

Editors' Note

A longstanding and remarkable feature of *Working Papers in Educational Linguistics* is its capacity for bringing together the work of seasoned academicians and burgeoning scholars. This issue is no exception. The five papers included in this issue are examples of the interdisciplinary nature of Educational Linguistics, an interdisciplinarity which makes the field a strong frontline from which to better understand the relationship between language and educational contexts and processes. Drawing on diverse data from interviews, participant observation, policy-text analyses, and literature reviews, this issue critically explores the current state of the field (King), approaches language policy debates by integrating curriculum development theories (Miranda Nieves) and highlights the hybrid orientations that minoritized populations build to thrive in countries and languages different to their own (Petreñas, Lapestra, & Huguet; Snell; Zheng). Moreover, we are especially proud of this issue as for the first time in its history *Working Papers in Educational Linguistics* is publishing an article in a language other than English. We feel this reflects the direction set by Dell Hymes (1984) in the inaugural issue to create a space that both allows different voices and languages to be heard and simultaneously seeks to raise consciousness regarding the importance of “interaction [through language] in [educational] context[s]” (p. i).

In “Who and What Is the Field of Applied Linguistics Overlooking?: Why This Matters and How Educational Linguistics Can Help,” Dr. Kendall King looks back on decades of research in Educational Linguistics and Applied Linguistics and asks how both fields are collaborating in light of increasing numbers of endangered, Indigenous, migrant, refugee, and other minoritized languages (and their learners) in the USA and abroad. In her words, “What [are] we, applied linguists, doing during the planet’s most intense period of language loss and destruction?” (p. 11). She incisively pushes both fields to collaborate not just in terms of knowing more about the languages (linguistic variation) or the development of teaching materials, but on engaging in conversations about how both fields can highlight the histories of pain, colonialism, and minoritization, in the process reminding us that “context, problems, and social justice” (p. 14) need to be at the center of the Educational Linguistics enterprise.

Miranda describes the ideological underpinnings of the Bilingual Colombia Program, the educational language policy that aims for students to become bilingual in Colombia. Through policy-text analyses, newspaper articles, and TV and radio broadcasts, she demonstrates how “a bilingual person [in Colombia]” is narrowly constructed as “one who can speak English in addition to Spanish” (p. 20), despite the country being home to more than 60 Indigenous languages. By employing curriculum theory to explain how the classroom level is an important layer of language policy, this paper is an invitation for researchers interested in language policy processes, as well as a call for policymakers to explore educational theory as a field that should be taken more seriously in educational language policy studies.

Petreñas, Lapestra, and Huguet, from the Universitat de Lleida, present results from their longitudinal study on plurilingualism and education in Catalonia, Spain. The authors analyze the ways Romanian youth identify with

their languages—Romanian, Spanish, and Catalan—showing how their linguistic practices depend on friendships, family language practices, labor, and the overall sense of belonging to different societies. Ultimately, this paper reveals how youth engage in practices of identity translation (Portes & Rivas, 2011), wherein they become artists of camouflage, change, and multiplicity depending on the contexts with the ones they engage with.

Zheng provides a “mini-autoethnography” (Aneja, 2016) of her own experiences as a nonnative English-speaking teacher (NNEST) with adult immigrant students. Through an honest account, she allows us to see the ways she and her students navigated their identities as immigrants, workers, authorities, adults, and students, in many instances leading to misunderstandings and contradictions. Using classroom discourse analysis with a particular focus on contextualization cues (Gumperz, 1977), Zheng analyzes these misunderstandings, as well as her own teaching assumptions, and argues that more research needs to be done with immigrant adult learners and NNESTs, where “instead of asking teachers to teach perfect grammar” (p. 71), student-teachers need to be taught about their own biases, adapt to the needs of students, and take advantage of the students’ funds of knowledge.

And finally, also addressing environments where adults learn, Snell’s paper “Play and Bricolage in Adult Second Language Classrooms” is a manuscript full of hope. The author investigates the ways Latino adult learners in a community-based class in Arizona play with language, blend media, and learn to care about each other as they become literate in English, immigration, and health topics. Snell points out that even though play has been historically favored as a pedagogical strategy, it is still looked down upon in language classrooms. By allowing students to play with poetry, experiment with social media, and exercise gardening as a language learning strategy, she shows how play and bricolage “display and celebrate [the] variety of interests, identities, and experiences” (p. 90) of her students, a successful strategy that could be considered in other adult-centered environments.

In closing, we want to thank Jennifer Phuong for her immense contribution to Production and Design for this issue, and we would also like to extend our heartfelt gratitude to all the reviewers and to the editorial team. We also join past Editors-in-Chief in thanking Dr. Nancy Hornberger for her consistent guidance and support for *Working Papers in Educational Linguistics*.

Aldo Anzures Tapia & David H. Hanks
November 29th, 2016

References

- Aneja, G. A. (2016). (Non)native speakered: Rethinking (non)nativeness and teacher identity in TESOL teacher education. *TESOL Quarterly*, 50(3), 572–596.
- Hymes, D. (1984). Foreword. *Working Papers in Educational Linguistics*, 1(1), i–iii.
- Gumperz, J. J. (1977). Sociocultural knowledge in conversational inference. In M. Saville-Troike (Eds.), *Georgetown University Round Table on Languages and Linguistics, 1977: Linguistics and anthropology* (pp. 191–211). Washington, DC: Georgetown University Press.

- King, K. A. (this issue). Who and what is the field of applied linguistics overlooking?: Why this matters and how educational linguistics can help. *Working Papers in Educational Linguistics*, 31(2), 1–18.
- Miranda, N. (this issue). Bilingual Colombia Program: Curriculum as product, only?. *Working Papers in Educational Linguistics*, 31(2), 19–37.
- Portes, A., & Rivas, A. (2011). The adaptation of migrant children. *The Future of Children*, 21(1), 219–246.
- Snell, A. (this issue). Play and bricolage in adult second language classrooms. *Working Papers in Educational Linguistics*, 31(2), 77–92.
- Zheng, B. (this issue). Listening to contextualization cues: Co-constructed power, identity, and learning between a NNEST and adult immigrant learners. *Working Papers in Educational Linguistics*, 31(2), 57–75.