

LANGUAGE IDEOLOGY AS A CONCEPTUAL FRAMEWORK TO ANALYZE ISSUES RELATED TO LANGUAGE POLICY AND LANGUAGE EDUCATION

Valentina Canese¹

Abstract

This article discusses how the notions of language ideology and language ideologies may be used as analytical tools to examine issues related to language policy and language education. First of all, it provides an overview of language ideology as a field of study. Following, it presents a discussion of language ideology in language policy and planning as well as language teaching. Subsequently, the article presents an overview of how language ideology may be used in research methodology as a conceptual framework to analyze issues related to language in education providing examples of how these concepts have been applied by different authors including this article's author. The article concludes that the notions presented may be powerful tools to be applied with caution as biases derived from our own positioning of members of a nation or a linguistic group may affect how we approach phenomena related to language and ideology. Key Words: language policy, language education language teaching, language ideology

Key Words: language policy, language education language teaching, language ideology

LA IDEOLOGÍA LINGÜÍSTICA COMO MARCO CONCEPTUAL PARA ANALIZAR TEMAS RELACIONADOS A LA EDUCACIÓN Y LAS POLÍTICAS LINGÜÍSTICAS

Resumen

Este artículo aborda la manera en que las nociones de ideología o ideologías lingüísticas pueden ser usadas como herramientas analíticas para examinar temas relacionados a la educación y a las políticas lingüísticas. Primeramente, presenta una visión general de la ideología lingüística como campo de estudio. A continuación, presenta una discusión de la ideología lingüística en el planeamiento y las políticas lingüísticas así como en la enseñanza de lenguas. Finalmente el artículo presenta una visión amplia de cómo la ideología lingüística puede ser utilizada en la metodología de la investigación como marco conceptual para analizar temas relacionados a la lengua en la educación brindando ejemplos de cómo estos conceptos han sido aplicados por diferentes autores, incluyendo la autora de este artículo. El artículo concluye argumentando que las nociones presentadas pueden constituirse en herramientas poderosas a ser aplicadas con cautelas ya que los prejuicios derivados de nuestro posicionamiento como

¹ Instituto Superior de Lenguas – Universidad Nacional de Asunción. Correo electrónico: vcanese@gmail.com

miembros de una nación o grupo lingüístico puede afectar la manera en que abordamos los fenómenos relacionados a la lengua y la ideología.

Palabras clave: políticas lingüísticas, educación de la lengua, enseñanza de lenguas, ideología lingüística.

Introduction

Globalization in all its forms, political, economic and technological, has brought to the forefront the role of language as a marker of identity and as a form of economic and social capital (Murais & Morris, 2003; Heller, 1999 cited in Pomerantz, 2002). Consequently, in recent years, language ideology has become increasingly prominent as a field of inquiry, especially in relation to language planning and policy as well as to educational settings. In this regard, Ricento (2000) argues that while ideology is a contested idea, “language policies can never be properly understood or analyzed as free-standing documents or practices” (p. 7). In this sense, language ideologies are not neutral and their role must be considered in the formation and enactment of such policies. Further, the same author notes that “ideologies about language generally and specific languages in particular have real effects on language policies and practices, and delimit to a large extent what is and is not possible in the realm of language planning and policy-making” (Ricento, 2006; p. 9). Woolard (1998) defines ‘language ideology’ as “representations, whether explicit or implicit, that construe the intersection of language and human beings in a social world” (p. 3). This paper will discuss how language ideology is used as a field of inquiry in general, the relation between language ideology and language policy as well as language ideology and language teaching. Finally, I will consider language ideology from a methodological perspective discussing alternatives for becoming aware of language ideologies, both official and unofficial, in school.

Language Ideology as a Field Of Inquiry

In terms of identifying language ideology as a field of inquiry, Woolard and Schieffelin (1994) note that “there is an emerging consensus that what people think, or take for granted, about language and communication is a topic that rewards investigation” (p. 56). Since then, there has been an increasing interest in the study of language ideology/ideologies, especially in relation to language policy and language teaching. In recent years, Pomerantz (2002) pointed out that “academics from disparate disciplines have begun to focus on the role language ideologies play in shaping our understanding of the links between structures at the institutional or sociocultural level and actual forms of talk” (p. 278). In defining language ideologies, Woolard and Schieffelin (1994) provide the following summary:

“Linguistic/language ideologies have been defined as “sets of beliefs about language articulated by users as rationalization or justification of perceived language structure and use”...”as self evident ideas and objectives a group holds concerning roles of language in the social experiences of members as they contribute to the expression of the group”... “the cultural system of ideas about social and linguistic relationships, together with their loading of moral and political interests”; and most broadly “as shared bodies of commonsense notions about the nature of language in the world” (p. 57).

According to Blommaert (2006), “the notion of language ideologies grew out of Sapirian and Whorfian linguistic anthropology, and it stands for socially and culturally embedded metalinguistic conceptualizations of language and its forms of usage” (p. 241), and its purpose is to “sharpen the understanding of linguistic issues among students of ideology, discourse and social domination” (Woolard and Schieffelin, 1994; p. 57). Furthermore, Woolard (1998) argues that

“a research focus on language ideology makes a promising bridge between linguistic and social theory. In spite of the traditional difficulties posed by the ideology concept, it allows us to relate the microculture of communicative action to political economic considerations of power and social inequality, to confront macrosocial constraints on language behavior, and to connect discourse with lived experiences” (p. 27)

These notions are in line with Volosinov’s (1976) idea that discourse is always ideological. In this regard, Woolard and Schieffelin (1994) also suggest that “the term ideology reminds us that the cultural conceptions we study are partial, contestable and contested, and interest-laden” (p. 58). In regards to ideologies Bourdieu (1991) notes that they “serve particular interests which they tend to present as universal interests, shared by the group as a whole” (p. 167), legitimizing the interests of the dominant group, establishing hierarchies and maintaining the status quo by legitimating current power structures (Galindo, 1997). Woolard (1998) highlights four strands in the study of ideology: 1) ideology as ideational or conceptual, referring to mental phenomena, having to do with consciousness, subjective representations, beliefs, ideas; 2) ideology as derived from, rooted in, reflective of, or responsive to the experience or interests of a particular social position, even though it represents itself as universally true; 3) ideology as a direct link to inhabitable positions of power, as ideas, discourse, or signifying practices in the service of the struggle to acquire and maintain power; 4) ideology as distortion, illusion, error, mystification, or rationalization. She points out that researchers of language ideology position themselves within one or more of these strands. At the same time, Phillips (1998) notes that the switch from “culture” to “ideology” in

linguistic anthropologists' interpretive perspectives signals a new attention to the way in which the prevalence of particular ideas are themselves forms of power.

In this regard, Fairclough (1989/2001) points out that through ideology, language contributes to the domination of some people by others through 'consent' rather than 'coercion'. Similarly, Silverstein (1998) notes that "language, like any social semiotic, is indexical in its most essential modality," making language ideologies a "necessary entailment" to this fact (p. 130). Haviland (2003) argues that the study of language ideologies is an understandable derivation of linguistic and anthropological curiosity and that "if ideas about language rub off onto ideas about people, groups, events, and activities (Irvine and Gal, 2000, 2009), we may find that linguistic ideologies pervade the very stuff of anthropology" (p. 764) Ideas about language will become crucial in researching and advocating for speakers and communities (Haviland, 2003). Similarly, Galindo (1997) argues that "the struggle over languages is not a debate over linguistic codes" as "the debate involves much more" (p. 341) and quotes Bakhtin's (1981) argument of "language not as a system of abstract grammatical categories, but rather language conceived as ideologically saturated, language as a world view" (p. 271). In this sense "languages become representative of perspectives or points-of-view, in other words, of ideological positions... [and] debates over linguistic resources are ultimately debates over the valuing and devaluing of languages in the competition for status between groups of speakers" (Galindo, 1997; p. 106).

Woolard and Schieffelin (1994) observe that the new direction for research on this topic treats it as "a process involving struggle among multiple conceptualizations and demanding the recognition of variation and contestation within a community as well as contradictions within individuals" (p. 71). Recognizing the complexity of the issue, Kroskrity (2000) points out that language ideologies are not monolithic or unidimensional; rather, they should be viewed as a cluster concept consisting of a number of converging dimensions, including: 1) language ideologies representing the perception of language and discourse that is constructed in the interest of a specific social or cultural group; 2) language ideologies as multiple and grounded in social experience which is never uniformly distributed throughout polities of any scale; 3) members possibly displaying varying degrees of awareness of local language ideologies; 4) and, language ideologies as bridging sociocultural experience and linguistic and discursive resources by constituting those linguistic and discursive forms as indexically tied to features of members' sociocultural experience.

Haviland (2003) observes that "ideologies of language are not everywhere the same, nor, indeed, are they commensurably identifiable in all societies at all times" (p.

765) and gives the contrasts examples of polyglotism in various areas of the world with the monoglot standard of the U.S. judicial system which according to him spawns a very different set of ideological principles that respond to different sociocultural formations. Similarly, Timm (2001) notes that “the importance of recognizing contesting ideologies revolving around language is evident in recent studies of language revitalization efforts in a number of societies in Europe (e.g., Basque)” (p. 448). Silverstein (1998) provides another example of a complex and contested ideological field with the case of the Mexicano–Castellano [Nahuatl–Spanish] bilingual register cline which he claims is dialectically regimented by this field. Further, he argues that ideologies are socially locatable, particularly at sites of production of concepts of locality through which people imagine their participation in a language community. “Hence, in each one of the cases of transformation of local language structures, and of the transformation of discursive practices, the ideological aspect of analysis is central and key to understanding how people experience the cultural continuities and interruptions in the particular case” (Silverstein, 1998; p. 420).

King (2000) notes that if language ideology is a site of interaction between language behavior and larger social systems and inequalities, “including the analysis of language ideology in the inquiry into the gap between language attitudes and language behavior is essential” (p. 168), because it will allow for a better understanding of the differences between expressed language attitudes and observed language behavior. Along similar lines, Kroskrity (2000) observes that language ideologies provide an additional tool or level of analysis that permits the use of “the more traditional skills of linguistic anthropologists as a means of relating the models and practices shared by members of a speech community to their political–economic positions and interests (p. 3). Within this field, Woolard (1998) identifies three approaches: 1) ideology at the intersection of language use and structure or studies of the beliefs people use to make sense of and validate particular language structures and communicative patterns; 2) ethnography of speaking or research into “ways of speaking” which bind particular speech communities together and shape their linguistic practices; 3) language contact and conflict or studies of language identification and status, what counts as language and the values associated with particular varieties by community members as well as assumptions that identity and allegiance are indexed by language use.

One of most widely researched topics within the topic of language ideologies is the connection between language and centering institutions (Blommaert, 2006) especially in the establishment of nation states. In this regard, Phillips (1998) points out that “the most significant shift in our understanding of language in powerful institutions... stems from the awareness of the language ideologies these

institutions promulgate as hegemonic in a Gramscian sense –that is a, as contributing to the constitution and maintenance of nation–states as political entities” (p. 213). She also observes that “language and language ideologies in the imagining of nations in institutions centrally involved in the production of state hegemony” (Philips, 1998; p. 223).

“But in societies that have undergone linguistic standardization, domination is not directly a result of economic weakness but is established exactly by the ideological construction of a ‘monoglot standard’, inculcated in schools and in mass media and viewed as the property of the bourgeoisie... Speakers may resist by continuing to use their own varieties, but within regimes of standardization they often also devalue themselves and the varieties they use” (Gal, 1995; p. 421).

For this reason, Kroskrity (2000) uses the term “Regimes of Language,” as both image and title, in an attempt to integrate two often segregated domains: politics (without language) and language (without politics). Bauman and Briggs (2003) trace the development of new regimes of metadiscursive ideology and practice in the symbolic construction of modernity as they considered these worthy of close examination as “ways of speaking and writing make social classes, genders, races, and nations seem real and enable them to elicit feelings and justify relations of power, making subalterns seem to speak in ways that necessitate their subordination” (p. 17). Conversely, Gal and Irvine (2000, 2009) argue that homogeneous language is as much imagined as is community. Furthermore, according to Timm (2001) “it is useful to consider to what degree language constitutes a central component in a people’s notions, invented or not, of their traditions or their nationhood” (p. 449). On the other hand, “where Anderson iconically associates an overly homogenized standard with its uniformizing effects, Bourdieu (1977, 1984, 1991) views linguistic diversity as inextricably linked to the production and reproduction of social inequality” (Kroskrity, 2000; p. 27). The study of language ideologies in language policy and planning is closely tied to these notions. The following section will consider the different dimensions of language ideologies as they relate to the study of language planning and policy.

Language Ideology in Language Planning and Policy

As noted in the previous section, language is the site of much ideological debate (Blommaert, 1999), especially as it is tied community membership and identity formation. Consequently, language policy and planning becomes a major site of these debates as their purpose is to make certain ideologies “official” as Tollefson (1991) notes when he asserts that

“With the historical–structural approach, language policy is viewed as one mechanism by which the interests of dominant sociopolitical groups are maintained and the seeds of transformation are developed... Language planning institutions are seen as inseparable from the political economy, and are no different from other class–based structures” (p. 32).

Among others, he draws on Bourdieu (1991) who observes that the notions of official language and the state are bound together both in its genesis and its social uses, creating a unified linguistic market where the “legitimate” language becomes the norm against which linguistic practices are measured and where legitimate competence can function as linguistic capital. Also from this perspective, McCarty (2004) observes that “as ideological constructs, language policies both reflect and (re)produce the distribution of power within the larger society” (p. 72). Furthermore, Reagan (2002) notes that “language policies involve public decisions about language, its use, status, and development... Language policies are, in short, inevitably ideological and political in nature” (p. 129). However, Ricento (2000) warns that “simple, often deterministic, formulations of relationships between language status and individuals, groups, and nation states are untenable... language policies are always socially situated and continually evolving” (p. 2). For example, Woolard’s (1989) research in Catalonia has challenged Bourdieu’s claim since Catalan was ascribed higher status than Spanish even though Spanish was the hegemonic language of public institutions throughout the Franco era; hence, she argues that it is face–to–face encounters rather than institutional arrangements that are most important in imbuing languages with prestige (as cited by Echeverria, 2003).

Similarly, Pennycook (2000) notes that discourses and material interests intersect in complex ways and that “ language policy can be only understood in the complex contexts of language use” as “the interests served by different ideological positions cannot be reduced to simple reflexes of prior economic or political order” (p. 64). In regards to language ideology Lyux (2003) comments that it “plays an important role in shaping language policy, and policy in turn shapes the social and institutional conditions that encourage certain kinds of language use and discourage others” (p. 99).

According to Spolsky (2004), “put simply, language policy is language ideology with the manager left out, what people think should be done. Language practices, on the other hand, are what people actually do” (p. 14). However, this view of language ideology and language policy is not shared by all. Sonntag (2000) writes:

“While ideology informs policy, it does not determine it. Nor can one derive ideology from policies. Policies are practical applications of substantially amorphous ideologies. Policies are contingent, adapted to changing material conditions. Ideologies, although not necessarily consistent, are more persistent” (p. 134).

This quote illustrates the complexities of the relationship language ideology/language policy, which are summarized by Ricento (2000) as follows: 1) different language policies may share a common underlying ideology, and similar language policies may derive from competing ideological orientations; 2) ideologies of language are linked to other ideologies that can influence and constrain the development of language policies; 3) ideologies in colonial and post-colonial contexts do not flow in one direction from the Center to the Periphery; rather the direction is two-way and colonial ideologies are shaped as much in the Periphery as they are in the Center; and, 4) ideology does not always apply to the efforts of dominant social groups to legitimate their power. Furthermore, Pennycook (2000) asserts that “in order to make sense of language policies we need to understand their location historically and contextually” (p. 59). Therefore, as language ideological debates are historically locatable (Blommaert, 1999), so are the language policies and practices being debated. These points are summarized by Tollefson (2002) in the following manner:

“It is possible to identify key components of a conception of ideology that shapes research in educational language policy: (1) Individuals in social situations construct realities through discursive processes... An important issue in language policy research is the study of how policies are shaped by ideologies, and how discursive processes naturalize policies that are adopted in the interests of dominant ethnolinguistic groups. (2) Language is not only socially and historically situated, it is also contested. This means that language policy can be an arena for the interplay of contested ideologies... In this sense, the study of ideology helps us understand how the language policymaking process is ‘grounded in culture’” (Tollefson, 2002; p. 6).

Additionally, Shohamy (2006) proposes an expanded view of language policy which includes ideology as one of the mechanisms that influence “de facto” policies in the creation of language practices. Studies of language ideology in language policy and planning include the study of the national/official policies, globalization, the spread of English, language shift and revitalization among other language policy issues. Researchers look at language as a site of negotiation (Canagarajah, 2000), language as means for social control (Wiley, 2000), language as symbol of democratization (Ridge, 2000), language and postcolonial performativity, appropriation and hybridity (Pennycook, 2000), language ecology (Pennycook, 2000; Ricento, 2006).

Ricento (2005; 2006), however, warns against the utilization of certain metaphors such as “language ecology” or “language-as-a-resource” since while they might draw temporary support for national security reasons for example, they could oversimplify the complexities of language ideological issues. Furthermore, Wright (2004) argues that “national language policy and planning... was supported by those it targeted and had some measure of success, when it was in sympathy with prevailing nationalist ideology... [however] it has been roundly challenged by contemporary scholarship. Language planning procedures are now subject to far greater scrutiny and challenge” (p. 96) by both scholars and language communities.

Tollefson and Tsui (2004) make a case for the centrality of medium-of-instruction policies as “it determines which groups have access to political and economic opportunities, and which groups are disenfranchised” (p. 2). However, much of the focus on language ideologies in language policy research is currently shifting from the national to the global (Wright, 2004; Phillipson, 2000; Pennycook, 2000, Murais and Morris, 2003). Phillipson (2000) observes that “globalization has economic, technological, cultural and linguistic strands to it...In the contemporary world the imagined community of the nation-state is being superseded by global and regional alliances and governmental, non-governmental and private organization (p. 90). Fairclough (2001) argues that “the primary terrain of domination is now global rather than national” (p. 203), Therefore, he notes, it is important to recognize dialectic between the local/national and the global when the focus of analysis is national or local.

As a result of this ideological and actual domination, in terms of choice of language, economic globalization has lead to Anglicization (Wright, 2004) which sparked the emergence and growth of English as a Global language as a field of study. Pennycook (2000) presents several divergent frameworks for understanding the global position of English, including: colonial-celebration, laissez-faire liberalism, language ecology, linguistic imperialism, language rights and post-colonial performativity (Pennycook, 2000). At the same time, Canagarajah (2005) proposes a reorientation in the field of English language teaching which he argues is an example of “globalization from below.” In this sense, Friedman (2003) argues that “this complex issue of dominant and subordinate languages is clearly one that must be dealt with in terms of the social contexts from which they emerge and within which they are sustained” (p. 744). In his discussion of language ideologies and globalization Jacquemet, (2005) argues that “ we should rethink the concept of communication itself, no longer embedded in national languages and international codes, but in the multiple transidiomatic practices of global cultural flows... of the contested words, mixed codes, simultaneous communicative frames, and metalinguistic struggles” (p. 274).

Echeverria (2003) uses the example of the Basque case to illustrate the complex relationships among language, prestige, and solidarity since in institutional terms standardized *Euskara* is in the best position it has ever been, and “although Basque language planners have attempted to use public institutions to increase the prestige and use of Basque, this has not yet happened” (p. 395) as Spanish continues to be the hegemonic language. Similarly, Wright (2004) notes that “Spain provides three extremely illuminating case studies which reveal how much the enactment of language rights is problematic...There will always be those whom the new practice marginalizes or excludes... On the other hand, a number of scholars have pointed out the symbolic nature of much policymaking in pluralism (i.e. May, 2001; Romaine, 2002) when there is no threat to the status quo (Wright, 2004). Within the Latin American context, Lyux (2004) argues that current language policies in Bolivia are based on ideological assumptions that reflect the language practice of Spanish speakers which include: standardization as key to language revitalization and political empowerment; etymological criteria as the best guide for elaborating a standard; and literacy- and school-based functions as the most crucial to Quechua’s future. These conclusions are consistent with other studies on language revitalization conducted not only in other Latin American countries, but around the world (e.g. King, 2000; Hornberger and Molina, 2004; Pic-Guillard, 2001).

Language Ideology and Language Teaching

In order for language policies and the ideologies that they attempt to promote not to be merely symbolic, they need to be legitimized through practice and use within institutional contexts and outside of these in linguistic communities. Because of this, Bourdieu (1991), observes:

“...like the sociology of culture, the sociology of language is logically inseparable from a sociology of education. As a linguistic market strictly subject to the verdicts of the guardians of legitimate culture, the educational market is strictly dominated by the linguistic products of the dominant class and tends to sanction the pre-existing differences in capital” (p. 62).

Along similar lines, Fairclough (2001) argues that “the educational system has the major immediate responsibility for differentials in access. In the words of Michel Foucault, ‘any system of education is a political way of maintaining or modifying the appropriation of discourses, along with the knowledges and powers which they carry’.” (p. 54) These two quotes illustrate the fact that language and education are highly political because they involve significant outcomes for people’s lives and futures (Watson-Gegeo and Gegeo, 1995). Many years ago, Tollefson (1991) observed that “language education has become increasingly ideological with the

spread of English for specific purposes, curricula and methods that view English as a practical skill, a 'tool' for education and employment" (p. 11). More recently, Reagan (2002) observed that "languages of wider communication provide their users (both native and nonnative) with economic, social, and political and educational advantages, as well as conferring status, and of course, power" (p. 3), and that "the language that an individual speaks, to a considerable extent, determines how he or she is perceived by others" (p. 4). He discusses a list of 'language myths' (p. 11), the objectification of language and concepts related to it such as linguistic legitimacy posing the question 'whose dialect is a language?' (p. 58) making evident the complexities and problematic nature of these issues, especially in educational contexts. At the same time, Blommaert (2005) reminds us of the complexities of the language, power and education as linguistic resources and how they can function in different sociolinguistic systems so "what counts as a prestigious language variety from the point of view of the school system can be a stigmatized variety from the point of view of the pupils, and vice versa" (p. 404).

"Educational practices, too, partly constitute reality, thus manifesting the nature of language policy in education through the pedagogical approaches chosen." (McGroarty, 2002; p. 27). In examining the politics, power and pedagogical choice in ESL classrooms, Auerbach (1993; 1995) shows the link between the micro and macro levels of analysis and argues that dynamics of power and domination permeate the fabric of classroom life including decisions that practitioners make inside the classroom, which shape and are shaped by the social order outside the classroom; therefore, they are inherently ideological in nature and have significant implications for learners' socioeconomic roles. Therefore, choices that teachers make are not just pedagogical, but political since "instruction is both a mirror and a rehearsal for relations of power in the broader society" (Auerbach, 1993; p. 10). From this perspective, Skilton-Sylvester (2003) examines the interplay of policy making and the ideologies that support those policies at multiple levels including the micro-level ideologies and policies of teachers and the macro-level legal ideologies and policies that surround them. Her analysis puts teacher policies at the center of discussion as they have a powerful role in shaping school contexts. She argues:

"Looking at the ways teachers create classroom policies of their own while accepting and challenging the policies that are handed down to them is a useful and important endeavor in working toward more equitable educational policies and practices for linguistically diverse students (p. 170)... the ways that teachers embrace and/or contest what the legal system contributes both ideologically and practically in their classrooms" (p. 182).

For this reason, Heller (1996) highlights the importance of looking at bilingual classroom discourse. It allows for a better understanding of the different dimensions of legitimate language, and beyond that, how legitimacy gets defined and by whom. "It allows us to see where there are struggles over that definition and what the consequences of definitions and struggles over definitions are for different kinds of students" (p. 156) teaching them about their position both in the school and in the community and showing their possibilities in regards to language and power. "By understanding what constitutes legitimate language in a bilingual classroom, we can see whose interests are favored and whose are marginalized and how bilingual education contributes to the welfare of minority groups" (p. 157). "Preexisting attitudes regarding status and capability influence participation in groups... and either enable or limit access to knowledge" (McGroarty, 1996; p. 33). Therefore, according to Hornberger (2003) while some practices collude with dominant positionings, others contest them. Teachers vary in their perception of students' languages and language use and community languages community languages could not only be marginalized but completely excluded from schools (Hornberger, 2003).

Spotti (2006) provides an example of the complex process by which teachers' discourse practices construct language minority students' identities as the 'disadvantaged ones.' In their study of Spanish departments, Valdés et al. (2003) observe that these transmit ideologies of nationalism, standardness, monolingualism and bilingualism, both directly and indirectly, therefore questioning "the ways that deep held cultural beliefs directly influence what appear to be nonhegemonic educational practices" (p. 24). Other researchers have also observed a gap or "discontinuity" between pluralist discourse and pluralist official policy and everyday practice (Tollefson, 2004; King and Benson, 2004). In indigenous language education, King and Benson (2004) note that ideological forces may work against the use of indigenous languages in the classroom even where training and recruitment issues are addressed as indigenous teachers might have bad memories of using their language in schools and have doubts about the suitability of the language for academic purposes. They might also be insecure about their own language skills or question the assumption that schooling is key to language maintenance.

On the other hand, Gegeo and Watson-Gegeo (2002) discuss counter-hegemonic teaching and dehegemonic village-based projects in relation to language and education in Solomon Islands raising the possibility of a different way of thinking about 'language' in 'language policy.' "Language is the medium for transformation, and in being so, itself is transformed" (p. 312). Similarly, McCarty (2002) observes:

“The politics, language, and culture of the school can be assets for heightening collective consciousness, promoting community dialogue, and mobilizing action. By their presence and their positions, bilingual educators demonstrate the instrumental value of the Native language. As we have seen in cases here, bilingual educators can be opinion leaders; they can act politically on behalf of the language and its users. Indigenous educators can assert the primacy of the Native language in the public domain of the school; they also can enlist the support of and assist community stakeholders in reinforcing the Native language at home” (p. 303)

For this reason, Gegeo and Watson-Gegeo (2002) argue that “Western and indigenous epistemology, praxis, pedagogy, and knowledge be integrated and given equal weight in the classroom” (p. 322). At the same time, Reagan (2002) calls for “for the recognition of the legitimacy of all human languages and language varieties, and rejecting the false categorization of some language varieties as non-legitimate... [This] does not in and of itself constitute any particular prescription for educational practice” (p. 78). Similarly, MacSwan (2000) regards semilingualism and prescriptivism as ideological constructs which contribute to “the formation of low expectations for linguistic minorities and high expectations for certain majority children” (p. 35). “In their effort to affect policy, teachers need to be aware of the power of factors in the wider climate of opinion... as reflected in the language policies, official and unofficial, at play in their schools, local and state communities and nations” (McGroarty, 1996; p. 35). Wiley (2005) emphasizes that “without an understanding of language differences, language prejudice and status ascription based on language are perpetuated” (p. 135). However, “a final challenge is that democratic pluralism must gain some degree of acceptance by dominant groups... Alternative progressive policies and ideologies must be developed that will respond to the demands of individual citizens facing their own fears and concerns about the future” (Tollefson, 2002; p. 337).

Language Ideology and Research Methodology

This section will focus on the application of language ideologies to educational research in language policy and planning. It will attempt to outline ways of becoming aware of the language ideologies, both official and unofficial, in educational settings. In his discussion of language ideologies and their relationship to standardization, in relation to the effects of the former on attitudes to language of nonlinguists and of language specialists, Milroy (2001) argues that the quantitative paradigm is limited “in its attempt to explain the social ‘life’ of language and the social origins of language change” (p. 553). Hence, according to Blommaert (2005), “in order to understand real processes of inequality, the different processes need to be situated” (p. 410); it is important to look at sociolinguistic phenomena from an angle that takes into account not only the state’s performative

actions (i.e. legislation, regimes of language in education, bureaucracy) but its role as a centering institution which often defines the value and relevance of actions undertaken by other actors. This, he argues, “might help us understand the real role and function of language practices for people, their value, attributions and their understandings of such practices... and this, requires an ethnographic outlook informed by history and general sociolinguistic insights.” (p. 410) Furthermore, Silverstein (1998) points out:

“Ideologies are socially locatable... in the sense that they bespeak interests of the social groups and categories of those who articulate or in other ways give evidence for them. But ideologies are also locatable, particularly at those sites of production of concepts of locality... through which people imagine their participation in a language community. Hence, in each one of the cases of transformation of local language structures, and of the transformation of discursive practices, the ideological aspect of analysis is central and key to understanding how people experience the cultural continuities and interruptions in the particular case” (pp. 419–420).

Wortham (2001) also considers that “language ideology has particular power as an analytic tool, because such ideologies both contribute to larger social belief systems and allow individuals to construe particular instances of discourse.” (p. 257) Moreover, he adds that “the concept of language ideology, and linguistic anthropologists’ account of how such ideologies mediate social identity, provides a useful framework for understanding such phenomena.” (p. 257) In this regard, the same author notes that research on language ideology and education is part of a larger field in research on linguistics and education, which he points out might contribute to a “linguistic anthropology of education” (p. 253). This subfield, in turn, would explore educational processes through the systematic use of concepts and approaches developed in contemporary linguistic anthropology, asking questions such as: How might ideologies about language influence classroom behavior and educational policy? How could social reproduction occur in part through language use in school? Are some educational practices “ritualized,” as ritual is understood by contemporary semiotic theories? “Thus, the linguistic anthropology of education is a subset of what Hornberger (2000) and Spolsky (1999) call ‘educational linguistics’.” (Wortham, 2001; p. 255)

In attempting to examine language ideologies, Blommaert (1999) proposes language ideological debates as a tentative model as they are “more or less historically locatable periods in which a ‘struggle for authoritative entextualization’ takes place,” (p. 9) involving ideology actors who can claim authority in the field of debate. These debates, where the struggle develops usually over definitions of

social realities, define or redefine language ideologies and become the locus of ideology (re)production. Domains for the analysis of language ideologies are situated “at the crossroads of discursive practices and sociopolitical processes, including: 1) language policy and planning, in which authoritative metadiscourses are the central instrument; 2) the role of language in nation–building processes together with practices aimed at modeling colonial “civilization” by imposing a language regime; 3) the theoretical issue of language and symbolic power; 4) language change and language shift; 5) the nature of politics as a discursive/textual process; and, 6) the historical processes in which ideology and ideological processes are formed and articulated. At the same time, he argues that “an ethnography of discourse data provides us with an adequate tool to expose the ongoing, contingent and practical processes of ideological (re)production.” (p. 33) Furthermore, he notes that it is important to consider the meta–dimension of this approach as depending on one’s point of view, the ideologies of language investigated can be seen as “theories” of language, or discourses highlighting some aspects of reality while backgrounding others. “We may now be in a position to grasp the hows and whys of such theorizing, and thus to lay bare some of the mechanisms by means of which power is being distributed and exercised.” (p. 33)

According to Kroskrity (2000), “since language ideologies are both pervasive and pervasively naturalized, they are often difficult to see without the aide of... sensitizing concepts designed to denaturalize language and explore its connections to the political–economic worlds of speakers.” (p. 30) He argues that “conceptual tools like fractal recursivity, iconization, and erasure (from Irvine and Gal, 2000, 2009) help to expose the often incompletely articulated models of community members and scholars and are particularly helpful in illuminating links between language and social experience.” (p. 30) These three semiotic processes are according to Irvine and Gal (2000, 2009) “means by which people construct representations of linguistic differences” (p. 37), as linguistic features are seen as reflecting and expressing broader cultural images of people or activities and these indexical relationships become the ground on which other sign relationships are built. Irvine and Gal explain:

“*Iconization* involves a transformation of the sign relationship between linguistic features (or varieties) and the social images with which they are linked. Linguistic features that index social groups or activities appear to iconic representations of them, as if a linguistic feature somehow depicted or displayed a social group’s inherent nature or essence....

Fractal recursivity involves the projection of an opposition, salient at some level of relationship, onto some other level...Thus the dichotomizing and partitioning process that was involved in some understood opposition (between groups or

linguistic varieties, for example) recurs at other levels, creating either subcategories on each side of a contrast or supercategories that include both sides but oppose them to something else....

Erasure is the process in which ideology, in simplifying the sociolinguistic field, renders some person or activities (or sociolinguistic phenomena) invisible. Facts that are inconsistent with the ideological scheme either go unnoticed or get explained away... Erasure in ideological representation does not, however, necessarily mean actual eradication of the awkward element, whose very existence may be unobserved or unattended to" (Irvine & Gal, 2000; pp. 37–38).

These conceptual tools act as defamiliarizing analytical tools (Kaomea, 2003) and can be used by themselves or in combination with other theoretical constructs such as Bourdieu's (1991) notions of legitimate language, cultural capital and the linguistic market, as well as Bakhtin's (1984) notions of heteroglossia, authoritative and internally persuasive discourse. For example, Messing (2002) discusses fractal recursivity in ideologies of language, identity and modernity in Tlaxcala, Mexico and how these ideologies of difference may contribute to language shift. Another example is provided by Tsisipis (2004) who argues that a careful application of these Bakhtinian notions to sociolinguistic inquiry can reveal crucial aspects of language ideology. He examines the language shift of Albanian-speaking communities in Greece and the erasure of Arvanitika (Greek-Albanian) discourse (Tsisipis, 2003; 2004). Heller (1996) applies Bourdieu's (1991) "legitimate language" not only to phonology and syntax but to language choice in her examination of the role of language in bilingual educational contexts. This notion implies the existence of legitimate speakers, legitimate interlocutors, under specific social conditions, in language that is formulated in the legitimate form. Heller (1996) looks at how certain language practices are legitimized and how this process helps advance or marginalize the interests of different groups, as well as the development of relations of power.

Further, the notions of "language ideological debates" (Blommaert, 1999) and "big 'C' conversations" (Gee, 2007), can enable researchers how the "truggle for authoritative entextualization takes place," (Blommaert, 1999; p. 9) and how educational actors who can claim different degrees of authority in the field of debate define or redefine language ideologies and become the locus of ideology (re)production. According to Blommaert (1999) the ideologies of language investigated can thus be seen as "theories" of language, or discourses highlighting some aspects of reality while backgrounding others. Similarly, Gee (2007), points out that looking at such public debates or big "C" conversations act as "an ever-present background you can bring to interpret things you hear and read or in terms of which you can formulate your own talk and writing" (p. 49). According to this

author, because people are often unaware of historical developments, Conversations are often easier to study than what he calls Discourses (language, actions, interactions, ways of thinking, believing, valuing, and using various symbols, tools, and objects to enact a particular sort of socially recognizable identity) directly.

In my study of teachers as mediators in the implementation of Guaraní as a second language in Paraguay, for example, I examined the debates or Conversations reflected in their discourse regarding the different varieties of Guaraní used for instruction through the notion of Discourse models (Gee, 2007) in combination with interpreted tools derived from literary criticism (Bakhtin, 1981/1990) such as heteroglossia, authoritative and internally persuasive discourses (Canese, 2008). Discourse models (Gee, 2007) are useful analytical tools since they provide a link between the 'micro' level of interaction and the 'macro' level of institutions. At the same time, a Bakhtinian approach considers discourse as "expressions of larger social concerns and understandings that get articulated by and through individuals as they speak" (Tobin, 2000). Looking at language ideologies in terms of these notions provides a deeper understanding of how this language ideological debate is constructed. Further, the concept of heteroglossia (Bakhtin, 1981) is especially useful since it helps in bringing to light the inherent dialogism and multi-voicedness of every day discourse.

Conclusion

As it is evident from this discussion, the concept of language ideologies, controversial as it is, provides a useful framework for examining the relationship between the sociopolitical and cultural context and individual language use. In language teaching in Paraguay, the examination of how language ideologies mediate the implementation of official and unofficial policies may allow for a better understanding of the complex relationships of power that come into play in educational contexts. Using 'defamiliarizing' conceptual tools such as iconization, fractal recursivity and erasure, as well as notions such as 'legitimate language', authoritative discourse and heteroglossia make it possible to explore how the different languages used in educational contexts as well as their varieties are ideologically positioned. For example, iconization may be used to see how Guaraní has become a symbol of Paraguayanness and democracy, but at the same time it remains a symbol of backwardness and rurality. Fractal recursivity may serve to examine how teachers differentiate between legitimate and illegitimate uses of Spanish, Guaraní or other languages in the classroom. Erasure could be used to explore what types of language have lost ground in recent years.

At the same time, the Bakhtinian concept of 'heteroglossia' can be useful to explain the multiple discourses, often contradictory, present in discussions of language teaching and language use in Paraguayan schools. Finally, the notions of 'authoritative discourse' and 'legitimate language' as noted above could be used to explore what constitute 'legitimate' uses of the different languages used in classrooms vis-à-vis more 'internally persuasive' discourses brought about by teachers and students. All these notions and concepts should be utilized with caution as Bourdieu (1991) very well noted: "science is destined to exert a theory effect, but one which takes a very particular form: by expressing in a coherent and empirically valid discourse what was previously ignored." (p. 133) Also, in the study of languages our own country, we have to be especially cautious as Kroskrity (2000) warns that "for scholars, the recognition of belonging perforce to the species *homo nationalis* alerts us to watch for the influence of nationalist projects in our own research" as "we ourselves are profoundly influenced by our national identities" (p. 30).

References

- Anderson, B. (1983). *Imagined Communities: Reflections on the Origins and Spread of Nationalism*. London: Verso.
- Auerbach, E. (1993). Re-examining English only in the ESL classroom. *TESOL Quarterly*, Vol. 27, No. 1, pp. 9-32.
- Auerbach, E. (1995). The politics of the ESL classroom: Issues of power in pedagogical choices. In J. Tollefson (Ed.), *Power and Inequality in Language Education* (pp. 9-33). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Bakhtin, M. (1981). Discourse in the novel (M. Holquist & C. Emerson, Trans.). In M. Holquist (Ed.), *Dialogic imagination: Four essays*. (pp. 259-422). Austin: University of Texas Press.
- Bauman, R. & Briggs, C. (2003). *Voices of Modernity: Language Ideologies and the Politics of Inequality*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.
- Blommaert, J. (1999). The debate is open. In J. Blommaert (Ed.), *Language Ideological Debates* (p. 1-38) Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Blommaert, J. (2006). Language Policy and National Identity. In T. Ricento (Ed.) *An Introduction to Language Policy: Theory and Method* (pp. 238-254). Malden, MA: Blackwell Publishing Co.
- Bloommaert, J., Collins, J. & Slembrouck, S. (2005). Spaces of Multilingualism. *Language & Communication*, Vol. 25, pp. 197-216.
- Bourdieu, P. (1991). *Language and Symbolic Power*. Oxford: Polity Press.
- Canagarajah, S. (2000). Negotiating Ideologies through English: Strategies from the Periphery. In T. Ricento (Ed.), *Ideology, Politics, and Language Policies: Focus on English* (pp. 121-132). Philadelphia: John Benjamins.

- Canagarajah, S. (2005). Dilemmas in Planning English/Vernacular Relations in Post-Colonial Communities. *Journal of Sociolinguistics*, Vol. 9, No.3, pp. 418–447.
- Echeverria, B. (2003). Language Ideologies and Practices in (En)gendering the Basque Nation. *Language in Society*, Vol. 32, pp. 383–413.
- Friedman, J. (2003). Globalizing Languages: Ideologies and Realities of the Contemporary Global System. *American Anthropologist*, Vol. 105, No. 4, pp. 744–752.
- Fairclough, N. (2001). *Language and Power* (2nd Ed.). Essex, England: Pearson Education.
- Gal, S. (1995). Language and the “Arts of Resistance.” *Cultural Anthropology*, Vol. 10, No. 3, pp. 407–424.
- Gal, S. (1998). Multiplicity and contention among language ideologies. In B. Schieffelin, K. A. Woolard & P. V. Kroskrity (Eds.), *Language ideologies: Practice and theory* (pp. 317–331). New York: Oxford University Press.
- Galindo, R. (1997). Language Wars: The Ideological Dimensions of the Debates on Bilingual Education. *Bilingual Research Journal*, Vol. 21, No. 2 & 3, pp. 103–141.
- Gee, J., & Gee, J. P. (2007). *Social linguistics and literacies: Ideology in discourses*. Routledge.
- Gegeo, D. and Watson-Gegeo, K. (2002). The Critical Villager: Transforming Language and Education in Solomon Islands. In J. Tollefson (Ed.), *Language policies in education: Critical issues* (pp. 309–326). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.
- Haviland, J. (2003). Ideologies Of Language: Some Reflections on Language and U.S. Law. *American Anthropologist*, Vo. 105, No. 4, pp. 764–774.
- Heller, M. (1996). Legitimate Language in a Multilingual School. *Linguistics and Education*, No. 8, pp. 139–157.
- Heller, M. (1999). *Linguistic Minorities and Modernity*. London: Longman.
- Hornberger, N. (2000). Educational Linguistics as a Field. In R. Cooper, E. Shohamy, & J. Walters (Eds.), *New perspectives and issues in educational language policy* (pp. 271– 296). Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
- Hornberger, N. (2003). Afterword: Ecology and Ideology in Multilingual Classrooms. *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism*, Vol. 6, No. 3&4, pp. 296–302.
- Hornberger, N. & Coronel-Molina, S.M. (2004). Quechua Language Shift, Maintenance, and Revitalization in the Andes: the Case for Language Planning. *International Journal of the Sociology of Language*. No. 167, pp. 9–67.
- Irvine, J. T., & Gal, S. (2000). Language ideology and linguistic differentiation. In P. V. Kroskrity (Ed.), *Regimes of language: Ideologies, politics, and identities* (pp. 35–83). Santa Fe, NM: School of American Research Press.

- Irvine, J. T., & Gal, S. (2009). Language ideology and linguistic differentiation. *Linguistic anthropology: A reader*, 402–34.
- Jacquemet, M. (2005). Transidiomatic practices: Language and power in the age of globalization. *Language & Communication*, Vol. 25, pp. 257–277.
- Kaomea, J. (2003). Reading Erasures and Making the Familiar Strange: Defamiliarizing Methods for Research in Formerly Colonized and Historically Oppressed Communities. *Educational Researcher*, Vol. 32, No. 2, pp. 14–25.
- King, K. (2000). Language Ideologies and Heritage Language Education. *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism*, Vol. 3, No. 3, pp. 167–184.
- King, K. & Benson, C. (2004). Indigenous Language Education in Bolivia and Ecuador: Contexts, Changes, and Challenges. In J. Tollefson & A. Tsui (Eds.). (2004). *Medium of Instruction Policies: Which Agenda? Whose Agenda?* (pp. 241–262). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.
- Kroskrity, P. (Ed.) (2000). *Regimes of language: Ideologies, politics, and identities*. Santa Fe, NM: School of American Research Press.
- McSwan, J. (2000). The Threshold Hypothesis, Semilingualism, and Other Contributions to a Deficit View of Linguistic Minorities in *Hispanic Journal of Behavioral Sciences*, Vol. 22 No. 1, February 2000, pp. 3–45.
- Maurais, J., & Morris, M. A. (Eds.). (2003). *Languages in a globalizing world*. Cambridge: Cambridge.
- May, S. (2001). *Language Minority Rights: Ethnicity, Nationalism and the Politics of Language*. Harlow: Longman.
- McCarty, T. (2002). Between Possibility and Constraint: Indigenous Language Education, Planning, and Policy in the United States. In J. Tollefson (Ed.), *Language policies in education: Critical issues* (pp. 285–307). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.
- McCarty, T. (2004). Dangerous Difference: A Critical–Historical Analysis of Language Education Policies in the United States. In J. Tollefson & A. Tsui (Eds.). (2004). *Medium of Instruction Policies: Which Agenda? Whose Agenda?* (pp. 71–93). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.
- McGroarty, M. (1996). Language attitudes, motivation, and standards. In S. L. McKay and N. H. Hornberger (Eds.), *Sociolinguistics and Language Teaching* (pp. 3–46). New York: Cambridge University Press.
- McGroarty, M. (2002). Evolving Influences on Educational Language Policies. In J. Tollefson (Ed.), *Language policies in education: Critical issues* (pp. 17–36). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.
- Milroy, J. (2001). Language Ideologies and the Consequences of Standardization. *Journal of Sociolinguistics*, Vol. 5, No. 4, pp. 530–555.
- Pennycook, A. (2000). English, Politics, Ideology: From Colonial Celebration to Postcolonial Performativity. In T. Ricento (Ed.), *Ideology, Politics, and*

- Language Policies: Focus on English* (pp. 107–119). Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
- Phillips, S. (1998). Language Ideologies in Institutions of Power: A Commentary. In B. Schiefflin, K. Woolard & P. Kroskrity (Eds.), *Language Ideologies: Practice and Theory* (pp. 211–225). Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press.
- Pic Gillard, C. (2000). La Transformación de un País Plurilingüe en un País Bilingüe. Un Caso Ejemplar: el Paraguay. *Revista Paraguaya de Sociología*. Vol. 37, No. 109, pp. 155–183.
- Pomerantz, A. (2002). Language Ideologies and the Production of Identities: Spanish as a Resource for Participation in a Multilingual Marketplace. *Multilingua*, Vol. 21, pp. 275–302.
- Reagan, T. (2002). *Language, Education, and Ideology: Mapping the Linguistic Landscape of U.S. Schools*. Westport, Connecticut: Praeger Publishers.
- Ricento, T. (Ed.). (2000). *Ideology, Politics and Language Policies: Focus on English*. Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
- Ricento, T. (2005). Problems with the ‘Language-as-Resource’ Discourse in the Promotion of Heritage Languages in the U.S.A. *Journal of Sociolinguistics*, Vol. 9, No.3, pp. 348–368
- Ricento, T. (Ed.) (2006). *An Introduction to Language Policy: Theory and Method*. Malden, MA: Blackwell Publishing Co.
- Ridge, S. (2000). Mixed Motives: Ideological Elements in the Support for English in South Africa. In T. Ricento (Ed.), *Ideology, Politics, and Language Policies: Focus on English* (pp. 1151–172). Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
- Romaine, S. (2002). The Impact of Language Policy on Endangered Languages. *International Journal on Multicultural Societies* (IJMS), Vol. 4, No.2, pp.194 – 212. In www.unesco.org/shs/ijms/vol4/issue2/art3
- Shohamy, E. (2006). *Language Policy: Hidden Agendas and New Approaches*. London and New York: Routledge.
- Silverstein, M. (1998). The Uses and Utility of Ideology: A Commentary. In B. Schiefflin, K. Woolard & P. Kroskrity (Eds.), *Language Ideologies: Practice and Theory* (pp. 123–145). Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press.
- Skilton-Sylvester, E. (2003). Legal Discourse and Decisions, Teacher Policymaking and the Multilingual Classroom: Constraining and Supporting Khmer/English Biliteracy in the United States. *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism*, Vol. 6, No. 3&4, pp. 168–184
- Sonntag, S. (2002). Ideology and Policy in the Politics of the English Language in North India. In T. Ricento (Ed.), *Ideology, Politics, and Language Policies: Focus on English* (pp. 133–150). Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
- Spolsky, B. (Ed.). (1999). *Concise Encyclopedia of Educational Linguistics*. Amsterdam: Elsevier. Pergamon.

- Spolsky, B. (2004). *Language Policy: Key Topics in Sociolinguistics*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Spotti, M. (2006). Multilingual Migrants and Monolingual Teachers: the Discursive Construction of Identity in a Flanders Primary School. In C. Mar-Molinero & P. Stevenson, *Language Ideologies, Policies and Practices: Language and the Future of Europe*. Houndmills: Palgrave-Macmillan.
- Timm, L. A. (2001). Transforming Breton: A Case Study in Multiply Conflicting Language Ideologies. *Texas Linguistic Forum*, Vol. 44, No. 2, pp. 447–461. Proceedings from the Eighth Annual Symposium about Language and Society—Austin, April 20–22, 2001.
- Tollefson, J. (1991). *Planning Language, Planning Inequality: Language Policy in the Community*. New York: Longman.
- Tollefson, J. (Ed.). (1995). *Power and Inequality in Language Education*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Tollefson, J. (Ed.). (2002). *Language Policies in Education: Critical issues*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.
- Tollefson, J., & Tsui, A. (Eds.). (2004). *Medium of Instruction Policies: Which Agenda? Whose Agenda?* Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.
- Tsitsipis, L. D. (2003). Implicit Linguistic Ideology and The Erasure Of Arvanitika (Greek–Albanian) Discourse. *Journal of Pragmatics*, Vol. 35, pp. 539–558.
- Tsitsipis, L. D. (2004). A Sociolinguistic Application of Bakhtin’s Authoritative and Internally Persuasive Discourse. *Journal of Sociolinguistics*, Vol. 8, No. 4, pp. 569–594.
- Valdés, G. et al. (2003). Language Ideology: The Case of Spanish in Departments of Foreign Languages. *Anthropology & Education Quarterly*, Vol. 34, No. 1, pp. 3–26.
- Volosinov, V. (1976a). Discourse in the life and discourse in the art. In N. Bruss (Ed.), *Freudianism: A Marxist critique* (I.R. Titunik, Trans.). New York: Academic Press. (Original work published in 1926)
- Volosinov (1976b). *Freudianism: A Marxist critique* (N. Bruss, Ed.; I.R. Titunik, Trans.). New York: Academic Press. (Original work published in 1926)
- Watson-Gegeo, K. and Gegeo, D. (1995). Understanding language and power in the Solomon Islands: Methodological lessons for educational intervention. In J. Tollefson (Ed.), *Power and Inequality in Language Education* (pp. 59–72). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Wiley, T. (2000). Continuity and change in the function of language ideologies in the United States. In T. Ricento (Ed.), *Ideology, Politics, and Language Policies: Focus on English* (pp. 67–86). Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
- Wiley, T. (2005). *Literacy And Language Diversity In The United States*, (2nd ed.). Washington, DC: Center for Applied Linguistics & DELTA.

- Woolard, K. A. (1989). *Double talk: Bilingualism and the politics of ethnicity in Catalonia*. Stanford: Stanford University Press
- Woolard, K. A. (1998). Language ideology as a field of inquiry. In B. Schieffelin, K. A. Woolard & P. V. Kroskrity (Eds.), *Language ideologies: Practice and Theory* (pp. 3–47). New York: Oxford University Press.
- Woolard, K. A., & Schieffelin, B. (1994). Language Ideology. *Annual Review of Anthropology*, 23, pp. 55–82.
- Wortham, S. (2001). Language Ideology and Educational Research. *Linguistics and Education*, Vol. 12, No. 3, pp. 253–259.
- Wright, S. (2004). *Language Policy and Language Planning: From Nationalisation to Globalisation*. New York: Palgrave MacMillan.