

Editors' Note

Language ideologies have long played a central role in research on language planning and policy (LPP). Kloss (1977) provides a typology of U.S. language policies on the basis of how he analyzed them to be *oriented* (e.g., *tolerance-oriented*, *repression-oriented*, etc.), a term that would see subsequent expansion by Ruíz (1984), who describes policy *orientations* in terms of “complex[es] of dispositions toward language and its role, and toward languages and their role in society” (p. 16). Ruíz himself points to the potential similarities between this concept and Heath’s (1977) initial use of the term *language ideology*, suggesting that the social frameworks they both depict work to “determine what is thinkable about language in society” (Ruíz, 1984, p. 16). Drawing attention to this influential relationship is at the heart of Woolard’s (1992) call for more direct investigation into language ideologies in their capacity as “a mediating link between social structures and forms of talk” (p. 235), ultimately laying the groundwork upon which a wealth of scholarship demonstrating links between LPP and language ideology is now built (see, e.g., Lippi-Green, 2012; Jaffe, 1999; Johnson, 2010; Salawu & Aseres, 2015).

This attention to the importance of the ideological dimension to LPP can be seen running through all the articles in this special issue of *Working Papers in Educational Linguistics*. In keeping with tradition, the pieces collected here are developed from student course papers written for Professor Nancy Hornberger’s seminar on Language Planning and Policy in Education. They are presented together with an article developed in collaboration between Prof. Hornberger and Educational Linguistics doctoral candidate Frances Kvietok Dueñas. The authors in this issue engage with language ideologies to varying degrees in (a) examining their role in the constitution of educational language policy (Lewis), (b) illuminating how on-the-ground multilingual realities run up against prescriptions in policy and practice (Anzures Tapia; Hornberger & Kvietok Dueñas), and (c) interrogating conflicting representations in language policy discourse that marginalize certain groups while privileging others (Hanks; Phuong).

Opening this issue, Hornberger and Kvietok Dueñas present vignettes from ethnographic monitoring (Hymes, 1980) conducted in community bilingual schools in the Peruvian Amazon. Using the continua of biliteracy (Hornberger, 1989; Hornberger & Skilton-Sylvester, 2000) to map the teaching of Spanish and Kichwa in these schools, the authors show how attempts by Kichwa teachers to mitigate student shyness may have been unintentionally reifying notions of Kichwa-speaking students as struggling Spanish learners. The article demonstrates how the inquiry stance of ethnographic monitoring was able to open up spaces for teachers to critically assess their pedagogical strategies and move toward an approach aimed at “develop[ing] spaces for Kichwa student voice to flourish” (Hornberger & Kvietok Dueñas, this issue, p. 4).

Lewis’s article looks across three centuries of historical development of language policies targeting mathematics education in the United States. Employing an intertextual methodological approach, he demonstrates how the enregisterment (Agha, 2007) of particular linguistic forms since the mid-17th century into a register of “math language” has come to be seen as signifying when “mathematics is being done or position the user as mathematically competent” (Lewis, this issue,

p. 30). Lewis argues that although contemporary math language policy is largely predicated on the notion that students must be taught how to talk about math in order to do math, historical policy indicates that this has not always been the case.

Shifting the focus to present-day U.S. educational language policy, Phuong critically examines representations of language learning and disability in both the *Individuals with Disabilities Education Improvement Act* of 2004 and the *Every Student Succeeds Act* of 2015. She employs corpus analytic methods to identify how discourses pertaining to both language and disability are co-constitutive in the policy texts. Despite the lack of explicit language policy found in either document, Phuong contends that they function as *de facto* language policy, in the process conflating learning disability with linguistic heterogeneity. The article concludes with a call for ethnography of LPP as a way of disentangling these conflated ideologies and moving toward a more nuanced understanding of individual student needs.

Building on the proclivity of researchers to employ metaphors in conceptualizations of LPP phenomena, Anzures Tapia proposes his own metaphor of a mutli-apertured analytic camera in seeking to draw attention to the oftentimes overwhelming complexity of LPP activities across various social domains. Focusing his lens(es) on Quintana Roo on the Yucatán Peninsula, he demonstrates, through a collection of ethnographic snapshots and analyses of policy texts, how the institutional and bureaucratic apparatuses that oversee the maintenance and development of Yucatec Maya operate in unpredictable ways in not only the educational arena, but also in the health, justice, and urbanism fields often overlooked in language policy and planning activities.

Finally, Hanks takes a look at educational language policy in Japan, seeking to understand how such policy has impacted efforts to revitalize the critically endangered Indigenous Ainu language. His historical analysis traces both the development of policies directly targeting Ainu as well as the development of English language education as it relates to globalization. By situating Japanese educational language policy in the context of nation building, he argues that these parallel developments have come to demonstrate conflicting representations of globalization in policy discourse—those representing opportunity (English) and those representing an existential threat (Ainu)—ultimately implicating depictions of Japan as a monoethnic/monolingual nation in the continuing marginalization of Ainu language revitalization efforts.

As always, this issue would not have been possible without the dedicated work of the *WPEL* editorial panel, the very generous contributions provided by our invited external reviewers, and *WPEL* faculty advisor Professor Nancy Hornberger. We would also like to extend a tremendous thank you to Jennifer Phuong and Kristina Lewis for their essential contribution to the production of this special issue, as well as our valued readers. Subscribe to our newsletter (<http://www.gse.upenn.edu/wpel/subscribe>) to stay on top of future updates including calls for papers, publication announcements, and more.

David H. Hanks & Aldo Anzures Tapia
April 23rd, 2017

References

- Agha, A. (2007). *Language and social relations*. Cambridge, United Kingdom: Cambridge University Press.
- Heath, S. B. (1977). Social history. In J. A. Fishman (Ed.), *Bilingual education: Current perspectives* (Vol. 1; pp. 53–72). Arlington, VA: Center for Applied Linguistics.
- Hornberger, N. H. (1989). Continua of biliteracy. *Review of Educational Research*, 59(3), 271–296.
- Hornberger, N. H., & Kvietok Dueñas, F. (2017). From student shyness to student voice: Mapping biliteracy teaching in Indigenous contexts. *Working Papers in Educational Linguistics*, 32(1), 1–23.
- Hornberger, N. H., & Skilton-Sylvester, E. (2000). Revisiting the continua of biliteracy: International and critical perspectives. *Language and Education*, 14(2), 96–122.
- Hymes, D. (1980). *Language in education: Ethnolinguistic essays*. Washington, DC: Center for Applied Linguistics.
- Jaffe, A. (1999). *Ideologies in action: Language politics on Corsica*. Berlin, Germany: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Johnson, D. C. (2010). Implementational and ideological spaces in bilingual education language policy. *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism*, 13(1), 61–79.
- Lewis, M. C. (2017). Planning math language in the United States, 1650 to 1945. *Working Papers in Educational Linguistics*, 32(1), 25–46.
- Lippi-Green, R. (2012). *English with an accent: Language, ideology, and discrimination in the United States* (2nd ed.). London, United Kingdom: Routledge.
- Kloss, H. (1977). *The American bilingual tradition*. Rowley, MA: Newbury House.
- Ruíz, R. (1984). Orientations in language planning. *NABE Journal*, 8(2), 15–34.
- Salawu, A., & Aseres, A. (2015). Language policy, ideologies, power and the Ethiopian media. *Communicatio*, 41(1), 71–89.
- Woolard, K. A. (1992). Language ideology: Issues and approaches. *Pragmatics*, 2(3), 235–249.