skills in the integration process, an overview of Mexican immigration history is important and a prerequisite to understand why a majority of Mexicans go north to increase their socioeconomic living standards.

Chapter 5 *Integration of Mexican Immigrants* will take its focal point in William S. Bernard’s tripartition of American integration history, which operates within the epochs the mid-nineteenth century, the turn of the early twentieth-century and post 1965. As the focus of the dissertation rests on the integration of Mexican immigrants, section 5.3 *Measuring Assimilation among Mexican and Vietnamese Immigrants*, illustrates how these two groups, which arrived to the US within the same time span, have assimilated very differently into US society.

Chapter 6 *Integration and Linguistic Assimilation* specifically addresses the role of English language skills in relation to the integration of Mexican immigrants and discusses how bilingualism could have a positive affect on the integration process. To answer the research questions listed in chapter 1 *Introduction: A Nation of Immigrants*, this chapter will intertwine the theories presented in chapter 2 *Theory and Method* and the theoretical discussions in chapter 3 *Integration Paradigms and Mexican Immigration* with empirical data. Finally, this chapter will address alternative ways of approaching linguistic integration by studying the interconnectedness between the integration paradigms.

This leads to the final chapter of the dissertation *Arizona – Case Study*, which primary goal is to align theory and empirical data already discussed in chapter 6 *Integration and Linguistic Assimilation*. The reason for choosing Arizona as case study is because it depicts the complex relationship between the two integration paradigms, transnationalism and assimilation, which, among other things, is reflected in the oppositional approaches by the *business sector* and *state legislation*. 
2.2.6 Terminology

**Integration:** The term integration is used as a super-ordinate term which includes all aspects of the integration paradigms. Assimilation, the melting pot and transnationalism are considered to be more specific terms.

**Immigration/migration:** The terms immigration and migration are used interchangeably and both refer to the movement from one country to another. The same goes for the terms *immigrant* and *migrant*.

**Native Americans:** The term Native Americans refers to the indigenous population in the US.

**Native-born Americans:** The term Native-born Americans refers to white Americans and those who are not perceived as immigrants.

**Mexican immigrants:** This term is applied throughout the dissertation when referring to Mexican immigrants whether they are from the first, second or third generation. This is done to maintain an overview because, unless otherwise noted, Mexican immigrants are referred to as an ethnic group and not as individuals belonging to specific generations.

**Definition of generations of immigrants:**
Unless otherwise noted, the following definitions captures the first, second, third and higher generations of immigrants:

- **First generation:** Immigrants born outside the US

- **Second generation:** Born in the US with at least one first-generation parent

- **Third and higher generation:** Born in the US with both parents born in the US
**Definition of Language skills:**

Throughout the dissertation the term **language skills** will be used as a superordinate term, which does not refer to any specific degree of language proficiency or usage of the English language. Contrary, when applying the term **English language proficiency**, it is used instrumentally in a socioeconomic perspective as a skill or a competence to experience social mobility, whereas the term **English usage** is closely connected to cultural assimilation and refers to an underlying assimilation into the host country.

**Definition of WASP**

When applied in the dissertation, the term **WASP** refers to White Anglo-Saxon Protestants, who descend from the early Northern and Scandinavian European immigrants. In addition, the term **WASP-culture/Anglo-Protestant** refers to the traditional culture of White Anglo-Saxon Protestants, where the key elements are the English language, Protestantism, religious commitment, English concepts of the rule of law, Protestant values of individualism and work ethic. This is captured in the belief that humans have the duty to create a heaven on earth.

**Definition of Americanization**

The term **Americanization** refers to the process by which the immigrants are Americanized in the attempt to make them into loyal US citizens. In this dissertation, there is, however, a strong convergence between the terms Americanization, Anglicization, and Anglo-Saxonization, which explains why the term Americanization also refers to English monolingualism.
3. Integration Paradigms and Mexican Immigration

In continuation of *chapter 2 Theory and Method*, the purpose of this chapter is to elaborate on the preliminary introduction of the integration paradigms. Whereas the previous chapter treated the paradigms from primarily a definitional level this chapter will provide a theoretical discussion of the development in the approach to integration and link the different integration paradigms with Mexican immigration.

The US has always boasted itself of being a country made up by immigrants – a country with room for everybody. But is American society really the great melting pot or is that perception outdated?

### 3.1 Assimilation

#### 3.1.1 The Stepping-Stone to Assimilation

The notion of the melting pot has been widely criticised. The critic has been based on the belief that even though the intention of the melting pot was to combine the cultural and ethnic backgrounds of the different immigration groups; it actually ended up suppressing other cultures rather than joining them together. Thereby, the WASP-culture became the new and most dominant culture in American society (Laubeová, 2000). The melting pot could therefore be interpreted as a process of Americanization or assimilation. In US immigration history, this was, as stated in chapter 2 *Theory and Method*, illustrated by the way in which immigrants were encouraged to learn English and to thrust aside their “foreign ways” (Hirschman, 1983).

#### 3.1.2 The Classical Approach to Integration

As stated earlier, the melting pot, in many ways, gave birth to assimilation. However, whereas the melting pot represents the uniting of different cultures into
one, assimilation emphasises complete cultural adaptation of newcomers. It refers to the belief that immigrants are expected to abandon their old way of life and completely “melt” into American society through residential integration and occupational achievement over several generations (Zhou, 1997). In other words, distinctive ethnic traits such as old cultural traits, native languages and residing in ethnic enclaves are, from a classical assimilation standpoint, sources of disadvantages, which will negatively affect the assimilation process. Scholar Milton Gordon is believed to have developed the most complete and redefined theoretical framework for the process of classical assimilation. In his book Assimilation in American Life, Gordon identifies seven steps in the process of assimilation, which he believed would take place in a fairly regular sequence (Gordon, 1964). The first step is, according to Gordon, the acculturation of the immigrants which implies the immigrant’s gradual adoption of the cultural habits of the receiving country – a culture which Gordon defines as white middle-class Protestant (Greenman and Xie, 2006). Gordon equally emphasizes the importance of the adoption of the English language, which is an interpretation of the assimilation process that very much correlates with the view of Samuel P. Huntington and Arthur M. Schlesinger Jr. However, Gordon argues that even though cultural assimilation is seen as the stepping-stone to the remaining steps of assimilation as stated in chapter 2 Theory and Method, the process of cultural assimilation does not automatically lead to other forms of assimilation. This is due to the fact that immigrants may remain distinguished from one another because of spatial isolation and lack of contact with the Native-born Americans. Therefore, full assimilation of the immigrants will ultimately depend on the degree to which these groups gain acceptance in the dominant population of the receiving society (Gordon, 1964).

This interpretation of the process of cultural assimilation correlates with the views of Warner and Srole, who argue that skin color, language of origin and religion are key factors in determining the level of acceptance of minorities by the dominant group. Hence, these factors combined with socioeconomic status set the speed for

---

9 The seven stages include: cultural, structural, marital, identificational, attitude-receptional, behavior-receptional and civic assimilation.
complete assimilation. They state that even though differences in social status and economic opportunity based on culture and language will erode over the course of several generations, the social mobility of readily identifiable minority groups is likely to be confined within racial-caste boundaries (Zhou, 1997). Consequently, maintaining a distinctive ethnicity can both help and hinder the social mobility of ethnic minorities (Zhou, 1997).

This rather structural perspective relates to the boundaries that systematically limit the immigrants’ access to social resources, such as opportunities for jobs, housing, and education, which ultimately results in persistent racial/ethnic disparities in levels of income, educational attainment and occupational skills. Hence, the benefits of becoming an American consequently depend on which stratum of the American society absorbs the new immigrants (Zhou, 1997). In other words, the process of becoming an American may not uniformly lead to middleclass status, but rather to the occupation of different rungs on the ethnic hierarchy. According to Gordon, this implies that structural assimilation becomes the keystone of the arch of assimilation, which inevitably will lead to other stages of assimilation (Zhou, 1997). This will, however, be addressed more thoroughly in section 3.3.1 Segmented Assimilation. However, even though complete assimilation to the dominant American culture may not ensure all immigrants full social participation in mainstream American society, supporters of the classical approach to assimilation believe that immigrants must free themselves from their old cultures in order to begin rising up from marginal positions (Zhou, 1997).

3.2 Transnationalism

As stated in chapter 2 Theory and Method, transnationalism is closely related to the political ideology multiculturalism. This paradigm is not a new phenomenon because the first waves of immigrants also stayed in contact with their families and their country of origin. However, in the late twentieth century, transnationalism experienced a new awakening, due to the fact that new patterns of internationalization and globalization became visible. This was reflected in new
types of relationships between individual nation-states, which were independent of borders and boundaries. By the 1980s these transnational patterns had become more apparent in the rapid scope and scale of international migration (Gerber, 2006). The growth in immigration was, among other things, due to the global economic development which created a global labour market, especially for low-skilled workers, in the developed world. The emergence of globalization and the development in communication and transportation technology created a population of transmigrants. Transmigrants are characterized by being individuals who while living in a foreign country maintain familial, economic, religious, political or social relations to their country of origin. It is therefore possible for the immigrant to feel a sense of belonging to both the sending and receiving country at the same time, which at times results in dual citizenship (Gerber, 2006).

Today, practically every immigrant participates in some kind of transnational practice whether it is through remittances or business projects in the country of origin (Itzigsohn and Saucedo, 2002). Therefore, when discussing the approach of transnationalism, it is relevant to take into account the importance of social and human capital (Kandel and Massey, 2002). This is due to the fact that they are very much interlinked with cross border movements and the way in which the immigrants use each other’s experiences and social relations in the decision-making process of whether or not to migrate. In the case of Mexican immigration, social capital formation is established when Mexicans living in Mexico have family members or acquaintances in the US because this will increase the incentive for the Mexican to move to the US himself (Kandel and Massey, 2002). The strong transnational ties among Mexicans can, among other things, be explained by the fact that about half of all adult Mexicans know someone who lives in the US (Massey and Espinosa, 1997).

Where social capital is related to a person’s social ties, the theory of human capital formation is characterized by its self-perpetuating nature, which is based on migration experience, such as crossing the border or living in the US for a certain period of ones life. Hence, the more cross border movement experienced, the
higher the possibility of crossing the border in the future. In addition, while the likelihood of travelling to the US increases, the odds of returning to Mexico decreases (Massey and Espinosa, 1997). In the words of Massey and Espinosa:

“This process of self-reinforcing human capital formation intersects with and reinforces the process of social capital formation since added experience makes a person more valuable as a resource for gaining entry to the United States.”

(Massey and Espinosa, 1997)

Generally, the transnational notion of national loyalty does not correlate with the traditional approach to integration in the US, assimilation, because the proliferation of transnational ties challenges conventional notions about the assimilation of immigrants into the American society. Nativist scholars such as historian Arthur M. Schlesinger Jr. and Harvard professor Samuel P. Huntington, therefore, regard transnationalism as a threat to American culture and national identity – especially due to the forces of bilingualism which has been enhanced through the notion of transnationalism. A further discussion of the effects of bilingualism will, however, take place in chapter 6 Integration and Linguistic Assimilation and 7 Arizona – Case Study.

3.3 Contemporary revisions of the classical approach to Assimilation

Though the classical assimilation perspective, in recent decades, has been met by criticism from scholars such as Douglas Massey, it continues to be the primary theoretical framework for sociological research on race and ethnic inequality (Hirschman, 1983). According to Rumberger and Larson, the classical approach to assimilation is not applicable to the recent flows of immigrants because unlike previous immigrant groups Latin American and Asian immigrants come from a much wider variety of socioeconomic backgrounds, which suggest that they start out on different stages of the American class system (Rumberger and Larson, 1998). Instead Rumberger and Larson contend that there is a process of segmented assimilation, which varies among and within the immigrant groups and depend on
both the social class of the immigrant families and on the communities in which they settle. Lower social class immigrants, for instance, are more likely to settle in homogeneous ethnic neighbourhoods where the need and opportunities to learn English are relatively low, with the result of their children becoming limited bilinguals. In contrast, entrepreneurial and professional immigrants are more likely to live in heterogeneous neighbourhoods, where the need and opportunity to learn English are stronger and therefore the children of these immigrants are more likely to become either English monolingual or fluent bilinguals (Rumberger and Larson, 1998).

3.3.1 Segmented Assimilation

What Rumberger and Larson are referring to above, is the theory of segmented assimilation. A theory, which is also supported by Min Zhou who states that because the US is a stratified and unequal society, the segmented assimilation theory offers a more appropriate theoretical framework for the understanding of the process by which the new second generation of immigrant children becomes assimilated into mainstream American society (Zhou, 1997; Greenman and Xie, 2006). In cooperation with Alejandro Portes, Zhou has observed three possible multidirectional patterns that are most likely to occur among contemporary immigrants and the following generations. These patterns explain what determines into which segment of American society a particular immigrant group may assimilate (Zhou, 1997).

- *The time-honoured upward mobility pattern* into the white middle-class.

- *The downward-mobility pattern* that leads straight into permanent poverty and finally assimilation into the underclass.

- *The pattern of economic integration into middle-class America* with lagging acculturation and deliberate preservation of the immigrant community’s values and tight solidarity.
3.3.1.1 Segmented Assimilation and Mexican Integration

Mexican immigrants can mostly be found in two of the three patterns, the pattern of economic integration into middle-class America or the downward-mobility pattern. This is due to the fact that the majority of Mexican immigrants hold the lowest socioeconomic status among ethnic minorities in America. (Zhou, 1997; Rumberger and Larson, 1998). This may be due to the continuing racial discrimination, which has had huge consequences for the children of immigrant parents, especially in terms of residential segregation on the basis of class and race (Zhou, 1997). Unequal distribution of economic and educational resources and an upbringing in isolated ghettos have seriously curtailed minority children’s chances in life. Consequently, the inequalities of class and race that plague American society are eventually carried into the American educational system with inner-city schools becoming “arenas of injustice” (Zhou, 1997). Studies show that the children of Latin American families that moved out of the inner-city neighbourhoods did better in school and in labour markets than those left behind (Zhou, 1997). The children of immigrants and further generations who have not been able to move up the socioeconomic ladder are concentrated in inner-city ghettos and due to their socioeconomic status they have developed an adversarial outlook on American society. This antipathy is entailed in a strong refusal of mainstream American norms and values, rather than the failure to assimilate. School achievement is thus seen as unlikely to lead to upward social mobility and high achievers are regarded as sell-outs to oppressive authorities (Zhou, 1997).

This adversarial outlook can have fatal consequences for the integration of ethnic minorities, and especially for newly arrived immigrants and their children. Not only does the adversarial outlook have consequences for the overall assimilation, it also strongly influences the future generations of immigrant children who are forced into a dilemma. Either, they are to meet their parents’ expectations for academic achievement or they are likely to be perceived as “acting white” by their home communities (Zhou, 1997). As a consequence, if the immigrant children submit to the pressure of their peers and oppress their wish to become “American”, they are likely to adopt the culture of the inner-city, which could
result in minority language maintenance instead of a gradual language shift toward English monolingualism. In this regard, ethnic communities themselves can hinder the assimilation of younger members of immigrant groups (Zhou, 1997). Cooperation and mutual agreement from ethnic minority groups, therefore, become essential in the assimilation process because support from the immigrants’ ethnic group, as stated by Bernard, is of great importance and maybe even a necessity if the immigrant is to experience any incentive to assimilate (Bernard, 1967).

In her article Min Zhou concludes that the segmented assimilation theory recognizes the fact that contemporary immigrants are being absorbed by different segments of American society, ranging from affluent middle-class suburbs to impoverished inner-city ghettos (Zhou, 1997). In this lies an important point because Zhou recognizes that there is more than one way of becoming American and that becoming American may not always be an advantage for the immigrants or for their children (Zhou, 1997; Greenman and Xie, 2006).

### 3.3.2 Transnationalism vs. Assimilation

The usage of English language skills has always been a measure of assimilation and thereby been the heart of discussion in relation to the integration of immigrants into American society. Language policies are related to beliefs about the relationship between language and national unity and between language and social mobility (Wiley and Lukes, 1996), which will be elaborate on in chapter 6 Integration and Linguistic Assimilation. Due to the massive flows of Mexican immigrants, both Huntington and Schlesinger are concerned about the seemingly decreasing importance of the English language, which they believe is crucial for national unity in the US. In addition, both scholars regard cultural and social assimilation as necessary means in the process of socioeconomic mobility.

New research has, however, shown that the two integration paradigms, assimilation and transnationalism, are not necessarily excluding each other. This is
supported by José Itzigsohn and Silvia Giorguli Saucedo, who in their article “Immigrant Incorporation and Sociocultural Transnationalism” have analyzed the transnational sociocultural linkages\(^\text{10}\) among three Latin American groups in the US. They argue that the paradigm for immigration has changed over the last decade. Whereas earlier integration studies almost solely focused on the process of immigrants’ assimilation into the host country by analyzing the sending and the receiving country as two separate societies, the new paradigm argues that immigrants redefine but do not break with values that stem from their country of origin. Instead they create a multiplicity of ties in different areas of social action, which transcend national boundaries (Itzigsohn and Saucedo, 2002).

This new paradigm is very relevant in connection with Mexican immigrants since scholars such as Huntington states that transnationalism is not compatible with being American and that transnational practices enhance the retention of Spanish, thereby diminishing the incentive to acquire English language skills and assimilate. Scholars, who have worked within the new paradigm, however, argue that assimilation-oriented studies have failed to capture the importance of the immigrants’ social lives that take place across national boundaries (Itzigsohn and Saucedo, 2002). This is a practice, which involves a majority of Latin American immigrants and implies living and being part of two societies that are linked through transnational social practices. Itzigsohn and Saucedo also state that despite the rise of transnational practices and linkages, immigrant assimilation is still taking place in the host society and most notably, transnational interests of the immigrants often assist the process of assimilation (Itzigsohn and Saucedo, 2002).

Even though, the first generation of immigrants is not expected to fully immerse into mainstream American society and culture because assimilation is a process, which spans over generations, both academic research and public policy nevertheless expect the first generation to sever its ties with the country of origin.

---

\(^{10}\) By sociocultural transnationalism the authors are referring to those transnational linkages that involve the recreation of a sense of community than encompasses migrants and people in the place of origin. Sociocultural transnationalism refers to social practices that are more affective oriented and less instrumental than political and economic transnationalism (Itzigsohn and Saucedo, 2002).
It is therefore relevant to include the first generation when studying the relationship between transnationalism and assimilation. The rise in transnational practices has, as previously mentioned, often been associated with the characteristics of the contemporary global capitalist economy and the developments in communication and transportation technology (Itzigsohn and Saucedo, 2002). However, in their article, Itzigsohn and Saucedo list three alternative explanations for why people participate in transnational practices:

- **Linear transnationalism** views transnational practice simply as a continuation of the ties that link immigrants to their families and place of origin. These ties are maintained by sending remittances, travelling home and building ethnic institutions in the receiving country in the attempt to rebuild the social relations and way of life from the country of origin.

- **Resource dependent transnationalism** refers to immigrants who are trying to reconstitute their linkage to the country of origin but cannot do so because of a lack of resources. When entering the receiving country, the immigrants have neither the time nor the financial means to engage in transnational practices. However, this changes over time and when the immigrants have enough economic resources they tend to engage in philanthropic or business projects in the country of origin.

Scholar Alejandro Portes supports the notion of resource dependent transnationalism by arguing that transnationalism is a specific avenue of mobility for entrepreneurial immigrants, which leads to a degree of social mobility not otherwise obtainable when solely doing business in either the sending or receiving country. Though, this type of transnationalism is slow it requires a certain amount of accumulated capital and is therefore directed at economically successful immigrants (Itzigsohn and Saucedo, 2002).
The final group in Itzigsohn and Saucedo’s division of immigrants differs from the previous two because in this group, the members use transnationalism as a way of reacting against the host country.

- **Reactive transnationalism** revolves around transnational practices as a reaction to a negative experience of assimilation. Due to a lack of satisfaction with their life in the host country the immigrants engage in transnational practices. This can either be the result of frustration with occupational careers or the low social status attained in the receiving country. Therefore, the immigrants, who can send remittances to their families at home or to their communities in the country of origin do so because in that way they will enjoy higher level of prestige in the home country than in the receiving country. Another reason why immigrants engage in transnational practices can be seen as a result of discrimination or a negative perception of the receiving society, which leads them to retain identification with their country of origin. This may also explain the rise in transnationalism among some members of the second generation.

To sum up, the three explanations for the participation in transnational practices are not mutually exclusive. They have different implications for the understanding of assimilation. In the case of linear transnationalism it is expected that as time passes by and as the immigrants assimilate into the society and culture of the receiving society, transnational linkages diminish. The remaining two, however, turn traditional studies of immigration on their head. The rise of transnational practices and linkages in relation to resource dependent transnationalism will rise proportionately with the increase in economic assimilation and social mobility. In the case of reactive transnationalism, the approach of transnationalism and transnational identities will emerge as a reaction to discrimination and a negative process of assimilation (Itzigsohn and Saucedo, 2002).

With this study Itzigsohn and Saucedo intend to show that assimilation and transnationalism are not mutually excluding one another but rather complementing
each other. The findings conducted by Itzigsohn and Saucedo are not adequately different from the multidirectional patterns, which Min Zhou outlines in her analysis on segmented assimilation. While Zhou tries to explain what determines into which segment of American society a particular immigrant group may assimilate, Itzigsohn and Saucedo focus on what influences transnational practices when the immigrants either are assimilating or have assimilated into American society. The two articles of the above mentioned scholars are substantiating each other because they both display the influence of transnationalism in relation to the assimilation process of Latin American immigrants into American society. Furthermore, both studies recognize the fact that assimilation alone does not necessarily secure successful integration nor is it a process which occurs without the influence of externally induced paradigms. Thereby, the recognition of the interconnectedness between the integration paradigms, assimilation and transnationalism does not differ substantially from the first period of integration, which will be touched upon in chapter 5 Integration of Mexican Immigrants and further elaborated on in chapter 6 Integration and Linguistic Assimilation.

3.4 Successful integration

In general terms, the responsibility for successful integration rests not only on one particular group but rather involves two set of actors; the immigrants and the receiving country. It is the interaction between these groups, which determines the direction and the ultimate outcome of the integration process (Penninx, 2003). However, it is important to note that the two actors are unequal partners in the sense that the institutional structure of the receiving country and the local communities’ attitude towards the immigrants have significant influence on the end result of the integration process (Penninx, 2003; Papademetriou, 2003). Though, when focusing on adjusting immigrants to the society and culture of the receiving country it is also necessary to take the two levels of integration into consideration; the level of the individual immigrant, which is measured in terms of e.g. education, and social and cultural adaption to the new society, as well as the
collective level of the immigrant group, which includes immigrant organizations (Penninx, 2003).

As stated in the beginning of the chapter, the purpose has been to discuss the integration paradigms, defined in chapter 2 Theory and Method. So far the chapters have applied a theoretical and a methodological approach to the topic of the dissertation. In continuation, the following chapters 4 Mexican Immigration to the US and 5 Integration of Mexican Immigrants will entail a historical and empirical discussion of Mexican immigration and integration into US society.
4. Mexican immigration to the US

The purpose of this chapter is to provide a short chronological overview of the main historical events that have shaped Mexican immigration to the US.

It was not until a century ago, in the 1900s that the first great migration wave from Mexico began. Since then migration patterns have changed over the spectre of time, often depending on external factors, such as America’s need for labour.

4.1 From an international railroad system to the two World Wars

At the beginning of the 20th century, the US and Mexico were structurally connected by means of a US-financed railroad system that ran from the US and southward thereby crossing the US/Mexican border (Durand, et. al, 2001). This transnational infrastructure connected the two countries in new ways and ultimately led to the beginning of the American labour recruitment of Mexican workers (Durand, et. al, 2001). The recruitment of Mexican workers through the railroad system therefore plays a great role in initiating the first great influx of migration from Mexico (Durand, et. al, 2001).

The aftermath of the First World War, also turned out to have an impact on Mexican immigration to the US. In view of the fact that the First World War cut off labour supply from Southern and Eastern Europe (Durand, et. al, 2001), the US was forced to turn south of the border in order to meet its need for labour. The US was growing fast as an industrialized nation and labour was a necessary means to expand even further. In 1913, 10,000 Mexican entries were reported, whereas 106,000 Mexicans crossed the border in 1924. According to official US statistics, 621,000 Mexicans crossed the Mexican/US border between 1920 and 1929 (Durand, et. al, 2001).

The Great Depression, which took place in 1929 somewhat, slowed immigration from Mexico and the 1940s was also characterized by a decrease of Mexican
migrants to the US (Durand, et. al, 2001). However, as the US suddenly found itself participating in the Second World War, it redirected its course in labour recruitment and re-initiated the employment of Mexican workers. This time, the recruitment was arranged through more official means, which is illustrated in the formation of the Bracero Program.

4.2 The Bracero Program

The Bracero program refers to a number of US/Mexican bilateral labour agreements between 1942 and 1964 (Martin, 2004). The Bracero Program was a guest worker program established to enable Mexicans to do temporary farm work in the US (Martin, 2004; Griswold, 2002). During this period around 4.6 million Mexicans migrated to the US. However, while some Mexicans returned to Mexico, an estimated 1-2 million Mexicans remained in the US where they obtained greater work experience and ultimately became legal guest workers (Martin, 2004).

Although migration from Mexico to the US was not a new phenomenon, the Bracero program formed the beginning of a new epoch in the history of Mexican migration. However, the program also had a downside as it formed the beginning of undocumented immigration to the US (Martin, 2004; Jenkins, 1977). This period is therefore marked by a heavy increase of undocumented immigrants from Mexico, the so-called “wetbacks” (Martin, 2004). The increase of undocumented Mexican immigration was facilitated by the American farmers who took advantage of the fact that hiring immigrants without a working permit would make both parties avoid tedious directives (Martin, 2004). This led to “operation Wetback” in 1954, which was designed to deport Mexican immigrants working in the US without a permit. Ultimately, the operation enabled the deportation of more than 1 million undocumented Mexicans (Martin, 2004).

The Bracero program ended in 1964 as it was put under pressure from both religious and labour organizations in the US (Durand, et al, 2001). However, the
Mexican government, which had previously supported its termination as it claimed that the rights of the Mexican workers were not protected under the program, did not support its termination because an incomplete worker program was to be preferred over unavoidable undocumented immigration to the US from Mexico (Martin, 2004).

An estimated 80% of the 222,000 Mexicans came to the US through the Bracero Program between 1957 and 1962 (Martin, 2004), from which it can be concluded that the Bracero Program has had great influence on increasing Mexican immigration.

4.3 NAFTA – Opening up the borders

The North American Free Trade Agreement, NAFTA, which came into effect in 1994 (Massy, 2005; Martin, 2004), also turned out to have a profound impact on Mexican migration. The purpose of NAFTA was originally to diminish trade barriers and increase investment between Canada, the US and Mexico (Martin, 2004). Even though it raised concerns of further immigration in the short run, it was believed that immigration from Mexico would diminish in the long run as it was predicted that the trade agreement would enhance the Mexican economy and thereby create more job opportunities and higher wages in Mexico (Martin, 2004). However, the outcome turned out differently because opening the borders to trade also meant opening the borders to migration (Massey, 2005). Due to Mexico’s entry into the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade (GATT) in 1986, the boundary was already open for cross border movement. This was further generated by NAFTA, which served to increase the annual inflow of immigrants increased. Together GATT and NAFTA offered new opportunities for cross border movement and the number of immigrants who travelled to the US on business visas tripled from 128,000 to 438,000, per year, between the years 1986-2003 (Massey, 2005). Furthermore, intra-company transferees increased from 4,300 to 16,000 during the same period.
NAFTA served to integrate the US and Mexico and according to Massey, the trade agreement was highly contradictory, because as the US was increasing border control and proposing bills to reduce immigration, the trade agreement as described above, resulted in further Mexican migration (Massey, 2005). It can therefore be argued that NAFTA and to some extent GATT encouraged migration. This notion is formulated in the quote below:

“The expanding binational network of transportation and communication that evolves to facilitate trade also makes the movement of people easier and cheaper. The interpersonal connections formed between Mexicans and Americans in the course of daily business transactions create a social infrastructure of friendship and kinship that encourages migration and facilitates further movement”

(Massey, 2005)

Conclusively, both the Bracero Program and NAFTA enhanced the great Mexican migration wave to the US. As stated in the quotation above, the increase of Mexican immigration resulted in a strong network for Mexicans in the US. As result of the migration hump, the likelihood of having acquaintances abroad increased and encouraged even more cross border movements, also referred to as social and human capital (Martin, 2004). A phenomenon already discussed in chapter 3 Integration Paradigms (Kandel and Massey, 2002).

To understand contemporary approaches to integration, chapter 5 Integration of Mexican Immigrants will start out by giving a historical perspective of the integration of immigrants in the US. This is done to provide an overview of the general tendencies in American integration history and also to provide a historical perspective on the development of the integration paradigms, assimilation and transnationalism. Finally, the following chapters will study how Mexican immigrants have integrated into American society and how Native-born Americans view this ethnic group.
5. Integration of Mexican Immigrants

As previously mentioned, various factors come into play in the immigration process. The movement itself is nevertheless only a limited part of the picture because what happens after people have immigrated is the touchstone of either success or failure (Bernard, 1967).

“Integration is the process by which immigrants become accepted into society, both as individuals and as groups“.

(Penninx, 2003)

Today’s immigrants in the US come from every corner of the world and represent an incredible array of linguistic and cultural heritages, which, according to an assimilation approach, need to be incorporated into the receiving country. This means that the societies in which the immigrants chose to settle quickly become a kaleidoscope of different cultures, identities and histories. In other words, these societies become the bedrock of integration (Ray, 2002). As stated earlier, the acquisition of English language skills among immigrants is by far the most common measure of integration. However, other factors such as age, gender, level of education, income, place of residence, country of origin, religion, citizenship, and generations in the US also come into play in the process of integration.

5.1 Three Periods of Integration

Being characterized as a country of opportunities, the US has, throughout history, received more immigrants than any other nation in the world. One of the biggest challenges has been to integrate the continuing flows of immigrants. American scholar William S. Bernard operates with three different periods in connection with the American history of integration. The first period has been labelled “Natural Selection” and lasted from the beginning of the official immigration to the young republic in 1789 to the beginning of the Great Migration Wave in 1882. This century was characterized by the rule of sink or swim, which means that there
did not exist any private or “voluntary” agencies that helped the immigrant in the integration process nor did the federal government concern itself with the settlement of the immigrants. As a result, an immigrant would either make it on his own or not at all. Furthermore, the immigrant did not leave behind his culture of origin, which indicates that he continued to speak his native tongue, read foreign language press, went to his national church and joined his group of fellow immigrants. All this was possible because the immigrant usually settled in a colony, which consisted of his own countrymen.

Bernard argues that the maintenance of cultural traits was a necessary step in the process of assimilation. These transnational activities facilitated rather than hindered the immigrant in the integration process because they provided security, and at the same time served as channels of interpretation and relationship to the new country.

The second period, “Indirect Government Internation”, which began in the beginning of 1882 and lasted until approximately the 1960s, was characterized by an incipient intervention in immigration by the federal government, which had an indirect and direct effect on integration. The US government implemented certain criteria and quota laws that the immigrant had to fulfil such as language testing. At the same time, it became a general belief that immigrants whose cultural background resembled that of the Native-born Americans would experience a higher rate of assimilation (WASP-culture). Therefore, with the exception of countries from the Western hemisphere, whose people were free to enter the US, the rest of the world was allocated national quotas of varying sizes. This was done to preserve and continue the cultural balance. Generally, the approach to integration from the US government and society at large became much more discriminatory and it was also during this period that the first (and only) explicitly race-based immigration act, the Chinese Exclusion Act, was introduced.

The third and last period has been labelled “Assisted Integration”. This period, which characterizes the integration process from 1960 is drastically different from that of the previous periods. The rule of sink or swim is now partly abandoned due to the fact that the immigrants can receive support from various organizations and
agencies such as the American Council for Nationalities Service, which is trained in the techniques of social work and is ready to offer the immigrants advice and aid in, for instance, language training, occupational guidance and preparation for citizenship. Furthermore, these organizations and agencies seek to interpret the culture of the immigrant to the American society and they thereby serve as a two-way bridge between the immigrant’s culture of origin and the new American culture. In terms of the involvement of the federal government, it continues its indirect influence of the process of individual integration, which can be illustrated by means of preparing textbooks in citizenship education (Bernard, 1967).

Bernard’s three periods give a rough view of how the integration process and the different institutional and governmental initiatives have developed throughout American history. According to Bernard, the general development of the integration process has resulted in successful integration of the newcomers into the American society. When analyzing the success of assimilation, Bernard mainly focuses on the integration of immigrants from the Scandinavian and Western-European countries. This does not constitute an accurate picture of the integration process in general, because these immigrants, as mentioned earlier, did not meet the same degree of discrimination and restrictions as other ethnic groups, which could partly explain the high level of assimilation among Scandinavian and Western-European immigrants. As the ethnic composition of the immigrants has changed over the last decades, so have the incentives to assimilate among certain immigrant groups. Nativist scholars would argue that the picture of perfect assimilation cracks when studying the most recent waves of immigrants.

Moreover, the different periods of integration overlap each other and it can therefore be argued that the rule of sink or swim still is very much present in contemporary American society. This will be further elaborated in chapter 7 Integration and Linguistic Assimilation.
5.2 Mexican Immigrants

The integration of Mexican immigrants has become a challenge. This ethnic group does not fit into the classical patterns of integration, nor does it experience the same degree of assimilation as other immigrant groups. The slow rate of assimilation is, among other things, evident through a life in a transnational milieu, also discussed in chapter 3 Integration Paradigms.

According to the report *Measuring Immigrant Assimilation in the United States*, the immigration population in the US almost quadrupled during the 1970s and doubled during the 1990s (Vigdor, 2008). As previously stated, due to the massive waves of immigrants, supporters of nativism argue that the country has had difficulties in absorbing the constant flows of immigrants, which, among things, has resulted in limited assimilation. As a result, some immigrants end up living in segregated communities (Zhou, 1997). According to Sánchez, this “failed assimilation” has given rise to an increase in nativist sentiments and some scholars even believe that Latin American immigrants pose a direct threat to the American society (Sánchez, 1997). The negative vibes towards this particular ethnic group are, as previously mentioned, based on the belief that Latin American immigrants and in particular the Mexican immigrants do not wish to assimilate into the American society. This is reflected in the maintenance of cultural traits such as the Spanish language and traditions, which nativist believe ultimately leads to a negation of the American national identity (Sánchez, 1997).

American scholar and supporter of nativism Samuel P. Huntington is famous for his critique of Mexican immigrants, who he believes differ from previous flows of immigrants due to their failure to approximate US norms such as the English language, which eventually complicate the process of assimilation (Huntington, 2004). Due to the distinct cultural differences, Huntington fears the social and cultural consequences of Latin American immigration. This is mainly due to the transnational milieu in which many of these immigrants live. Traditionally Mexican immigrants have settled in states such as Arizona, California and Florida,
which is geographically close to the Mexican border. California especially experienced an increase of Mexican immigrants due to the implementation of the Bracero Program, described in chapter 4 Mexican Immigration to the US. The geographical setting has made it easy for the immigrants to remain closely connected to their country of origin by means of, for instance, dual citizenship. This has, according to Huntington, become possible because the US government has embraced a multicultural ideology, which impedes assimilation especially by acknowledging bilingualism, which makes it possible for the public schools to no longer promote national identity and patriotism. Huntington thereby believes that if the normative pressure to identify as an American is reduced then so is the immigrants’ effort to assimilate (Citrin et. al., 2007).

Huntington’s critique of Mexican immigrants may not entirely be unfounded and research conducted by Jacob L. Vigdor also shows that Mexican immigrants are generally poorly assimilated in the American society (Vigdor, 2008). As illustrated in the figure below, Mexican immigrants are the least assimilated group in the US.

**Figure 1 - Assimilation by Country of Origin, 2006**
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The US usually regards immigration as being a phenomenon that can contribute to the country’s economic and demographic growth. However, the Mexican immigrants’ lack of assimilation, as shown in figure 1, is, among other things, the
result of very low levels of English language skills, education and naturalization rates. This has, consequently, left this ethnic group with the lowest level of social mobility and a reputation of taking rather than contributing to American society (Bean et. al., 2006).

As a continuation of this section, the following will put the integration paradigm, assimilation into perspective by comparing Mexican immigrants with Vietnamese immigrants. This is to give an overview of how Mexican immigrants differ from Asian immigrant groups – a relevant comparison because these two groups arrived to the US during the same decades.

5.3 Measuring assimilation among Mexican and Vietnamese immigrants

The rationale for comparing Mexican immigrants with Vietnamese immigrants relates to the fact that recent and increasing immigration rates have been dominated by these two groups (Vigdor, 2008). Even though the two groups have travelled to the US during the same decades, they have assimilated very differently into the American society. Thus, where Mexican immigrants have experienced slow rates of assimilation, Vietnamese immigrants on the other hand have assimilated faster into the American society (Vigdor, 2008).

Explaining why Mexican immigrants do not assimilate as successfully as do other immigrant groups is a study in itself and can therefore only be discussed to a limited extent. However, the comparison with other immigrant groups isolates the Mexican assimilation experience and forms a greater perspective of the barriers faced by a great number of Mexican immigrants - a perspective which forms the foundation of Mexican integration (Vigdor, 2008). As a result, this section serves to highlight significant aspects of assimilation among Mexican immigrants in order to draw attention to why Mexican immigrants make such an interesting case study when it comes to the subject of integrating successfully into the American society.
Jacob L. Vigdor, associate professor of public policy studies and economics from Duke University, has conducted a comparative immigration study where he has measured assimilation among various immigrant groups in the US. In his research he measured and compared the degree of assimilation between three immigration groups, Vietnamese-, Italian- and Mexican immigrants. In order to gain a more thorough understanding of how diverse ethnic groups have assimilated differently into society, he measured assimilation through three assimilation indexes:

- Economic assimilation
- Civic assimilation
- Cultural assimilation

As will be illustrated, the three indexes serve to measure assimilation through three different perspectives, which provides a more nuanced representation of Mexican integration into the US.

5.3.1 Economic Assimilation

The first index identified is the Economic assimilation index. According to Vigdor, economic assimilation refers to the degree of economic contribution that immigrants give to US society in comparison with Native-born Americans. Thus, when the economic contribution by immigrants resembles that of the Native-born Americans, economic assimilation is high (Vigdor, 2008). The following factors are used to measure economic assimilation:

- Earned income
- Labour force participation
- Unemployment ¹¹

According to Vigdor’s study, Vietnamese immigrants begin at a higher economic level when they arrive as opposed to Mexican immigrants. As a result, the

¹¹ Factors that are not relevant for the topic of this dissertation are not included.
economic assimilation for newly arrived Vietnamese immigrants in 1980 was around 85 on the assimilation index, whereas for Mexican immigrants the number was 50 (Vigdor, 2008). Furthermore, compared to the Mexican immigrants, the Vietnamese immigrants also display stronger economic assimilation over time (Vigdor, 2008).

Figure 2 - Comparing economic assimilation between Mexican and Vietnamese immigrants

Despite the progress as illustrated in the above figure, Mexican immigrants still display a low level of economic assimilation compared to Vietnamese immigrants. One explanation can be attributed to the fact that a great number of Mexicans who immigrate to the US are unskilled workers and therefore have low educational backgrounds, which means that they face great obstacles in terms of economic assimilation (Vigdor, 2008). The barriers to economic advancement increases further because of the fact that a high number of Mexican immigrants live in the US without citizenship and therefore have limited possibilities for socioeconomic mobility.

5.3.2 Civic Assimilation

Secondly, Vigdor includes the Civic Assimilation index. Vigdor describes civic assimilation as a measure of immigrant’s formal participation in society which
takes place primarily through naturalization but also includes military service (Vigdor, 2008). Among other things, civic assimilation measures:

- Naturalization rate
- The immigrant’s formal participation in society such as military service

When comparing Vietnamese and Mexican immigrants, the below figure clearly shows that both groups start at relatively low levels in terms of civic assimilation, Vietnamese immigrants are however quick to progress (Vigdor, 2008). In comparison, Mexican immigrants show very little civic progress over time.

**Figure 3 - Comparing civic assimilation between Mexican and Vietnamese immigrants**

According to Vigdor, the difference in civic assimilation among Vietnamese and Mexican immigrants can be attributed to the consequences of the Vietnam War. Due to the fact that Vietnam became a communist regime, it did not make trade agreements with the US - at least not in the earliest cohorts (Vigdor, 2008). Accordingly, the Vietnamese who were likely to flee from the communist regime were most likely people who favoured a free market economy. Thereby, the Vietnamese were possibly entrepreneurs or skilled workers who sought to improve their living conditions and escape oppression. On these grounds, this ethnic group strongly differs from Mexican immigrants because first of all, they are not
regarded as refugees and secondly Mexican immigration is first and foremost driven by economic incentives as well as social and human capital. Moreover, the Vietnamese immigrants, who wanted to free themselves from the negative sentiments associated with their country of origin were, as a result, more willing to let go of the past and embrace American customs and norms (Vigdor, 2008). Besides, in order to travel to the US, Vietnamese immigrants had to have capital to pay for the high travelling expenses. On the contrary, it is less costly for Mexican immigrants to cross the border, which enables them to maintain a closer tie to the country of origin. Due to the high travelling costs, the majority of Vietnamese immigrants permanently settled in the US, which gave them greater incentives to assimilate into American society (Vigdor, 2008). According to US legislation, the road to citizenship is further facilitated when you are a refugee as opposed to merely going to the US to work without authorization, a situation faced by a great number of Mexican immigrants (Vigdor, 2008). On these grounds, Vietnamese immigrants are like to have had strong incentives to fully integrate into the American society (Vigdor, 2008).

Mexican immigrants are not only less civic assimilated than Vietnamese immigrants, but in fact the least assimilated immigrant group in the US as illustrated in figure 1 section 5.2 The Integration of Mexican Immigrants (Vigdor, 2008). The lack of assimilation can partly be explained by the low degree of naturalization among Mexican immigrant. In 2006, Mexican immigrants constituted, by far, the largest immigrant group in the US. Between 1980 and 2006, the number of Mexican-born residents in the US more than sextupled, to nearly 11 million immigrants, which corresponds to an annual growth of more than 6% and the majority of these immigrants did not have American citizenship (Vigdor, 2008). Furthermore, according to Vigdor, Mexican immigrants’ incentives to obtain citizenship differ from the Vietnamese immigrants because the incentives are likely to be weakened if the Mexican immigrant should decide to return to the country of origin (Vigdor, 2008).
5.3.3 Cultural Assimilation

The final index and also the most important one in regard to the subject of this dissertation is the Cultural assimilation index. Cultural assimilation measures the extent to which immigrants are able to adjust and adapt to the customs of the Native-born Americans (Vigdor, 2008). The following factors are used to measure cultural assimilation:

- Ability to speak English
- Intermarriage
- Number of children

Culturally, Vietnamese and Mexican immigrants actually display similar assimilation patterns. In the figure below it is clear that Mexican cohorts arriving in the late 1970s and the late 1980s show an upward trend towards cultural assimilation (Vigdor, 2008). However, for Vietnamese immigrants arriving in the late 1980s the trend towards cultural assimilation decreases.

The immigration patterns from cohorts arriving after 1995 are very different for the two groups. Thus, in the 1995-2000 cohorts Vietnamese immigrants start at a lower level than Mexican immigrants but in return progress faster than Mexican immigrant. Whereas in the 2002 to 2005 cohorts, Vietnamese immigrants start at a higher level but make progresses more slowly than Mexican immigrants from the same cohorts (Vigdor, 2008). It is however important to note that the two groups in general are experiencing some progress along cultural lines. Vigdor attributes these developments to marital patterns. During the 1990s, Vietnamese and Mexican immigrant groups had grown, which made it more likely for an immigrant to find a spouse deriving from the same ethnic group, who were born in the US and thus had already adapted to US cultural norms (Vigdor, 2008). In addition, during this time span the immigrants’ attitude towards intermarriage had, in all probability, changed as they had become more tolerant towards other ethnic groups. This might have contributed to the facilitation of cultural assimilation within recent cohorts.
Figure 4 - Comparing cultural assimilation between Mexican and Vietnamese immigrants

Figure 4 illustrates the difficulties faced by immigrants whose culture differ greatly from that of the US and therefore find it difficult to integrate into a society based on core WASP principles. Both the Vietnamese and Mexican culture differ greatly from the American tradition, which might explain why the assimilation patterns of the two groups seem to be so similar.

Conclusively, when comparing the two groups by means of Vigdor's three assimilation indexes, it becomes clear that Mexicans are overall more poorly assimilated than Vietnamese immigrants. This can, according to Vigdor, be ascribed to the fact that immigrants originate from different nations and therefore have different experiences both before and after arriving to the US (Vigdor, 2008).

The purpose of the previous two chapters was to provide a historic overview of Mexican immigration and illustrate how this group has assimilated into American society. In continuation, the following two chapters will constitute the analysis of this dissertation by merging the theoretical and historical background presented so far with the underlying construct and hold it in relation to the linguistic assimilation of Mexican immigrants.
6. Integration and Linguistic Assimilation

The purpose of this chapter is to elucidate the importance of English language skills in relation to the cultural and economic integration of Mexican immigrants into the American society. Firstly, this section will provide a short theoretical introduction to linguistic assimilation and subsequently apply these theories in the empirical analysis. Furthermore, this chapter will incorporate the two integration paradigms, assimilation and transnationalism as basic analytical tools as well as various quantitative surveys, which are applied in the attempt to support the empirical approach which forms the basis for this chapter.

6.1 Two dimensions of linguistic assimilation

Linguistic assimilation is an important tool in measuring immigrants’ assimilation and acculturation into a host society. Social scientists make use of two dimensions of linguistic assimilation, the extent of English usage and the degree of English proficiency (acquisition). The two viewpoints are very distinct. Whereas English usage is related to an underlying assimilation into American culture, English proficiency by itself does not imply anything about the degree of identification with the host country or the extent to which English is used in practise. On the contrary, studies show that English language proficiency is significant in the broader process of economic mobility within the US (Espinosa and Massey, 1997). In other words, the extent of English usage is closely related to the socio-cultural perspective as a symbol of ethnic identity and assimilation into mainstream American culture, while English proficiency relates to the socioeconomic perspective, where English acquisition is viewed instrumentally – primarily as a skill or competence required to achieve social mobility in a country where English is the predominant language (Rumberger and Larson, 1998). These two dimensions of linguistic assimilation can also be transferred to the understanding of the political ideologies. Nativism tries to expand English usage by implementing English monolingualism, while multiculturalism views the
English language more as a proficiency and thereby does not reject foreign languages.

6.2 The way towards a monolingual state

As previously mentioned in chapter 1 *Introduction: A Nation of Immigrants*, the US has always been the destination for millions of immigrants from all over the world. In the attempt to create a homogeneous American society, English language skills became a central and relevant objective.

The English language has always been an important symbol as well as a hot political topic in the US and even though neither the Constitution nor the federal law codify English as being the nation’s official language, American English has since the beginning of the 19th century, been regarded as superior to other minority languages (Santoro, 1999). The ambivalence towards the acquisition of English language skills in relation to the integration of immigrants dates back to the founding fathers. At that time, the US was in many ways a visible multicultural country where linguistic diversity was a viable option for the newcomers – with foreign languages being used as e.g. language of instruction (Pavlenko, 2001). The lack of an official national language has, however, resulted in various interpretations of the status of the English language. Nativists believe that bi-or multiculturalism was not necessarily a desired goal for the founding fathers (Pavlenko, 2001) and therefore claim that English-only policies will only encourage non-Anglophones to assimilate economically, politically and morally into the American culture (Santoro, 1999). Contrary to this, multiculturalists interpret the lack of reference as an indication of a tolerant attitude toward linguistic diversity and view English-only policies as xenophobic (Pavlenko, 2001; Santoro, 1999).

Due to the Great Migration Wave (1880-1924) an ideological shift took place in the US. Until then language ideologies and policies had been marked by a multicultural approach to colonial and immigrant languages of European origin
and to immigrant language maintenance. Despite concerns about immigrants’ assimilation into American society, language maintenance was, in many places, if not encouraged then at least either assisted or not tampered with. Thereby, Americanization was not yet fully synonymous with Anglicization (Pavlenko, 2001). However, as a consequence of the Great Migration Wave with approx. 24 million immigrants entering the country, Anglicization and Anglo-Saxonization came to symbolize Americanization and as a result monolingualism in English became a constitutive part of the American national identity. Simultaneously, other languages became “accents of menace”, the tangible personification of the threat of cultural pluralism and racial and ethnic diversity (Pavlenko, 2001).

‘We have room for one language here, and that is the English language… And we have room for one sole loyalty, and that is the loyalty to the American people’

Former US President Theodor Roosevelt (Pavlenko, 2001)

The convergence of Americanization took place due to a raising concern about the cultural disuniting of American society and the capacity of American society to assimilate such a large influx of newcomers (Pavlenko, 2001). As a response to the continuing flows of immigrants, nativist sentiments increased. This resulted in a rise to the ideal of “100 percent Americanism” and the establishment of the Americanization movement which peaked in the 1920s. The movement succeeded in bringing together the public and private sector of the country in a massive effort to assimilate the newcomers, which in large part took place through the use of English as language of instruction. The strong bond between the English language and Americanization was captured in the slogan “One language, one country, one flag” (Carnevale, 2006).

The negative and at times even hostile attitudes towards foreign languages and traditions decreased during the post-World War II era. Emphasis was now put on submerging cultural differences. From a political perspective, the national change in attitude towards immigrants, ethnicity and languages was launched in the beginning of the 1960s with the Voting Rights Act of 1965. Though designed to
protect southern blacks, the law finally barred discrimination based on language and education and thereby signalled a period of liberalization and a more multicultural approach to English language requirements and participation in American political life by immigrants (Carnevale, 2006). During the same year the Immigration and Nationality Act was implemented, which discontinued quotas based on national origin. The most important initiative towards a new era of tolerance for immigrant languages was, however, passed by US Congress in 1968 with the signing of the Bilingual Education Act. This legislation was to provide bilingual education and it was primarily directed to Spanish-speaking children (Carnevale, 2006).

As will be elaborated in section 6.4 Bilingualism and in chapter 7 Arizona – Case Study, bilingual education has been and continues to be a lightening rod for American attitudes toward immigrants and language. However, the increasing flows of Latin American immigrants caused efforts to dismantle bilingual educational programs and once again underlined nativist sentiments in American society. As a result, the 1980s and 1990s were characterized by attempts to make English the official language of the US, which indicated the degree to which language and national membership remained linked (Carnevale, 2006). Despite the fact that Congress, during these two decades, resisted repeated attempts to pass constitutional amendments such as the HR bill 123 of 1996\textsuperscript{12} to make English the nation’s official language, 23 states passed legislation that made English the official state language. As a response to the increasing immigration from Latin America, the English-only movement was formed. The re-emerged English-only laws were especially targeted at Latin American immigrants because the increasing number of Spanish-speakers raised fears about changes in the linguistic balance in the US (Carnevale, 2006; Santoro, 1999). Furthermore, the re-establishment of the Chicano movement, which put renewed emphasis on Chicano cultural pride, was a significant catalyst for this backlash against the Latinos (Carnevale, 2006; Santoro, 1999).

\textsuperscript{12} See appendix 2
6.3 Linguistic Assimilation of Mexican Immigrants

Both the acquisition and usage of English language skills is a process that occurs over time. In their study of the loss or preservation of the mother tongue among grandchildren of contemporary immigrants, Alba et. al. presents a three-generation process of Anglicization. A process, which schematically occurs in the following way:

Some immigrants of the first generation learn English, but the retention of the native language continues to be strong. The language of origin is still the preferred language spoken at home, the children of first generation immigrants, however, usually grow up as bilinguals. Due to the exposure to American culture many of these children prefer to speak English even in converse with their immigrant parents. Due to the second generation’s preference of the English language both in the public and private sphere, the third generation of immigrants prevalently becomes English monolinguals and their knowledge of the mother tongue is fragmentary at best (Alba et. al, 2002).

It can be discussed if the model of Anglicization, which has generally been adopted by immigrants of European ancestry, is applicable to contemporary immigrant groups. Mexican immigrants differ from other immigrant groups because they, as stated earlier, constitute the largest minority group in the US and the majority continue to maintain some knowledge of their language of origin - a tendency evident throughout generations. The complexity in relation to linguistic assimilation will be discussed more thoroughly in the remaining sections of this chapter.

Nativist scholar Samuel P. Huntington would argue that the pattern of linguistic assimilation as described above is not taking place in contemporary American society. He therefore fears that the US will be divided into two peoples, two cultures and two languages (Huntington, 2004). This is happening, he argues, because unlike previous immigrant groups the majority of today’s immigrants come from Latin America - a continent, which aside from Brazil shares the same native language. Hence, Huntington states that the incentive to learn English is being reduced because the majority of Latin American immigrants reside in ethnic
enclaves where the retention of the Spanish language and culture are strong. These immigrants therefore have not succeeded in assimilating into mainstream American culture, which eventually has slowed the intergenerational rate of linguistic assimilation (Huntington, 2004).

In their article “Testing Huntington: Is Hispanic Immigration a Threat to American Identity?” Citrin et. al. examined the rate of linguistic assimilation among Mexicans and other ethnic groups in the US by using figures conducted by the US Census Bureau. Figure 5 below illustrates the findings of Citrin et. al. and shows the proportions who either speak only English or English very well in the cohorts 1980 and 2000, respectively. More importantly, it also indicates that the overall linguistic assimilation of Mexican immigrants is much lower than among other ethnic groups (Citrin et. al., 2007).

**Figure 5 - Linguistic Assimilation of Mexican and other Immigrants**
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(Citrin et. al., 2007)

---

13 “All Others” indicates all respondents of a given ancestry who are neither foreign-born nor of the second generation living with immigrant parents.

*Other Latinos includes those of South American, Puerto Rican, and Cuban ancestry.

**Asian includes those of Chinese, Japanese, Korean and Vietnamese ancestry. Indians were excluded due to the extremely high English proficiency among first-generation immigrants.

***European (non-English speaking) including those of German, Italian, Polish and Russian ancestry.
Huntington is therefore right in stating that the rate of linguistic assimilation is low among Mexican immigrants. However, the pace of linguistic assimilation among recent Mexican immigrants portrayed in the 2000 census seems to be more rapid than in the past. This indicates that two decades of steady large-scale immigration has not slowed the rate of linguistic assimilation even though it is believed that Mexican immigrants may know less English than other newcomers entering the US (Citrin et al., 2007). This is supported by research conducted by Jacob L. Vigdor who states that immigrants, who have arrived to the US after 1995, are culturally assimilating more rapidly than their predecessors and that Mexican immigrants are generally experiencing relatively normal rates of cultural assimilation (Vigdor, 2008). On these grounds, it can be concluded that, if Spanish is increasingly spoken in the US, it is because a large number of Spanish-speaking immigrants have arrived in a short time, not because there is any perceptible resistance on the part of Mexican immigrants to learn English per se. In addition, although the pace of the intergenerational rate of linguistic assimilation may be slower among the descendants of Spanish-speakers compared to other ethnic groups, children of Mexican immigrants are demonstrating a decline in competence in the mother tongue (Espinosa et al, 1997; Alba et al, 2002). This means that for the children of the third or later generations, the pressure to speak English exclusively is so sufficiently strong that parental endogamy is, by itself, not enough to preserve Spanish as the children’s first language (Espinosa et al, 1997; Alba et al, 2002).

6.4 Bilingualism

As previously mentioned, the bilingual approach to integration has continuously been the subject of much discussion and an ambivalent discourse towards bilingualism has always been present in American society. From a historical perspective, the approach to bilingualism changed between 1917 and 1922. During this period of time, the attitude towards bilingualism went from being rather liberal to becoming quite restrictive with the passing of several Americanization laws.
Two types of discourses were converted in the attempt to promote the hegemony of English monolingualism:

- The discourse of the superiority of English

- A set of hegemonic discourses that validated monolingualism and delegitimized particular language practices such as bilingualism, foreign language education and immigrant language maintenance

Together these discourses linked the English language with superior moral and intellectual values, while bilingualism was associated with inferior intelligence, low moral standards, and lack of patriotism - at least for the immigrants and their children. This era was, however, characterized by double standards in the American ideology of bilingualism. While white middle-class children were encouraged to gain some degree of proficiency in French, Spanish and perhaps even German, their immigrant counterparts were discouraged from maintaining their native languages and demanded to focus on English only (Pavlenko 2001). As the below quotation indicates, an American citizen could not be bilingual.

“A hyphenated American is not an American at all”
Former US President Woodrow Wilson (Pavlenko, 2001)

Recent political legislation concerning bilingualism has changed from being restrictive as a consequence of the Great Migration Wave to becoming liberal in the 1960s and returning to restrictive measures in the 1980s. President George W. Bush’s replacement of the Bilingual Education Act of 1968 with the English Acquisition Act of 2001 is the latest initiative on a federal level. This revolving door of political initiatives has not eased the integration of Mexican immigrants.
6.4.1 The Disuniting of America

It is not only the pace of linguistic assimilation that worries nativist scholar Huntington. What really concern him are the ongoing influx of Spanish speakers and the emergence of bilingual enclaves (Citrin et. al., 2007). Huntington considers Mexican immigrants to be such a complex and unique group that he does not believe that they will follow the same pattern of linguistic assimilation as did earlier immigrant groups. He is convinced that by the third generation, Mexican immigrants will differ from previous immigrant generations by not only being fluent in English but quite possibly also in Spanish (Huntington, 2000). This step towards bilingualism among Mexican immigrants is by no means favoured by Huntington, who believes that since the final decades of the 20th century the US and its Anglo-Protestant culture have been assaulted by the popularity of multiculturalism and cultural diversity (Huntington, 2004). He blames globalization for encouraging transnationalism and thereby bilingualism. It is, however, noteworthy that the embrace of transnationalism by immigrants in relation to language skills is not a new phenomenon. For a long time immigrants, who arrived to the US, were joining a multicultural society where people were visibly bilingual and bicultural and where linguistic diversity was a viable option as reflected in the policies and practices of the 18th and 19th century. Spanish was, for instance, an integrated part of the country’s annexation policies in the 19th century, which can be illustrated by various bilingual initiatives such as bilingual education and Spanish-speaking officials and community leaders (Pavlenko, 2001). This bilingual approach to integration has formed the basis for the beliefs of contemporary multiculturalists who do not see Latin American culture as a possible decomposition of the American society. Furthermore, a multicultural approach to bilingualism could also be seen as a way of easing the integration process as the immigrants are not forced to leave behind their cultural traits in the attempt to assimilate into American society. Huntington opposes the transnational milieu and fears its impact on society because it favors group identities based on e.g. race and ethnicity over national identity, which will eventually disrupt the homogeneous American society.
(Massey, 2004). He bases this on the argument that there will be less incentive to learn English in a society built upon transnational identities (Huntington, 2004). His statements are supported by Arthur M. Schlesinger Jr., who argues that bilingualism hinders assimilation (Schlesinger, 1992). In his book “The Disuniting of America”, Schlesinger states that the cult of ethnic diversity exaggerates differences, intensifies resentments and antagonisms, and drives ever deeper the awful wedges between races and nationalities (Schlesinger, 1992). He blames the combination of multiculturalism with a continuing flood of Spanish-speaking immigrants for having provided bilingualism new impetus. In addition, Schlesinger does not believe that bilingualism has worked out as planned because he states that bilingual education retards rather than expedites the assimilation of Hispanic children into the English-speaking world and that it promotes segregation more than it fosters integration. In other words, according to Schlesinger, bilingualism shuts the door and dooms people using other languages than English to second-class citizenship (Schlesinger, 1992).

“Using some languages other than English dooms people to second-class citizenship in American society….. monolingual education opens doors to the larger world”

(Schlesinger, 1992).

Recent studies, however, show that neither transnational ties nor retention of a native language foster less incentive to learn English among Mexican immigrants (Alba et. al., 2002). Nor does bilingualism shut doors and dooms people to second-class citizenship (Schlesinger, 1992). Huntington and Schlesinger’s attitudes towards the influence of transnationalism in relation to bilingualism are, nevertheless, not totally unfound. According to the 2002 National Survey of Latinos, 46% of Hispanic adults possessed the ability of speaking both English and Spanish, as illustrated in figure 6. This is supported by the report "English Usage Among Hispanics in the United States” conducted by the Pew Hispanic Center, which states that bilingualism is a phenomenon that is continuing among third and higher generations of Hispanic immigrants (Hakimzadeh and Cohn,
2007). These findings are not equivalent with Alba et. al.’s three generation process of Anglicization and further support both Huntington and Schlesinger’s worries concerning the expansion of bilingualism.

Figure 6 - English and Spanish Speaking Abilities of Hispanic Adults

According to Itzigsohn and Saucedo, it is the overall perception that immigrants regardless of educational background participate in the transnational community (Itzigsohn and Saucedo, 2002). Naturally, living in a transnational milieu will often lead to a continuing retention of Spanish which, among other things, is required to maintain the ties to the country of origin. This is supported by data from the US Census Bureau, which shows that the number of Latinos speaking Spanish at home has risen from 10.2 million in 1980 to 24.7 million in 2000 (Pew Hispanic Center, 2004). Nevertheless, it is important to note that transnationalism does not exclude the acquisition of English language skills and that the majority of the immigrants, who speak Spanish at home, become bilinguals, and thereby pose varying degrees of English knowledge. Furthermore, both family and community contexts play important roles in determining whether or not, the immigrant will become bilingual. Consequently, the immigrants who live in highly segregated communities are more exposed to the Spanish language and therefore experience higher retention of the native tongue (Alba et. al., 2002). In addition, the
development in transportation technology and the close geographic placement to the Mexican border have made it possible for the immigrants to introduce their children to the country of origin, thus giving the children an incentive to master Spanish language skills as means of communication (Alba et. al, 2002). In reference to the above, transnationalism should not be seen as a barrier for neither the cultural nor the economic integration of Mexican immigrants. On the contrary, the 2002 National Survey of Latinos shows that bilingual speaking Hispanics are more economically and educationally successful than their counterparts that only speak Spanish (Pew Hispanic Center, 2004).

6.4.2 Immigrant Generations and Bilingualism

The benefits of bilingualism are not only limited to Hispanic adults. Studies conducted by Alejandro Portes and Rubén G. Rumbaut show that fluent bilingual immigrant children have the highest educational aspirations, the highest self-esteem, the lowest rates of psychological depression and score best on standardized reading and math tests in comparison with monolingual immigrant children (Massey, 2004). This is supported by Rumberger and Larson who have conducted research on the educational achievement among Mexican American language-minority students. In their research they concluded that bilingual students who are fluent English speakers had better grades and higher rates of educational stability than students from an English-only background. This was based on the argument that bilingual students have the English language skills to function effectively in school without abandoning their Spanish language and culture, which enables them to maintain an identity and to function effectively in their families and communities (Rumberger and Larson, 1998). This disproves Schlesinger’s statement that bilingual education retards the integration process and points to the fact that Huntington and Schlesinger, in particular, are generally more concerned about the retention of Spanish rather than the failure to learn English among immigrants. However, as stated earlier, the maintenance of the Spanish language and the ethnic differences diminish over time because the acquirement of English language skills becomes a natural process since learning
English becomes virtually inevitable for the children and grandchildren of immigrants who are living in the US (Citrin et. al., 2007). This gradual loss of the language of origin can be illustrated in table 2 by the Washington Post/Kaiser Family Foundation/Howard University Survey Project, which shows language usage among Hispanics throughout three generations.

Table 2 - Language Dominance (%) Among Hispanics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Language Dominance (%)</th>
<th>English</th>
<th>Bilingual</th>
<th>Spanish Dominant</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1st generation</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd generation</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3rd generation</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Citrin, et. al, 2007)

It can, nevertheless, be concluded that even though studies have displayed the advantages of bilingualism, the maintenance of minority languages is generally difficult in the US because of the overwhelming dominance of English language skills in all areas of American life and the general lack of interest both culturally and politically in promoting other languages (Carnevale, 2006). As mentioned earlier, bilingualism can be used as a way to ease the integration process of the immigrant children, which, among other things, will result in improvements of the statistics of educational attainment among Mexican immigrants. This will,
however, be discussed in section 6.6 A Linguistic Approach to Integration and in chapter 7 Arizona – Case Study.

6.5 Segmented assimilation and other factors that influence the linguistic assimilation

The acquisition of English language skills does not only influence the cultural assimilation of Mexican immigrants. On the contrary, English language skills also affect the immigrants’ socioeconomic status in the receiving country. Though bilingualism, according to Portes and Rambaut, improves the general educational attainment of immigrant children, results nevertheless shows that Mexican immigrants have the lowest educational attainment among all immigrant groups. Consequently, Mexican immigrants end up having a lower socioeconomic status than other immigrants from Central and South America (Rumberger and Larson, 1998).

Education is a key indicator of achievement in the socioeconomic hierarchy. As indicated in appendix 1 the proportion of Hispanics with less than 9\textsuperscript{th} grade education is more than 6 times higher than that of Whites and more than twice as many Whites have a college degree compared to Hispanics.

One of the main reasons for the lack of educational attainment could be explained by Min Zhou’s theory on segmented assimilation, in which she argues that today’s immigrants assimilate into different levels of American society. This is due to the fact that many Mexican immigrants settle in segregated communities where low social class immigrants account for the majority and the need and opportunities to learn English thereby automatically decreases. This does not only result in a community with poor English language skills but also creates poor conditions for the development of bilingualism (Zhou, 1997).

Furthermore, it also illustrates how the American school system is not capable of providing the inner-city schools with tools to improve the rate of educational attainment among Mexican immigrants (Zhou, 1997). Zhou found that the lack of educational resources combined with the fact that the majority of members of the first generation seldom are able to motivate their children to excel in school to be
significant factors in explaining why the children of Mexican immigrants find it very difficult to move up the socioeconomic ladder (Zhou, 1997). This is supported by research which indicates that the drop-out rates of second and third generation Mexican immigrants continue to be twice as high as those of Native-born Americans (Alba, 2006).

As described in chapter 3 Integration Paradigms, Zhou operates with three multidirectional patterns and according to her research, the majority of Mexican immigrants either assimilate into the downward mobility pattern or the pattern of economic integration into middle-class America with lagging acculturation and deliberate preservation of the immigrant community’s values and tight solidarity. It is especially the downward mobility pattern that can result in reactive transnationalism, which is studied by José Itzigsohn and Silvia Giorguli Saucedo (Itzigsohn and Saucedo, 2002). A negative reaction towards the US assimilation approach correlates with Zhou’s findings which illustrate that an unequal distribution of economic and educational resources and an upbringing in segregated communities might ultimately limit the acquisition of English language skills, and therefore prevent integration of immigrant children into American society.

In reference to the above, educational attainment and the acquisition of English language skills are strongly related to occupational attainment and socioeconomic mobility. Furthermore, Hispanics who possess high levels of education, are educated in the US and are fluent in English will most likely experience upward social mobility. Strengthened English language skills will even increase the socioeconomic status of highly-skilled immigrants who enter the US (Toussaint-Comeau et. al., 2005).

However, according to the Pew Hispanic Center, the low social status is also influenced by the fact that Mexican immigrants compared to other ethnic groups hold one of the lowest tendencies to naturalize, which may be due to the lack of educational attainment and low English language skills (Passel, 2007). The low tendency to naturalize as illustrated in figure 7 indicates that the rate of...
naturalization among Mexicans is low compared to the other ethnic groups such as other Latin Americans, Europeans, Canadians and South and East Asians.

Figure 7 - Naturalized Citizen Population by Country or Region of Birth, 1995-2005

This carries significance because naturalization seems to foster not only educational attainment among children of immigrants but also greater commitment to the values of the society of the receiving country (Bean et. al., 2006).

6.6 A Linguistic Approach to Integration

The relationship between transnationalism and assimilation is rather complex and therefore, scholars often tend to be either for or against one of the two integration paradigms. As previously mentioned, Americanization has been symbolized by monolingualism in English since the Great Migration Wave. As a result, assimilation has become the dominating paradigm in the integration process, leaving aside the possibility for the immigrants to stay connected to their culture of origin. However, as stated in chapter 3 Integration Paradigms, new research conducted by Itzigsohn and Saucedo implies that assimilation and transnationalism do not mutually exclude one another (Itzigsohn and Saucedo, 2002). In fact, the two scholars argue that the process of assimilation does not
weaken transnational ties; rather they consider assimilation to be an important catalyst for transnational practices. This result is also evident in Min Zhou’s multidirectional patterns, discussed in the previous section. In her research Min Zhou finds that negative experiences with assimilation may prompt transnational practices among immigrants.

Itzigsohn and Saucedo as well as Zhou conclude that the two integration paradigms are influenced by each other and that in most cases the attempt to integrate immigrants into American society is not a distinct linear process. Though, as stated in chapter 3 Integration Paradigms, alternative approaches could also be applied when addressing the process of integration. Still acknowledging the interconnectedness between assimilation and transnationalism, the integration process could also be addressed by letting the immigrants indulge themselves in transnational practices in the early process of assimilation because as stated previously, the rise in transnational practices will not diminish the process of assimilation but instead assist integration (Itzigsohn and Saucedo, 2002).

In that way, the immigrants would feel more open towards assimilating into American society because this approach would avoid leaving the immigrant in the twilight zone while trying to assimilate into the host society. This is based on the argument that the immigrants will find security in the fact that they will be able to maintain their cultural traits while gradually assimilating into the host society. In addition, studies have shown that the linear process of especially linguistic assimilation will dominate the longer the immigrants and their families reside in the receiving country. The findings of Itzigsohn and Saucedo do not only challenge the classical approach to integration but will also have implications for the way of addressing both language policies as well as the linguistic assimilation of immigrants in the US. Consequently, the above study stands as a stark contrast to nativists’ perception of the process of linguistic assimilation.

In relation to the ongoing debate concerning the integration of Mexican immigrants, supporters of the assimilation paradigm claim that this particular ethnic group does not embrace the English language due to a strong retention of Spanish. Nevertheless, it is fact, that if the integration process is influenced by
transnational practices then the presence of Spanish language skills will not be reduced at the same rate as if the Mexican immigrants assimilated into American society by means of the linear process. However, as noted earlier in this chapter, supporters of assimilation are more concerned about the retention of Spanish than the failure to learn the English language because Hispanic immigrants, in general, are recognizing that English language skills is a requirement to become part of American society. This is supported by a survey conducted by the Pew Hispanic Center, which studies Hispanic attitudes towards learning English. In that regard, the Pew Hispanic Center has conducted a table showing the percentage of immigrants who either agrees or disagrees with the statement that immigrants have to speak English to say that they are part of American society.

**Table 3 - Do immigrants have to speak English to say they are part of American society, or not?**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total Latinos</th>
<th>Nativity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Foreign born (%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Pew Hispanic Center, 2006)

As the table indicates, the majority of the consulted immigrants responded that mastering English language skills was a necessary ability to become integrated into mainstream America. However, the table also displays the linguistic dilemma, which could arise when addressing the interconnectedness of the integration paradigms, assimilation and transnationalism. If the integration of immigrants is reflected in a joined process between assimilation and transnationalism then the process of linguistic assimilation will be overwhelmingly influenced by maintenance of the immigrant’s language of origin, which will slow the intergenerational rate of linguistic assimilation towards English monolingualism.
due to a higher prevalence of bilingualism among immigrants. However, this does not substantiate Huntington and Schlesinger’s statements that the embrace of bilingualism will contribute to a further disuniting of the American society (Huntington, 2004; Schlesinger, 1992). On the contrary, in terms of language skills, when letting the immigrants stay closely connected to their culture of origin in the process of assimilation, the maintenance of the Spanish language will not lead to a negation of the English language but instead function as a language of instruction which will ultimately increase the immigrant’s incentive to integrate. This is supported by Carnevale, who states that bilingualism ought to be seen more as a transitional phenomenon on the way to English monolingualism. Furthermore, she argues that even though Spanish speakers have higher rates of bilingualism than other ethnic groups, the rates of linguistic assimilation is proceeding at a rate comparable to previous immigration waves (Carnevale, 2006). In other words, bilingualism should not be seen as neither a barrier to assimilation or as a threat to the American society but rather as a path to assimilation. This is due to the fact that even though the ideology of multiculturalism is gaining more and more foothold in the Western Hemisphere, English language skills continue to be a symbol of Americanization and thereby ultimately becomes a catalyst for the integration of immigrants into American society. However, as stated in section 6.5 The Disuniting of America bilingualism could make the process of integration more flexible.

This correlates with Bernard’s study of the history of integration in the US described in chapter 5 Integration of Mexican Immigrants, where he states that the first period of integration was characterized by an acceptance of diversity and multiculturalism. This eventually fostered assimilation because the ideology of multiculturalism in relation to integration provided security for the immigrants and served as channels of interpretation and relationship to the new country (Bernard, 1967). Despite the liberal approach to integration, the period was also dominated by the rule of sink or swim, which relates to the fact that the immigrant either made it on his own or not at all (Bernard, 1967). This can also be transferred to contemporary immigration because even though various agencies and
organizations such as La Raza, the Hispanic National Bar Association and the Association for the Advancement of Mexican Americans\textsuperscript{14} are to be found as spokesmen for contemporary Latin American immigrants, the rule of sink or swim still exists in the US. From a socioeconomic perspective this is particularly true for the Mexican immigrants, who are to be found at the bottom of the social hierarchy. As stated earlier in section 6.5 \textit{Segmented assimilation and other factors that influence the linguistic assimilation}, this is often due to a lack of English language skills. Consequently, English language proficiency can be considered a catalyst for the low socioeconomic status as it leads to a domino effect based on its complex relation to educational attainment, occupational attainment, and the rate of naturalization. Therefore, the acquirement of English language skills becomes the leading focal point for the Mexican immigrants’ rise or fall in contemporary American society. Ultimately, schooling becomes of crucial importance for the immigrants because educational attainment strongly boosts the odds of English language proficiency (Espinosa, et. al., 1997).

In terms of cultural assimilation, history might provide answers for how to solve future approaches to integration. In retrospect, Bernard’s argument concerning the embrace of multiculturalism may seem to foster the process of integration because the immigrants can find comfort and security in the maintenance of their culture of origin and native language while gradually assimilating into the society of the receiving country.

Bilingualism tends to be seen as either a curse or a blessing (Wiley and Lukes, 1996). Though a majority of social scientists believe that the ideology of multiculturalism and the embrace of linguistic diversity seem preferable in addressing the integration of Mexican immigrants, the US legislative branch and the common white American population tend to disagree. This is illustrated by means of tougher legislation towards bilingual programs and immigration in general. Nevertheless, history shows that the attention to language issues in relation to immigration tend to be more intense during times of national crisis such

\textsuperscript{14} \url{http://hispanicexecutivesociety.org/resources/hispanicsociety.aspx}
as war and economic recession because language is perceived to be the key area for the expression of cultural anxieties (Carnevale, 2006; Pavlenko, 2001).

A further study of specific restrictive political initiatives and the linguistic assimilation of Mexican and Latin American immigrants will take place in chapter 7 Arizona – Case Study. In reference to the above, emphasis will, however, be put on the linguistic assimilation of immigrant children in the Arizonian school system as it illustrates how political initiatives have affected the integration process.
7. Arizona – Case Study

This chapter presents Arizona as an empirical case study that serves to concretize and visualize how English language skills in practice affect the general integration process. The primary objective with this case is to illustrate that by adopting a monolingual approach, Mexican immigrants are forced to leave behind cultural traits, such as their language of origin during the assimilation process, which is likely to get them to react negatively to the host society.

As stated in chapter 2 Theory and Method, Arizona makes an interesting case study, because it epitomizes the consequences and sentiments of increasing immigration from Mexico, which is reflected in the legislation aimed at transforming Arizona into a monolingual state. The case study also depicts the complex relation between the transnational and assimilation approach to integration illustrated in the oppositional initiatives taken on by the business sector and state legislation, respectively.

This chapter is based on the theories and discussions of the previous chapter, 6 Integration and Linguistic Assimilation.

Since this section’s primary focus rests on the aspect of language in terms of integration, it has proven difficult to differentiate between Mexican and Latin American immigrants. However, to the degree possible emphasis will be put on Mexican immigrants.

Before discussing the importance of English language skills in relation to integration in Arizona, it is necessary to provide background knowledge by presenting geographic and demographic facts on Arizona and demonstrate the increasing divisional attitudes towards the Spanish-language.
7.1 Geographic Features

As a border state Arizona has naturally been the point of entry to many Latin American immigrants. Figures published by the US Census Bureau in 2007 specify that in 2004, the four states bordering Mexico had the highest percentages of Hispanics in their population. Table 4 shows percent of Hispanics in the four bordering states in comparison with 4 Northern States:

Table 4

Percent Hispanics in the states bordering Mexico vs. the states bordering Canada in 2004

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>States bordering Mexico</th>
<th>28%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Arizona</td>
<td>28%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>California</td>
<td>35%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Texas</td>
<td>35%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Mexico</td>
<td>43%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>States bordering Canada</th>
<th>1.1%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>North Dakota</td>
<td>1.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Montana</td>
<td>2.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minnesota</td>
<td>3.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Washington</td>
<td>8.5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(US Census Bureau, 2004)

The continuing flow of Latin American immigrants has heavily affected the population of the bordering states – and Arizona is no exception. Consequently, Arizona’s foreign-born population has grown substantially since the 1990s. In 1990, there were 268,700 immigrants in the state. By the year of 2000, that figure had increased by 143% to 652,200 and by the year of 2004, the number had grown to 830,900 immigrants. This means that since 1990, Arizona has experienced an immigration increase of 300% (Gans, 2007). In terms of undocumented immigration, estimates published by the Pew Hispanic Center indicate that in the year
of 2002, there were between 250,000 and 350,000 undocumented immigrants in Arizona. However, by the year of 2005, this figure had increased to 500,000 (Gans, 2007).

In her report, Gans concludes that in 2000, the Mexican population in Arizona constituted 68% of the total foreign-born population, of who most were undocumented (Gans, 2007). Conclusively, this clearly illustrate that Mexico is in fact the primary sending country in Arizona.

A possible reason for the significant increase of Mexican immigrants in Arizona during the years 1990 to 2000 can in all probability be ascribed to more than job opportunities. The increase of Mexican immigrants in Arizona may also be owed to the fact that various means have been taken to increase border enforcement along the US/Mexican border in states such as Texas and California. As a consequence, Arizona experienced a rise in undocumented immigration as federal agents were focusing on the borders of Texas and California, which forced immigrants heading for the US to find alternative routes through the Arizona Desert (Speizer, 2008).

As stated above, for years, Arizona was not the primary destination for Mexican or Latin American immigrants, however, as the economy in Arizona got stronger, many immigrants chose to settle in the state (Jordan, 2008). As a result, from the 1990s to the year of 2000, the population of Phoenix, the state capital, increased by 18,000 a month, this corresponds to an increase of two million people in a single decade (Jordan, 2008).

The majority of immigrants have chosen to settle in Spanish-speaking communities and in Arizona, 68.7% immigrants live in the state of Maricopa, where Phoenix is the state capital. To put it differently, more than two out of three immigrants live in the county of Maricopa (Gans, 2007). Pima County constitutes the second largest immigrant population with 14% and finally Yuma County has the third largest population at 7% (Gans, 2007).
Table 5
Immigrant Population by County in Arizona

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Maricopa County</th>
<th>Pima County</th>
<th>Yuma County</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>68.7 %</td>
<td>14 %</td>
<td>7 %</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Gans, 2007)

Similar for these counties is their proximity to the Mexican/US border, which could indicate that the majority of the foreign-born included in these percentages derive from Mexico. As the majority of Mexican immigrants live in Phoenix, Maricopa County, it could result in social segregation, which consequently results in immigrants being linguistically isolated from the native-born Americans as discussed in chapter 6 Integration and Linguistic Assimilation.

7.2 Demographic Features

As described in the previous section, the proportion of Mexican immigrants settling in the state of Arizona has increased over the last decade and in the perspective of demography, this trend seems to be continuing. Humnicutt and Castro base this on the fact that the Mexican immigrant population is very young compared to the overall Arizonian population (Humnicutt, Castro, 2005).

When comparing the age structure between the Native-born Americans and the immigrants in Arizona, in the years, 1990 to 2000, it becomes clear that the growth of Arizona’s immigrant population has primarily been among people of working age while the Native-born Americans experienced higher growth rates in the age group less than 25 and more than 35 years old (Gans, 2007). This carries great significance in terms of the future working structure in Arizona, because if this trend continues, immigrants are going to play an important role in the growth of Arizona’s workforce (Gans, 2007; Gonzaléz, 2003). In addition, the number of Native-born women between the age of 25 and 34 has actually decreased between 1990 and 2000 (Gans, 2007), while a majority of the Latin American women in Arizona are in the child-bearing age. As a consequence, in 2002, the US Department of Health and Human
Services affirmed that the Hispanics were the fastest growing ethnic group in Arizona, with a rate of 109 births per 1,000 women of childbearing ages\textsuperscript{15}. In her report, Gans, accordingly, points to the fact that immigrants have higher birth rates than do the Native-born Americans. In reference to chapter 6 \textit{Integration and Linguistic Assimilation}, this could from a nativist’s perspective lead to increasing bilingualism especially among the second generation and thereby a disuniting of the American society.

\textbf{7.3 Language Diversity vs. Language Division}

Apart from the increase of Latin Americans and in particular Mexicans, Arizona is also experiencing growth among other national origin groups (Wiley, et. al., 2005).

On a federal level, 8.4\% speak another language than English at home, whereas in Arizona, 14.7\% speak another language than English at home (Wiley, et. al., 2005). Even though language diversity exists in Arizona, it must be noted that as the Spanish-speaking part of the population continues to increase, the Spanish language is likely to become the state’s second language. This is illustrated in table 8 which shows that in a single decade, Arizona has experienced a growth of 13 \% of Spanish-speakers.

\footnote{http://bhpr.hrsa.gov/healthworkforce/border/arizona/highlights.htm}
Supported by the above table, it is evident that Spanish has become the dominating language among immigrants. This underlines the point that language diversity is in fact decreasing and that the English language, rather than being challenged by multiple languages as in the past, is now being confronted by a single player who grows more influential by the day (Camarota and McArdle, 2003). Thus, when studying contemporary immigration in terms of languages, it is more accurate to refer to the linguistic quarrel as a language division rather than language diversity.

The great language division, which persists in the population of Arizona, is further prompted by the fact that a great number of Spanish-speakers are not able to speak English fluently. Accordingly, the total number of persons who are Limited English Proficient (LEP) is increasing in Arizona. Between 2000 and 2006, the number of foreign-born persons, age 5 and older, in Arizona who were LEP, increased by 53%.

(Camarota, McArdle, 2003)
In 2006, 60.3% of Arizona’s total foreign-born population aged 5 and older were LEP, compared to 56.2% in 2000 and 49.0% in 1990 (MPI, 2006).

Table 6
Percentage of the Foreign-born who are LEP

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Speaks Spanish at Home</th>
<th>Speaks Indo-European Languages at Home</th>
<th>Speaks Asian and Pacific Island Languages at Home</th>
<th>Speaks other Languages at Home</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>75.4 %</td>
<td>37.9 %</td>
<td>54.9 %</td>
<td>39.7 %</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(MPI, 2006)

As illustrated in table 6, a majority of the Spanish-speaking part of the population was the least proficient in English, it could be indicated that compared to other immigrant groups, Mexican and Latin American immigrants experience higher rates of language maintenance. As previously mentioned in chapter 3 Integration Paradigms, one of the important aspects of transnationalism refers to the maintenance of cultural traits from the sending country, and this is clearly manifested in the retention of the mother tongue. But what might explain the strong retention of Spanish among Mexican immigrants in Arizona?

As already illustrated in figure 5, which depicts the Linguistic assimilation of Mexicans and other immigrants groups, Mexicans immigrants are more poorly linguistic assimilated than are immigrants from other Latin American countries, Asia, the Philippines and other European nations. The poor linguistic assimilation could be related to the lack of breathing space in Mexican immigration to the US instead of a mere rejection of English (Massey, 1995). In addition, the geographic placement and degree of social capital, as demonstrated in chapter 3 Integration Paradigms also play

---

16Note: “Indo-European languages include: French, Italian Portuguese, German, Yiddish, Other West Germanic languages, Scandinavian languages, Greek, Russian, Polish, Serbo-Croatian, Other Slavic languages, Armenian, Persian, Gujarathi, Hindi, and Urdu, among others. Asian and Pacific languages include: Chinese, Japanese, Korean, Monkhmer/Cambodian, Miao/Hmong, Thai, Laotian, Vietnamese, and Tagalog, among others. Finally, other languages include: Navajo, other native North American languages, Hungarian, Arabic, Hebrew, and African languages, among others” (MPI, 2006).
a role in the retention of Spanish because when Latin American immigrants live in a
border state such as Arizona, it means that they are close to their homeland, which
increases the capacity to maintain transnational ties (Ovando, 2003). In addition,
churches have become an important tool with which to retain the Spanish language in
the Southwest where such institutions make use of bilingualism in order to serve
newly arrived immigrants (Gonzaléz, 2003). Moreover, Spanish is expanding as
public and private sectors have recognized the necessity to accommodate the
increasing Spanish purchasing power (Gonzaléz, 2003). This will be elaborated on in
the section 7.7 Para progresar oprima el 2.

In the case of Arizona, the above facts concerning the usage of Spanish once again
underline that it is more accurate to refer to the phenomenon of language division
rather than language diversity. The linguistic division is epitomized in the language
debate in Arizona because it reflects the clash between monolingualism and
bilingualism as will be discussed in the below section.

7.4 Monolingualism vs. Bilingualism

Ironically, supporters of bilingualism and supporters of English Immersion in Arizona
work for the same goal, they just disagree on the mean (Garcia, 1990). Opponents of
bilingualism, such as the national association, U.S. English, believe that
transnationalism divides the population into two units. On the U.S. English website,
they state that:

“English is the key to opportunity in the US and without a common language, how
long would we remain the "United" States?”

In other words, the association U.S. English believes that the great language division
in the US is dividing the public into two communities with each their own cultures
traditions and languages, which also correlates with the beliefs of Huntington and
Schlesinger. In addition, Ovando equally describes how opponents of bilingual

17 http://www.us-english.org/view/15
programs claim them to constitute a disuniting of the nation, because bilingual education is an instrument used to maintain ethno linguistic enclaves, which will ultimately dominate the unity of the US (Ovando, 2003). Thus, supporters of proposition 203\(^{18}\), which will be discussed more specifically in section 7.5 Language Legislation in Arizona, declare that the public schools in Arizona are not succeeding in educating immigrant children and that bilingual educational programs fail to integrate the immigrants into the American society. Therefore, in order to be integrated immigrants need to be exposed to as much English as possible\(^{19}\).

The replacement of bilingual programs in favour of more focus on monolingualism has happened because critics of bilingual programs did not think that the bilingual programs were successful in minimizing the number of foreign-born who was LEP (Wiley, et. al, 2005). The resistance towards bilingual education has arisen from popular assumptions of how language is acquired. These assumptions capture the belief that a person learns another language by using it frequently and by avoiding the native language. However, when acquiring a new language, the tools and instructional process is extremely important. More time spent immersed in the new language is not necessarily associated with greater gains, if the student does not understand the content of the lesson (Ovando, 2003). Rather, as stated by Ovando:

\[
\text{Assimilation and language acquisition do not take place through coercion, nor do they take place when children are deprived of cognitive and academic development in their first language before they have mastered academic English. Full cognitive development occurs in language-affirming classroom contexts that build on student’s linguistic foundations, rather than destroying them.}
\]

(Ovando, 2003)

According to supporters of bilingualism, policy that forbids bilingual education cannot be defended on empirical grounds (Rolstad, et. al., 2005). Research on bilingualism has thus established that both national and international evidence points to the fact that bilingual programmes promote educational success, with the additional

\(^{18}\) See appendix 4
\(^{19}\) [http://ourworld.compuserve.com/homepages/jwcrawford/Krashen8.htm](http://ourworld.compuserve.com/homepages/jwcrawford/Krashen8.htm)
asset that students become bilingual (Ovando, 2003). By prioritizing bilingual programmes, the Spanish language becomes an asset rather than an obstacle to the language-minority children (Ovando, 2003), which was addressed in chapter 6 Integration and Linguistic Assimilation.

Defenders of bilingualism, such as the Arizona Association for Bilingual Education (AABE), therefore believe that bilingualism will actually promote student achievement and success in the educational process. This, they believe, can be achieved by utilizing and developing proficiency in two languages, one of which is English (AABE Mission Statement, 2008). Ultimately, bilingual programs are likely to lead to better educational outcomes for the Mexican immigrants and provide them with the opportunity of more socioeconomic mobility (Rolstad, et al, 2005).

Political initiatives and the results gathered from research conducted on the advantages on bilingual programs work against each other. In reference to chapter 6 Integration and Linguistic Assimilation, the current debate on linguistic integration indicates that the symbolic value of English monolingualism takes precedence of the value of research on bilingualism despite the fact that studies continually show that bilingualism, in the long term, makes integration more flexible. The symbolic value of monolingualism in English can be explained by its strong connection to the American national identity as will be discussed in the section 7.6 The Symbolic Use of Language Legislation. However, before addressing the issue of English monolingualism and its connection to the American national identity, it is interesting to study the development of language policies in Arizona.

### 7.5 Language Legislation in Arizona

As a consequence of the rapid influx of Mexican immigration, both undocumented and documented, as well as the increasing presence of Spanish among Latin American immigrants, Arizona has adopted some of the nation’s toughest laws against immigration. The escalating legislative restrictiveness has in fact placed Arizona at the centre of the immigration debate in the US (Jordan, 2008). The most
restrictive legislation has been put into practice within the past 4 years (Jordan, 2008). Since 2000, proposition 103 and proposition 203 have been implemented with the purpose of minimizing the presence of the Spanish language.

Even though Arizona was not the nation’s front runner in adopting English as the state’s official language the choice to make English the official language carries great symbolism and ultimately has a great impact on the Spanish-speaking part of the population. With the implementation of proposition 103 in 2006, the law of Arizona dictated that all official actions must be conducted in English (Jordan, 2008). More specifically, the purpose of the bill is to preserve, protect and enhance the role of English and protect the rights of those who speak the language (Lydersen, 2005). In this lies the message that if a person takes on the English language and is thereby linguistically assimilated into the US, then he or she is guaranteed greater opportunities in the American society (Lydersen, 2005). This correlates with the hypothesis of the dissertation, that English plays a vital role in the integration process, and illustrates that the approach of English monolingualism is being carried out in practice in Arizona.

In addition to the implementation of proposition 103, Arizona practices a strict interpretation of proposition 203. Proposition 203 dictates that all instruction in schools should take place in English. This initiative was aimed at excluding bilingual programmes in favour of English Immersion. The following quote constitutes an official summary of proposition 203 as executed in the state of Arizona:

“...requires that all public school instruction be conducted in English. Children not fluent in English shall normally be placed in an intensive one-year English immersion program to teach them the language as quickly as possible while also learning academic subjects. Parents may request a waiver of these requirements for children

---

20 It must be noted that according to Gonzaléz, Arizona approved a ballot measure in 1988 which made English the state’s official language; however it was later found unconstitutional (Gonzaléz, 2003).

21 See appendix 3 and 4

22 When working according to the model of English Immersion, kids are instructed through the English language and at a low level so that all the LEP speakers are able to follow the classes (Gonzaléz, 2003).
who already know English, are ten years or older, or have special needs best suited to a different educational approach. Normal foreign language programs are completely unaffected. Enforcement lawsuits by parents and guardians are permitted”.

(Proposition 203)²³

Even though other states have taken similar initiatives, which dictates English instructions in the school curricular, such as proposition 227 in California, proposition 203 in Arizona is different because of its strict interpretation in relation to obtaining waivers²⁴ (Jordan, 2008). Although proposition 203 do allow for waivers, as illustrated in the quote above, a lot of parents who speak another language than English find it difficult to obtain them (Jordan, 2008). In her article *Defending Bilingualism*, Salas accordingly argues that Arizona’s Superintendent of Public Instruction insisted on a strict interpretation of proposition 203 and thereby denied waivers to most parents. Furthermore, according to the Mexican American Legal Defense and Educational Fund (MALDEF), in order for parents to apply for waivers from participating in the English Immersion programs, the child need to have some knowledge of English already, be 10 years old or be a special need student. This means that waivers are basically only obtainable by parents whose child has certain physical or psychological needs (MALDEF). As a consequence of the strict interpretation of proposition 203, almost all of Arizona's bilingual programs have been abandoned and bilingual education is practically no longer available (Salas, 2006).

Both propositions work to prevent the usage of other languages than English. As a consequence, the opportunities of the Spanish-speaking population are reduced because the requirements of the Arizonian state government are practically impossible to fulfil. This can be illustrated by proposition 203 which limits LEP speakers to learn English within a year²⁵. This is contradictory because, as stated

²³ [http://ourworld.compuserve.com/hompages/JWCrawford/echar.htm](http://ourworld.compuserve.com/hompages/JWCrawford/echar.htm)
²⁴ A waiver is a dispensation from the law giving access to apply the immigrant’s language of origin as a language of instruction.
²⁵ See appendix 4
earlier, research regards assimilation as a long term process. Consequently, putting a
time limit on LEP speakers may result in complicating or even slowing the process of
linguistic assimilation. According to assistant professor of education at Arizona State
University, Jeff MacSwan:

"Research indicates that it usually takes immigrant children three to five years to
learn English well enough to meet redesignation criteria -- sometimes more time,
sometimes less..... There's absolutely no evidence that English immersion teaches
English faster than bilingual education does."26

As indicated above, there is a wish for fast assimilation by the Native-born
Americans. This is rooted in a sense of strong relation between the English language
and the American national identity, which in many ways is depicted in the support of
proposition 103 and 203 as will be further discussed in the below section.

7.6 The Symbolic Use of Official Language Legislation

According to Citrin, et. al., the implementation of “Official English” by a state,
depends on more than the large concentrations of Hispanics or Asians (Citrin et. al,
1990). The support of Official English laws can also be ascribed to the fact that
immigration from Mexico has increased at an extremely fast rate. At a local or
regional level, the English language is a significant and highly emotional subject
when there is rapid change in the existing language patterns (Citrin, et.al, 1990). In
other words, linguistic conflict has been most fervent in states that have experienced a
rapid influx of cultural minorities (Citrin, et.al, 1990). This statement fits perfectly the
case of Arizona, because as the influx of immigrants, primarily from Mexico, has
taken place at a fast rate, so has the linguistic initiatives to implement Official English
and abandon bilingual programs.

Ovando argues that the absence of a constant language ideology in the US has led to a
more symbolic approach to language politics, creating resentment of special treatment

26 http://www.englishfirst.org/be/arizona/az203antipr.htm
for minority groups (Ovando, 2003). The US’ symbolic approach to language politics is partly supported by Rolstad who states that bilingual programs seem to be facing opposition for political rather than pedagogical reasons (Rolstad, 2005). As previously mentioned in this chapter, in Arizona the symbolic value of English monolingualism continues to have support even though the benefits of bilingual programs have been provided through research. In other words, there still exists widely support for reducing Spanish and increasing English monolingualism.

Thus when asked the following questions in a state-wide poll conducted in November, 2006: Will you vote in favour of Proposition 103? 67% answered yes, while 30% answered no. When asked the following question: Will you vote in favour of Proposition 203, 61% answered yes, whereas 38% answered no.

This poll indicates a clear support by the Arizonian population to adopt English as the state’s official language and English Immersion in favour of bilingual programmes. The poll illustrates that the majority of Arizonians are in favour of the state’s restrictive approach to exclude minority languages from the public sphere. Furthermore, it also indicates that the rapid increase of Spanish could be perceived as a threat to the American national identity as stated by Huntington in chapter 7 Integration and Linguistic Assimilation. In addition, Citrin, et al. state that challenges to the status of one’s language, as witnessed through the increasing presence of Spanish, most often engage in deep-seated feelings about national identity and group worth (Citrin, et. al, 1990).

According to Citrin, et. al., the language debate has been framed with symbols of national unity and equality (1990). The ability to speak English fluently is therefore manifested as an icon of American nationality and adherence to American society. In their research Citrin, et.al. found that the reason for the popularity of Official English


is the pervasive public desire to reiterate an attachment to a traditional image of Americanism that now seems vulnerable (Citrin, et.al., 1990).

“When advocates of multiculturalism frame demands for change in the status of minorities in way that challenge core values, they tend to engender resistance in an intensified ethnic conflict”

(Citrin, et. al., 1994).

As stated earlier, throughout US history, there has been a connection between the reaction against a rapid increase of immigrants and the implementation of Official English. Since culture and language are so deeply intertwined, the implementation of Official English has been a way in which to prevail American values and traditions (Citrin, et.al., 1990). Hence, in order to resist the perceived threat of immigrants with unfamiliar traditions and languages, states have passed Official English laws and made English the only language of instruction in schools (Citrin, et. al., 1990). This captures the implementation of restrictive language policies in a border state such as Arizona.

The choice to adopt official English and insert English Immersion programmes by Arizona is to encourage a society where the people already are divided along linguistic lines. In order for the Spanish-speaking group to be accepted into the American society, it must conform to American norms and values, which means that it has to adapt to the English language and give up the native tongue (Pavlenko, 2001). Thus, to become part of the American society, it is necessary for immigrants to undergo a linguistic transformation, a transformation that, as stated earlier, does not correlate with hyphenation and other national affiliations (Pavlenko, 2001). In many, though not all, states in the Southwest, bilingual programmes have accordingly become perceived as Un-American (Pavlenko, 2001). The English language has become a vital part of the American national identity, which means that if immigrants chose to retain their linguistic and cultural traits, it may very well result in a marginalized socioeconomic status in the majority society (Pavlenko, 2001). Nevertheless the Spanish language is expanding rapidly in Arizona.
7.7 Para Progresar Oprima el 2

“Para progresar oprima el 2”, means “Press two to continue in Spanish” (González, 2003). This quote refers to the fact that the majority of the Arizonian service industries, such as airline companies, hotels and credit card companies are now answering their telephones with a recorded Spanish menu. Often, these answering systems begin by asking the caller to “press one to continue in English” or “Para progresar oprima el 2” (González, 2003). This phenomenon is also very much present in the financial sector, where, in the majority of the Automated Teller Machines (ATMs), people are able to choose whether they prefer to be guided in English or in Spanish when carrying out money transactions. Ultimately, these initiatives by the business sector indicate an increasing Spanish-population which needs to be addressed.

There seems to be an increasing recognition of Spanish among the Arizonian businesses as they acknowledge the fact that because of the scope of Latin American immigrants, the purchasing power of this ethnic group is strong. Many companies and banks in Arizona have acknowledged that Spanish is the preferred language for millions of Americans and have therefore adopted it for services (González, 2003). In Arizona more specifically, a great number of firms and agencies have taken on a transnational approach to fit into a bilingual society. This approach has been adopted by the Phoenix fire-fighters who study Spanish and the Maricopa County Medical Interpreter Program; a programme which was implemented in response to a growing need to interact with more and more Spanish-speaking patients (González, 2003). In order to meet the needs of the Spanish-speaking part of the population, the majority of companies have become bilingual in the efforts to adapt to the demographic changes in Arizona (González, 2003).

By using the Spanish language to reach Spanish clients, the business sector is actually encouraging transnational practices by immigrants. Despite the willingness on part of the Arizonian businesses to embrace the Spanish language, the efforts to minimize Spanish by legislative initiatives such as proposition 203 have gotten a firm hold on
the state. Therefore, while the business sector is taking a more bilingual approach to accommodate the needs of Spanish-speaking immigrants, state legislation has taken a step in the opposite direction and now practises a classic assimilation approach to the integration of immigrants.

Despite the fact that several Arizonian businesses have succeeded in serving the immigrants by targeting them through their language of origin, legislative initiatives such as proposition 103 and 203 could complicate this transnational approach by promoting English only and thereby indirectly deny them basic rights. As will be illustrated in section 7.8 Arizona – An English Monolingual State, the division between the immigrants and the Native-born Americans is actually widening as a consequence of proposition 203.

7.8 Arizona – An English Monolingual State

As previously stated English language skills constitute the first step towards social mobility and thereby integration in the US (Gordon, 1967). However, the pressure for fast assimilation in Arizona seems to slow down the integration process for the Mexican immigrants, who constitute the state’s largest group of Spanish-speakers.

As illustrated in the quotation by Jeff MacSwain in section 7.5 Language Legislation in Arizona, the acquisition of English language skills is not a process which can be forced within a one year time span but is instead a long-term process, which happens proportionately with a general integration into society. Therefore, one of the most serious consequences by applying a strict assimilation approach in relation to the school system is based on the fact that children of Mexican immigrants, while learning English, fall academically behind compared to the Native-born Americans\(^\text{29}\). These findings correlate with the facts presented in chapter 6 Integration and Linguistic Assimilation. The facts concluded that Mexican immigrants hold the lowest rate of educational attainment compared all minority groups and that the proportion of Hispanics with less than 9th grade education is more than 6 times higher than Native-

\(^{29}\) http://www.englishfirst.org/be/arizona/az203anti.htm
born Americans\textsuperscript{30}. Therefore, the insertion of proposition 203, may actually contribute to a continuing academic division in Arizona, which ultimately leads to unequal opportunities between the LEP and Native-born Americans due to the fact that educational attainment promote English language acquisition. Conclusively English-Only classrooms are going to pose a barrier to educational mobility especially among Mexican immigrants.

In Arizona, children who learn English in bilingual classrooms are showing better results than their counterparts in English-Only classrooms\textsuperscript{31} - a trend seen throughout the country as illustrated in chapter 6 Integration and Linguistic Assimilation. Therefore, implementing a transnational approach in the school curricular creates an open environment, where bilingualism could ease the way towards higher English proficiency among Mexican immigrants and make the process of assimilation both more flexible and successful. According to Ovando, the maintenance of the language of origin in the classrooms will in fact encourage linguistic assimilation because a cognitive process must take place in language affirming surroundings (Ovando, 2003).

As illustrated above, the implementation of proposition 103 and 203 could enhance the socioeconomic division in Arizona because without proper schooling Mexican immigrants are not likely to advance socially or economically in US society, which may also have implications for the second and future generations of Mexican immigrants. This is supported by Min Zhou, who states that assimilation may not always be an advantage for the immigrants and their children if society does not recognize the need for a slower pace of assimilation (Zhou, 1997).

By ignoring the importance of gradual assimilation, it becomes difficult for the immigrants to become part of society and eventually the immigrants may end up feeling excluded and segregated from the host society.

\textsuperscript{30} See Appendix 1
\textsuperscript{31} http://www.englishfirst.org/be/arizona/az203anti.htm
“If a socially and linguistically defined racial minority group wishes to assimilate but finds that the normal paths of integration are blocked, then the group might be forced to take alternative survival strategies that enable them to cope psychologically with the barriers that do not necessarily encourage school success”

(Zhou, 2004)

As stated earlier, Milton Gordon finds that the first step in the assimilation process takes place through cultural assimilation (Gordon, 1967). For this reason, a lack of English language skills, which are vital for feeling a sense of belonging, could become a source of discrimination. This is affirmed by the following figure which shows that 46% of Latin American immigrants cite language as the main cause of discrimination.

Figure 9 - Top cause of discrimination among Latin Americans in the US

According to Min Zhou, if a social and linguistic ethnic minority group finds it hard to assimilate then the group might be forced to take alternative survival strategies such as excluding themselves from the main society by viewing educational success as a way of acting white (Zhou, 1997). As discussed in chapter 6 Integration and Linguistic Assimilation, this may lead to negative patterns of assimilation. The negative pattern could be caused by an academic division between Mexican immigrants living in segregated communities and the Native-born Americans as
inner-city schools lack tools to improve the rate of educational attainment among marginalized immigrant groups.

In Arizona, a negative reaction could be prevented by applying a more transnationalist approach to the Mexican immigrants through the acknowledgement of bilingualism. This approach has, as already mentioned in section 7.7 *Para Progresar Oprima el 2*, been adopted by various Arizonian businesses and institutions. These businesses reach the Spanish-speaking immigrants through their native linguistic frame by using Spanish as a language of instruction. This gives the Mexican immigrants the opportunity to be included in society and enables them to actively participate in society instead of reacting against it. Due to the successful results of addressing immigrants by transnational means, it can be concluded that the procedure taken on by the legislative branch in Arizona hinders rather than promotes fast assimilation. On the contrary, acquiring English language skills must be seen as a gradual process that occurs proportionately with the general integration into American society.
8. Conclusion

The purpose of the dissertation was to study whether English language skills were a catalyst for the integration of Mexican immigrants. The choice to use language skills as a measurement of integration becomes interesting because even though the US does not have an official language, English has, since the Great Migration Wave, been regarded as the key nominator of being American. Now more than ever, the issue of language skills has become a constitutive part of the public debate due to the increasing flow of Latin American immigrants, who to a great extent have entered the US since the beginning of the 1980s. As multiculturalism has gained more acceptance in the globalized world, there has been an increasing need for unification which in the US is symbolized by the English language. For that reason English language skills have become a catalyst for the integration of immigrants into the US.

This correlates with the findings of the dissertation, which demonstrate that English language skills are a catalyst for the integration of Mexican immigrants. It can therefore be concluded that no or limited English skills doom Mexican immigrants to second class citizenship which is illustrated in the section 6.5 Segmented Assimilation and other Factors that Influence the Linguistic Assimilation.

The conclusion that English language skills are a prerequisite for the integration into American society is in agreement with the conviction of nativist scholars, who regard assimilation and thereby monolingualism in English as a necessity to become a true American. Schlesinger and Huntington argue that the negative patterns of assimilation among Mexican immigrants, among other things, are caused by bilingualism which will ultimately create a division between English and Spanish-speakers in US society. This belief captures the first research question presented in the introduction of the dissertation.

However, in contradiction to Schlesinger and Huntington’s argumentation, this dissertation has proven that bilingualism does not result in a negative pattern of
assimilation. As stated in the analysis, research conducted by Alejandro Portes and Rubén G. Rumbaut show that fluent bilingual immigrant children outperform monolingual immigrant children (Massey, 2004). This is further supported by Rumberger and Larson who have conducted research on the educational achievement among Mexican American language-minority students. In their research they concluded that bilingual students who are fluent English speakers had better grades and higher rates of educational stability than students from an English-only background. This was based on the argument that bilingual students have sufficiently English language skills to do well in school without abandoning their Spanish language and culture, which enables them to maintain an identity and to function effectively in their families and communities (Rumberger and Larson, 1998). In other words, monolingualism alone does not open doors to the larger world. This statement is supported by the analysis in chapter 6 and 7, which illustrates that the intergenerational rate of linguistic assimilation decreases when a pure assimilation approach is adopted. In fact, the process of assimilation is often expedited by Native-born Americans who require of immigrants to quickly adopt the English language. In the dissertation, this belief is, among other things, illustrated by the implementation of legislation which promotes English monolingualism in the American school system. It can therefore be concluded that monolingualism instead of opening doors are in fact closing them. This was concretized in chapter 7 Arizona – Case Study, where English immersion causes Mexican immigrants, who are LEP, to fall behind academically in comparison with Native-born Americans. The academic disparity can be prevented by a more multicultural approach, through the adoption of bilingual programs in the school curricular.

As stated in the dissertation, the responsibility for successful integration rests not only on one particular group but rather involves two set of actors; the immigrants and the receiving country. However, it is important to note that the two actors are unequal partners in the sense that the institutional structure of the receiving country and the local communities’ attitude towards the immigrants has significant influence on the end result of the integration process (Penninx, 2003; Papademetriou, 2003). In the dissertation, this is also supported by Milton Gordon,
who states that full assimilation ultimately depends on the degree to which the immigrants gain acceptance from the dominant population of the receiving country (Gordon, 1964). This answers the first part of the second research question by stating that integration is not a one way street but rather involves both the immigrants and the receiving country.

To answer the second part of the second research question, American integration history has always been influenced by multiculturalism or nativism. As illustrated in Bernard’s three periods of integration each period displays different attitudes towards the issue of integration and thereby a shift in the ideologies, nativism and multiculturalism. US integration history illustrates that the quarrel between the two ideologies have persisted ever since the founding of the country. However, the recent flows of Latin American immigrants call for a new interpretation of how to approach integration. Due to the close geographical placement, the highly increasing number of Spanish-speakers and globalization, it has been necessary to view integration as a transnational phenomenon. These new conditions set recent standards for how to address integration. According to José Itzigsohn and Silvia Giorguli Saucedo, an interplay between the two integration paradigms, assimilation and transnationalism more correctly displays the contemporary integration process. First of all, the two scholars recognize that assimilation oriented studies have failed to capture the importance of the immigrants’ social lives - something that takes place across national boundaries. Rather, Itzigsohn and Saucedo view transnationalism as an inevitable phenomenon when talking about assimilation and that transnational practice often assists the process of assimilation (Itzigsohn and Saucedo, 2002). In other words, the embrace of multiculturalism fosters assimilation because it gives the immigrants the opportunity to find comfort and security in the retention of their native language while gradually assimilating into the society of the receiving country.

Therefore in order to integrate immigrants more successfully into the American society, it is vital that the immigrants are preserved the right to maintain their mother tongue and that they are not prevented from developing their native language. As declared by Eduardo Hernández-Chávez, (1988):
“The denial of a people’s development and use of its native tongue is thus a denial of its participation in society and of its very peoplehood”

(Ovando, 2003)

In reference to the third research question the above illustrates that the interplay between assimilation and transnationalism will ease the process of assimilation and enable more successful integration for future generations. Positively influencing the process of integration, the interconnectedness between the integration paradigms will have an affect on the intergenerational rate of linguistic assimilation.

In his research on Anglicization, Alba et. al. found that traditionally the third generation of immigrants prevalently becomes English monolinguals and that their knowledge of the mother tongue is fragmentary at best. However, table 3 Language Dominance among Hispanics, indicates that the retention of Spanish remains strong among the second and third generation. This suggests that the interconnectedness between the integration paradigms will slow but not hinder the intergenerational rate of linguistic assimilation. Even though bilingualism remains stronger among Mexican immigrants there are no indications that this will create a disuniting of the US society as stated by Huntington and Schlesinger. This is also supported by table 3 because by the third and future generations, English becomes the dominant language. Conclusively, linguistic assimilation will take its natural course.

Generally, the acquisition of English language skills by immigrants is necessary in order to participate in the American society. In many respects, proficiency in the English language gives access to improved opportunity for the immigrants. Even though this dissertation recognizes that the usage of the English language might not in itself guarantee successful integration, without sufficient English language proficiency, integration practically becomes impossible (Watt, et. al., 2004). Once again, it has been proven that English language skills become a catalyst for the integration of Mexican immigrants. Milton Gordon also supported this view when he
argued that cultural integration is the first step towards general assimilation (Milton, 1964). We therefore agree on the necessity to learn English, however, we do not believe that the pressure to abandon bilingual programs is going to improve the language skills of the Mexican immigrants. English immersion programs require fast adaptation into the American society – however in order for Mexican immigrants to fully assimilate and thereby climb the socioeconomic ladder, both integration and the adoption of the English language needs to take place in a slower and more language affirming context.

The intention of the dissertation was not to provide a fixed solution of how to approach the integration of Mexican immigrants, as there is no clearly defined answer to the “perfect” assimilation process. On the contrary, the aim was to elucidate alternative measures for understanding the complexity of integration. Neither assimilation nor transnationalism can solely function as measures of integration. However, in a globalized world, the influence of other cultures is undeniable. On these grounds, US nativism is no longer able to tackle current integration because of its glorification of the WASP-culture. Conclusively, the dissertation substantiates that when these two approaches are merged, the integration process is better equipped to fit the conditions of contemporary society.
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### 10. Appendix

#### Appendix 1

**Table 4 - Educational Attainment by Race and Ethnicity: 2006**

Universe: 2006 resident population ages 25 and older

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Percent Distribution</th>
<th>Less than 9th grade</th>
<th>9th to 12th grade</th>
<th>High school graduate</th>
<th>Some college</th>
<th>College graduate *</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic</td>
<td>23.8</td>
<td>15.8</td>
<td>28.2</td>
<td>19.9</td>
<td>12.3</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Native born</td>
<td>9.8</td>
<td>14.6</td>
<td>31.7</td>
<td>28.6</td>
<td>15.3</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Foreign born</td>
<td>34.0</td>
<td>16.7</td>
<td>25.6</td>
<td>13.6</td>
<td>10.1</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White alone, not Hispanic</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>7.7</td>
<td>30.7</td>
<td>28.3</td>
<td>29.9</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5.9</td>
<td>14.6</td>
<td>34.2</td>
<td>28.5</td>
<td>16.9</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black alone, not Hispanic</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian alone, not Hispanic</td>
<td>8.3</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>17.4</td>
<td>18.7</td>
<td>49.6</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>6.5</td>
<td>9.4</td>
<td>30.2</td>
<td>26.9</td>
<td>27.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* College graduate” refers to a person who has attained at least a bachelor's degree.

Source: Pew Hispanic Center tabulations of 2006 American Community Survey (1% IPUMS)

(Pew Hispanic Center, 2006)
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104th CONGRESS

2d Session

H. R. 123

To amend title 4, United States Code, to declare English as the official language of the Government of the United States.

As passed by the House of Representatives, August 1, 1996

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the ``Bill Emerson English Language Empowerment Act of 1996''.

TITLE I--ENGLISH LANGUAGE EMPOWERMENT

SEC. 101. FINDINGS.

The Congress finds and declares the following:

(1) The United States is comprised of individuals and groups from diverse ethnic, cultural, and linguistic backgrounds.

(2) The United States has benefited and continues to benefit from this rich diversity.

(3) Throughout the history of the United States, the common thread binding individuals of differing backgrounds has been a common language.

(4) In order to preserve unity in diversity, and to prevent division along linguistic lines, the Federal Government should maintain a language common to all people.

(5) English has historically been the common language and the language of opportunity in the United States.
(6) The purpose of this title is to help immigrants better assimilate and take full advantage of economic and occupational opportunities in the United States.

(7) By learning the English language, immigrants will be empowered with the language skills and literacy necessary to become responsible citizens and productive workers in the United States.

(8) The use of a single common language in conducting official business of the Federal Government will promote efficiency and fairness to all people.

(9) English should be recognized in law as the language of official business of the Federal Government.

(10) Any monetary savings derived from the enactment of this title should be used for the teaching of the English language to non-English speaking immigrants.

SEC. 102. ENGLISH AS THE OFFICIAL LANGUAGE OF FEDERAL GOVERNMENT.

(a) In General.--Title 4, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following new chapter:

``
CHAPTER 6--LANGUAGE OF THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT
``

``Sec.
``161. Declaration of official language of Federal Government
``162. Preserving and enhancing the role of the official language
``163. Official Federal Government activities in English
``164. Standing
``165. Reform of naturalization requirements
``166. Application
``167. Rule of construction
``168. Affirmation of constitutional protections
``169. Definitions
``Sec. 161. Declaration of official language of Federal Government
The official language of the Federal Government is English.

Sec. 162. Preserving and enhancing the role of the official language

Representatives of the Federal Government shall have an affirmative obligation to preserve and enhance the role of English as the official language of the Federal Government. Such obligation shall include encouraging greater opportunities for individuals to learn the English language.

Sec. 163. Official Federal Government activities in English

(a) Conduct of Business.--Representatives of the Federal Government shall conduct its official business in English.

(b) Denial of Services.--No person shall be denied services, assistance, or facilities, directly or indirectly provided by the Federal Government solely because the person communicates in English.

(c) Entitlement.--Every person in the United States is entitled--

(1) to communicate with representatives of the Federal Government in English;

(2) to receive information from or contribute information to the Federal Government in English; and

(3) to be informed of or be subject to official orders in English.

Sec. 164. Standing

A person injured by a violation of this chapter may in a civil action (including an action under chapter 151 of title 28) obtain appropriate relief.

Sec. 165. Reform of naturalization requirements

(a) Fluency.--It has been the longstanding national belief that full citizenship in the United States requires fluency in English. English is the language of opportunity for all immigrants to take their rightful place in society in the United States.

(b) Ceremonies.--All authorized officials shall conduct all naturalization ceremonies entirely in English.

Sec. 166. Application

Except as otherwise provided in this chapter, the provisions of this chapter shall supersede any existing Federal law that contravenes such provisions (such as by requiring the use of a language other than English for official business of the Federal Government).
Sec. 167. Rule of construction

Nothing in this chapter shall be construed--

(1) to prohibit a Member of Congress or an employee or official of the Federal Government, while performing official business, from communicating orally with another person in a language other than English;

(2) to limit the preservation or use of Native Alaskan or Native American languages (as defined in the Native American Languages Act);

(3) to discriminate against or restrict the rights of any individual in the country; and

(4) to discourage or prevent the use of languages other than English in any nonofficial capacity.

Sec. 168. Affirmation of constitutional protections

Nothing in this chapter shall be construed to be inconsistent with the Constitution of the United States.

Sec. 169. Definitions

For purposes of this chapter:

(1) Federal government.--The term `Federal Government' means all branches of the national Government and all employees and officials of the national Government while performing official business.

(2) Official business.--The term `official business' means governmental actions, documents, or policies which are enforceable with the full weight and authority of the Federal Government, and includes publications, income tax forms, and informational materials, but does not include--

(A) teaching of languages;

(B) requirements under the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act;

(C) actions, documents, or policies necessary for--

(i) national security issues; or

(ii) international relations, trade, or commerce;

(D) actions or documents that protect the public health and safety;

(E) actions or documents that facilitate the activities of the Bureau of the Census in compiling any census of population;
(F) actions, documents, or policies that are not enforceable in the United States;

(G) actions that protect the rights of victims of crimes or criminal defendants;

(H) actions in which the United States has initiated a civil lawsuit; or

(I) using terms of art or phrases from languages other than English.

(3) United states.--The term `United States' means the several States and the District of Columbia."

(b) Conforming Amendment.--The table of chapters for title 4, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following new item:


SEC. 103. PREEMPTION.

This title (and the amendments made by this title) shall not preempt any law of any State.

SEC. 104. EFFECTIVE DATE.

The amendments made by section 102 shall take effect on the date that is 180 days after the date of enactment of this Act.

TITLE II--REPEAL OF BILINGUAL VOTING REQUIREMENTS

SEC. 201. REPEAL OF BILINGUAL VOTING REQUIREMENTS

(a) Bilingual Election Requirements.--Section 203 of the Voting Rights Act of 1965 (42 U.S.C. 1973aa-1a) is repealed.

(b) Voting Rights.--Section 4 of the Voting Rights Act of 1965 (42 U.S.C. 1973b) is amended by striking subsection (f).

SEC. 202. CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.
(a) References to Section 203.--The Voting Rights Act of 1965 (42 U.S.C. 1973 et seq.) is amended--

(1) in section 204, by striking ``or 203,''; and

(2) in section 205, by striking ``, 202, or 203'' and inserting ``or 202''.

(b) References to Section 4.--The Voting Rights Act of 1965 (42 U.S.C. 1973 et seq.) is amended--

(1) in sections 2(a), 3(a), 3(b), 3(c), 4(d), 5, 6, and 13, by striking ``, or in contravention of the guarantees set forth in section 4(f)(2)'';

(2) in paragraphs (1)(A) and (3) of section 4(a), by striking ``(in the case of a State or subdivision seeking a declaratory judgment under the second sentence of this subsection) in contravention of the guarantees of subsection (f)(2)'';

(3) in paragraph (1)(B) of section 4(a), by striking ``(in the case of a State or subdivision seeking a declaratory judgment under the second sentence of this subsection) that denials or abridgements of the right to vote in contravention of the guarantees of subsection (f)(2) have occurred anywhere in the territory of such State or subdivision''; and

(4) in paragraph (5) of section 4(a), by striking ``(in the case of a State or subdivision which sought a declaratory judgment under the second sentence of this subsection) that denials or abridgements of the right to vote in contravention of the guarantees of subsection (f)(2) have occurred anywhere in the territory of such State or subdivision''.
PROPOSITION 103

OFFICIAL TITLE

HOUSE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION 2036

PROPOSING AN AMENDMENT TO THE CONSTITUTION OF ARIZONA; REPEALING ARTICLE XXVIII, CONSTITUTION OF ARIZONA; AMENDING THE CONSTITUTION OF ARIZONA BY ADDING A NEW ARTICLE XXVIII; RELATING TO ENGLISH AS THE OFFICIAL LANGUAGE.

TEXT OF PROPOSED AMENDMENT

Whereas, the United States is comprised of individuals from diverse ethnic, cultural and linguistic backgrounds, and continues to benefit from this rich diversity; and
Whereas, throughout the history of the United States, the common thread binding individuals of differing backgrounds has been the English language, which has permitted diverse individuals to discuss, debate and come to agreement on contentious issues; and
Whereas, in recent years, the role of the English language as a common language has been threatened by governmental actions that either ignore or harm the role of English or that promote the use of languages other than English in official governmental actions, and these governmental actions promote division, confusion, error and inappropriate use of resources; and
Whereas, among the powers reserved to the States respectively is the power to establish the English language as the official language of the respective States, and otherwise to promote the English language within the respective States, subject to the prohibitions enumerated in the Constitution of the United States and federal statutes.
Therefore
Be it resolved by the House of Representatives of the State of Arizona, the Senate concurring:
1. Article XXVIII, Constitution of Arizona, is proposed to be repealed as follows if approved by the voters and on proclamation of the Governor:
   Article XXVIII, Constitution of Arizona, relating to English as the official language, is repealed.
2. A new article XXVIII, Constitution of Arizona, is proposed to be added as follows if approved by the voters and on proclamation of the Governor:
   ARTICLE XXVIII. ENGLISH AS THE OFFICIAL LANGUAGE
   1. Definitions
   SECTION 1. IN THIS ARTICLE, UNLESS THE CONTEXT OTHERWISE REQUIRES:
   1. “GOVERNMENT” INCLUDES ALL LAWS, PUBLIC PROCEEDINGS, RULES, PUBLICATIONS, ORDERS, ACTIONS, PROGRAMS, POLICIES, DEPARTMENTS, BOARDS, AGENCIES, ORGANIZATIONS AND INSTRUMENTALITIES OF THIS STATE OR POLITICAL SUBDIVISIONS OF THIS STATE, AS APPROPRIATE UNDER THE CIRCUMSTANCES TO A PARTICULAR OFFICIAL ACTION.
   2. "OFFICIAL ACTION" INCLUDES THE PERFORMANCE OF ANY FUNCTION OR ACTION ON BEHALF OF THIS STATE OR A POLITICAL SUBDIVISION OF THIS STATE OR REQUIRED BY STATE LAW THAT APPEARS TO PRESENT THE VIEWS, POSITION OR IMPRIMATUR OF THE STATE OR POLITICAL SUBDIVISION OR THAT BINDS OR COMMITS THE STATE OR POLITICAL SUBDIVISION, BUT DOES NOT INCLUDE:
(a) THE TEACHING OF OR THE ENCOURAGEMENT OF LEARNING LANGUAGES OTHER THAN ENGLISH.
(b) ACTIONS REQUIRED UNDER THE FEDERAL INDIVIDUALS WITH DISABILITIES EDUCATION ACT OR OTHER FEDERAL LAWS.
(c) ACTIONS, DOCUMENTS OR POLICIES NECESSARY FOR TOURISM, COMMERCE OR INTERNATIONAL TRADE.
(d) ACTIONS OR DOCUMENTS THAT PROTECT THE PUBLIC HEALTH AND SAFETY, INCLUDING LAW ENFORCEMENT AND EMERGENCY SERVICES.
(e) ACTIONS THAT PROTECT THE RIGHTS OF VICTIMS OF CRIMES OR CRIMINAL DEFENDANTS.
(f) USING TERMS OF ART OR PHRASES FROM LANGUAGES OTHER THAN ENGLISH.
(g) USING OR PRESERVING NATIVE AMERICAN LANGUAGES.
(h) PROVIDING ASSISTANCE TO HEARING IMPAIRED OR ILLITERATE PERSONS.
(i) INFORMAL AND NONBINDING TRANSLATIONS OR COMMUNICATIONS AMONG OR BETWEEN REPRESENTATIVES OF GOVERNMENT AND OTHER PERSONS IF THIS ACTIVITY DOES NOT AFFECT OR IMPAIR SUPERVISION, MANAGEMENT, CONDUCT OR EXECUTION OF OFFICIAL ACTIONS AND IF THE REPRESENTATIVES OF GOVERNMENT MAKE CLEAR THAT THESE TRANSLATIONS OR COMMUNICATIONS ARE UNOFFICIAL AND ARE NOT BINDING ON THIS STATE OR A POLITICAL SUBDIVISION OF THIS STATE.
(j) ACTIONS NECESSARY TO PRESERVE THE RIGHT TO PETITION FOR THE REDRESS OF GRIEVANCES.

3. “PRESERVE, PROTECT AND ENHANCE THE ROLE OF ENGLISH” INCLUDES:
(a) AVOIDING ANY OFFICIAL ACTIONS THAT IGNORE, HARM OR DIMINISH THE ROLE OF ENGLISH AS THE LANGUAGE OF GOVERNMENT.
(b) PROTECTING THE RIGHTS OF PERSONS IN THIS STATE WHO USE ENGLISH.
(c) ENCOURAGING GREATER OPPORTUNITIES FOR INDIVIDUALS TO LEARN THE ENGLISH LANGUAGE.
(d) TO THE GREATEST EXTENT POSSIBLE UNDER FEDERAL STATUTE, PROVIDING SERVICES, PROGRAMS, PUBLICATIONS, DOCUMENTS AND MATERIALS IN ENGLISH.

4. “REPRESENTATIVES OF GOVERNMENT” INCLUDES ALL INDIVIDUALS OR ENTITIES DURING THE PERFORMANCE OF THE INDIVIDUAL’S OR ENTITY’S OFFICIAL ACTIONS.

2. Official language of Arizona

SECTION 2. THE OFFICIAL LANGUAGE OF THE STATE OF ARIZONA IS ENGLISH.

3. Preserving and enhancing the role of the official language; right to use English

SECTION 3. A. REPRESENTATIVES OF GOVERNMENT IN THIS STATE SHALL PRESERVE, PROTECT AND ENHANCE THE ROLE OF ENGLISH AS THE OFFICIAL LANGUAGE OF THE GOVERNMENT OF ARIZONA.
B. A PERSON SHALL NOT BE DISCRIMINATED AGAINST OR PENALIZED IN ANY WAY BECAUSE THE PERSON USES OR ATTEMPTS TO USE ENGLISH IN PUBLIC OR PRIVATE COMMUNICATION.

4. Official actions to be conducted in English

SECTION 4. OFFICIAL ACTIONS SHALL BE CONDUCTED IN ENGLISH.

5. Rules of construction

SECTION 5. THIS ARTICLE SHALL NOT BE CONSTRUED TO PROHIBIT ANY REPRESENTATIVE OF GOVERNMENT, INCLUDING A MEMBER OF THE LEGISLATURE, WHILE PERFORMING OFFICIAL DUTIES, FROM COMMUNICATING UNOFFICIALLY THROUGH ANY MEDIUM WITH ANOTHER PERSON IN A LANGUAGE OTHER THAN ENGLISH IF OFFICIAL ACTION IS CONDUCTED IN ENGLISH.

6. Standing; notification of attorney general; recovery of costs

SECTION 6. A. A PERSON WHO RESIDES OR DOES BUSINESS IN THIS STATE MAY FILE A CIVIL ACTION FOR RELIEF FROM ANY OFFICIAL ACTION THAT VIOLATES THIS ARTICLE IN A MANNER THAT CAUSES INJURY TO THE PERSON.
B. A PERSON WHO RESIDES OR DOES BUSINESS IN THIS STATE AND WHO CONTENDS THAT THIS ARTICLE IS NOT BEING IMPLEMENTED OR ENFORCED MAY FILE A CIVIL ACTION TO DETERMINE IF THE FAILURE OR INACTION COMPLAINED OF IS A VIOLATION OF THIS ARTICLE AND FOR INJUNCTIVE OR MANDATORY RELIEF.
C. A PERSON SHALL NOT FILE AN ACTION UNDER THIS SECTION UNLESS THE PERSON HAS NOTIFIED THE ATTORNEY GENERAL OF THE ALLEGED VIOLATION AND THE ATTORNEY GENERAL OR OTHER APPROPRIATE REPRESENTATIVE OF GOVERNMENT HAS NOT PROVIDED APPROPRIATE RELIEF WITHIN A REASONABLE TIME UNDER THE CIRCUMSTANCES. AN ACTION FILED UNDER THIS SECTION MAY BE IN ADDITION TO OR IN LIEU OF ANY ACTION BY OFFICERS OF THIS STATE, INCLUDING THE ATTORNEY GENERAL.

D. A PERSON WHO FILES AND IS SUCCESSFUL IN AN ACTION UNDER THIS SECTION MAY BE AWARDED ALL COSTS EXPENDED OR INCURRED IN THE ACTION, INCLUDING REASONABLE ATTORNEY FEES.

3. This amendment is intended to be self-executing and does not require implementing legislation, but, subject to the provisions of the amendment if adopted, the legislature may enact any measure designed to further the purposes of the amendment.

4. If a provision of this amendment or its application to any person or circumstance is held invalid, the invalidity does not affect other provisions or application of the amendment that can be given effect without the invalid provision or application, and to this end the provisions of this amendment are severable.

5. The Secretary of State shall submit this proposition to the voters at the next general election as provided by article XXI, Constitution of Arizona.

ANALYSIS BY LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL

Proposition 103 would replace the existing provision of the Constitution of Arizona with a new provision establishing English as the official language of this state. Representatives of the state or a local government would be required to preserve, protect and enhance the role of English as the official language.

Proposition 103 would require that all official actions of the government be conducted in English. Official actions include actions on behalf of the government that appear to present the position of the government or that bind the government. The proposition specifies situations in which state or local government could act in a language other than English, including:

1. When required by federal law or when necessary to preserve the right to petition the government.
2. In teaching languages other than English, or in using or preserving Native American languages.
3. In actions to protect the public health and safety, including law enforcement and emergency services, or to protect the rights of crime victims and criminal defendants.
4. Providing assistance to hearing impaired or illiterate persons.
5. In informal or nonbinding communications or translations among or between government officials and the public.
6. For actions necessary for tourism, commerce or international trade.

Proposition 103 would prohibit discrimination against a person because the person uses English in any public or private communication.

Proposition 103 also would allow a person who resides or does business in Arizona to enforce this new constitutional requirement in court. However, a person shall not file an action under this section unless the person has notified the attorney general of the alleged violation and the attorney general or other appropriate representative of government has not provided appropriate relief within a reasonable time under the circumstances. If the person is successful, they may be awarded costs and reasonable attorney fees.
Appendix 4
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PROPOSITION 203

OFFICIAL TITLE
AN INITIATIVE MEASURE

TITLE 15, CHAPTER 7, ARTICLE 3.1, ARIZONA REVISED STATUTES, IS REPEALED. SEC. 3. TITLE 15, CHAPTER 7, ARIZONA REVISED STATUTES, IS AMENDED BY ADDING A NEW ARTICLE 3.1, ENGLISH LANGUAGE EDUCATION FOR CHILDREN IN PUBLIC SCHOOLS

TEXT OF PROPOSED AMENDMENT

Sec. 1. Findings and Declarations
The People of Arizona find and declare:
1. The English language is the national public language of the United States of America and of the state of Arizona. It is spoken by the vast majority of Arizona residents, and is also the leading world language for science, technology, and international business, thereby being the language of economic opportunity; and
2. Immigrant parents are eager to have their children acquire a good knowledge of English, thereby allowing them to fully participate in the American Dream of economic and social advancement; and
3. The government and the public schools of Arizona have a moral obligation and a constitutional duty to provide all of Arizona’s children, regardless of their ethnicity or national origins, with the skills necessary to become productive members of our society. Of these skills, literacy in the English language is among the most important.
4. The public schools of Arizona currently do an inadequate job of educating immigrant children, wasting financial resources on costly experimental language programs whose failure over the past two decades is demonstrated by the current high drop-out rates and low English literacy levels of many immigrant children.
5. Young immigrant children can easily acquire full fluency in a new language, such as English, if they are heavily exposed to that language in the classroom at an early age.
6. Therefore it is resolved that: all children in Arizona public schools shall be taught English as rapidly and effectively as possible.
7. Under circumstances in which portions of this statute are subject to conflicting interpretations, these Findings and Declarations shall be assumed to contain the governing intent of the statute.

Sec. 2. Repeal
Title 15, chapter 7, article 3.1, Arizona Revised Statutes, is repealed.

Sec. 3. Title 15, chapter 7, Arizona Revised Statutes, is amended by adding a new article 3.1, to read:

ARTICLE 3.1. ENGLISH LANGUAGE EDUCATION FOR CHILDREN IN PUBLIC SCHOOLS

SECTION 15-751. DEFINITIONS
IN THIS ARTICLE,
1. "BILINGUAL EDUCATION/NATIVE LANGUAGE INSTRUCTION" MEANS A LANGUAGE ACQUISITION PROCESS FOR STUDENTS IN WHICH MUCH OR ALL INSTRUCTION, TEXTBOOKS, OR TEACHING MATERIALS ARE IN THE CHILD'S NATIVE LANGUAGE OTHER THAN ENGLISH.
2. "ENGLISH LANGUAGE CLASSROOM" MEANS A CLASSROOM IN WHICH ENGLISH IS THE LANGUAGE OF INSTRUCTION USED BY THE TEACHING PERSONNEL, AND IN WHICH SUCH TEACHING PERSONNEL POSSESS A GOOD KNOWLEDGE OF THE ENGLISH LANGUAGE. ENGLISH LANGUAGE CLASSROOMS ENCOMPASS BOTH ENGLISH LANGUAGE MAINSTREAM CLASSROOMS AND SHELTERED ENGLISH IMMERSION CLASSROOMS.
3. "ENGLISH LANGUAGE MAINSTREAM CLASSROOM" MEANS A CLASSROOM IN WHICH THE STUDENTS EITHER ARE NATIVE ENGLISH LANGUAGE SPEAKERS OR ALREADY HAVE ACQUIRED REASONABLE FLUENCY IN ENGLISH.
4. "ENGLISH LEARNER" OR "LIMITED ENGLISH PROFICIENT STUDENT" MEANS A CHILD WHO DOES NOT SPEAK ENGLISH OR WHOSE NATIVE LANGUAGE IS NOT ENGLISH, AND WHO IS NOT CURRENTLY ABLE TO PERFORM ORDINARY CLASSROOM WORK IN ENGLISH.
5. "SHELTERED ENGLISH IMMERSION" OR "STRUCTURED ENGLISH IMMERSION" MEANS AN ENGLISH LANGUAGE ACQUISITION PROCESS FOR YOUNG CHILDREN IN WHICH NEARLY ALL CLASSROOM INSTRUCTION IS IN ENGLISH BUT WITH THE CURRICULUM AND PRESENTATION DESIGNED FOR CHILDREN WHO ARE LEARNING THE LANGUAGE, BOOKS AND INSTRUCTIONAL MATERIALS ARE IN ENGLISH AND ALL READING, WRITING, AND SUBJECT MATTER ARE TAUGHT IN ENGLISH. ALTHOUGH TEACHERS MAY USE A MINIMAL AMOUNT OF THE CHILD'S NATIVE LANGUAGE WHEN NECESSARY, NO SUBJECT MATTER SHALL BE TAUGHT IN ANY LANGUAGE OTHER THAN ENGLISH, AND CHILDREN IN THIS PROGRAM LEARN TO READ AND WRITE SOLELY IN ENGLISH. THIS EDUCATIONAL METHODOLOGY REPRESENTS THE STANDARD DEFINITION OF "SHELTERED ENGLISH" OR "STRUCTURED ENGLISH" FOUND IN EDUCATIONAL LITERATURE.

SECTION 15-752. ENGLISH LANGUAGE EDUCATION
SUBJECT TO THE EXCEPTIONS PROVIDED IN SECTION 15-753, ALL CHILDREN IN ARIZONA PUBLIC SCHOOLS SHALL BE TAUGHT ENGLISH BY BEING TAUGHT IN ENGLISH AND ALL CHILDREN SHALL BE PLACED IN ENGLISH LANGUAGE CLASSROOMS. CHILDREN WHO ARE ENGLISH LEARNERS SHALL BE EDUCATED THROUGH SHELTERED ENGLISH IMMERSION DURING A TEMPORARY TRANSITION PERIOD NOT NORMALLY INTENDED TO EXCEED ONE YEAR. LOCAL SCHOOLS SHALL BE PERMITTED BUT NOT REQUIRED TO PLACE IN THE SAME CLASSROOM ENGLISH LEARNERS OF DIFFERENT AGES BUT WHOSE DEGREE OF ENGLISH PROFICIENCY IS SIMILAR. LOCAL SCHOOLS SHALL BE ENCOURAGED TO MIX TOGETHER IN THE SAME CLASSROOM ENGLISH LEARNERS FROM DIFFERENT NATIVE LANGUAGE GROUPS BUT WITH THE SAME DEGREE OF ENGLISH PROFICIENCY.
FLUENCY. ONCE ENGLISH LEARNERS HAVE ACQUIRED A GOOD WORKING KNOWLEDGE OF ENGLISH AND ARE
ABLE TO DO REGULAR SCHOOL WORK IN ENGLISH, THEY SHALL NO LONGER BE CLASSIFIED AS ENGLISH
LEARNERS AND SHALL BE TRANSFERRED TO ENGLISH LANGUAGE MAINSTREAM CLASSROOMS. AS MUCH AS
POSSIBLE, CURRENT PER CAPITA SUPPLEMENTAL FUNDING FOR ENGLISH LEARNERS SHALL BE MAINTAINED.
FOR FIRST LANGUAGE CLASSES FOR CHILDREN WHO ALREADY KNOW ENGLISH SHALL BE COMPLETELY
UNAFFECTED, AS SHALL SPECIAL EDUCATIONAL PROGRAMS FOR PHYSICALLY- OR MENTALLY-IMPAIRED
STUDENTS.

SECTION 15-753. PARENTAL WAIVERS
A. THE REQUIREMENTS OF SECTION 15-752 MAY BE WAIVED WITH THE PRIOR WRITTEN INFORMED CONSENT,
TO BE PROVIDED ANNUALLY, OF THE CHILD'S PARENTS OR LEGAL GUARDIAN UNDER THE CIRCUMSTANCES
SPECIFIED IN THIS SECTION. SUCH INFORMED CONSENT SHALL REQUIRE THAT SAID PARENTS OR LEGAL
GUARDIAN PERSONALLY VISIT THE SCHOOL TO APPLY FOR THE WAIVER AND THAT THEY THERE BE PROVIDED
A FULL DESCRIPTION OF THE EDUCATIONAL MATERIALS TO BE USED IN THE DIFFERENT EDUCATIONAL
PROGRAM CHOICES AND ALL THE EDUCATIONAL OPPORTUNITIES AVAILABLE TO THE CHILD. IF A PARENTAL
WAIVER HAS BEEN GRANTED, THE AFFECTED CHILD SHALL BE TRANSFERRED TO CLASSES TEACHING
ENGLISH AND OTHER SUBJECTS THROUGH BILINGUAL EDUCATION TECHNIQUES OR OTHER GENERALLY
RECOGNIZED EDUCATIONAL METHODOLOGIES PERMITTED BY LAW. INDIVIDUAL SCHOOLS IN WHICH 20
STUDENTS OR MORE OF A GIVEN GRADE LEVEL RECEIVE A WAIVER SHALL BE REQUIRED TO OFFER SUCH A
CLASS; IN ALL OTHER CASES, SUCH STUDENTS MUST BE PERMITTED TO TRANSFER TO A PUBLIC SCHOOL IN
WHICH SUCH A CLASS IS OFFERED.
B. THE CIRCUMSTANCES IN WHICH A PARENTAL EXCEPTION WAIVER MAY BE APPLIED FOR UNDER THIS
SECTION ARE AS FOLLOWS:
1. CHILDREN WHO ALREADY KNOW ENGLISH: THE CHILD ALREADY POSSESS ES GOOD ENGLISH LANGUAGE
SKILLS, AS MEASURED BY ORAL EVALUATION OR STANDARDIZED TESTS OF ENGLISH VOCABULARY
COMPREHENSION, READING, AND WRITING, IN WHICH THE CHILD SCORES APPROXIMATELY AT OR ABOVE THE
STATE AVERAGE FOR HIS GRADE LEVEL OR AT OR ABOVE THE 5TH GRADE AVERAGE, WHICHEVER IS LOWER; OR
2. OLDER CHILDREN: THE CHILD IS AGE 10 YEARS OR OLDER, AND IT IS THE INFORMED BELIEF OF THE
SCHOOL PRINCIPAL AND EDUCATIONAL STAFF THAT AN ALTERNATE COURSE OF EDUCATIONAL STUDY
WOULD BE BETTER SUITED TO THE CHILD'S OVERALL EDUCATIONAL PROGRESS AND RAPID ACQUISITION OF
BASIC ENGLISH LANGUAGE SKILLS; OR
3. CHILDREN WITH SPECIAL INDIVIDUAL NEEDS: THE CHILD ALREADY HAS BEEN PLACED FOR A PERIOD OF
NOT LESS THAN THIRTY CALENDAR DAYS DURING THAT SCHOOL YEAR IN AN ENGLISH LANGUAGE
CLASSROOM AND IT IS SUBSEQUENTLY THE INFORMED BELIEF OF THE SCHOOL PRINCIPAL AND
EDUCATIONAL STAFF THAT THE CHILD HAS SUCH SPECIAL AND INDIVIDUAL PHYSICAL OR PSYCHOLOGICAL
NEEDS, ABOVE AND BEYOND THE CHILD'S LACK OF ENGLISH PROFICIENCY, THAT AN ALTERNATE COURSE OF
EDUCATIONAL STUDY WOULD BE BETTER SUITED TO THE CHILD'S OVERALL EDUCATIONAL DEVELOPMENT
AND RAPID ACQUISITION OF ENGLISH. A WRITTEN DESCRIPTION OF NO LESS THAN 250 WORDS DOCUMENTING
THOSE SPECIAL INDIVIDUAL NEEDS FOR THE SPECIFIC CHILD MUST BE PROVIDED AND PERMANENTLY ADDED
TO THE CHILD'S OFFICIAL SCHOOL RECORDS, AND THE WAIVER APPLICATION MUST CONTAIN THE ORIGINAL
AUTHORIZING SIGNATURES OF BOTH THE SCHOOL PRINCIPAL AND THE LOCAL SUPERINTENDENT OF
SCHOOLS. ANY SUCH DECISION TO ISSUE SUCH AN INDIVIDUAL WAIVER IS TO BE MADE SUBJECT TO THE
EXAMINATION AND APPROVAL OF THE LOCAL SCHOOL SUPERINTENDENT, UNDER GUIDELINES ESTABLISHED
BY AND SUBJECT TO THE REVIEW OF THE LOCAL GOVERNING BOARD AND ULTIMATELY THE STATE BOARD OF
EDUCATION. TEACHERS AND LOCAL SCHOOL DISTRICTS MAY REJECT WAIVER REQUESTS WITHOUT
EXPLANATION OR LEGAL CONSEQUENCE. THE EXISTENCE OF SUCH SPECIAL INDIVIDUAL NEEDS SHALL NOT
COMPEL ISSUANCE OF A WAIVER, AND THE PARENTS SHALL BE FULLY INFORMED OF THEIR RIGHT TO REFUSE
TO AGREE TO A WAIVER.

SECTION 15-754. LEGAL STANDING AND PARENTAL ENFORCEMENT
AS DETAILED IN SECTIONS 15-752 AND 15-753, ALL ARIZONA SCHOOL CHILDREN HAVE THE RIGHT TO BE
PROVIDED AT THEIR LOCAL SCHOOL WITH AN ENGLISH LANGUAGE PUBLIC EDUCATION. THE PARENT OR
LEGAL GUARDIAN OF ANY ARIZONA SCHOOL CHILD SHALL HAVE LEGAL STANDING TO SUE FOR
ENFORCEMENT OF THE PROVISIONS OF THIS STATUTE, AND IF SUCCESSFUL SHALL BE AWARDED NORMAL
AND CUSTOMARY ATTORNEY’S FEES AND ACTUAL AND COMPENSATORY DAMAGES, BUT NOT PUNITIVE OR
CONSEQUENTIAL DAMAGES. ANY SCHOOL BOARD MEMBER OR OTHER ELECTED OFFICIAL OR
ADMINISTRATOR WHO WILLFULLY AND REPEATEDLY REFUSES TO IMPLEMENT THE TERMS OF THIS STATUTE
MAY BE HELD PERSONALLY LIABLE FOR FEES AND ACTUAL AND COMPENSATORY DAMAGES BY THE CHILD'S
PARENTS OR LEGAL GUARDIAN, AND CANNOT BE SUBSEQUENTLY INDEMNIFIED FOR SUCH ASSESSED
DAMAGES BY ANY PUBLIC OR PRIVATE THIRD PARTY. ANY INDIVIDUAL FOUND SO LIABLE SHALL BE
IMMEDIATELY REMOVED FROM OFFICE, AND SHALL BE BARRED FROM HOLDING ANY POSITION OF AUTHORITY
ANYWHERE WITHIN THE ARIZONA PUBLIC SCHOOL SYSTEM FOR AN ADDITIONAL PERIOD OF FIVE YEARS.

SECTION 15-755. STANDARDIZED TESTING FOR MONITORING EDUCATION PROGRESS.
IN ORDER TO ENSURE THE EDUCATIONAL PROGRESS OF ALL ARIZONA STUDENTS IN ACADEMIC
SUBJECTS AND IN LEARNING ENGLISH IS PROPERLY MONITORED, A STANDARDIZED, NATIONALLY-NORMED
WRITTEN TEST OF ACADEMIC SUBJECT MATTER GIVEN IN ENGLISH SHALL BE ADMINISTERED AT LEAST ONCE
EVERY YEAR TO ALL ARIZONA PUBLIC SCHOOL CHILDREN IN GRADES 2 AND HIGHER. ONLY STUDENTS
CLASSIFIED AS SEVERELY LEARNING DISABLED MAY BE EXEMPTED FROM THIS TEST. THE PARTICULAR TEST
TO BE USED SHALL BE SELECTED BY THE OFFICE OF THE STATE SUPERINTENDENT OF PUBLIC INSTRUCTION
AND IT IS INTENDED THAT THE TEST SHALL GENERALLY REMAIN THE SAME FROM YEAR TO YEAR. THE
NATIONAL PERCENTILE SCORES OF STUDENTS SHALL BE CONFIDENTIALLY PROVIDED TO INDIVIDUAL
PARENTS, AND THE AGGREGATED PERCENTILE SCORES AND DISTRIBUTIONAL DATA FOR INDIVIDUAL
SCHOOLS AND SCHOOL DISTRICTS SHALL BE MADE PUBLICLY AVAILABLE ON AN INTERNET WEB SITE; THE
SCORES FOR STUDENTS CLASSIFIED AS "LIMITED-ENGLISH" SHALL BE SEPARATELY SUB-AGGREGATED AND
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MADE PUBLICLY AVAILABLE THERE AS WELL. ALTHOUGH ADMINISTRATION OF THIS TEST IS REQUIRED SOLELY FOR MONITORING EDUCATIONAL PROGRESS, ARIZONA PUBLIC OFFICIALS AND ADMINISTRATORS MAY UTILIZE THESE TEST SCORES FOR OTHER PURPOSES AS WELL IF THEY SO CHOOSE.

Sec. 4. Severability
If a provision of this act or its application to any person or circumstances is held invalid, the invalidity does not affect other provisions or applications of the act that can be given effect without the invalid provision or application, and to this end the provisions of this act are severable.

Sec. 5. Application

The provisions of this act cannot be waived, modified, or set aside by any elected or appointed official or administrator, except as through the amendment process provided for in the Arizona constitution.