

Editors' Note

A little over thirty years ago, Richard Ruíz (1984) published his seminal work on language planning orientations, which laid the foundation for much ideological work in language planning and policy (LPP) research and advanced a concern for social justice in bilingual and language minority education. As students and scholars of LPP at the Graduate School of Education, our research and practitioner work continues to critically question language-as-problem framings and advocate and advance language-as-right and as-resource orientations. A little over thirty years ago as well, at the University of Wisconsin-Madison, Richard Ruíz and Nancy Hornberger engaged in a mentor-mentee relationship from which Nancy remembers most of all his understated brilliance and endless generosity. Carrying on Dr. Ruíz's unwavering support for new generations of scholars, Dr. Hornberger followed his lead through her inspiring scholarship and nurturing mentorship. As her former students Francis Hult and Kendall King (2011) recently noted, we have all benefited tremendously from the lineage of "Ruíz's supportive, humble and open stance as a mentor" (p. xxii). Honoring the life and scholarship of Dr. Richard Ruíz, we dedicate this LPP special issue to him.

In this issue, our authors consider the possibilities and implications of a language-as-resource orientation to language planning and teaching in a diversity of contexts, language policy settings and language education modalities, drawing from a variety of methodologies and LPP conceptual tools. Together, the papers in this issue lend a critical analysis that is informed, much like Ruíz's scholarship, by a continuous search for spaces for multiple languages in society as well as spaces for voice and social justice for all members of our multilingual society.

One such experience of a language-as-resource approach to endangered language teaching is described by Hornberger, DeKorne and Weinberg, in their study of Lenape language education for non-Lenape students in a colonial-origin university. While including Indigenous languages in higher education runs the risk of creating new forms of commodification and colonialism, based on their ethnographic study, they argue that such initiatives can rather facilitate more nuanced and anti-essentializing understanding of notions of language, place and identity, benefiting non-Lenape students as well as wider Lenape language reclamation goals. Participatory, reflective, and collaborative projects, they argue, constitute a promising medium for the inclusion of variety of actors and goals of Indigenous language reclamation projects.

Following a historical-textual approach to the study of multilingual policies in Peru, Kvietok considers how actors at different layers of the LPP onion have ongoingly negotiated and transformed language policy orientations through time, creating ideological and implementation spaces (Hornberger, 2002) for Indigenous languages in society. Within a current policy context that aims to extend the domains of Indigenous languages in society as well as the numbers of Indigenous language speakers, Kvietok argues that implementation spaces that transcend views of diversity as an obligation or as an apolitical celebration will be crucial to guide LPP activities in the quest to work with and for Indigenous communities as well as for cultural and linguistic diversity for all.

Taking us to the Italian context, Leone offers a rich review of supranational and national policies that influence the ways in which CLIL (content and language integrated learning) is realized at local and classroom levels. While recognizing the promises of such models to further EU goals of plurilingualism, Leone notes that CLIL implementation is situated within a context that continues a “long struggle to transition from framing this linguistic complexity as a problem to seeing it as a resource” (p. 53). With this in mind, her paper invites us to consider CLIL experiences as sites that must negotiate competing discourses and practices about teaching in dominant dialects of Italian and English while accommodating Italian minority languages and immigrant minority languages.

The next two papers take us to scenes of LPP in Asia. In contrast to previous papers’ discussions of LPP for a second or additional language in multilingual contexts, both Liu and Kim tackle issues arising from acquisition planning for a foreign language. Liu adopts a historical-structural approach to review the development of foreign language education planning in China since 1949. Across three historical eras, Liu critically examines decision making processes and their underlying language ideologies. Also informed by Ruíz’s fundamental orientations toward language in LPP, Liu attributes the pendulum in Chinese foreign language education planning goals and implementation to treating language as a tool instead of as a resource.

In the same vein, Kim points out that since English proficiency has become a token of power in South Korea, it is treated as an indispensable tool to climb up the social ladder. In responding to the ineffective public English education caused by top-down planning, the booming private English education sector spawned from this English fervor has served as the de facto mechanism that mediates English learning for the vast majority in South Korea, an LPP trend which has disturbingly deepened social inequality.

Following our long tradition of publishing an LPP special issue, we are proud to present this collection of student papers from Nancy Hornberger’s 2014 LPP seminar as well as her collaborative piece with two students. In our regular issues, we welcome submissions engaging a wide range of issues in Educational Linguistics. We would like to remind you that our current and past issues are also available on our website. Subscribe to our newsletter today and stay in touch!

Frances Kvietok Dueñas and Yeting Liu
March 17, 2015

References

- Hornberger, N. H. (2002). Multilingual language policies and the continua of biliteracy: An ecological approach. *Language Policy*, 1(1), 27–51.
- Hult, F. M., & King, K. A. (2011). *Educational linguistics in practice: Applying the local globally and the global locally*. Bristol, England: Multilingual Matters.
- Leone, A. R. (2015). Outlooks in Italy: CLIL as language education policy. *Working Papers in Educational Linguistics*, 30(1), 45–65.
- Ruíz, R. (1984). Orientations in language planning. *NABE Journal*, 8(2), 15–34.