Researching Historical Perspectives on Language, Education, and Ideology

Thomas Ricento

Abstract

In this article, I focus on aspects of ideology which relate to education and the social processes, relations, and especially social hierarchies which are reflected in and produced through ideologies of language. As Woolard and Schieffelin (*Annual Review of Anthropology 23*, 55–56, 1994) note, ideologies of language "...envision and enact links of language to group and personal identity, to aesthetics, to morality, and to epistemology." Some of the key ideologies that are considered in this article are (1) the verbal deprivation construct, (2) the ideology of individualism, (3) the ideology of English monolingualism, (4) the standard language ideology, and (5) the ideology of the native speaker. Conceptual and empirical challenges to these widely accepted social constructs by critical scholars in applied linguistics and related disciplines are presented; these scholars have used a variety of theoretical and methodological approaches to debunk ideologies in which individuals and attributes of their language and "culture" are blamed for deficiencies in school performance, while systemic institutional factors that marginalize "nonmainstream" individuals, including the language/language variet(ies) they use, are downplayed or ignored. Ethnic, racial, and gender bias may correlate with the marginalization of language minorities in various contexts, whether or not an individual from a marginalized group speaks a "standard" version of the dominant/national language. Innovation in research methods over the past decade has provided more fine-grained tools to investigate relations between language policies and the social actions of individuals; examples of such methods include nexus analysis and scale analysis.

T. Ricento (✉)
Werklund School of Education, University of Calgary, Calgary, AB, Canada
e-mail: tricento@ucalgary.ca

K.A. King et al. (eds.), *Research Methods in Language and Education*, Encyclopedia of Language and Education, DOI 10.1007/978-3-319-02249-9_5

Keywords

Critical discourse analysis • English monolingualism ideology • Ideologies of language • Native speaker ideology • Standard language ideology • Verbal deprivation theory

Contents

Introduction

This article considers research on language ideologies and the relevance of this work for educational contexts. To be sure, the amount of theorizing and empirical investigation on the topic of language ideologies published just over the past several decades is substantial; therefore, I will focus only on particular aspects of this topic which relate to education and the social processes, relations, and especially social hierarchies which are reflected in and produced through ideologies of language. In doing so, I will have to leave out much of the theoretical work from the literatures of anthropology, critical theory, philosophy, political science, sociolinguistics, cultural studies, among other areas that could be cited.

As Woolard and Schieffelin (1994, pp. 55–56) point out, ideologies of language "are not only about language. Rather, such ideologies envision and enact links of language to group and personal identity, to aesthetics, to morality, and to epistemology." Language and languages are not simply "conveyor belts" for transmitting information between human interactants; rather, they are complex systems which perform a number of social functions, including signaling who we are (i.e., information about where we were born or raised, how much education we have had, our social skills, the group(s) we wish to be identified with, and so on). One of the primary socializing environments in most societies is formal schooling.

Schools are places where young children are taught the "correct," usually dominant "standard," language, where they may come into contact with students from different cultural and/or linguistic backgrounds, and in multicultural and multilingual settings, they are likely to begin to develop identities which include an awareness of the relative social status of the language(s) they use (or do not use). If the child's home language variety is the same as that spoken and written at school, the transition from home to school with regard to linguistic identity is not usually a problem; however, when the home variety is substantially different from the school

variety, and the home variety is stigmatized as "nonstandard" or deficient, the mismatch can lead to problems. The assumption that the "standard" variety of the dominant (often national or regional) language is "better" than, more "logical" than, and more "pure" than the "nonstandard" variety is an example of one of the most ubiquitous and powerful language ideologies around the world.

Early Developments

Questions surrounding language are almost never exclusively about language, per se. They are very often concerned with identities, both ascribed and achieved, in particular sociohistorical contexts. Scholars have identified the rise of the modern nation-state beginning in the eighteenth century in Europe as the primary factor in the association of a particular language with a particular ethnic group living within a geographically contiguous, politically defined area. Johann Gottlieb Fichte, the German metaphysician who championed the cultural and linguistic uniqueness of the German *Volk*, famously said: "Wherever a separate language is found, there is also a separate nation which has the right to manage its affairs. . . and to rule itself" (cited in Inglehart and Woodward 1992, p. 410). The roots of the language/nation nexus, of course, extend far back into antiquity; in the third century BC, Ashoka, India's Buddhist Emperor, pursued political unification through linguistic toleration, whereas Qin Shi Huangdi, the first emperor of a united China, suppressed regional scripts and selected a single standardized writing variety and mandated its use (cited in Lo Bianco 2004, p. 745). Dante Alighieri (1265–1321) chose to write his greatest work, *La Divina Commedia*, in his native Tuscan variety of Italian rather than in the customary Latin and in so doing brought to the fore the *questione della lingua* ("language question"), a debate that runs through the entire course of modern Italian history. The "language question" continues to intrude in all aspects of social life in the contemporary world. Questions and conflicts about which language or language variety is valued (or not valued), taught (or not taught) in school, and used (or not used) for different functions in different domains often are implicated in deadly conflicts between groups with historical reasons for not wanting to share territory, power, and/or resources.

Some of the most important early research by sociolinguists with implications for language ideology in education was done by William Labov. In his now classic essay "The Logic of Nonstandard English" (1972), Labov debunked the verbal deprivation theory promoted by psychologists (e.g., Bereiter and Engelmann 1966) which claimed, among other things, that African American children in the USA come to school without sufficient verbal ability to succeed. Bereiter et al. (1966, pp. 112–113), based on a study of 4-year-old black children from Urbana, Illinois, claim that their communication was by gestures, "single words," and "a series of badly connected words or phrases." He describes their speech as "the language of culturally deprived children . . . [that] is not merely an underdeveloped version of standard English, but is a basically nonlogical mode of expressive behavior." Labov argued that the idea of verbal deprivation has no basis in social reality and that black children in the urban ghettos receive a lot of verbal

stimulation and participate in a highly verbal culture. He claimed that the psychologists' lack of understanding of linguistics along with poor experimental design and methodology resulted in a fundamental misreading and misinterpretation of the verbal abilities of black children.

Another early landmark study was conducted by Ray Rist (1970). In a 2.5-year longitudinal study of a single group of African American kindergarten children, Rist found that the teacher developed expectations of the academic potential and abilities of each student based on her subjective evaluation of that student's oral language. Importantly, students judged by the teacher to be "fast learners" (placed at the first of three tables) were quite verbal and displayed a greater use of Standard American English within the classroom compared to children at the other tables, who usually responded to the teacher in black dialect (p. 420). The children more adept at "school language" were viewed by the teacher as more capable and more likely to succeed in school and life, despite the fact that IQ test scores indicated no statistically significant differences among the children at the three tables. Students labeled as "slow learners" were unable to move up in their reading groups even if their performance in reading warranted such a change in classification. All the children in the class and the teacher were African American. Despite this shared cultural background, differences in socioeconomic class appeared to correlate with students' placement in reading groups. Rist concludes that "the child's journey through the early grades of school at one reading level and in one social grouping appeared to be pre-ordained from the eighth day of kindergarten" (p. 435).

To summarize, research in the 1960s by some psychologists (e.g., Bereiter and Engelmann 1966; Jensen 1969) and sociologists (e.g., Basil Bernstein 1966) placed the blame for school failure on minority children who were characterized as having a variety of cognitive deficits, especially with regard to their language abilities. Other researchers from linguistics and anthropology located the problem not in the children but in the relations between them and the school system. This position found that, for example, inner-city children differ from the standard culture of the classroom and that these differences (in language, family style, and ways of living) are not always understood by teachers and psychologists. This research leads scholars in the social sciences and education to examine the nature of ideologies about language and how these ideologies impacted the school experiences of different groups defined in terms of socioeconomic status, ethnicity, race, and/or language or language variety spoken. In the decades following the groundbreaking research described earlier, researchers used a variety of research methods (especially ethnographic and discourse analytic techniques) to better understand the impact of ideologies on educational practices and policies from the classroom to the national policy-making level.

Major Contributions

As suggested by the studies described earlier, a major contribution in applied linguistics and educational research over the last 50 years or so has been the critical examination of the causes of social inequality and how language (often implicitly)

plays a role in maintaining such inequalities. Scholars in the field of language policy (e.g., Pennycook 1994; Phillipson 1992; Tollefson 1991) have relied on theories developed by thinkers such as Bourdieu (1991), Foucault (1972), Gramsci (1988), and Habermas (1975) among many others to develop models to explain how language is imbricated in all aspects of social life and how it plays a central role in the establishment and maintenance of social control by powerful elites. However, despite the critical turn in research in language policy, educational policies and practices in most parts of the world continue to be informed by ideologies about language, which can be detrimental to the achievement of greater educational access for many language minority groups.

Critical scholars, in analyzing the causes for the persistence of educational programs and practices which (in their view) are relatively ineffective in closing the educational and economic gaps between dominant (majority language) groups and marginalized (minority language) groups in many settings around the world, have identified ideologies which often inform such programs and practices. Methods of analysis used include discourse analysis of both spoken and written language in the communication and reproduction of racism (e.g., van Dijk 1984; Wodak and Reisigl 2003), in gender bias (e.g., Corson 1993; Matsui 1995; McGregor 1998), and in the marginalization of language minorities in various contexts (e.g., Tollefson 1991; Ricento 2005b). An example of a study which employs a historical analysis in the US context is Wiley and Lukes (1996), who describe three ideologies which, together, inform social and educational policies which tend to marginalize speakers of minority languages in US classrooms. The first is the "ideology of individualism." This ideology is evident in research in second language acquisition, which assumes that the variables which are involved in second language acquisition (or the acquisition of a standard variety of a language) are located entirely within the individual. An important effect of this view is that motivation – and lack thereof – is viewed by practitioners and policy makers as something an individual has or does not have. A person's class, racial, or linguistic characteristics (achieved or ascribed) are seen as largely irrelevant to his or her motivation or prospects for social mobility. Scholars in second language acquisition (e.g., Norton 2000; Ricento 2015) have conducted ethnographic research among immigrant populations and found that learners' identities influence motivation and, ultimately, acquisition of a second language. Rather than viewed as a constant or fixed trait, researchers have shown that identity (and motivation) is a "contingent process involving dialectic relations between learners and the various worlds and experiences they inhabit and which act on them" (Ricento 2005a, p. 895).

The second ideology described by Wiley and Lukes is the "ideology of English monolingualism" (in the US context, but it applies to other languages in other polities as well). This ideology reflects the view that language diversity is essentially something imported as a result of immigration. The "normal" situation in the USA, according to this ideology, is English monolingualism. Thus, a language such as Spanish, which existed within what is now the continental USA prior to and after the declaration of independence from England, is characterized as a "foreign" language rather than an "American" language, which it demonstrably is. This ideology

informs the 25-year-old movement to ban bilingual education programs (with many "successes" along the way) and federal and state initiatives to declare English as the (only) official language of a state or the USA. Research by Veltman (1983) using US census data from 1940, 1960, and 1970 found a dramatic shift from minority languages to English as evidence that assimilation to virtual English monolingualism was beginning in the second generation and nearly completed by the third generation among immigrant populations in the USA. More recently, Rumbaut et al. (2006, p. 458), relying on data from two published studies and a survey they conducted themselves in Southern California during 2001–2004, conclude that "under current conditions. . .the ability to speak Spanish very well can be expected to disappear sometime between the second and third generation for all Latin American groups in Southern California." They also found that "the average Asian language can be expected to die out at or near the second generation" (ibid). A number of critical scholars (e.g., Ricento 2005a; Wiley 1998), using historical and discourse analytic research methods, have shown that the ideology of English monolingualism in the USA was largely achieved during the Americanization movement in the period prior to and immediately following the US entry in World War I.

The third ideology is the "standard language ideology," which elevates a particular variety of a named language spoken by the dominant social group to a (H)igh status while diminishing other varieties to a (L)ow status (Ferguson 1972). This variety is claimed (by its speakers) to be more "logical," "efficient," and "correct" than most other varieties. The "standard" variety tends to gain legitimacy through the publication of dictionaries, style sheets, and grammar books which provide usage guides and "correct" spelling and pronunciation (however, reflecting the fact that no language can be completely standardized, variations for both spelling and pronunciation are included, thousands of new words are not represented, the meaning of well-attested words often shifts, and changes in spelling, grammar, and pronunciation render dictionaries less authoritative than language purists would care to admit). Those who speak other varieties, often referred to as "bad [English/Spanish/French, etc.]" or "vulgar," "uncivilized," "illogical," and so on, often ascribed other defects in intelligence, behavior, and morality. Speakers of these "nonstandard" varieties may suffer discrimination and obstacles in education and employment opportunities simply because they do not command the prestige (standard) variety. The "cure" for speakers of "nonstandard" varieties, according to mainstream educators, is to replace the "bad" language variety with the "good" ("standard") variety. While some individuals clearly do have opportunities and the desire to modify their language, those who do not are then blamed for their own failure to "assimilate" or become acculturated to the mainstream language variety. As Lippi-Green (2012) points out, communication is (at least) a two-way process, requiring goodwill on the part of both parties in a two-way communication. If a teacher (as seen in the research by Rist earlier), for example, prejudges a person's intelligence and character based on the way they speak, the blame for "miscommunication" typically resides with the speaker society deems to be deficient. Thus, language minorities are often blamed for their educational failures because of the "shortcoming" of speaking a variety different from those of higher social and economic class (Dudley-Marling and Lucas

2009; Johnson 2014). The claims made by Lippi-Green and many other scholars in recent years are based on findings from sociolinguistic research, including attitudinal measures such as Likert, matched guise, and the semantic differential techniques, and ethnographic studies in multilingual communities (see Baker 2006, for discussion of methods used in assessing attitudes toward languages and those who speak them).

Another important contribution to research in language and ideology has come from scholars working in poststructuralist/postmodern paradigms (see Pennycook 2006 for a discussion of these two terms). While scholars from critical paradigms have tended to invoke categories such as race, class, and ethnicity as crucial in understanding the nature and effects of language policies and practices in educational contexts, scholars working in postmodern paradigms have expressed great skepticism about such categories. Rather, as Pennycook (2006, p. 63) notes, such "taken-for-granted categories . . . are seen as contingent, shifting, and produced in the particular, rather than having some prior ontological status." This approach does not discount the fact that racialized and gendered categories are ascribed by others and even taken up by group members themselves and that such ascribed characteristics are implicitly or explicitly invoked in policies involving language status, use, or acquisition in educational and other contexts. Rather, postmodern research is concerned (among other things) primarily with the specific ways in which power is exercised and reflected in the discourses of powerful interests. Scholars working within a postmodern framework tend to be skeptical of research which posits particular pedagogical approaches (such as bilingual/mother tongue education) as inherently superior to other approaches, since such approaches can as easily be employed by some groups to maintain social control as can a policy of monolingual instruction (see, e.g., Pennycook 2000). Postmodern scholars in applied linguistics tend to question the validity and utility of sweeping grand narratives (such as those associated with linguistic imperialism (Phillipson 1992) because such narratives often tend to perpetuate the same ideologies and modernist discourse (e.g., nation-state, standard language, mother tongues, discrete ethnic/racial/gender categories, and so on) which have enabled the dominance and domination of European "imperial" countries in the first place (see Ricento 2012, for a critique of Phillipson). For researchers, the most important implication of this shift in theory is that structural analyses which, for example, tended to localize the causes of social inequality within institutions, social structures, or ideologies are viewed as being too deterministic in explaining educational failure among language minority populations. Instead, researchers working within postmodern approaches have adopted methodologies, such as critical discourse analysis (van Dijk 1993), which investigate the ways in which social structures are mediated through discourse and how individuals (re) create and respond to these discourses in their lived (performed) experiences as members of diverse communities with complex identities. Another approach to understanding the operation of discourse(s) in society is scale analysis (Blommaert 2007; Hult 2010) that ". . .focuses on how discursive processes operate within and across scales of space and time. . .to understand[ing] relationships between language policies and the social actions of individuals" (Hult 2010, p. 8). A methodology

(or more accurately, a meta-methodology) that attempts to integrate methodological tools from interactional sociolinguistics, ethnography of communication, and critical discourse analysis in order to account for relationships between individual social actions and circulating discourses across dimensions of social context is nexus analysis (Scollon and Scollon 2004). As Hult (2010) puts it: "The elements of nexus analysis provide a rough guide for following the trajectories of fractal discourses as they are taken across scales of TimeSpace in order to mediate the social actions of LPP processes" (p. 21).

Work in Progress

The critical turn in linguistics and applied linguistics has placed in doubt many of the foundational concepts that have guided research in the language sciences since at least the advent of modern linguistics in the mid-nineteenth century. Perhaps, the most fundamental critique has been the questioning of the nature of language itself as a fixed, discrete code, with the corollary (within the Chomskyan framework) of the native speaker who possesses, in his or her brain, the "rules" necessary to produce and interpret an infinite number of sentences. Critics of the "autonomy of syntax" paradigm, such as Talbot Taylor (1997), have argued that rather than describing language as it is used, the Chomskyan model is actually a prescriptive model which reflects the more or less standard version of the written language. Thus, "correct" grammar as determined by the intuitions of linguists reflects the rules of usage and "grammaticality" of the written standard language of the educated classes, i.e., the language of the linguists and the language of social power and mobility. In second language contexts, the "native speaker fallacy" promulgated by Chomsky and his adherents has dominated research in second language acquisition, learning, and teaching for the last 50 years. The ideology of the construct "native speaker," the possessor (owner) of the "correct" language, has elevated the standard varieties of written languages as the only legitimate language in schooling and public life, generally, whereas indigenized varieties of "world" languages (such as English and French) have often been viewed as inferior or inadequate in comparison. This ideology has helped to perpetuate the dominance of particular varieties of "standard" languages (such as British and North American English) while casting into doubt the abilities and qualifications of teachers in EFL settings where such varieties of the language are not spoken.

Critical scholars in applied linguistics and related areas have investigated the effects of the ideology of the "native speaker" along with several other ideologies on research and practice in various educational contexts. Researchers working in postmodern paradigms, while not disputing the benefits of such critical research, have nonetheless questioned basic assumptions that have informed such research. That is, received categories such as language, mother tongue, native speaker, and so on, these scholars argue, may help perpetuate some of the very problems and inequalities such research seeks to correct. For example, scholars within a postmodern paradigm have claimed that the very positing of language as a discrete,

rule-governed system by linguists and other social scientists is in itself an important result of the modernist project, which has privileged and helped promote the hegemony of Western languages, thought and tools of inquiry throughout the world. Terms such as "standard" and "nonstandard" already imply a normative hierarchical framework with regard to language(s) and language varieties. The term "native speaker" implies there are "nonnative" speakers, and both terms are rooted in the eighteenth-century European conceptions of the "nation," a group of culturally similar people who speak a common language (whether or not this is actually the case as it very often is not). In this sense, the "nonnative" speaker is almost by definition a "foreigner," an "outsider," or someone who can never really fully belong to the "nation."

Another term of art, "ethnicity," needs to be critically examined as well. Glynn Williams (1992) argues that in American sociology, ethnicity became a dichotomized construct of the normative/standard group – a unitary citizenry speaking a common language (us) – and nonnormative/nonstandard groups, including those speaking other languages (them). This naturalizing of a sociological construct (ethnicity) informs the widely held popular view promoted by Western scholarship that "reasonable" (modern) people should naturally become part of the culture of the state (or the transnational world) and speak its language, whereas irrational (traditional) people will tend to cling to their ethnic language and culture.

Interesting work has been done to counteract the hegemony of Western ways of "knowing" the world. The articles in Canagarajah (2002) demonstrate how researchers can use local knowledge in diverse settings to understand other cultures in ways that avoid the pitfalls of normative "etic" research. Makoni and Pennycook (2006) argue that Western-based and Western-imposed ideas about language – what it is and how it is represented – help perpetuate imperialist/colonized mentalities in South Africa and in other countries in the developing world. Borrowing from the work of Michel Foucault (1991), Makoni and Pennycook use the term governmentality defined as an "array of technologies of government," which can be analyzed in terms of the different strategies, techniques, and procedures by which programs of government are enacted (in Pennycook 2006, p. 64). Pennycook (2006, p. 65) explains that language governmentality is best understood in terms of "how decisions about languages and language forms across a diverse range of institutions (law, education, medicine, printing) and through a diverse range of instruments (books, regulations, exams, articles, corrections) regulate the language use, thought, and action of different people, groups, and organizations." A consequence of a governmentality approach is the questioning of grand narratives, which offer totalizing views of the role and effects of languages, such as English, in killing other languages and in homogenizing world culture, and the related claim that languages need protection through regimes of language rights. Such totalizing views, labeled "preservationist" and "romanticist," often assume an ineluctable connection between language and ethnicity (Pennycook 2006). Pennycook (2006, pp. 68–69) argues that while linguistic imperialism and language-rights discourses "operate from different epistemological and political assumptions . . . both operate from within theories of economy, the state, humanity, and politics that have their origins in the grand modernist project."

Blommaert (2006, p. 249) provides a case study on the limitations of the state to enforce a particular totalizing ideology on a multilingual nation. The attempt by the Tanzanian socialist government to effectuate socialist ideological hegemony through the spread of Swahili failed because of the existence and role of English and local indigenous languages in social life, as well as the persistence of "impure" varieties of Swahili. Blommaert argues that language policy should be seen as a *niched* activity in which, for example, the role of certain actors (such as the state) is limited to specific domains, activities, and relationships, not general ones.

The work of these and many other scholars does not seek to downplay the negative effects of linguistic imperialism nor diminish the possible benefits of a language-rights approach in contexts in which cultures and the languages that express them are threatened; rather, it seeks to problematize assumed causal relations between actors, groups, and language policies which may be empirically unsubstantiated and complicit with the very ideologies and constructs they wish to defeat (see, for example, Canagarajah 2013; Wee 2011).

Problems and Difficulties

While the facts and effects of Western imperialism are debated by scholars in applied linguistics and other social sciences, conflicts involving language in education continue unabated in many parts of the world. Romaine (2015) provides evidence that English medium of instruction programs in low-income countries where it is not the language of the home or community is detrimental to academic achievement and attainment of a high level of literacy in any language. However, there have also been some significant policy changes in at least some English-dominant countries, despite ongoing opposition from those who support "English-only" language policies in public education; in the USA, despite many years of restrictions on bilingual education programs in states that passed "English for the Children" initiatives mandating structured English immersion programs (California, Arizona, and Massachusetts), dual language bilingual education programs have grown in popularity. California became the first state to offer a "Seal of Biliteracy" on the high school diploma of graduates who could provide evidence of proficiency in another language, a distinction now available in other states including Texas, New York, Washington, and Illinois (Wright and Ricento in press). There has also been a growth in heritage language programs in K-12 schools and in higher education (Lee and Wright 2014). Yet, despite these positive changes, the number of students studying strategically important languages, such as Arabic, Urdu, Pashto, and Farsi, in the USA remains quite low. For example, based on the data on foreign language enrollments in US postsecondary institutions for fall 2002, compiled by the Modern Language Association, only 10,584 students were reported to be enrolled in Arabic language classes, representing 8% of the total foreign language enrollments. Research on attitudes toward the study of languages in addition to English in schools in the USA, generally, has tended to focus on the perceived economic and social benefits associated with learning and using particular foreign/second languages in

various contexts. Critical scholars, using techniques of discourse analysis and historical analysis (e.g., Ricento 2005b), have argued that immigrant languages in countries such as the USA have generally not survived into the third generation due to many factors, including social pressure for immigrants to assimilate fully to English and American cultural norms. In the European context, Francois Grin (2003) provides a model for evaluating competing language plans for protecting and promoting minority languages relying, in large part, on cost-effectiveness as a criterion for policy selection and design. This approach takes into account a range of variables relevant to language planning and decision-making and can be applied to diverse demographic and sociolinguistic contexts and settings.

Decisions about which language(s) should be used as the medium of instruction or offered as subjects in schools are often contentious and in a state of flux, reflecting changes in local, regional, national, and/or global political conditions. All these factors play a role in Malaysia, where Chinese-medium schools have come under pressure and where a public controversy erupted over a government decision to start teaching mathematics and science in English after 20 years in which they had been taught in Malay.

Another case involving controversies about medium of instruction is in the Republic of Slovakia in which the minority Hungarian population has resisted attempts by the Slovak majority to replace Hungarian mother tongue education with a Slovak-Hungarian bilingual program (Langman 2002). Each group is guided by particular ideologies about how the Slovak state should be constructed and the role of language in this process. This is an example in which the histories of various ethnolinguistic groups continue to influence their current aspirations and fears about their status, both within the Republic of Slovakia and also within an expanding European Union. Long memories and fears about absorption and assimilation (by the Hungarians) or about the emergence and realignment of a "Greater Hungary" in the region (by the Slovaks) have complicated prospects for a solution acceptable to all parties.

There have also been some notable successes in instantiating multilingual language ideologies, however. Egger and Lardschneider McLean (2001) report on a solution to the "standard" language problem with regard to Ladin in South Tyrol, Italy. Ladin is used primarily as a spoken language (although it is written), and attempts to standardize the many dialects of Ladin into an artificial, common variety have been resisted and perceived as a danger to the survival and vitality of the language. This suggests one way that the ideology of "standard language," which privileges one particular variety of a language while downgrading other varieties deemed to be "nonstandard," can be thwarted. Another example of how a minority language can be revitalized, despite lack of official governmental recognition, exists in the Basque region of France. The Basque language is not officially recognized or supported by the French state (although it does have co-official status with Spanish within the autonomous Basque community of Spain (Euskadi). In the 1960s, a small group of Basque parents in France organized a Basque language preschool. Out of this effort, an organization (called "Seaka," meaning seed) began coordinating a few community-based Basque-language primary schools, using a model developed in Spain during the Franco era (Paulston and Heidemann 2006, p. 304). By the end of

the 1970s, enrollment had grown from 8 to over 400 students. By 1990, over a dozen schools were operating, serving 830 students. As the commitment of the Basque community became more widespread, by the year 2000, nearly 2,000 students were enrolled in two-dozen Basque-medium schools from preschool to the high school level.

Another relatively successful attempt to revitalize a threatened minority language concerns the Saami language in Norway. Since the early 1990s, the status of Saami in public schooling has improved dramatically, and it is recognized as a legitimate medium across the curriculum (Todal 2003). The new attitude toward Saami has come about through a combination of regional political mobilization and the work of international indigenous rights organizations, which helped facilitate "a new attitude towards conflict solving on the part of the [Norwegian] authorities" (p. 191).

Future Directions

One of the most promising areas of research on language, education, and ideology is critical discourse analysis (CDA). The central goal of CDA is to provide "an account of intricate relationships between text, talk, social cognition, power, society and culture" (van Dijk 1993, p. 253). Research in CDA is especially concerned with uncovering the implicit arguments and meanings in texts which tend to marginalize nondominant groups, in part by selectively asserting certain attributes, e.g., physical characteristics, cultural beliefs, and behavioral characteristics, among others. Examples of research in CDA relevant to language policies in education are Santa Ana (2002) and Ricento (2005b). More recently, quantitative studies using large text corpora have been conducted allowing researchers to investigate the relative frequency and distribution of words and phrases in large numbers of texts (e.g., Biber et al. 2007; Biber and Conrad 2009). CDA research has depended, largely, on linguistic analyses of written and spoken texts, uncovering the often implicit meanings which may be different from the explicit claims made by politicians in speeches and legislation on topics such as immigration and affirmative action. CDA, however, has been criticized for this focus on textual analysis at the expense of a deeper and theoretically motivated analysis of society. Another criticism is that not enough attention has been paid to ideas and models developed in cognitive and evolutionary psychology, which could help explain why certain types of exclusionary behavior persist and why the language forms associated with such behavior are so powerful (Chilton 2005). Despite these (and other) criticisms, CDA offers great promise as a research approach in the analysis of the nature and effects of ideologies on language and education at all levels of society.

Cross-References

► Ethnography and Language Education
► Ethnography of Language Policy

- Investigating Language Education Policy
- Linguistic Ethnography

Related Articles in the Encyclopedia of Language and Education

Francis M. Hult: Discursive Approaches to Policy. In Volume: Discourse and Education

Rebecca Rogers: Critical Discourse Analysis in Education. In Volume: Discourse and Education

References

Baker, C. (2006). Psycho-sociological analysis in language policy. In T. Ricento (Ed.), *An introduction to language policy: Theory and method* (pp. 210–228). London: Blackwell.

Bereiter, C., & Engelmann, S. (1966). *Teaching disadvantaged children in the pre-school*. Englewood Cliffs: Prentice-Hall.

Bereiter, C., Engelman, S., Osborn, J., & Reidford, P. (1966). An academically oriented pre-school for culturally deprived children. In F. M. Hechinger (Ed.), *Pre-school education today*. New York: Doubleday.

Bernstein, B. (1966). Elaborated and restricted codes: Their social origins and some consequences. In J. Gumperz & D. Hymes (Eds.), *The ethnography of communication, American Anthropologist*, 66 (6, part 2).

Biber, D., & Conrad, S. (2009). *Register, genre, and style*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Biber, D., Connor, U., & Upton, T. A. (2007). *Discourse on the move: Using corpus analysis to describe discourse structure*. Amsterdam: Benjamins.

Blommaert, J. (2006). Language policy and national identity. In T. Ricento (Ed.), *An introduction to language policy: Theory and method* (pp. 238–254). London: Blackwell.

Blommaert, J. (2007). Sociolinguistic scales. *Intercultural Pragmatics, 4*(1), 1–19.

Bourdieu, P. (1991). *Language and symbolic power*. Oxford: Polity.

Canagarajah, S. (Ed.). (2002). Celebrating local knowledge on language and education. *Journal of Language, Identity, and Education, 1*(4), 243–333.

Canagarajah, S. (2013). *Translingual practice: Global Englishes and cosmopolitan relations*. New York: Routledge.

Chilton, P. (2005). Missing links in mainstream CDA: Modules, blends and the critical instinct. In R. Wodak & P. Chilton (Eds.), *A new agenda in (critical) discourse analysis*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Corson, D. (1993). *Language, minority education, and gender: Linking social justice and power*. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.

Dudley-Marling, C., & Lucas, K. (2009). Pathologizing the language and culture of poor children. *Language Arts, 86*(5), 362–370.

Egger, K., & Lardschneider McLean, M. (2001). Trilingual schools in the Ladin valleys of South Tyrol, Italy. In D. Christian & F. Genessee (Eds.), *Bilingual education* (pp. 57–67). Arlington: TESOL.

Ferguson, C. A. (1972). *Language structure and language use*. Stanford: Stanford University Press.

Foucault, M. (1972). *The archaeology of knowledge*. New York: Pantheon.

Foucault, M. (1991). Governmentality. In G. Burchell, C. Gordon, & P. Miller (Eds.), *The Foucault effect: Studies in governmentality* (pp. 87–104). Hemel Hempstead: Harvester Wheatsheaf.

Gramsci, A. (1988). In D. Forgacs (Ed.), *An Antonio Gramsci reader: Selected writings, 1916–1935*. New York: Schocken Books.

Grin, F. (2003). *Language policy evaluation and the European charter for regional or minority languages*. London: Palgrave Macmillan.
Habermas, J. (1975). *Legitimation crisis*. Boston: Beacon Press.
Hult, F. (2010). Analysis of language policy discourses across the scales of space and time. *International Journal of the Sociology of Language, 202*, 7–24.
Inglehart, R., & Woodward, M. (1992). Language conflicts and political community. In J. Crawford (Ed.), *Language loyalties: A source book on the official English controversy* (pp. 410–422). Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
Jensen, A. (1969). How much can we boost IQ and scholastic achievement?'. *Harvard Educational Review, 39*, 1–123.
Johnson, E. (2014). (Re)categorizing language-minority literacies in restrictive educational contexts. *International Multilingual Research Journal, 8*(3), 167–188.
Labov, W. (1972). *The logic of nonstandard English, in Language in the inner city: Studies in the Black English vernacular*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press (Chapter 5).
Langman, J. (2002). Mother-tongue education versus bilingual education: Shifting ideologies and policies in the Republic of Slovakia. *International Journal of the Sociology of Language, 154*, 47–64.
Lee, J. S., & Wright, W. E. (2014). The rediscovery of heritage and community language education in the United States. *Review of Research in Education, 38*, 137–165.
Lippi-Green, R. (2012). *English with an accent: Language, ideology, and discrimination in the United States* (2nd ed.). London: Routledge.
Lo Bianco, J. (2004). Language planning as applied linguistics. In A. Davies & C. Elder (Eds.), *The handbook of applied linguistics* (pp. 738–762). London: Blackwell.
Makoni, S., & Pennycook, A. (Eds.). (2006). *Disinventing and reconstituting languages*. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.
Matsui, M. (1995). Gender role perceptions of Japanese and Chinese female students in American universities. *Comparative Education Review, 39*, 356–378.
McGregor, L. (Ed.). (1998). Gender issues in language teaching [special issue]. *The Language Teacher*, *22*.
Norton, B. (2000). *Identity and language learning: Gender, ethnicity and educational change*. London: Longman.
Paulston, C. B., & Heidemann, K. (2006). Language policies and the education of linguistic minorities. In T. Ricento (Ed.), *An introduction to language policy: Theory and method* (pp. 292–310). London: Blackwell.
Pennycook, A. (1994). *The cultural politics of English as an international language*. London: Longman.
Pennycook, A. (2000). Language, ideology and hindsight: Lessons from colonial language policies. In T. Ricento (Ed.), *Ideology, politics and language policies: Focus on English* (pp. 49–65). Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
Pennycook, A. (2006). Postmodernism in language policy. In T. Ricento (Ed.), *An introduction to language policy: Theory and method* (pp. 60–76). London: Blackwell.
Phillipson, R. (1992). *Linguistic imperialism*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
Ricento, T. (2005a). Considerations of identity in L2 learning. In E. Hinkel (Ed.), *Handbook of research in second language learning and teaching*. Mahwah: Lawrence Erlbaum (pp. 895–911)
Ricento, T. (2005b). Problems with the 'language-as-resource' discourse in the promotion of heritage languages in the U.S.A. *Journal of Sociolinguistics, 9*, 348–368.
Ricento, T. (2012). Political economy and English as a 'global' language. *Critical Multilingualism Studies, 1*, 30–52.
Ricento, T. (2015). Refugees in Canada: On the loss of social capital. In B. Spolsky, O. Inbar-Lourie, & M. Tannenbaum (Eds.), *Challenges for language education and policy: Making space for people* (pp. 135–147). New York: Routledge.

Rist, R. (1970). Student social class and teacher expectations: The self-fulfilling prophecy in ghetto education. *Harvard Educational Review, 40*, 411–451.

Romaine, S. (2015). Linguistic diversity and global English: The pushmi-pullyu of language policy and political economy. In T. Ricento (Ed.), *Language policy and political economy: English in a global context* (pp. 252–275). New York: Oxford University Press.

Rumbaut, R. G., Massey, D. S., & Bean, F. D. (2006). Linguistic life expectancies: Immigrant language retention in Southern California. *Population and Development Review, 32*(3), 447–460.

Santa Ana, O. (2002). *Brown tide rising: Metaphors of Latinos in contemporary American public discourse*. Austin: University of Texas Press.

Scollon, R., & Scollon, S. W. (2004). *Nexus analysis: Discourse and the emerging internet*. London: Routledge.

Taylor, T. (1997). *Theorizing language: Analysis, normativity, rhetoric, history*. Amsterdam: Pergamon.

Todal, J. (2003). The Sámi school system in Norway and international cooperation. *Comparative Education, 39*, 185–192.

Tollefson, J. (1991). *Planning language, planning inequality: Language policy in the community*. London: Longman.

van Dijk, T. (1984). *Prejudice in discourse*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

van Dijk, T. (1993). Principles of critical discourse analysis. *Discourse & Society, 4*, 249–283.

Veltman, C. (1983). *Language shift in the United States*. Berlin: Mouton.

Wee, L. (2011). *Language without rights*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Wiley, T. (1998). The imposition of World War I era English-only policies and the fate of German in North America. In T. Ricento & B. Burnaby (Eds.), *Language and politics in the United States and Canada: Myths and realities* (pp. 211–241). Mahwah: Lawrence Erlbaum.

Wiley, T., & Lukes, M. (1996). English-only and standard English ideologies in the U.S. *TESOL Quarterly, 30*, 511–535.

Williams, G. (1992). *Sociolinguistics: A sociological critique*. London: Routledge.

Wodak, R., & Reisigl, M. (2003). Discourse and racism. In D. Schiffrin, D. Tannen, & H. E. Hamilton (Eds.), *The handbook of discourse analysis* (pp. 372–397). Oxford: Blackwell.

Woolard, K. A., & Schieffelin, B. (1994). Language ideology. *Annual Review of Anthropology, 23*, 55–82.

Wright, W.E., & Ricento, T. (in press). Language policy and education in the United States. In T. McCarty (Ed.), *Language policy and political issues in education* (Vol. 1). In S. May (General Editor), *Encyclopedia of language and education* (3rd ed.). Dordrecht: Springer.