

Chapter 1

Research and Practice in Language Policy and Planning

James W. Tollefson and Miguel Pérez-Milans

The idea of a *Handbook* such as the one we offer here began to take shape in February 2012. Jim had just taken a new post in the Division of English Language Education at Hong Kong University, where Miguel was in the last year of a postdoctoral fellowship funded by the Spanish Ministry of Education. We met for the first time at a research seminar at which a postdoctoral researcher based in another university in Hong Kong presented data about Korean Chinese learning the Korean language in South Korea. Drawing heavily from Pierre Bourdieu's work (1993) on the *linguistic market* and *symbolic capital*, and relying on interview data, the speaker at that seminar provided an account of the minority participants as social actors not having access to the Korean linguistic market due to their lack of competence in the national language. These broad claims resonated with our own research and life experiences, and aligned well with the type of academic arguments that both of us had published in previous work. Yet, we sensed also that other issues must be considered to fully grasp language in the changing socio-institutional dynamics derived from wider patterns of sociopolitical and economic transformation that we believed to be important; we sensed also that some of these patterns complicated nationally bounded views of linguistic markets and the processes of production, distribution and valuation of symbolic resources that operate within them.

Previous to his arrival in Hong Kong, Jim had conducted research in multiple contexts internationally while being based in the United States and Japan. Over many

years, that research had illuminated the central role of LPP processes in sustaining systems of inequality under different historical conditions, including neoliberalism in the United States and East Asia (Tollefson, 2015; Tollefson & Tsui, 2007), an independent socialist alternative in Yugoslavia (Tollefson, 2002), and in processes of mass migration (Tollefson, 1993). Miguel had carried out research on language education policy shifts in Madrid, mainland China, London, and Hong Kong. Committed to describing ethnographically the social patterns of global change tied to economic conditions of late modernity, his work contributed to a body of literature preoccupied with shifting forms of inequality resulting from processes of transnational migration, late modern nationalism, institutional neoliberalization and commodification of diversity (see, for instance, Pérez-Milans, 2011, 2013, 2015; Pérez-Milans & Soto, 2014, 2016).

In the context of these research trajectories, and what we believed to be interesting differences in our professional training and perspectives emerging from different periods in the development of LPP, the research seminar at The University of Hong Kong spurred a dialogue between us that led to our decision to co-teach a postgraduate class in sociolinguistics that placed theoretical and empirical developments in the field within their historical contexts. As we worked through that class, we increasingly focused on the ways in which the relationship between LPP and political-economic conditions has been understood, and how this changing relationship has shaped knowledge production in the field. It was this dialogue about the history of LPP that has led to the present volume. Equally interested in language, social critique and inequality, our research and work experiences across different regional, national, and institutional settings, and more specifically our latest involvement in research from and about Asian

conditions, drove our attention to on-going processes and nuances that have gradually become the focus of contemporary LPP research, in many cases forcing scholars and practitioners in the field to revisit their own assumptions, views, and methodological perspectives.

Against the background of this particular journey, we decided to embark on *The Oxford Handbook of Language Policy and Planning*, as a project that aims to explore this set of issues, beyond just providing a set of summaries of specific sub-fields within LPP (although some will be provided as needed, or can be found elsewhere; e.g., Ricento, 2016; Spolsky, 2012). In particular, this *Handbook* addresses many of the current questions that LPP researchers face under contemporary conditions of change, with an ambition to better understand the current period in which the field operates today.

But before detailing the specific questions that have guided the organization of this volume, we first provide an overview of the foundations of the field.

Foundations of LPP Research

LPP activities existed long before language policy and planning emerged as a distinct field of inquiry. Tied to the rise of the bourgeoisie in the 19th century and to its interests in expanding economic activities both within and among unified national markets, the political and socioeconomic mode of organization of the nation-state required from the start intensive discursive work (Bauman & Briggs, 2003; see also Hobsbawm, 1990), both in the institutional arena and in everyday life, for the “imagination” (Anderson, 1983) of a monolingual citizenry (e.g., grammars, dictionaries and other forms of

regulation of speakers). However, the terms *language policy* and *language planning* emerged as such in the 1960s, in connection with what would be the early years of LPP research.

The term *language planning* referred to deliberate efforts to affect the structure (usage, corpus) or function (use, status) of languages. As evident in early scholarship (e.g., Haugen, 1966), such efforts were understood primarily as the work of planning agencies. Accordingly, in their classic book about language planning, Rubin and Jernudd (1971) defined *language planning* as follows: “language planning is *deliberate* language change; that is, changes in the system of language code or speaking or both that are planned by organizations that are established for such purposes or given a mandate to fulfill such purposes” (p. xvi). Subsequently, the most widely cited definition of *language planning* was developed by Robert Cooper, who added acquisition planning to corpus and status planning: “Language planning refers to deliberate efforts to influence the behavior of others with respect to the acquisition, structure, or functional allocation of their language codes” (Cooper, 1989, p. 45). Cooper also extended the notion of language planning to include a broad range of policy actors beyond formal state authorities (e.g., Māori community leaders who fought to extend the use of the Māori language into pre-schools and elementary schools in New Zealand).

Use of the term *language policy* emerged from the focus on national language planning. At times, the terms *policy* and *planning* seemed to be used interchangeably (e.g., Das Gupta, 1970; Rubin & Jernudd, 1971, p. xx). At other times, language planning was described as following from language policy, as in Fishman’s discussion of corpus planning, which involves “the elaboration, codification, and implementation that go on

once language-policy decisions have been reached” (Fishman, 1971, p. 9). This understanding accorded with Ferguson’s (1968) focus on graphization, standardization, and modernization as the central processes of language planning. For other early scholars, a language policy was seen as the output of the planning process and understood as a set of national goals (e.g., adoption of a single lingua franca) and an explicit statement about how to achieve those goals. For example, Jernudd and Das Gupta, in “Towards a theory of language planning” (1971), focused on national planning processes:

Social planning at high levels of enlargement (“macro” levels) involves the construction of an over-all design of organized action that is considered necessary for economic utilization of resources and that is directed by formally constituted authority. It consists of a structure of coordinated programs, and the latter in their turn consist of a set of coordinated projects (p. 196).

This attention to national language policy and planning meant that the major issues investigated in early LPP research were nation building, nationalism, political and sociocultural integration, national education policies, economic development, and official languages.

In its origins, LPP was assumed to be an area of specialization in sociolinguistics. For example, written as an overview of LPP, Joshua Fishman’s introduction to the foundational book *Language Problems of Developing Nations* (Fishman, Ferguson & Das Gupta, 1968) opens with the question “what is sociolinguistics, and why?” (Fishman, 1968b, p. 3). Another early, influential volume (Fishman, 1968a) on sociolinguistics and

the sociology of language included a major section on language planning, and a follow-up two-volume set included a similar section on “policy, planning and practice” (Fishman, 1972a, p. 15) as an important subfield of sociolinguistics.

Such efforts to place LPP within a disciplinary framework, as well as explicit definitions of policy and planning, were particularly evident in the remarkable formative period of LPP during the years 1964-1974. After the founding of the Center for Applied Linguistics in 1959 under its first director Charles A. Ferguson, the need for research on LPP had become evident. Accordingly, during the early- and mid-1960s, a series of meetings and conferences, often organized by Ferguson and Joshua Fishman and sponsored by the Social Science Research Council, the Ford Foundation (see Fox, 1975), and other funding agencies, produced many of the foundational early research projects and publications. These meetings took place during Joshua Fishman’s year at the Center for Advanced Study in the Behavioral Sciences at Stanford University in 1963-64; in the summer of 1964, when the Committee on Sociolinguistics of the Social Science Research Council organized an eight-week LPP seminar of linguists and social scientists (see Ferguson, 1965, for a report on this important seminar); in November, 1966, at a meeting at Airlie House in Warrenton, Virginia, which focused on language and development and led directly to publication of *Language Problems of Developing Nations* (Fishman, Ferguson, & Das Gupta, 1968); and during 1968-69 at the East-West Center at the University of Hawaii, where Jyotirindra Das Gupta, Joshua Fishman, Björn Jernudd, and Joan Rubin spent a year that included a meeting of selected LPP scholars during April 1969.

This work at the East-West Center led to publication of the influential *Can Language Be Planned?* (Rubin & Jernudd, 1971) and to establishment of the International Research Project on Language Planning Processes at Stanford University (where Ferguson had founded the Committee on Linguistics [later a Department] in 1967), which eventually spawned the important book *Language Planning Processes* (Rubin *et al.*, 1977). Other influential publications during this period included Fishman's *Advances in Language Planning* (Fishman, 1974), Fishman's reconsideration of his earlier work (Fishman, 1964) on language maintenance and shift as a field of inquiry (Fishman, 1972c), and his analysis of language and nationalism (Fishman, 1972b), as well as a growing body of case studies in contexts around the world (e.g., Das Gupta, 1970; Fishman, 1972a, volume II; Mazrui, 1968; Sibayan, 1971; Zima, 1968). In Europe, work within the Prague School was extended to LPP (Garvin, 1973; Neustupný, 1970), and case studies on LPP provided rich empirical data beyond postcolonial contexts (e.g., Lewis, 1972; Lorwin, 1972; also see Tauli, 1968). This impressive output over a period of just ten years served as the foundation for the next 45 years of LPP scholarship.

But this scholarship has not followed a linear incremental development. Rather, LPP has been shaped by various ontological and epistemological shifts linked to wider discussions in the social sciences and to the kind of worldwide shifting socioeconomic conditions with which we opened this introduction. For the purpose of this brief discussion, and acknowledging the subsequent oversimplification of regional and interdisciplinary dynamics that it involves, we group such shifts into two major stages, namely: early work, and the contributions of the critical and ethnographic approaches.

(For surveys of the field, see Tollefson, 1991; Ricento, 2000; Jernudd & Nekvapil, 2012; and Heller, this volume).

Early Work

Although social scientists frequently theorize about practice, LPP initially emerged as *essentially* pragmatic, with the aim of providing direct and explicit tools to achieve concrete social and linguistic goals. This early work – termed “classic language planning” (Ricento, 2000, p. 206) or “neoclassical language planning (Tollefson, 1991, p. 26) – viewed LPP as a practical objective science, driven by technical experts who served as the practitioners of policymaking and planning as well as the preferred decision makers for the complex details of policy formulation, implementation, and evaluation (see Rubin, 1971). The dominance of this positivist belief in the scientific objectivity of LPP practitioners had direct impact on LPP methodology. In particular, the presumption of a definable underlying reality that LPP practitioners could analyze and change in predictable ways encouraged historical and quantitative methodologies, evident for example in the development of national sociolinguistic surveys, such as the influential English language policy survey of Jordan (Harrison, Prator, & Tucker, 1975) and the language policy survey of the Philippines (Sibayan, 1971).

Although this approach generated extensive descriptive data about the language situation in many contexts, it also tended to close off process understandings of language that emerge from process methodologies (such as those that are ethnographically informed). Partly as a consequence, in LPP – and language studies generally – dominant

conceptual frameworks included important ontological and epistemological assumptions such as the following: languages have reality apart from their speakers; sociolinguistic categories such as language, dialect, diglossia, and national identity have fixed meanings and clear boundaries; and there is a direct link between language and identity that places the individual speaker neatly in ethnic and national categories. Moreover, the presumption that the world is composed of identifiable chunks (languages, dialects, native speakers, communities, nations, national identities) invites causal explanation, prediction, and replication.

The work of early LPP, therefore, was aimed at finding specific, replicable techniques to achieve identifiable and quantifiable goals such as language learning and bilingualism, economic development, and political stability. Such an orientation in LPP fit well with the Chomskyan revolution in linguistic theory also taking place in the 1960s, with its assumption of universal mental structures that were essentially linguistic categories. Indeed, the universalism inherent in language research in this period meant that scholarly analysis was characterized by a sense of the potential for major breakthroughs in research and practice.

In LPP, this meant that the processes of language “modernization” and “development” (see Rostow, 1960) were understood as universally transplantable into new contexts by LPP specialists working with social scientific techniques that promised predictable outcomes. The confluence of scholars’ and planners’ confidence in technical analysis and expert-driven LPP, however, meant that the use of LPP to sustain systems of inequality was not sufficiently recognized. It also meant that the life trajectories of individuals living in complex social groups were subdivided into a range of discourses –

linguistics, politics, economics, law, science, and more – that were impenetrable to the people whose languages and lives were being planned. It was partly in reaction to that yawning gap between analysts and their analytical objects that alternative approaches to LPP began to emerge.

Critical and Ethnographic Approaches

Although the Chomskyan revolution meant that distinctions between languages were conceptualized as surface phenomena, historical and structural analysis revealed that these distinctions can be constructed as having moral, aesthetic and cognitive significance. Thus, along with developments in sociology, anthropology and linguistics, the work of LPP scholarship began to examine the processes by which such constructions are developed, their social consequences, and the interests they serve. It was this understanding of LPP that led to the focus on power and ideology in LPP that was evident in critical approaches in the 1990s.

Critical approaches emerged from the wide range of alternative social scientific perspectives that undermined positivist approaches, including existentialism, deconstruction, postmodernism, and critical theory, in which notions of permanence were largely abandoned. This critical turn, which examined the processes by which language is associated with power and inequality, led to an alternative definition of LPP that became widespread in the 1990s:

Language planning-policy means the institutionalization of language as a basis for distinctions among social groups. That is, language policy is one mechanism for locating language within social structure so that language determines who has access to political power and economic resources.

Language policy is one mechanism by which dominant groups establish hegemony in language use (Tollefson, 1991, p. 16).

Critics of earlier LPP also pointed out that corpus, status, and acquisition planning efforts in the 1960s and 1970s often failed to achieve their stated goals (e.g., see Spolsky, 2012, p. 4). This claim that early LPP was mostly ineffective was justified in many cases, as LPP was understood primarily as the plans and policies formulated and implemented at the national level by ministries of education and similar state authorities. Critics of state LPP also pointed out that planners often ignored community concerns, and that language policies sometimes were used to sustain systems of inequality (e.g., in apartheid South Africa; see Blommaert, 1996).

The shift in LPP research to a focus on power and inequality involved historical-structural analysis of state LPP; it did not lead to increased research on what were called the micro contexts of everyday social life, although precisely such contexts had received significant scholarly attention in linguistic anthropology, especially the ethnography of communication (e.g., Gumperz & Hymes, 1972), and interactional sociolinguistics (Gumperz 1986). Indeed, the focus on the nation-state left little room for attention to the forms of LPP that take place in schools, individual classrooms, workplaces, non-governmental organizations, and the private sector, where individual teachers, students,

workplace supervisors, employees, and household members make critical decisions about language structure, use, and acquisition. When LPP is considered from this wider perspective, and is not limited to the plans and policies of the nation-state, then researchers begin to discover a broader range of consequences of LPP.

Analysis of such contexts required a shift towards epistemological frameworks such as those that are ethnographically informed, yet the shift to process research methods did not mean the loss of the practical focus that had characterized LPP since its founding. Indeed, ethnographic analysis is grounded fundamentally in the notion that what one learns about what it means to be human is found in examples, models, and exemplars rather than abstract principles. Whereas positivist notions of scientific objectivity assume that science is *deep* and culture is *superficial*, process methodologies seek depth of understanding through the detailed and concrete analysis of individuals-in-culture. The spread of ethnographic analysis in LPP, which followed shortly upon historical-structural analysis, revealed that understanding why individuals learn and use languages and how they adopt subject positions and identities cannot be found by examining structural forces and institutional socialization alone, but by analyzing how these are extensions of earlier processes of socialization that take place during childhood and adolescence. If researchers want to understand language loss and language shift, the development of bi/multilingualism, and the complex sociolinguistic systems of daily life, then they must explore the interface between individuals' life trajectories and the culture and practices of the classroom, the street, the playground, or the home, and how these are linked with national and international ideologies, discourses, and policies.

The research that is required for this undertaking is more than traditional anthropology, however, with its focus on personal histories and group practices, and its belief that long-term immersion *in a culture* allows the researcher to develop an insider's perspective. Rather than such faith in the scholar's craft, which mirrors early faith in the technical LPP expert, what is needed is the effort to reveal the specific links connecting trajectories of socially positioned actors with current social contexts, including the relationships between use of particular linguistic forms, notions of cultural competence and institutional forms of discursive organization (Martin-Jones & Heller, 1996), thereby shedding light "on the ways that the social order reproduces itself through everyday microlevel mechanisms" (Desmond, 2007, p. 269). The result, in LPP, was a gradual shift toward the understanding of language as social practice, identities as fluid and multiple, and research methodologies that emphasize process.

The remarkable development of LPP – from its earliest technical focus on solving concrete language-related problems of the new postcolonial nation-states using quantitative and historical analysis, to its current attention to the ways in which structured communication, ideological and normative conventions, and institutional and global discourses are linked in the daily policies and practices of individuals and institutions – suggests that theoretical and conceptual issues in LPP have been, and will continue to be, transformed at a rapid pace. Indeed, the current dynamic condition of LPP research, characterized by approaches and methodologies responding to the rapid global and local changes in politics, the economy, and society, reveals a discipline whose concerns are at the center of profound historical transformations. It is for this reason that this *Handbook* has a forward-looking orientation. More specifically, seeking to understand the trajectory

of this current period, we ask the following set of questions: What does LPP mean today? How is our understanding of LPP shaped by the most important issues currently confronting LPP scholars? What research methodologies are used to investigate these issues? How have changes in the conditions of the modern nation-state altered LPP policies and policymaking, and their consequences? How do the processes of late modernity, particularly neoliberalism and various forms of globalization, impact LPP?

In the remainder of this introduction, we shall try to map out some of the different threads of recent LPP research evident in this *Handbook*, highlighting the issues that scholarly analysis seeks to understand and the approaches to research used in the investigation, and to anticipate some of the generalizations that emerge.

The Chapters in this *Handbook*

The issues and approaches in this volume are grouped around three major points of focus. The first one is concerned with the key theoretical and methodological underpinnings of past and present LPP research, which are presented as constituting a multi-angled starting point for the rest of the contributions. The second strand of discussion is focused on LPP as a window to further understand core socioeconomic, political and institutional processes involving the modern nation-state and its role in shaping community-based relations. Finally, the third major section turns our attention to shifting economic conditions in the last few decades, with a view to how they impact LPP as a field of inquiry.

Part I: Conceptual Underpinnings of Language Policy and Planning: Theories and Methods in Dialogue

Part I of the *Handbook* takes us through some of the key ontological and epistemological foundations upon which the interdisciplinary field of LPP has historically evolved, from its origins in the 1960s until contemporary developments. The review unfolds in different directions, with a focus on both theoretical and epistemological implications of such an evolving process. In her opening chapter, Monica Heller lays down the ideological underpinnings of LPP through situating its development at various historical junctures connected to political and economic interests. Far from representations of policy making as a rational/technical activity, she aligns with the critical tradition that since the 1990s has encouraged LPP scholars to problematize their own agenda. She does so by putting forward a key argument: that if anything has changed in the field, it is in how the relationship between LPP and political economic conditions has been understood, and how this has shaped knowledge production accordingly.

In her genealogy of ideas in LPP research, Heller pays close attention to the linkages between the authoritative knowledge produced by scholars and practitioners, on the one hand, and the various forms of social, economic and political engineering tied to the emergence and development of the modern nation-state, on the other. Drawing from literature on modern nationalism, language ideology, and late capitalism, she examines the shifts in such forms of engineering vis-à-vis the constitution of language as discursive terrain for the advancement of political economic interests, from the civilization projects of the colonial times in the 19th and early 20th centuries to the decolonization movements

of the 1960s – and the accompanying programs of modernization – to the extension and specialization of networks of production, circulation and consumption driven by contemporary neoliberalism.

The subsequent chapters in Part I of the *Handbook* provide us with a roadmap to specific epistemological developments and innovations in LPP, against the background of the wider disciplinary shifts discussed by Heller. In his analysis of the history of LPP research methods, Johnson considers the implications of a focus on “language problems” (Fishman, Ferguson & Das Gupta, 1968) that derived from what Fishman (1972a, vol. II) called LPP’s initial “formative half decade.” This stress on practical problems, initially in postcolonial states, resulted in reliance on varied methods drawn from sociolinguistics, sociology, law, economics, and education. As a result, early LPP scholarship varied enormously in its underlying theories, epistemologies, and explanations for findings; yet without agreed-upon theoretical frameworks and methodologies, these fundamental differences could not be systematically examined. LPP-specific methods emerged only gradually and later, as empirical findings accumulated, dissatisfaction with ad hoc explanation intensified, and the need for theories and conceptual frameworks specific to LPP became clear. Thus over time, LPP scholars began to confront deeper questions about what constituted acceptable theories and methods in LPP research. Johnson’s survey of the development of such methods shows that they are associated with different epistemological foundations. As the positivist work that dominated early LPP gave way to critical approaches, researchers increasingly emphasized historical and structural analysis, with attention to power in social systems and to reflexivity, particularly the researcher’s position in the research process. More recently, the shift toward critical,

discursive and ethnographic approaches to LPP focuses attention on the interplay of structure and agency and the ethics of social research.

The next three chapters offer an account of different traditions that have emerged out of the critical, discursive, and ethnographic turns which have taken place in LPP in recent decades. Marilyn Martin-Jones and Ildegrada da Costa Cabral trace the intellectual and research traditions that are the foundation of the critical ethnography of language policy. These traditions – ethnography of communication, critical sociolinguistic ethnography, linguistic anthropology (including research on language ideology), linguistic ethnography, and ethnography of language policy – developed detailed description and analysis of culturally varied interactional practices and narrative styles, particularly in multilingual schools and classrooms, such as indigenous education programs in North and South America and bilingual education programs in the United States. Yet much of this work was not integrated with that of LPP scholars focusing on policy texts, policymaking processes, and wider issues of national economic development, sociocultural and politico-administrative integration of the new postcolonial nation-states, and national survey data about language in society.

As Martin-Jones and da Costa Cabral show, these two broad strands of research – historical-structural analysis within LPP and processes of the nation-state, often labelled as macro, and a range of types of so-called micro analysis of schools and other settings – have increasingly come together within the critical ethnography of language policy, a major focus of which is to overcome the macro-micro divide. The result is that LPP research has been characterized by a gradual change in focus from its early attention to the policy processes of modernity to the recent attention to the policy processes of

classrooms, schools, families, and other social groups, all linked to globalization and late modern conditions such as increasing mobilities and the heteroglossia of social life. As Martin-Jones and de Costa Cabral trace these changes, they show that new issues have emerged in LPP methods, including questions of scale and the complex discursive processes of policy creation, interpretation, and appropriation.

In their chapter, Ruth Wodak and Kristof Savski keep our attention focused on the critical and ethnographic turns in LPP research. Yet, their approach exemplifies a very particular disciplinary tradition that stems from Critical Discourse Studies. Aimed at demystifying ideology and power relations in language use, this tradition brings about two alternative orientations in LPP that also feature ethnographic fieldwork as a constitutive part of their discourse-based analysis, namely: the discourse-historical approach (Reisigl & Wodak, 2015) and mediated discourse analysis (Scollon, 2008). Building on such orientations, as well as on research in the areas of sociolinguistic, linguistic, and organizational anthropology, a critical discourse-ethnographic approach such as the one presented by Wodak and Savski describes observational data and recorded practices from different sites and communicative genres in the European Parliament, all of it with reference to the historical context of such an institution and the broader socio-political trends that might influence the practices being observed. In so doing, they illustrate the relevance of multi-method approaches to identify, as they put it, “the repertoire of, and the facilitating factors for, different kinds of language choice as well as the intricacies of the language regime in a transnational organizational entity such as the EU.”

Still relying on critical, ethnographic and discourse-based perspectives, Miguel Pérez-Milans introduces yet another strand of work that comes with its own sensitivities and is potentially relevant to LPP researchers. In this case, Pérez-Milans' chapter invites us to rethink the way in which we conceptualize, investigate and analyze texts, contexts and meanings. Though he explicitly engages with literature in the ethnography of language policy, as discussed in Johnson's as well as in Martin-Jones and da Costa Cabral's chapters, his claims are intended to address more generally those who, like Wodak and Savski, are interested in the ethnographic triangulation of contextual and discursive data. By drawing from contemporary work on the indexicality of language in sociolinguistics and linguistic anthropology, he advocates for a (metapragmatic) approach to LPP in which context is seen as enacted, negotiated and made sense of in situated discursive practices across space and time.

This approach, Pérez-Milans reminds us, requires empirical commitment towards the ways in which social actors connect communicative events, normative conventions and inter-subjective stances throughout their trajectories of performative identification, beyond ethnographic approaches whereby institutional events, content analysis of research interviews, and denotational descriptions of policy documents have been extensively privileged. Indeed, he states, this overemphasis on denotational analysis of texts, contexts, and meanings in LPP may have contributed to reifying a widely problematized view of policy as a cultural artefact that only shapes social life externally and whose influence in people's lives can only be (empirically) grasped through analysis of talk *about* it. In an attempt to show how performative and trajectory-based

ethnographic studies of LPP may look, Pérez-Milans' chapter reports on previous fieldwork carried out in the educational space of Hong Kong.

The final chapter in Part I, by Yael Peled, turns the attention towards the ethics of LPP research. Peled's chapter emerges from her extensive work examining the complex relationships between morality and language within the framework of political theory and her interest in issues related to interdisciplinarity in the social sciences and humanities. Peled argues for a role for language ethics, which she defines as "the inquiry on the moral problems, practices, and policies relating to language, on par with equivalent topics in applied ethics such as environmental ethics or the ethics of war." Peled's normative approach to LPP, focusing on ethical theory and action, is particularly relevant to recent interest in language rights, linguistic justice, reflexivity in research, and democratic processes in language policymaking. In fact, a normative approach is particularly important for critical LPP scholars, who argue that researchers must be engaged in social change, a principle that emerges not only from the theoretical frameworks that underlie critical LPP (e.g., critical theory and Marxist approaches), but also from the early origins of the field as a practical discipline. Peled argues that this commitment to social change raises ethical questions about LPP that political theory addresses through its attention to the analysis of *what is* and *how things should be*.

Part II: LPP, Nation-states and Communities

Part II includes chapters that examine the close links between LPP and nationalism and influential ideas about language and the institutions of the nation-state. Chapters also

investigate the social position of minority languages and specific communities facing profound language policy challenges.

II.A: Modern nationalism, languages, minorities, standardization, and globalization

Since its foundational period in the 1960s, LPP research has included extensive analysis of state policies and planning processes. As critical perspectives toward LPP emerged during the 1980s and 1990s, attention to language and power meant that research focused on how LPP processes contribute to social, economic, and political inequalities and how greater opportunities for marginalized sociolinguistic groups may be opened. Thus research continued to be characterized by analysis of LPP decision-making primarily within state planning agencies. This section of the *Handbook* examines several key areas of state LPP, in particular its role in nationalism, the treatment of linguistic minorities, and language standardization processes, as well as the expansion of the economic activities of specific social groups across different nationally constituted markets via the role that English plays in globalization.

We begin with two chapters that examine the role of the state in LPP. First, Tomasz Kamusella's chapter focuses on the use of language in nationalism within European states in the 20th century, particularly after the collapse of the Berlin Wall in 1989. Kamusella focuses on the ethnolinguistically homogenous nation-state as the norm of legitimate statehood in Europe by tracing what he terms the "normative isomorphism" of language, nation, and state in Central Europe. As the foundation of state nationalism dating to the 19th century, language became a key focus of state planning, and continues

to be so under the processes of globalization and the weakening of nation-state control over the economy. Kamusella examines the linkage between language and nationalism across a remarkable range of contexts, including, for example, the breakup of Yugoslavia (1990-1992), which has been accompanied by the breakup of the Serbo-Croatian language, so that the successor states of Yugoslavia (except Kosovo) have claimed their own national languages (i.e., Croatian, Serbian, Bosnian, and Montenegrin; Slovene and Macedonian were distinguished in earlier periods). Kamusella also touches on language and nationalism in other regions of the world, such as those areas where the imposition of colonial languages has prevented the normative insistence that languages should make nations. He also looks to the future and whether the European Union's push for polylingual language policies may blunt the impact of ethnolinguistic nationalism.

In the second chapter about the link between language and the nation-state, Peter Ives offers his perspective drawn from Western political theory. He examines the foundational theorists of the modern liberal tradition, John Locke and Thomas Hobbes, as well as Rousseau and Herder's ideas about language and the state, which have been the foundation for many versions of multiculturalism and for communitarian political theory. With regard to Locke and Hobbes, Ives delves into their differing concepts of the social contract, which, he argues, is the basis for ideas about government planning. He shows that they spelled out two competing foundational ideas about planning: Locke articulated the view that there is only a highly limited role for state LPP, whereas Hobbes provided the key philosophical argument for state language planning. Examining work by Spolsky (2004) and others, Ives shows how this difference is mirrored in contemporary LPP.

Ives also spells out the importance of this debate for contemporary discussions about global English, instrumentalism in language policy, the role of ideology in LPP, and, in particular, the rational choice theory that underlies a great deal of LPP theory and practice. As for Rousseau and Herder, Ives examines in some detail the widely held view that Herder's theories of language and the state are the foundation for ethnolinguistic nationalism. Ives' chapter suggests that the widespread attention to Herder in LPP theory deserves new analysis. Indeed, Ives argues that Herder's theories provide a more useful basis for contemporary understandings of LPP than has been previously recognized.

After the chapters by Kamusella and Ives examining the role of the state in LPP, Katherine Chen directs our attention to language standardization as a key process whereby different social groups struggle over legitimacy within the political model of the modern nation-state. In her chapter, Chen presents us with a specific case: the analysis of LPP and modern nationalism through the lens of the ideologies of standardization of the Cantonese language in the context of contemporary Hong Kong. She uses the period leading up to the handover of Hong Kong from Britain to China, in 1997, as a point of reference to track the changing social meaning of Cantonese to the people of Hong Kong and the development of a distinct Hong Kong identity that has gained greater social and political significance in the two decades following the handover.

Chen focuses specifically on the process of standardization of Cantonese initiated by three key Cantonese language authorities; she takes this process as an index of language ideologies operating in connection with wider socioeconomic and political interests in postcolonial Hong Kong and mainland China. These interests, she claims, have never been just aesthetic or linguistic in a narrow sense; rather, they are part of a

broader agenda that places language as a key discursive arena for negotiating community boundaries and identities, and thereby for furthering sociopolitical differentiation. More specifically, Chen's analysis shows how the standardization of Cantonese in Hong Kong is part of an ideological struggle over who gets to decide what counts as the *authentic* or *pure* Chinese national community.

With chapters having established the basic logic under which the ideological framework of the modern nation-state operates, as well as the importance of language in it, the chapter by Thomas Ricento expands our lens. He examines different state responses to the role of English under conditions of globalization, a process that is inherent to the consolidation and amplification of the economic activities of a transnational class across previously well-demarcated national markets. Ricento offers the perspective of political economy to analyze two competing claims about English: that it is a form of linguistic imperialism and that it is a vehicle for social and economic mobility. Ricento's analysis looks specifically at which economic sectors and which social groups benefit from English, arguing that people in the so-called knowledge economy find English a means for economic mobility, whereas the vast majority of people in the global workforce receive no benefit or in some cases suffer economic consequences from the domination of English.

One of the important contributions of Ricento's chapter to this *Handbook* is that it introduces explicitly a political-economic approach to LPP research, in line with the arguments advanced by Heller in the first chapter of the volume. Ricento shows that a political-economic approach avoids grand narratives about English and globalization, and instead examines English (and other languages) within the particular economic and

political conditions of specific countries and regions. This approach reveals, in Ricento's words, that "the economic power of English is often assumed" rather than empirically verified, and even when there is some benefit, it is often overstated.

The focus of attention in the chapters above foregrounds the role of the state in LPP and the interests of the social groups who benefit the most from it, yet they say very little about minorities and their linguistic demands in the context of the ideological confines of the modern nation-state. This concern raises the issue of language rights. Although arguments for language rights are often primarily aesthetic, with diversity celebrated, honored, or appreciated rather than protected or promoted for compelling political, social, or economic reasons, Stephen May shows that language rights can make a significant contribution to social and political stability in multilingual states. In his analysis of language rights and language repression, Stephen May continues the investigation of the state and LPP by examining historical and contemporary conflicts that are often framed in ethnic terms, but actually involve language and language policy as a central issue.

Considering cases of language rights and language repression around the world, May explores, in the final chapter of this section of the *Handbook*, three sources of the widely held belief that language diversity inevitably contributes to instability: the negative ascription of ethnicity in political and scholarly discourse; the concept drawn from European nationalism, as outlined in Kamusella's chapter, that the ideal nation-state is ethnically and linguistically homogeneous; and the implicit use of both ideas in common conceptions of citizenship and human rights. May's analysis of the historical development of these ideas reveals the underlying ideologies and official narratives that

serve as the foundation for language policies of nation-states worldwide. He also presents alternative bases for minority language rights that, in his view, promote social and political stability by accommodating minority language rights and contributing to what he terms “ethnocultural and ethnolinguistic democracy.”

The ideological frameworks, processes and struggles discussed in the previous five chapters operate in different institutions of the modern nation-state. This is the focus of the following section of Part II.

II.B: LPP in institutions of the modern nation-state: Education, citizenship, media, and public signage

The five chapters in this section explore LPP in the institutions and daily life of the nation-state, specifically schools, citizenship and immigration, mass media, and public linguistic landscapes. All together, they provide extensive analysis of different cases, in various regional and national contexts, with which to better understand the ways in which the ideological dynamics discussed in the previous section are played out through specific institutional logics.

In his chapter, James W. Tollefson examines one of the most important forms of LPP in schools – medium of instruction (MOI) policies – particularly debates about the use of children’s home languages in schools. Despite the success of programs that use home languages, many states have continued to promote English or other postcolonial languages. In particular, as Tollefson shows, the pressures on state educational authorities to adopt MOI policies supporting so-called global English have transformed education in

many contexts, including China, European higher education, and elsewhere. As a result, parents, educators, and policymakers often must navigate contradictory personal, pedagogical and political agendas implicit in MOI policies. Nevertheless, despite the pressure for English in many contexts, a discourse of language rights can be a counterforce to English promotion policies. In addition, community efforts in some contexts have successfully used MOI to reduce educational inequality. Tollefson's chapter suggests that LPP research adopting situated approaches can place MOI policies and practices within local and global economic, political, and social conditions, in order to make explicit the links between MOI and the social life of children, schools, families, and communities.

Focusing on a key aspect of education – language tests – Tim McNamara and Kellie Frost examine the broader linkage between language testing, immigration policy, and citizenship. Adopting the perspective of language tests as language policy (Shohamy, 2006), they show how language testing in Australia has been incorporated into immigration policy and citizenship requirements, with test scores serving as a key indicator in migrant selection processes that determine individuals' eligibility to remain in Australia. However, they do not limit their analysis to state policies and institutional practices; rather, McNamara and Frost examine also the impact of testing, immigration, and citizenship requirements on individuals who are subject to policy controls. Within a poststructural analysis of the function of examinations in modern societies, they show how individuals' life chances are shaped by language-testing policies, thereby revealing the complex ways that language proficiency requirements shape the subjectivity of individuals. Their chapter has particular implications for LPP in countries where there

has been a long history of policies encouraging immigration, including Australia, New Zealand, Canada, and the United States.

A growing body of research on policymaking processes has found that mass and social media can significantly constrain the language policies that are considered in a particular context and on the public understandings of those policies (Gao, 2015, in press; Tollefson, 2015). The following two chapters in the volume speak to this issue. In their chapter on mass media and LPP, Xuesong Gao and Qing Shao focus on how the mass media discursively frame language issues and mediate the consideration of language policy alternatives. Using representation theory and the concepts of media framing (Jefferies, 2009; Scheufele & Iyengar, 2011) and legitimization (Chilton, 2004), they analyze three cases in which the media are policy actors in the policymaking process: the state print media coverage of the *dialect crisis* in mainland China, including the Protecting Cantonese Movement; high-stakes English language examinations in mainland China; and medium of instruction in the United States and Hong Kong, including English medium policies and the use of Putonghua as a medium of instruction for teaching Chinese in Hong Kong. Gao and Shao's chapter reveals that media may play a decisive role in determining policies, such as in Hong Kong, where media framing delegitimized Putonghua-medium instruction and thereby closed the policy window for this option. Thus Gao and Shao argue that current LPP research, in which mass media is not a central focus, deserves serious reconsideration, so that mass (and social) media can be incorporated as key policy actors in LPP processes.

Continuing Gao and Shao's focus on the role of mass media in LPP, Sandra Silberstein raises fundamental questions about media and policymaking: In media outputs

with policy implications, who is allowed to speak? Whose voices count? Whose perspective is reported? Into whose identities are viewers interpellated? Silberstein is especially interested in activities of mass media during times of national crisis, when the ideological work of media framing makes crises intelligible, often without challenging the policy agendas of political elites. The questions Silberstein raises draw our attention to the intersection of media studies, discourse analysis, and LPP. She also raises questions about the boundaries of LPP scholarship.

Like Ruth Wodak's discourse-historical approach, Silberstein's work adopts critical discourse analysis in order to investigate how language is used to instantiate particular social relations of power and to show how that instantiation is a form of language policy. Silberstein's concern is how media construct "good guys" and "bad guys" through the complex discursive processes that take place in media products. In order to show how LPP scholars might trace these processes, she analyzes the case of simultaneous CNN coverage of two international crises in July 2014: the downing of Malaysian Airlines Flight 17 over Ukraine and Israel's "Operation Protective Edge" into Gaza. Like Gao and Shao, Silberstein argues that LPP scholars should incorporate into their work a systematic analysis of the ways that media and other forms of public discourse constrain the voices and perspectives that may be heard, and thus the policy alternatives that are viewed as legitimate options.

The chapter by Francis Hult, the last in this section, invites us to think about LPP through the lens of public signage, also known as "linguistic landscapes" (LL). Generally interested in the ways in which language is used visually in public space, LL offers a platform to examine the intersecting factors that mediate language choices such as beliefs

and ideologies about languages, language policies, or communicative needs. Hult considers direct and indirect relationships between LPP and LL with reference to a wide range of contexts including Malaysia, the U.S., Canada, Estonia, Spain, Czech Republic, Ethiopia, or Cambodia, among others. In so doing, Hult's chapter brings into focus another popular and contested dichotomy in LPP research, in addition to the *micro/macro* or *agency/structure* referred to above: the *top-down/bottom-up* distinction.

The relationship between policy discourses /ideologies and LL is complex and not unidirectional. Whether explicit governmental regulations about public signage or visual language use linked to individual experiences and constructions, it may be problematic to assume any form of alignment between planning objectives related to shaping the sense of place through signage and people's beliefs about how the sense of place should be shaped. The relationship between policy and practice may include processes of resemiotization of policy discourses into LL practices. Drawing from Blommaert (2013) and Pennycook (2006), Hult also shows that non-government forms of *de facto* policy can also emerge through iterative choices mediated by values about language which permeate multiple domains of society, including visual language use. Such processes, Hult points out, call for ethnographic, (critical) discourse analytic orientations and nexus analysis, or geosemiotics, to focus attention on the role of LL as a language policy mechanism in concert with other mechanisms like education and media.

These non-government forms of *de facto* policy that Hult stresses lead us to the last section of Part II.

II.C: LPP in/through communities

The next five chapters investigate LPP in different communities: those whose members speak endangered languages; those which have responded critically to crises such as war and mass migration; indigenous peoples contesting and adjusting institutional views of bilingualism in public educational and healthcare systems; families, particularly those experiencing migration; and Deaf communities around the world. In the first of these five chapters, Teresa L. McCarty examines the processes and prospects for revitalizing endangered languages. Her analysis focuses on what she terms the work of “sustaining” languages (distinct from preserving or maintaining them), in order to emphasize the complex, dynamic, heteroglossic and often multisited language situation in communities working on revitalization projects. The chapter offers useful definitions of key terms and analysis of some of the major classification systems used in language endangerment research.

McCarty then turns to discussion of three contexts for sustaining languages: the new speaker movement, involving individuals who acquire a minority language (e.g., Yiddish in Poland, Irish in Ireland, or the Manx language on the Isle of Mann) through educational programs or private study, with little or no exposure at home; indigenous-language immersion in education (including Hawaiian in the U.S., Māori in Aotearoa/New Zealand, and Saami in Norway, Sweden, Finland, and western Russia); and bi/multilingual education using both the endangered language and a language of the wider community (such as in Nepal, the states of Andhra Pradesh and Orissa in India, and bilingual/intercultural education in Latin America). McCarty’s analysis of these widely varying language-sustaining projects reveals how the global effort for revitalization has

been able to significantly disrupt what has often seemed to be the inevitable slide toward language endangerment and loss. Moreover, McCarty demonstrates that sustaining endangered languages is always political work that must challenge dominant language ideologies and entrenched systems of linguistic inequality.

From McCarty's international perspective toward LPP for revitalizing and sustaining languages, the next chapter shifts to a local lens directed toward community language policies. Unamuno and Bonnin study the formulation of national public policies linked to regional integration processes in Argentina. In their chapter, they focus on the emergence of bilinguals as an outcome of a recent phenomenon in the region: the valorization of Spanish-Wichi bilingualism as a professional qualification to apply for State positions in the field of public healthcare and education. Relying on ethnography, discourse analysis, and studies of interaction, they look at the practices and experiences of indigenous teachers and health workers at El Impenetrable, in Chaco Province. In their analysis, Unamuno and Bonnin reveal a conflict between institutional ideologies of "access" and indigenous ideologies of "identity" which they explain as characteristic of the struggle between modern, state-oriented language policies and grassroots activism, including language as a part of a wider repertoire of political action. Unamuno and Bonnin's chapter shows how the actual production of language policies at different levels is contested and re-interpreted from the margins by the same indigenous people who are supposed to passively implement them.

Such forms of contestation and reinterpretation can be very intensive and transformational, as reported by Karen Ann Watson-Gegeo, David Welchman Gegeo, and Billy Fito'o. Based on their combined many decades of living and working in

Solomon Islands, they examine community language policies in education on the island of Malaita, where violent conflict (1998-2007) displaced thousands of speakers of Kwara'ae, the largest language in Solomon Islands. In this new installment in their ongoing research dating to the 1970s (Gegeo and Fito'o are both indigenous Kwara'ae), the chapter focuses on community responses to the forced return of 20,000 Malaitans, driven from Guadalcanal back to Malaita, and the collapse of the state educational system. This crisis on Malaita was met by intense community efforts to reconstruct a new, indigenous approach to education, which Watson-Gegeo, Gegeo and Fito'o call "critical community language policy and planning in education" (CCLPE).

CCLPE on Malaita meant that educational policymaking shifted from the nation-state to the community, with profound implications for the asymmetrical power relations that shape language-in-education policies. In this regard, CCLPE in Solomon Islands provides further evidence of the need for epistemological and ontological diversity, a view that is increasingly being advanced in LPP, as well as in education and development theory and related studies (see Dei, Hall & Rosenberg, 2000; Gegeo & Watson-Gegeo, 2013).

In the next chapter, Curdt-Christiansen turns to families and households by looking at explicit and implicit family language policies (FLP), particularly under conditions of transnational migration. Recent focus on FLP within LPP research emerges from the growing recognition that language policies are immanent in daily life, and that individual agency within households deserves research attention at least as much as policymaking by state agencies and institutions. As Curdt-Christiansen shows, research on FLP draws from language socialization and language acquisition research and from

analysis of the language ideologies that underlie family language decisions. Why do some families retain heritage languages whereas others undergo language shift? What are the consequences of different family language practices for the intergenerational transmission of language? How do family decisions about language interact with social, economic, and political pressures from the wider society? Curdt-Christiansen's survey of FLP research shows that such questions can be investigated with a range of research methods, including quantitative analysis, qualitative/interpretive approaches, and sociolinguistic ethnography. Her chapter also suggests that future FLP research must extend beyond the household, to include the life trajectories of family members in a broad range of social contexts.

Ronice Müller de Quadros' chapter examines Deaf communities, which face language policy issues that are specific to sign languages, yet also overlap significantly with LPP in minority-language communities. Her overview of sign languages and Deaf communities includes discussion of the sign language transmission and maintenance processes in several contexts worldwide, including those in which spoken languages are dominant. Of particular interest is her analysis of the dominant ideologies that underlie sign languages policies, which she terms a "medical view of deafness." Based on a critical analysis of the medical view, Quadros offers an agenda for Deaf LPP based on a "linguistic perspective" and a language rights discourse. She concludes by arguing that this agenda requires significant participation in policymaking processes by Deaf community members. Her advocacy for Deaf community control of Deaf LPP echoes Watson-Gegeo, Gegeo and Fito'o's call for a critical community language policy and planning in education.

Part III: LPP and Late Modernity

Many chapters in Part I and Part II of the *Handbook* make reference to shifting cultural, institutional and economic conditions in their consideration of LPP issues. Inspired by contemporary social theory (see Appadurai, 1990; Archer, 2012; Bauman, 1998; Giddens, 1991), in Part III we link these shifting conditions to the broad label of “late modernity” with reference to widespread processes of late capitalism, leading to the selective privatization of services (including education), the information revolution (associated with rapidly changing statuses and functions for languages), the repositioning of the institutions of nation-states (with major implications for language policies), and the fragmentation of overlapping and competing identities (associated with new complexities of language-identity relations and new forms of multilingual language use).

As an academic discipline in the social sciences, language policy must confront tensions between these processes of change and the powerful ideological framework of modern nationalism. The chapters in Part III place these issues at the centre of our attention by approaching LPP through the lens of the following strands of research: neoliberalism and governmentality; mobility, diversity and new social media; and new forms of engagement with language, ideology, and critique.

III.A: LPP, neoliberalism and governmentality: A political economy view of language, bilingualism and social class

As revealed in chapters by Heller and Ricento, political economy has begun to be a source discipline for critical LPP research, and neoliberalism and governmentality key issues for analysis. The six chapters in this section offer conceptual and epistemological guides to the study of such issues, beginning with Eva Codó's contribution.

In her chapter, Codó sets up some key principles that in our view should characterize a critically oriented approach to LPP under contemporary conditions. In alignment with Harvey (2005), she departs from accounts of globalization that only refer to the intensification of the circulation of capital, people and semiotic practices around the globe, in order to argue for a view that conceptualizes globalization "as a new mode of production predicated on the volatility of markets in rapidly evolving technological environments and on the flexibilization of labour." Indeed, she adds, "flexibilization is the buzzword of neoliberal globalization, and the condition and the outcome of neoliberal policy." A key research area is the changing relationship between the state and the economic sector derived from this environment, in which the state partially retreats from key social fields such as education, social services and healthcare, while civil society organizations and private companies increasingly take on socially regulatory roles in lieu of or together with the state – with subsequent tensions and contradictions.

With this as a premise, Codó reviews LPP issues in three key institutional domains transformed by neoliberalising policies (i.e. workplace, education, and civil society organizations). Her discussion shows that neoliberalism is not just an abstract model of action or thought. Rather, it is a form of ethos that, while permeating institutions' missions and discursive arrangements, shapes the production/legitimization

of moral categories about appropriate social actors and forms of knowledge (including the linguistic) and, in turn, individual subjectivities.

These processes are further expanded and analyzed in the following chapters. Joan Pujolar focuses on how tertiarization, neoliberalism and globalization reconfigure the role of language in people's lives and the ways in which individuals and organizations treat languages. He specifically looks at language as an economic asset. Taking "linguistic commodification" (Heller, 2003) as an entry point to ideologies and practices of governance that emerge from the changing relationship between public and non-public institutions, Pujolar reminds us that an "important point to learn from research on linguistic commodification is to appreciate that what we are witnessing is not so much a retreat of the state but a transformation of its modes of intervention in public and economic life, and that language policy makes a particularly good lens to understand this transformation." In his chapter, he exemplifies this by exploring slightly different modes of state involvement or non-involvement in three areas of activity: the language learning abroad industry in Spain; the policies of Francophone economic development in Canada; and multilingual call centers from the workers' perspective.

The repositioning of the state under the economic conditions outlined by Codó and Pujolar can be clearly identified in the institutional space of education. The chapter by Ana María Relaño-Pastor offers an analytical example of this. In her chapter, Relaño-Pastor proposes a political economy angle to the implementation of Content and Language Integrated Learning (CLIL), a type of bilingual education policy aimed at enhancing English language education while successfully meeting the demands of the Council of Europe and the European Commission. In contrast to a dominant body of

literature that has contributed to romanticizing it as a truly European approach that celebrates multilingualism, Relaño-Pastor embraces a critical sociolinguistic ethnography perspective on CLIL as policy and practice to shed light on the neoliberalization and commodification processes involved in the global spread of English in Europe. She illustrates these processes through a case study of CLIL-type English/Spanish bilingual programs in the south-central autonomous region of Castilla-La Mancha, in Spain.

Moving the focus from state institutions to multinational corporations, Alfonso Del Percio takes us through the process whereby linguistic aspects of communication get locally resignified by managers, consultants, and marketing specialists in such corporations as economic assets that contribute to the individualization or customization of products and services. In particular, Del Percio documents ethnographically the institutional techniques, tactics and forms of expertise through which language and communication are governed in a Swiss multinational organization based in the major economic centre of German-speaking Switzerland. He shows that corporate actors' policing is not merely linguistic. Instead, he argues, "such forms of policing are a method of enhancing multinationals' productivity and securing their competitiveness under changing market conditions." This, we believe, resonates strongly with Codó's analysis, and, as Del Percio highlights, invites LPP researchers to address language and communication "as part of a package of activities that are subjected to discipline and regimentation" and not just as "abstract entities detached from the institutional logics in which they are anchored."

Steering the discussion towards the individual subjectivities also anticipated by Codó, Luisa Martín Rojo delves into the extension of the neoliberal logic to language

management and practices. By engaging with Foucault's (2009) notion of governmentality, she urges us "to understand the process by which a set of economic principles have become an ideology and a form of governance, at this moment in time when the crisis of neoliberalism as an economic and political order comes hand-in-hand with the rise of right and left-leaning populism (and even neo-fascism) in different parts of the world." As market mechanisms begin to organise speakers' trajectories and practices, and to govern their conduct, Martín Rojo sees in linguistic governmentality an area of inquiry that allows us to understand how forms of power mutate, what key changes are currently taking place, and which languages and language policies are involved.

To us, the novelty of this perspective resides precisely in the locus of power under investigation which, as Martín Rojo states, is "the multiple forms of activity whereby human beings, who may or may not be part of government or of an institution, seek to control the conduct of other human beings – that is, to govern them." Based on this premise, Martín Rojo discusses the ways in which the behavior of individuals, and that of the population in general, becomes regulated when one language is given prominence over others.

By this point of the narrative it is clear that a political economy approach to LPP and the study of neoliberalism offer insightful perspectives to contemporary processes that impact our daily lives. Yet, and as David Block points out in the last chapter of this section, neoliberalism continues to be ill-defined and undertheorized, particularly when it comes to analysis of social class. In his own words: "the rise of economic inequality and new forms of class struggle that have accompanied neoliberal policies and practices are

effectively erased from analysis, or they are dealt with only in a cursory manner.” In response, Block articulates an argument for the centrality of class as a key construct for understanding the effects of neoliberalism in LPP. Block’s chapter includes concrete analysis of the ways that these are used in LPP research, as well as specific examples of how a class analysis offers insight into policymaking processes. His chapter calls for more careful definition of terms (e.g., middle class) and it includes specific suggestions for how future LPP research may better incorporate class as a central theoretical construct.

But an approach to late modernity such as we specified in the opening of Part III not only requires us to take on political economy more fully; it also invites us to adopt a self-reflective attitude towards our own assumptions as researchers.

III.B. Mobility, diversity, and new social media: Revisiting key constructs

As the cultural, economic and institutional conditions we inhabit change, it is part of our job as social scientists, we believe, to revisit from time to time the core concepts, notions, and analytical perspectives with which we address our objects of study. This is part of a larger paradigm shift in the study of language and society which, according to Blommaert and Rampton (2016), has entailed, over a period of several decades, an ongoing revision of fundamental ideas about languages, about language groups and speakers, and about communication: “rather than working with homogeneity, stability, and boundedness as their starting assumptions, mobility, mixing, political dynamics, and historical embedding are now central concerns” (p. 24). In line with this spirit, the following four chapters

revisit influential constructs that have continuously underpinned LPP research, either explicitly or implicitly. These are concerned with the notions of community, speaker, security, and culture.

The dominant meanings of *community* and *community language* in the language disciplines, Li Wei suggests, are today challenged by the intensification of mobility. In his chapter, he argues that such intensification makes it more difficult than ever to ignore that communities: 1) have fuzzy and multiple boundaries, 2) are constantly intersecting and connected, and 3) constitute locations and generators of grassroots responsibilities and power. Engaging in dialogue with contemporary work on “superdiversity” (Vertovec, 2007), Li Wei provides us with a historical account of how meanings of community have shifted over time, from frames that emphasize physical closeness to those that foreground *unity of will*.

He then extends this account to the notion of *diaspora*, closely related to the phenomenon of migration, as well as to that of *multilingualism* via exploration of the ways in which the *speech community* construct has changed as a result of changing patterns of mobility and subsequent disciplinary refinements in socio- and anthropological linguistics. He also reflects on the LPP implications of a general shift of sociological attention to a practice-based notion of community, which in his view points to the importance of grassroots actions and the everyday, beyond institutionalized contexts.

Bernadette O’Rourke, Josep Soler and Jeroen Darquennes drive our attention to the very notion of *speaker*. Relying on the discursive and ethnographic turns undertaken in contemporary LPP, they advocate for situated description of linguistic practices and

trajectories of speakers outside the traditional native-speakers communities. In their account, the *new speaker* is seen as contrasting with longstanding terms such as *L2* and *non-native* in that it moves away from the notion of deficit or deficiency “and instead encapsulates the possibilities available to the speaker to expand his/her linguistic repertoire through active use of the target language”. In other words, the approach described by O’Rourke, Soler and Darquennes in their chapter compels us to foreground the lived experiences and challenges that individuals face as they become (and are recognized as) speakers of another language.

Though such an approach is not new in LPP studies, O’Rourke, Soler and Darquennes show that it may offer new insights if expanded to different research contexts, beyond those of language revitalization in European minority language settings. With this in mind, the authors take as a starting point examples of attempts to revitalise autochthonous minority languages, from which they turn to urban settings characterised by different forms of migration and transnational, flexible workplaces. In doing so, O’Rourke, Soler and Darquennes argue for a reconsideration of more traditional approaches to LPP in minority language settings in which new speakers have tended to be overshadowed by native speaker profiles, and in which “the in-between linguistic spaces and frequently more hybridized forms of language inherent in language contact situations have often been ignored”.

Moving onto the construct of security, Constadina Charalambous, Panayiota Charalambous, Kamran Khan and Ben Rampton push LPP research to look into the ways in which *security* is being reconfigured within the contemporary world, with developments in digital technology, large-scale population movements, and the

privatization of public services. They welcome a shift in LPP away from a mainstream tradition that has contributed to the idealization of the sovereign nation-state through understanding security as a policy response to threats and dangers, which therefore emphasizes issues of territorial integrity and national sovereignty. They also acknowledge that this mainstream literature has also devoted only superficial attention to communication.

In contrast, Charalambous, Charalambous, Khan and Rampton align with relatively recent work in critical security studies that draws more centrally from ethnography and practice theory and that attends to context and ideology. Their chapter advocates Huysmans' conceptualization of security as "a practice of making 'enemy' and 'fear' the integrative, energetic principle of politics displacing the democratic principles of freedom and justice" (2014, p. 3); it does so through consideration of two case studies of how "enemy" and "fear" have been active principles in language policy development, in Britain and Cyprus. These two cases shed light on the processes of securitization, insecurity, and desecuritization, which in their view "provide only a hint of the different ways in which 'security' and language policy are likely to be related in the period ahead".

The last construct to be revisited in this section is that of *culture*, particularly in relation to the impact of new media on contemporary social life. In her chapter, Aoife Lenihan relies on Jenkin's (2006) notion of *convergence culture*, which refers to "the technological, industrial and societal changes in contemporary culture where old and new media collide, where grassroots and corporate media intersect, where the power of the media producer and the power of the media consumer interact in unpredictable ways"

(pp. 1-2). Lenihan highlights that this approach signifies a cultural shift from passive media spectatorship to a participatory culture. Her innovative approach, which emerges out of a three-year study using virtual ethnographic methods, reveals that commercial entities such as Facebook, online communities of translators, and Translation app users become both users and producers of LPP, all functioning as language policy actors capable of exerting influence over language policy and language use online.

This “convergence” of media producers and users means that contradictory processes take place in online LPP: on the one hand, the result is the commercialization of minority languages such as Irish, with the major goal being profit for the Facebook commercial entity; on the other, new forms of individual involvement in policymaking are possible, as individuals not only become translators, but they also may have direct impact on policy, for example, in terminology development and language standardization. Moreover, this individual involvement in LPP can lead to new forms of ownership of policy, as online communities take on policymaking processes (such as translation) formerly dominated by official agencies and institutions.

As the chapters in Part III have shown, political economy and self-reflectiveness constitute two fundamental pillars in the research agenda of LPP. As such, they show us a possible path for a future critique in the field that does not take for granted the ideas about language, culture, power and identity that emanated from the socioeconomic and political form of organization of the modern nation-state. This path may demand rethinking long-standing forms of critical engagement, as chapters in the last section of Part III show.

III.C: Language, ideology and critique: Rethinking forms of engagement

A form of critique that pays attention to changing forms of state-involvement as well as to alternative constructs and research perspectives such as those discussed above requires engaging critically with certain tendencies in the field. These tendencies include the privileging of institutional domains of language planning and language engineering, and the inclusion of problematic suggestions for change in critical LPP researchers' work.

Adam Jaworski addresses the former issue. While acknowledging the current emphasis in the studies of language policy on political economy, diversity, social justice, and social inclusion, he claims that “turning to text-based art may offer ... a useful lens through which to explore how hegemonic, unorthodox, non-normative, challenging, inclusive, or ‘merely’ playful language ideologies may exist side by side.”

In particular, Jaworski analyzes how the famous Chinese text-based artist, Xu Bing, reinscribes, subverts, inverts and transcends modernist, national language ideologies through his own artwork. That is to say, Jaworki's chapter places artists as both theorists of language policy and planning and as the agents implementing the very ideologies that underpin their works. The work of Xu Bing demonstrates, in Jaworski's words:

Despite operating within the powerful institutional frameworks of galleries and museums, individual text-based artists ... create their own private or personal domains of language planning and language engineering. In so

doing they respond to and comment on language planning at the level of the nation state, or they transcend the nationalist agenda by developing an internationalist dream or a democratizing stance of planning a universal language for all humanity.

The issues raised by the suggestions for change made by critical researchers are tackled by Jürgen Jaspers in the last chapter of Part III. He argues that such suggestions often reproduce some of the main assumptions behind the policies that the researchers critique. Jaspers specifically examines the field of education, where teachers and other school actors tend to be positioned as those responsible for social change and increased equity. Calls for change based on this premise, Jaspers reminds us, share representations of the policy implementation process with the state authorities that they criticize; in some cases, suggestions for change complicate the emancipatory project of the school by reducing language use at school to group interests. The problem, in Jaspers' words, is "the view that education motors social change, and that to the degree that it does not, urgent (linguistic) intervention is required. In consequently insisting on teachers' responsibility, it looks as if several policy critiques share with governments a penchant for disciplining behaviour."

Jaspers warns that his critique "necessitates a reconsideration of the received opposition between sociolinguistics (broadly understood) and language education policy, and requires calls for change to take a different tack." Jaspers exemplifies this line of argument in relation to research on linguistic diversity. Influenced by neo-Marxist analyses of social class reproduction, which have helped us see the school as a space of

social struggle, this research tradition pushes for more inclusive policies that valorize pupils' primary languages and pluralize the language of instruction, in line with developments in sociolinguistics (e.g., translanguaging) and educational research (e.g., critical pedagogy). Based on these concerns, Jasper highlights a need for more research that explores which opportunities and limitations emerge when employing certain types of linguistic practices in class, without reducing the struggle for social equality to an educational issue.

Part IV: Summary and Future Directions

Parts I, II and III offer an opportunity to reflect on common issues emerging from the different strands of discussion described above. The last chapter of this *Handbook* reflects on these issues by identifying possible directions for future research. In so doing, it foregrounds those developments that, in our view, put LPP researchers in a suitable position to better grasp the transformations of the current historic juncture. The chapter also identifies unresolved problems and contradictions that we believe need further consideration.

With this roadmap as a guide, the journey may begin.

Acknowledgement

For reading earlier drafts of this chapter, we are grateful to Alfonso Del Percio, Monica Heller, Tom Ricento, and Sandra Silberstein.

References

- Anderson, B. (1983). *Imagined communities*. London & New York: Verso.
- Appadurai, A. (1990). Disjuncture and difference in the global cultural economy. *Theory, Culture and Society* 7(2), 295-310.
- Archer, M. S. (2012). *The reflexive imperative in late modernity*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Bauman, Z. (1998). *Globalization: The human consequences*. New York: Columbia University Press.
- Blommaert, J. (1996). Language planning as a discourse on language and society: The linguistic ideology of a scholarly tradition. *Language Problems & Language Planning* 20, 199–222.
- Blommaert, J. (2013). *Ethnography, superdiversity and linguistic landscapes: Chronicles of complexity*. Bristol: Multilingual Matters.
- Blommaert, J & Rampton, B. (2016). Language and superdiversity. In K.A. Arnaut, J. Blommaert, B. Rampton & M. Spotti (Eds.), *Language and superdiversity* (pp. 21-48). New York & London: Routledge.
- Bourdieu, P. (1993). *Language and symbolic power*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Bauman, R. & C. Briggs (2003). *Voices of modernity: Language ideologies and the politics of inequality*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

- Chilton, P. (2004). *Analyzing political discourse: Theory and practice*. London: Routledge.
- Cooper, R. L. (1989). *Language planning and social change*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Das Gupta, J. (1970). *Language conflict and national development: Group politics and national language policy in India*. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.
- Dei, J. S., Hall, B. D., & Rosenberg, D. G. (Eds.). (2000). *Indigenous knowledges in global contexts: Multiple readings of our world*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press.
- Desmond, M. (2007). *On the fireline: Living and dying with wildland firefighters*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Ferguson, C. A. (1965). Directions in sociolinguistics: Report on an interdisciplinary seminar. *SSRC Items* 19 (1), 1-4.
- Ferguson, C. A. (1968). Language development. In J. A. Fishman, C. A. Ferguson, & J. Das Gupta (Eds.), *Language problems of developing nations* (pp. 27-35). New York: John Wiley and Sons
- Fishman, J. A. (1964). Language maintenance and language shift as a field of inquiry. *Linguistics* 9, 32-70.
- Fishman, J. A. (Ed.) (1968a). *Readings in the sociology of language*. The Hague: Mouton.
- Fishman, J. A. (1968b). Sociolinguistics and the language problems of the developing countries. In J. A. Fishman, C. A. Ferguson, & J. Das Gupta (Eds.), *Language problems of developing nations* (pp. 3-16). New York: John Wiley and Sons.

- Fishman, J. A. (1971). The impact of nationalism on language planning. In J. Rubin & B. H. Jernudd (Eds.), *Can language be planning? Sociolinguistic theory and practice for developing nations* (pp. 3-20). Honolulu: University Press of Hawaii.
- Fishman, J. A. (Ed.) (1972a). *Advances in the sociology of language* (vol. I & II). The Hague: Mouton.
- Fishman, J. A. (1972b). *Language and nationalism: Two integrative essays*. Rowley, MA: Newbury House.
- Fishman, J. A. (1972c). Language maintenance and language shift as a field of inquiry: Revisited. In A. S. Dil (Ed.), *Language in sociocultural change: Essays by Joshua A. Fishman* (pp. 76-134). Stanford: Stanford University Press.
- Fishman, J. A. (Ed.) (1974). *Advances in language planning*. The Hague: Mouton.
- Fishman, J. A., Ferguson, C. A., & Das Gupta, J. (Eds.) (1968). *Language problems of developing nations*. New York: John Wiley and Sons.
- Foucault, M. (2009). *Security, territory, population: Lectures at the Collège de France 1977–1978*. New York: Picado.
- Fox, M. (1975). *Language and development: A retrospective survey of Ford Foundation language projects 1952-1974*. 2 volumes. New York: Ford Foundation.
- Garvin, P. L. (1973). Some comments on language planning. In J. Rubin & R. Shuy (Eds.), *Language planning: Current issues and research* (pp. 24-33). Washington: Georgetown University Press.
- Gao, X. (2015). The ideological framing of ‘dialect’: An analysis of mainland China’s state media coverage of ‘dialect crisis’ (2002-2012). *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development* 36(5), 468-482.

- Gao, X. (in press). Linguistic instrumentalism and national language policy in mainland China's state print media coverage of the 'Protecting Cantonese Movement'. *Chinese Journal of Communication*.
- Gegeo, D. W., & Watson-Gegeo, K. A. (2013). (Re)conceptualizing language in development: Towards demystifying an epistemological paradox. *The Journal of Pacific Studies* 33(2), 137-155.
- Giddens, A. (1991). *Modernity and self-identity: Self and society in the Late Modern Age*. Cambridge: Polity Press.
- Gumperz, J. (1986). Interactional sociolinguistics in the study of schooling. In J. Cook-Gumperz (Ed.), *The social construction of literacy* (pp. 45-68). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Gumperz, J. J. & Hymes, D. (1972). *Directions in sociolinguistics: The ethnography of communication*. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston.
- Harrison, W., Prator, C., & Tucker, G. R. (1975). *English-language policy survey of Jordan: A case study in language planning*. Washington: Center for Applied Linguistics.
- Harvey, D. (2005). *A Brief history of neoliberalism*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Haugen, E. (1966). Linguistics and language planning. In W. Bright (Ed.), *Sociolinguistics: Proceedings of the UCLA Sociolinguistics Conference, 1964* (pp. 50-71). *Janua Linguarum, Series Maior*, 20. The Hague: Mouton.
- Heller, M. (2003). Globalization, the new economy and the commodification of language and identity. *Journal of Sociolinguistics* 7(4), 473-492.
- Hobsbawm, E. (1990). *Nations and Nationalism since 1760*. Cambridge: Cambridge

- University Press.
- Huysmans, J. (2014). *Security unbound: Enacting democratic limits*. New York: Routledge.
- Jefferies, J. (2009). Do undocumented students play by the rules? Meritocracy in the media. *Critical Inquiry in Language Studies* 6, 15-38.
- Jenkins, H. (2006). *Convergence culture: Where old and new media collide*. New York: New York University Press.
- Jernudd, B. H. & Das Gupta, J. (1971). Towards a theory of language planning. In J. Rubin & B. H. Jernudd (Eds.), *Can language be planned? Sociolinguistic theory and practice for developing nations* (pp. 195-215). Honolulu: University Press of Hawaii.
- Jernudd, B. H. & Nekvapil, J. (2012). History of the field: A sketch. In B. Spolsky (Ed.), *The Cambridge handbook of language policy* (pp. 16-36). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Lewis, E. G. (1972). Migration and language in the USSR. In J. A. Fishman (Ed.), *Advances in the sociology of language, vol. II* (pp. 310-341). The Hague: Mouton.
- Lorwin, V. R. (1972). Linguistic pluralism and political tension in modern Belgium. In J. A. Fishman (Ed.), *Advances in the sociology of language, vol. II* (pp. 396-412). The Hague: Mouton.
- Martin-Jones, M. & Heller, M. (1996). Language and social reproduction in multilingual settings. *Linguistics and Education* 8(1), 3-16.

- Mazrui, A. A. (1968). Some sociopolitical functions of English literature in Africa. In J. A. Fishman, C. A. Ferguson, & J. Das Gupta (Eds.), *Language problems of developing nations* (pp. 183-197). New York: John Wiley.
- Neustupný, J. V. (1970). Basic types of treatment of language problems. *Linguistic Communications* 1, 77-98.
- Pennycook, A. (2006). Postmodernism in language policy. In T. Ricento (Ed.), *An introduction to language policy: Theory and method* (pp. 60-76). Malden, MA: Blackwell.
- Pérez-Milans, M. (2011). Being a Chinese newcomer in Madrid compulsory education: Ideological constructions in language education practice. *Journal of Pragmatics* 43(4), 1005-1022.
- Pérez-Milans, M. (2013). *Urban schools and English language education in late modern China: A critical sociolinguistic ethnography*. New York & London: Routledge.
- Pérez-Milans, M. (2015). Language education policy in late modernity: (Socio) linguistic ethnographies in the European Union. *Language Policy* 14(2), 99–109.
- Pérez-Milans, M. & Soto, C. (2014). Everyday practices, everyday pedagogies: A dialogue on critical transformations in a multilingual Hong Kong school. In J. Byrd Clark & F. Dervin (Eds.), *Reflexivity in language and intercultural education: Rethinking multilingualism and interculturality* (pp. 213-233). New York & London: Routledge.
- Pérez-Milans, M. & Soto, C. (2016). Reflexive language and ethnic minority activism in Hong Kong: A trajectory-based analysis. *AILA Review* 29(1), 48-82.

- Reisigl, M., & Wodak, R. (2015). The discourse-historical approach. In R. Wodak, & M. Meyer (Eds.) *Methods of Critical Discourse Studies* (pp. 23-61). London: Sage.
- Ricento, T. (2000). Historical and theoretical perspectives in language policy and planning. *Journal of Sociolinguistics* 4, 194-213.
- Ricento, T. (2016). *Language policy and planning: Critical concepts in linguistics* (4 volumes). London: Routledge.
- Rostow, W.W. (1960). *The stages of economic growth: A non-communist manifesto*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Rubin, J. (1971). Evaluation and language planning. In J. Rubin & B. H. Jernudd (Eds.), *Can language be planning? Sociolinguistic theory and practice for developing nations* (pp. 217-252). Honolulu: University Press of Hawaii.
- Rubin, J. & Jernudd, B. H. (1971). Language planning as an element in modernization. In J. Rubin & B. H. Jernudd (Eds.), *Can language be planning? Sociolinguistic theory and practice for developing nations* (pp. xiii-xxiv). Honolulu: University Press of Hawaii.
- Rubin, J., Jernudd, B. H., Das Gupta, J., Fishman, J. A., & Ferguson, C. A. (Eds.) (1977). *Language planning processes*. The Hague: Mouton.
- Scheufele, D. A. & Iyengar, S. (2011). The state of framing research: A call for new directions. Retrieved from <http://pcl.stanford.edu/research/2011/scheufele-framing.pdf>.
- Scollon, R. (2008). *Analyzing public discourse: Discourse analysis in the making of public policy*. London: Routledge.

- Shohamy, E. (2006). *Language policy: Hidden agendas and new approaches*. London: Routledge.
- Sibayan, B. (1971). Language planning processes and the language-policy survey in the Philippines. In J. Rubin & B. H. Jernudd (Eds.), *Can language be planned? Sociolinguistic theory and practice for developing nations* (pp. 123-140). Honolulu: University Press of Hawaii.
- Spolsky, B. (2004). *Language policy*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Spolsky, B. (Ed.) (2012). *The Cambridge handbook of language policy*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Tauli, V. (1968). *Introduction to a theory of language planning*. Acta Universitatis Upsaliensis, Studia Philologiae Scandinavicae Upsaliensia 6. Uppsala: University of Uppsala.
- Tollefson, J. W. (1991). *Planning language, planning inequality: Language policy in the community*. London: Longman.
- Tollefson, J. W. (1993). Language policy and power: Yugoslavia, the Philippines, and the U.S. in Southeast Asia. *International Journal of the Sociology of Language* 103, 73-95.
- Tollefson, J. W. (2002). The language debates: Preparing for the war in Yugoslavia – 1980-1991. *International Journal of the Sociology of Language* 154, 65-82.
- Tollefson, J. W. (2015). Language policy-making in multilingual education: Mass media and the framing of medium of instruction. *Current Issues in Language Planning* 16(1-2), 132-148.

Tollefson, J. W. & Tsui, A. B. M. (2007). Issues in language policy, culture and identity.

In A. B. M. Tsui and J. W. Tollefson (Eds.) *Language Policy, Culture, and*

Identity in Asian Contexts (pp. 259-270). New York: Routledge.

Vertovec, S. (2007). Super-diversity and its implications. *Ethnic and Racial Studies*

30(6), 1024–1054.

Zima, P. (1968). Hausa in West Africa: Remarks on contemporary role and functions. In

J. A. Fishman, C. A. Ferguson, & J. Das Gupta (Eds.), *Language problems of*

developing nations (pp. 365-377). New York: John Wiley.