

Editors' Note

Much of the work in the field of Educational Linguistics is grounded in or linked to de jure and de facto policies (Johnson, 2013) around language-in-education and/or language education. This typology has a vast scope and requires a nuanced understanding of the ways in which Ricento & Hornberger's (1996) "LPP onion" gets sliced ethnographically and then how it is "cooked" by education practitioners (García & Menken, 2010). Defining standards for national language assessments or materials for curricular corpus planning is inevitably bound up with normative notions of orthography and literacy (Donaldson, this issue); of indigeneity, power, and privilege (Anzures, this issue); and of ethnolinguistic heritage and national belonging (Wang, this issue). The authors in this issue each take up to some extent the subject of sociopolitically marginalized languages and peoples and situate them in the context of normative notions of literacy, education, and nation.

In the opening article, Coleman Donaldson frames orthography development as an ideological project rather than as a technical endeavor, pointing to the several co-present scripts for Manding, a language and dialect continuum in West Africa. Donaldson argues that orthography does not originate or reside exclusively in an institutional domain, but that language users must also interact with and orient to a writing system when they use it as a medium to communicate in their language(s). While linguists' development of these various scripts (for Manding or any language) may have simply been a means for documenting sound structure, an anthropologically informed account of how orthography has been taken up and reworked in Indigenous and post-colonial language-in-education settings is necessary for a fuller conceptualization of orthography as a socially negotiated construct. In this view, orthographies have to be seen as sites of reanalysis and contention, not simply professional artifacts of linguistic expertise.

The ideological underpinnings governing the representation of Indigenous languages and peoples in educational contexts becomes an even greater focus in Aldo Anzures Tapia's paper. Here, we look toward Mexico's national assessment (ENLACE/PLANEA) and what he argues is a systematic non-recognition of students from minoritized linguistic backgrounds. Anzures situates his analysis of policy documents, assessment characteristics, historical data, and demographic figures in a sociology of absences framework, making evident the ways in which Indigenous languages and children continue to be systematically "pushed out" of academic consideration in a post-colonial context.

In our final paper, Ge Wang discusses the present multilingual education policies in China and explores conceptualization of ethnic minority students embedded in these policies. Wang focuses specifically on the trilingual education policy of the ethnically and linguistically diverse Yunnan province, which calls for the development of an ethnic minority language, the national language (Putonghua), and a foreign language (e.g. English). He notes particular gaps between policy formation and implementation and calls for more ethnographic research to be done with multilingual learners in Yunnan in order to better inform policymakers, schools, and curriculum developers.

Educational linguists must continue developing an understanding of the long- and short-term effects of language-in-education and/or language education policies, and find new ways to integrate micro and macro levels of language policymaking. As demonstrated in this issue, language-in-education policies have the potential to either broaden or restrict participation in schooling, and they have the power to either imbue forms of language proficiency and literacy with social and institutional value or to take such value away. It is our hope that this issue urges continued and varied research into language-in-education and/or language education policies.

In closing, we want to thank David Hanks for his immense contribution toward Production and Design of this issue, and we would also like to extend heartfelt thanks to external reviewers and to the editorial team. We also join past editors-in-chief in thanking Nancy Hornberger for her consistent guidance and support for Working Papers in Educational Linguistics.

Mark C. Lewis & Andrea R. Leone-Pizzighella
October 30th, 2015

References

- García, O., & Menken, K. (2010). Stirring the onion: Educators and the dynamics of language education policies (looking ahead). In K. Menken & O. García (Eds.), *Negotiating language policies in schools: Educators as policymakers* (pp. 249–261). New York, NY: Routledge
- Johnson, D. C. (2013). *Language policy*. New York, NY: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Ricento, T., & Hornberger, N. H. (1996). Unpeeling the onion: Language planning and policy and the ELT professional. *TESOL Quarterly*, 30(3), 401–425.