Lang Policy (2009) 8:139–159
DOI 10.1007/s10993-009-9136-9

ORIGINAL PAPER

Ethnography of language policy

David Cassels Johnson

Received: 8 July 2008 / Accepted: 17 March 2009 / Published online: 2 April 2009

Abstract While theoretical conceptualizations of language policy have grown increasingly rich, empirical data that test these models are less common. Further, there is little methodological guidance for those who wish to do research on language policy interpretation and appropriation. The ethnography of language policy is proposed as a method which makes macro–micro connections by comparing critical discourse analyses of language policy with ethnographic data collection in some local context. A methodological heuristic is offered to guide data collection and sample data are presented from the School District of Philadelphia. It is argued that critical conceptualizations of educational language policy should be combined with empirical data collection of policy appropriation in educational settings.

Keywords Language policy · Bilingual education · Ethnography · No Child Left Behind · Discourse analysis

Introduction

While theoretical conceptualizations of language policy have grown increasingly rich, empirical data that test these models are scarce. As Ricento (2000) points out, language policy research has tended to fall short of fully accounting for precisely how micro-level interaction relates to the macro-levels of social organization. Thus, there is still (a) a gap in the literature on educational language policy interpretation and appropriation that illuminates connections between macro and micro policy, and, (b) scant methodological guidance for those who wish to engage in such research. This article aims to build a stronger methodological foundation for

D. C. Johnson (✉)
Department of Teaching and Learning, Washington State University, Cleveland 321, P.O. Box 642132, Pullman, WA 99164-2132, USA
e-mail: johnsondc@wsu.edu

language policy research and, here, the focus is on using ethnography and discourse analysis in educational settings. It is proposed that one way to make micro–macro connections is with the ethnography of language policy, a methodology that compares critical discourse analyses of language policy texts with ethnographic data collected in some local educational context. To substantiate this approach, this article takes one language policy as an example—Title III of the No Child Left Behind Act—and examines how the ethnography of language policy can illuminate creation, interpretation, and appropriation in one US school district.

Language policy theory

Early scholarship in language planning and policy presented frameworks that described the process of national language planning (Fishman 1979; Haugen 1983). While enumerating the steps in, and goals of, language planning, these so-called positivistic models have been criticized for their linearity and lack of consideration of the sociopolitical contexts in which languages are planned (see Ricento 2000).

Earlier frameworks have been eclipsed by critical approaches, which emphasize how policies marginalize minority languages and how the state can use language policy to perpetuate systems of social inequality (Ricento 1998; Tollefson 1991, 2002; Wiley 2002). Tollefson (2006) articulates the aims of Critical language-policy: (1) It eschews traditional apolitical LPP approaches and instead "acknowledges that policies often create and sustain various forms of social inequality, and that policy-makers usually promote the interests of dominant social groups" (Tollefson 2006: 42); (2) It seeks to develop more democratic policies which reduce inequality and promote the maintenance of minority languages; and (3) It is influenced by critical theory (Foucault 1991; Habermas 1975).

Pennycook (2002, 2006) argues that power does not solely rest with the state, or within the policy text, but is enacted by educational practitioners through discursive practices that operate in relation to some authoritative criteria (referencing what Foucault calls "governmentality", 1991). Pennycook offers a means to flesh out the first of the three aims of Critical language-policy (CLP) (how policies create inequality), suggesting a method which takes the focus off of "the state as an intentional actor that seeks to impose its will on the people and instead draws our attention to much more localized and often contradictory operations of power" (Pennycook 2006: 65).

Tollefson frames policy creation as essentially hegemonic while Pennycook takes state-driven intentionality out and places the locus of governance within micro-level operations like classroom language use. Pennycook's move to the micro-level does not insert agency into LPP processes as much as it positions discourse, and therefore discoursers, as perpetuating their own subjugation by acting out larger power relationships over which they have no control.

Ethnography and LPP

Davis (1999) criticizes critical approaches for not capturing the processes of language planning and argues that, instead, an ethnographic approach can provide a

thick description of language policy within communities and schools. While not typically considered "ethnographies of language policy," there are many examples of qualitative studies that illuminate the complexity of language policy processes. For example, a number of studies have examined the appropriation of Proposition 227, a voter-approved measure that restricted access to bilingual education in California. Baltodano (2004) finds that formerly pro-bilingual education parents internalized the English-only ideology in Proposition 227, thus succumbing to its hegemonic influence. However, Stritikus (2002) and Wiese (2001) analyze the agentive role that teachers played in responding to Proposition 227, sometimes resisting the English-only focus to meet the needs of their classrooms. Stritikus (2002) argues that teachers are not simply "conductors" of policy implementation—they actively shape how Proposition 227 is experienced.

With a similar focus on teachers as agents in the policy making process, Ramanathan (2005) and Skilton-Sylvester (2003) argue that teachers can sculpt instruction which uses the students' L1 as a resource—or as Ramanathan (2005: 99) puts it, "harnesses their students' vernacular resources and literate practices"—even within potentially restrictive language policies. Based on her research on non-bilingual ESL instruction for Khmer speakers in Philadelphia, Skilton-Sylvester (2003) shows that while macro-level legal ideologies and policies do not explicitly support Khmer/English biliteracy/bilingualism, teachers can still incorporate Khmer language and culture as a resource into their ESL classrooms.

Still, other research using ethnographic methodology suggests that, despite local agency, some macro ideologies and/or policies are too much for schools to overcome. Bekerman (2005) shows how a Hebrew–Arabic dual language school enjoyed parental support and institutional legitimization but could not sustain symmetry between Arabic and Hebrew because of the power of macro-level segregationist and monolingual policies. As well, Palmer and Lynch (2008) show how the testing requirements in No Child Left Behind encourage bilingual teachers to abandon bilingual instruction and instead match the language of the tests, teaching in either Spanish or English, but not both.

The ethnography of language policy is, in part, inspired by a tradition of ethnographic research on language diversity influenced both by Hymes' (1974) ethnography of communication and Fishman's (1964, 1991) work on language revitalization. For example, Hornberger (1988) and King (2001) look at how policies impact the maintenance of indigenous languages in South America and Freeman (1998) and Freeman-Field (2004) have conducted ethnographic research in Washington D.C. and Philadelphia on how local language ideologies interact with local and national language policies. While this tradition of research employs ethnography to develop an insider's perspective of sociocultural and linguistic processes within a group or community, thus illuminating language policy, the focus in this paper is squarely on policy discourse and a tripartite set of processes—creation, interpretation, and appropriation—of language policy, specifically.

It should be noted that Fishman (1994) disagrees that ethnography is a particularly "anti-hegemonic" methodology and he argues that the sanctification of ethnography and the "corresponding devilisation of other methods, smacks of Stalinism" (96). Research methods, instead, should be chosen based on technically substantive rather

than "trendy salvation grounds" (97). Fishman avers that language planning students, practitioners, researchers, and theoreticians are "co-responsible and must 'pull their weight' in creating a better sociocultural reality for all those whose lives are touched by the efforts that language planning encompasses" (98).

Indeed, it should not be sanctified, nor is it the salvation of language policy research, but ethnography has been useful for illuminating language policy processes and ethnographers *have* been concerned with creating a better sociocultural reality for linguistic minorities, specifically, and the ideals of equity and social justice, more generally (cf. Stritikus and Wiese 2006). With a refreshing sense of policy pragmatism, Canagarajah (2006) notes that ethnography is not only useful for studying language policy but also for *contributing* to policy by providing feedback on the various stages of the "language policy cycle" (cf. Corson 1999). As well, Johnson and Freeman (2009) argue that ethnographers can both provide thick descriptions of, and contribute to, policy processes to validate and promote language diversity as a resource in schools and society.

Ethnographic and critical approaches to language policy are not mutually exclusive—both are committed to resisting dominant policy discourses that subjugate minority languages and, therefore, minority language users. Indeed, the ethnography of language policy should include both critical analyses of local, state, and national policy texts and discourses as well as data collection on how such policy texts and discourses are interpreted and appropriated by agents in a local context.

Anthropological and sociological conceptualizations of educational policy

Anthropological and sociological work on educational policy has tended to foreground educator agency and champion ethnographic methods. Levinson and Sutton (2001) propose a sociocultural approach which recognizes the power in authorized policy and but also emphasizes the need to consider policy appropriation[1] when the "temporarily reified text is circulated across the various institutional contexts, where it may be applied, interpreted, and/or contested by a multiplicity of actors" (2). Levinson et al. (2007) argue that traditional divisions between policy formation and implementation implicitly ratify a top–down perspective by characterizing those in power as legislating directives that are implemented by practitioners. Instead, "policy" is a dynamic process that stretches across time, and implementation (or "appropriation") is not just what happens after policy is made—it is a link in the chain of policy process in which all actors potentially have input.

Like CLP approaches, Ball (1993, 2006) borrows from critical theory, especially Foucault (1977), to posit two conceptualizations of educational policy—policy as text and policy as discourse. Influenced by literary theory, a *policy as text* orientation rejects the quest for understanding authorial *intentions,* thus de-emphasizing analyses of policy text alone, and instead emphasizes the variety of ways in which a particular legislative or 'top down' policy is interpreted and put into action by active and creative agents. On the other hand, a *policy as discourse* orientation re-emphasizes the

[1] Following Levinson and Sutton (2001) I adopt "appropriation" as a term to describe negotiation and implementation of language policy.

potential power of educational policies to set discursive boundaries on what is considered educationally feasible or normal. While a plurality of readings and interpretations are possible, "[W]e need to appreciate the way in which policy ensembles…exercise power through the production of truth and knowledge as discourses" (Ball 1993: 23). Ball offers a richer, if not clearer, framework: by emphasizing the state's ability to manipulate schools we distort the processes of policy interpretation and enactment but by exclusively focusing on interpretation and enactment we tend to forget the discursive control that policies can exert.

The sociological and anthropological work on educational policy attempts to strike a balance between critical analyses of policy power and educator agency. Such a balance in *language* policy research, it is here argued, is captured by the ethnography of language policy which provides a methodological companion for CLP theory and a heuristic for uncovering connections between macro and micro language policy. As well, it offers a means for exploring how local appropriation can pry open implementational and ideological spaces for multilingual education and how such spaces can be obfuscated and/or closed by both macro and *local* language policy text and discourse (cf. Hornberger and Johnson 2007).

An ethnography of language policy: the research context

Hornberger and Johnson (2007) introduced the "ethnography of language policy" as a way to illuminate the different layers of what Ricento and Hornberger (1996) metaphorically refer to as the language policy onion. While a thicker description of the language policy processes mentioned herein is found in Johnson (2007, 2009a, b), here the point is to further explicate the ethnography of language policy by presenting a methodological heuristic and offering data to illuminate the method. However, I first contextualize this discussion with a description of the context and methodology for the study—including my role vis-à-vis the research—and the main language policy of note, Title III of the No Child Left Behind Act.

The results reported herein are based on a multi-sited ethnographic study (2002–2006) of language policy and bilingual education in the School District of Philadelphia[2] (SDP) (Johnson 2007). Ethnographic data collection emerged out of a series of action-oriented research projects on language policy and bilingual education program development with teachers and administrators. These projects engendered participant-observation and field note collection in a Spanish–English dual language classroom, teacher meetings, and language policy meetings (in which appropriation strategies of local and national policies were discussed). For the sake of data triangulation multiple formal and informal interviews were conducted with teachers, administrators, and Pennsylvania and federal policy makers and I recorded naturally occurring conversation at meetings. These ethnographically collected data were then compared with critical discourse analyses (CDA) of federal, state, and local language policy and discourse, including the congressional debate surrounding, and the multiple drafts leading up to, the enactment of NCLB.

[2] Besides for the real name of the school district, all other names are pseudonyms.

During my 3 years within the SDP, my role was mostly that of an observer studying language policy and bilingual education, but I was also invited to participate in projects on bilingual education policy and pedagogy development, often with the main ESOL/bilingual administrative office. Educators referred to the physical office, and the administrators therein, as "downtown" because the physical building was in downtown Philadelphia and I refer to it as downtown as well. The downtown office is responsible for language education in the SDP and, concomitantly, the interpretation and appropriation of federal and state policy. I was sometimes, but rarely, consulted on issues pertaining to second language acquisition theory; however, it was no secret that I was an advocate of developmental bilingual education and supported policies and programs which incorporated the linguistic diversity in Philadelphia as a resource.

The 3 years of data collection were a very active time for educational policy reform locally and nationally. Bilingual educators and downtown administrators were involved in projects designed to coordinate and articulate the bilingual programs. This included the development of the official SDP language policy, created by teachers and administrators from various levels of institutional authority. At the same time, there was an intensifying focus on appropriating the new version of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (aka, the No Child Left Behind Act or NCLB), the preeminent federal education policy in the US, which had recently been signed into law by George W. Bush. Title VII of the earlier policy, known as the Bilingual Education Act, had been replaced by Title III and the new policy text put the focus squarely on *English* education for bilingual learners which engendered concern among educators and bilingual education scholars alike.

An ethnography of language policy: proposing a heuristic

A methodological heuristic is proposed to help guide ethnography of language policy data collection: one must consider the (1) agents, (2) goals, (3) processes, and (4) discourses which engender and perpetuate the policy, and (5) the dynamic social and historical contexts in which the policy exists, keeping in mind that these categories are neither static nor mutually exclusive.

(1) The *agents* include both the creators of the policy and those responsible for policy interpretation and appropriation. (2) *Goals* refers to the intentions of the policy as stated in the policy text. (3) The *processes* of interest include creation, interpretation, and appropriation. (4) The *discourse* category is meant to capture the discourses within and without the policy; i.e. the discourses (whether explicit or implicit) within the language policy text, intertextual connections to other policies, and the discursive power of a particular policy. Also of interest are the local and societal discourses that interact with policy discourses but these are best captured under the next category. (5) Finally, an ethnography of language policy is interested in the dynamic social, historical, and physical *contexts* in which language policies are created, interpreted, and appropriated.

Certainly, there may be more categories—this heuristic is not meant to be intractable or static but, hopefully, provides a series of starting points that the

ethnographer may alter as needed during data collection. The rest of the article offers ethnographically collected data from an ethnography of language policy in the SDP to further explore each of the categories.

Agents

Because the effects of policy rely on human agents who interpret and appropriate policies in potentially unpredictable ways, the ethnography of language policy foregrounds educator interpretation and, then, turns to textual analyses of language policy to examine the interaction between macro and micro-level policy text discourse. For this paper, I focus on two OLCA administrators—Emily Dixon-Marquez and Lucía Sanchez—who were integrally involved in interpretation and appropriation of top–down policies as well as the creation of local language policies. I will return to Sanchez' interpretation and appropriation of Title III later but here I examine how Dixon-Marquez commanded agency, both for herself and for bilingual teachers.

Emily Dixon-Marquez was a lead actor in the education of bilingual learners for years, both as a director in the downtown office and as a Title VII and Title III grant writer. She was a staunch advocate of developmental bilingual education and used Title VII monies to, among other things, hire a bilingual education consultant (Eve Island) and, beginning in 2000, develop an initiative to implement dual language programs. When I began data collection in 2002, the NCLB testing requirements were beginning to be implemented and Title III text prompted concern about the fate of bilingual education. Yet Dixon-Marquez remained resolute in her commitment to bilingual education and wrote the Title III application with the intention that the money would be used to maintain bilingual programs. I asked Dixon-Marquez about Title III's emphasis on English:

Johnson: Ok, so do you see this new Title III as advantageous?…[for=
Dixon-Marquez: [yes
Johnson: =bilingual education?
Dixon-Marquez: Yes [yes
Johnson: [really?
Dixon-Marquez: Very much so
Johnson: That's interesting—it's interesting because there is a lot of negative energy—sort of negative sentiment surrounding No Child Left Behind
Dixon-Marquez: Well, that's because there's an emphasis on English language acquisition—but it doesn't mean that's all they're going to fund—we haven't changed our programs dramatically—we're pretty much going to do what we've been doing…They changed the name of the Office of Bilingual Education to the Office of English Language Acquisition—(the focus) couldn't be clearer…as long as they haven't changed the (right) so much so that I can't include dual language and I can't

> include other types of bilingual education—that's fine, I don't care what they call it. (recorded interview, 4.11.03)

As a Title III and Title VII grant writer, Dixon-Marquez is well aware of the English-focused shift in policy text and discourse but doesn't believe this will change what they are doing (i.e. developmental bilingual education) in the SDP.

In fact, Dixon-Marquez sees Title III as advantageous for bilingual education and for ELL education in general. She expresses gratitude that under Title III, unlike Title VII, money is no longer distributed according to a competitive grant formula:

> Yeah, but now course title seven is now title three as of this year – so now it is no longer a competitive grant category – it's an entitlement – and for a state like ours which never had a bilingual education law, it's wonderful news – because the only monies we ever brought in, we had to compete for – and now we get a per pupil amount (Dixon-Marquez: 4.11.03)

Because Title III monies are now distributed as an entitlement, Dixon-Marquez describes this as wonderful news because the amount of money is *more* per pupil than it was under Title VII. She suggests that state language policy might dictate the flow of this money but Pennsylvania has none.

Dixon-Marquez helped sustain an ideological space in the SDP in which multilingualism was seen as a resource and developmental bilingual education was championed. Elsewhere (Johnson 2009a), I show how a group of educators, including Dixon-Marquez, incorporate these beliefs into the development of the SDP language policy. Dixon-Marquez actively sought to develop a more egalitarian community of policy creators by incorporating the beliefs and voices from educators from multiple levels of institutional authority. She encouraged bilingual teachers to become actively involved in the development of language policies and programs. During a meeting with bilingual education teachers and downtown administrators, Dixon-Marquez comments on the impact of Title III:

> For the first time in the history of this state, we have [Title III] money for ELL's and the definition of an ESL program is broad enough to include bilingual – so when *you* develop *your* program, there might be funds to fund the program (emphasis mine, Dixon-Marquez: 3.20.04).

Here, Dixon-Marquez assures the teachers that they will have agency and funding under Title III to develop *their* bilingual programs. She portrays Title III as flexible and her office as supportive of the teacher's efforts, which both empowers teachers and erodes the division between top-down (i.e. downtown driven) and bottom-up policy making and appropriation.

Goals

The beliefs and actions of local agents, like Dixon-Marquez, can quite powerfully sculpt how language policies are appropriated; still, the bounds of their agency might be limited by the goals of a policy as expressed within the text. However, here

a sample excerpt from Title III is offered to illustrate how difficult it is to establish intentionality from policy language alone.

There is a tension in Title III between its proposed flexibility and the requirement that language education programs must be based on scientifically based research. The legislative process leading up to the enactment of NCLB was marked by repeated appeals for federal flexibility over programmatic choice from (especially Republican) lawmakers who feared too much federal control in US education (see Johnson 2007). For example, Ron Paul (R-TX) lambasted the policy, referring to it as "No *Bureaucrat* Left Behind". Such criticism perhaps helped engender policy text like the following:

> The purposes of [Part A of Title III] are to…provide State agencies and local agencies with the flexibility to implement language instructional educational programs, based on scientifically-based research on teaching limited English proficient children, that the agencies believe to be the most effective for teaching English (Title III, Part A, Sec. 3102 (9))

What can be said about the goals of Title III based on this text? The passage insists on local flexibility and emphasizes educator beliefs while restricting programs to those supported by scientifically based research. Yet, what is "believe" referring to—beliefs about programs, scientifically based research, or both? The structure of the passage, with "based on…" as a subordinate clause, suggests that "beliefs" is referring to programs and not research; however, such a construction does not exclude the interpretation that "believe" is referring to beliefs about scientifically based research.

It is clear that analyses of language policy goals, or intentions, based solely on policy text are going to be limited because (1) there may be multiple intentions behind a single policy text, and, (2) it is difficult to predict the de facto impact which will depend on its interpretation by educators and, as we have seen with Dixon-Marquez, such interpretation is not necessarily predictable. Further, even if we assume that Dixon-Marquez is not conforming to the de jure goals of NCLB, if she still uses Title III money for developmental bilingual education, this leads to the rather unusual result that NCLB now must be considered a de facto pluralistic language policy, at least for the School District of Philadelphia.

Creation

The quest for authorial intentions in policy is perhaps, as Ball (1993) argues, not very useful since such analyses might not accurately predict how the policy will be appropriated by educators. However, I argue that it is still useful to analyze how the creators *themselves* interpret the intentions of a policy because their beliefs help form the discourse within and without the policy text and help contextualize its interpretation.

NCLB did not arrive on George W. Bush's desk unscathed and uncontested—the revisions and congressional debate surrounding those revisions reveal that earlier House drafts of Title III were even more restrictive, while Senate versions were less, than what was eventually adopted (see Johnson 2007). Representative Boehner (R-OH), who chaired the primary education committee in the House of

Representatives in 2001, introduced the first version of Title III (House Resolution 1 or HR 1) on March 22, 2001, which was injected with a strong shot of English-only discourse. HR 1 begins, as the Bilingual Education Act (BEA) does, with "Findings" which act as a sort of introduction and rationale for the policies:

> (a) FINDINGS – The congress finds as follows: (1) English is the common language of the United States and every citizen and other person residing in the United States should have a command of the English language in order to develop their full potential (H.R.1., Title III, Sec. 3102)

Compare this with the beginning of the BEA:

> (a) Findings – The congress finds that: (1) language minority Americans speak virtually all world languages plus many that are indigenous to the United States (Title VII, Part A, Sec. 7102, 1)

Instead of the BEA's recognition that the US is a multilingual country, HR1 instead emphasizes that everyone should command English in order to develop "their full potential."

HR 1's singular focus on English education was coupled with a 3-year time limit on L1 instruction (HR1, Title III, Sec. 3102). It passed on May 23, 2001 and was sent to the Senate who, then, defanged Title III's focus on English. By June 14, 2001, the Senate had completely revamped HR 1 including the title—"*English* Language Acquisition, Language Enhancement, and Language Acquisition Programs" was changed to "*Bilingual* Education, Language Enhancement…" James Jeffords (I-NH) introduced an amendment which re-inserted BEA language including "Part A—*Bilingual Education*," declaring "This part may be cited as the Bilingual Education Act" (HR1, Engrossed Amendment as Agreed to by Senate). The 3-year time limits and the jingoistic "findings" that US citizens need English to realize their full potential were abandoned in the Senate's version, which in describing the purpose of the act, instead quotes the BEA:

> [Purpose] (2) developing bilingual skills and multicultural understanding: (3) developing the English of limited English proficient children and youth and, to the extent possible, the native language skills of such children and youth.

While the final version of Title III would eventually replace *bilingual* skills with *language* skills, these Senate revisions maintained the possibility of developmental bilingual education in the US.

The confluence of HR 1, transparently dominated by a language as problem, transitional discourse, and the Senate amendments, which were a return to the ideas behind the BEA, led to a version of Title III that was supported by both proponents and opponents of bilingual education. For example, while Boehner celebrated NCLB as a policy which would transform bilingual programs into English focused programs (see citation), Silvestre Reyes (D-TX), Chair of the Congressional Hispanic Caucus, celebrated the compromise bill on the House floor:

> As Chair of the Congressional Hispanic Caucus (CHC), I am proud to support the conference report on HR 1…bilingual programs are important to limited

> English proficiency children because they build on native language proficiency to make the transition to all-English academic… The compromise bill gives students the flexibility to remain enrolled in bilingual education as long as is appropriate…it will extend bilingual education to millions of eligible students who currently do not receive bilingual education services. (Congressional Record 12.20.01)

Reyes suggests that Title III will actually increase access to bilingual education for students who are currently not being served by such programs. However, he narrowly defines "bilingual education" as transitional. Reyes does not support time restrictions for the transition but he does consider bilingual education to be, *by definition*, transitional, and not a method for native language maintenance and development.

Since federal language policies emerge both from older policies and legislative compromise, they may be ideologically inconsistent and tend to be heterogeneous (containing varying and sometimes contradictory stylistic and semantic values). Policy writing is its own genre, a characteristic of which is the constant borrowing of previous policy text. From policy to policy, old to new, the new language entwines with the old and the policy morphs into something new, a hybrid of old and new policy texts and discourse. It can be difficult enough to pinpoint the semantic intentions of a single authored text but policies are necessarily multi-authored *and* the different authors may interpret the meaning of their creation in different ways. Because a multitude of intentions can be realized by a single policy text, the question becomes: How do educators interpret and appropriate such heterogeneous policy texts?

Interpretation and appropriation

Lucía Sanchez began working in the SDP in 2004 around the time Dixon-Marquez left. As the director of ESOL/Bilingual programs, Sanchez has arguably been the most influential appropriator of federal and state language policy since 2004. Before going to Philadelphia, she worked at the Pennsylvania Department of Education where she reviewed and approved Title III applications, including the plan submitted by Dixon-Marquez and, thus, she adopted the responsibility of overseeing implementation of the Title III monies she had approved.

Yet, Sanchez' ideas about bilingual education and Title III differ markedly from Dixon-Marquez':

> It has always been you know if your last name is Rodriguez, even though you were born here, you would be offered the program with the perspective that you have some language delays or language gaps without any kind of assessment to see whether your Spanish is really proficient enough that you can benefit from these programs…So, you know the target of bilingual programs is not actually to teach Spanish, the target of the bilingual program is to use your Spanish which is the language that you bring to the table to build your skills in content area and at the same time offer you the opportunity to acquire English through a very you know targeted instruction in ESOL. (*Sanchez*: interview, 6.13.05)

Like Silvestre Reyes, Sanchez defines "bilingual education" as transitional—it is not a programmatic model intended to *teach* Spanish but *utilize* Spanish to transition students into English-medium classrooms. Even though a student might have a Latino last name and/or language gaps, that student is not well served by a bilingual program if they are not already proficient in Spanish. Notably, Sanchez mentions no other languages besides Spanish representing another mainstream assumption that bilingual education is only used for Spanish speakers even though the SDP has programs in other languages.

In turn, Sanchez' conceptualization of what bilingual education is—i.e. it does *not* include maintenance or additive programs—interacts with her interpretation of Title III:

> Title III was created to improve English language acquisition programs by increasing the services or creating situations where the students would be getting supplemental services to move them into English language acquisition situations. (Sanchez: 6.13.05)

Sanchez interprets the goals of "bilingual education" and Title III as the same—eventual transition of ELLs into mainstream classrooms and has overseen implementation of transitional bilingual education programs for Spanish speakers. The preferred model is late–exit transitional (with all bilingual education students entering mainstream classrooms by 6th grade) with the option of heritage language classes to continue biliteracy development *after* the students are English proficient.

Either Sanchez was a reflection, or the cause, of an ideological shift in the downtown office. Dixon-Marquez helped foster an ideological space that empowered teachers to own their own programs and the language policies built to serve those programs. Sanchez' beliefs about bilingual education perpetuated the dissolution of this space and her beliefs manifested themselves at teacher training and language policy meetings. While Dixon-Marquez would ask teachers what they needed, Sanchez would instruct teachers on how they should implement policies. At one such meeting in April of 2005, in contrast to what Dixon-Marquez had expressed at previous meetings, Sanchez declared that NCLB was "not that flexible anymore" about language program choice and the district would have to implement transitional programs, even though developmental programs were already in place.

While both Dixon-Marquez and Sanchez advocate bilingual education, their beliefs about language education and research color their interpretation of Title III which, in turn, influences the course of language policy in the SDP. Dixon-Marquez' interpretation that Title III is as flexible as it claims, and her beliefs about bilingual education research, created and supported ideological and implementational spaces for additive bilingualism and teacher agency. The shift in SDP language policy toward transitional programs relied on Lucía's interpretation of Title III as rigidly English-dominant. The question then becomes: Can we make discursive links between local interpretation/appropriations and the varying discourses operating within the multi-layered contexts of language policy?

Discourse (analysis)

Because a lot of language policy analysis is, essentially, discourse analysis, it behooves the field to establish more disciplined forms of language policy discourse analysis. While establishing intentionality is problematic (Shuy 2001), in order to make claims about macro policy goals, and establish links between language policy and language education practice, disciplined discourse analysis is essential. The object of analysis is *policy discourse*, which includes spoken interaction (e.g. policy meetings, congressional debate, interviews) and writing (e.g. language policy language). Contained within, and engendered by, policy discourse are *policy texts,* which manifest as physical language policies. For example, Title III is the product of congressional debate and, therefore, a section of Title III is both a *policy text* and a product/part of *policy discourse*. These new policy texts, like Title III, can then create new discourses.

Language policy processes are essentially discursive—generated, sustained, and manipulated in spoken interaction and policy documents that, in turn, interact with each other—and may appropriate, resist, and/or possibly change dominant and alternative discourses about language and language policy. Critical Discourse Analysis (CDA) makes connections between micro-discursive practices and macro-level discourses or, what Fairclough (1989) calls, orders of discourse. There is a strong sense of Foucault's (1977, 1978) theories of discourse and power underlying CDA. Foucault argues that "discourse" makes certain ways of talking, being, and acting "normal" and can thus be hegemonic; however, counter-discourses also exist: "Discourse can be an instrument and an effect of power, but also a hindrance, a stumbling-block, a point of resistance and a starting point for an opposing strategy" (Foucault 1978: 100–102). CDA, in turn, analyzes both how discourse constrains our behavior and/or thoughts and how discourse, or at least the illumination of discursive patterns, can be emancipatory.

Instead of a discrete set of specific methods, CDA is instead bound by a philosophical commitment to defying the power of dominant discourses, which subjugate (Wodak 1996). This nebulousness, perhaps reflecting its post-modernist tendencies, is not without its critics (Blommaert 2005) but CDA is useful for LPP for the following reasons: (1) Its attention to the various layers of context in which a text is produced and interpreted lines up well with the multiple layers of context through which language policies must pass; (2) Its focus on discourse and power helps explore how language policies, and societal discourses, can hegemonically sculpt language education toward monolingual practices; (3) While CDA recognizes the power of macro discourses, it allows for counter-discourses (and thus counter-discoursers who interpret and appropriate language policies in agentive ways). CDA of language policy, then, is focused on finding connections between language policy texts and the discourses within and surrounding the texts.

I have shown how one piece of Title III text can be interpreted in different ways, suggesting that diverging interpretations may lead to different appropriation. However, it is not just the text but the discourses generated within and from language policies which may impact language education. Sanchez' assertions reflect circulating discourses that bilingual education is, by definition, transitional which in

turn interacts with her interpretation and appropriation of Title III as an inflexible English-focused policy.

During this study, meetings between downtown administrators and bilingual education teachers often provided a forum for teachers and administrators to work together to develop quality bilingual education programs. When Sanchez took over as head of ESOL/Bilingual programs, she altered the nature of these meetings—from a forum for collaboration and negotiation of language policy to a forum in which policy and pedagogy were dictated. Because she planned to alter the bilingual programs—discontinuing some developmental bilingual education programs in favor of transitional programs—these meetings were used by Sanchez to inform the teachers about the changes.

These changes were abrupt and prompted criticism and resistance. During a meeting in which Sanchez was describing the new transitional policy, a few of the teachers expressed concern that the programmatic changes were a clandestine attempt to abandon bilingual education and one of the teachers challenged the decision to transition students:

> Teacher: Who or where did the decision make—come from to [transition students]?
>
> Sanchez: Because, because, number 1, we looked at all the programs that are effective based on Krashen's research—and the beginning of Title III of the No Child Left Behind Act, which is long, and there's nothing we can do to change that (tape recorded, 12.1.05).

Sanchez' beliefs about Title III and "the research" are used to justify her interpretation of Title III as restrictively focused on English language development. She positions the research, here embodied by Krashen, and Title III as setting rigid standards to which the teachers must adapt and there is "nothing [they] can do to change that." Concomitantly, by forcing the teachers to defer to her own (mis)interpretation of Title III and Krashen's research, Sanchez effectively strips the teachers of their expertise and agency in making language policy decisions.

Macro and micro contexts for LPP research

Ricento and Hornberger (1996) use the metaphor of an onion to describe the multiple contexts or layers through which language policy develops and moves and argue that research has unsuccessfully accounted for activity in all layers. In analyzing a piece of discourse data, deciding which aspect of the multiple layers of context is most relevant is one of the central tasks of discourse analysis. Each layer contains its own language policies, a multiplicity of agents who engage with those policies, and various dominant and counter-discourses. It would be impossible in this article to trace the activity surrounding Title III in all the relevant contexts but here I illuminate just a few critical aspects of a few critical layers.

First, let's consider the macro-societal context in which NCLB was penned and passed. Perhaps a change in administration (i.e. the election of George W. Bush) led to an ideological shift in the US Department of Education and in congress who, in

turn, created a document which reflected a conservative agenda including monolingual English education. There is certainly evidence to support this idea—the Office of Bilingual Education and Minority Affairs was renamed the Office of English Language Acquisition; the Bilingual Education Act was abandoned, and its replacement, Title III, reinvigorated focus on English language education (see Hornberger and Johnson 2007; Wiley and Wright 2004; Wright 2005). Further, the US Department of Education refused to publish a study they themselves had commissioned, perhaps because it supported bilingual education pedagogy (August and Shanahan 2006). Indeed, one author of the study, Diane August believes that there were "people around Bush" and "in the Department of Education" who opposed bilingual education (personal communication, 4.4.07). However, another author, Timothy Shanahan notes that the study was *not* suppressed and the copyright was released to the authors (Toppo 2005). Copyright suppression is exactly what happened when the results of other studies on health care and the environment conflicted with ideology within the Bush administration (see Shulman 2006).

Other discourses were also circulating at the federal level. Consider comments made by Rod Paige, the first Secretary of Education for Bush, during the debate over bilingual education in the state of Colorado in which a campaign was launched to end bilingual education. Paige made a conspicuous visit to the state, declaring in the media that:

> Governments can do a lot to encourage good education, but telling schools exactly how to do their business is going too far…Whether or not it is advisable to completely shut the door on native-language instruction is a decision that has to be made at the point of instruction (Paige: at Crawford 2002).

By raising the question of whether or not completely shutting the door on native-language instruction is advisable, doesn't Paige suggest that it is *not*?

Consider also a statement made by Brinda Sea who, as director of the State Consolidated Grant Division in the Office of English Language Acquisition, overseas distribution of Title III money. In an interview, when I asked her which language education programs her office endorsed she immediately and unequivocally responded that they do not promote or prefer any particular method and are, in fact, prohibited from doing so: "We stay completely out of it" (5.24.06). She stressed that it was up to the states and schools to choose particular pedagogical programs for ELLs as long as the chosen programs are "research-based".

Still, the federal context is not the only context of interest. Because NCLB transfers much of the discretionary spending power from the US Department of Education to state departments of education, state language policy has become increasingly important. Making up the bulk of the official commonwealth education policies are the Pennsylvania Basic Education Circulars (PABEC) and guiding the instruction of English language learners is "Educating students with limited English proficiency (LEP) and English language learners (ELL)." While there perhaps has been an ideological shift away from minority language maintenance in Title III, that shift is not yet reflected in Pennsylvania state educational language policy:

> Districts have the option of choosing which program to implement…All programs must include ESL classes and must be based on sound educational and second language acquisition theory…Students must have meaningful access to the academic content classes in order for them to achieve the academic standards (PABEC 22, PA Code 4.26, 4).

This passage emphasizes district choice but demands that English language learners have meaningful access to academic content, citing "ESL instruction" and "modification" as two possibilities for giving them this access. A very common way to teach content knowledge to English language learners is through bilingual education, an option for "ESL instruction" that Pennsylvania policy discusses briefly, citing transitional, developmental, and dual-language programs as models. Thus, Pennsylvania policy text leaves pedagogical options open or, at least, closes no doors left open by Title III. Furthermore, in interviews with the ESL/Bilingual Education Advisor in the Pennsylvania Department of Education, she insisted that while Title III's focus is English, Pennsylvania schools can choose which programs to implement, including bilingual education (see Johnson 2007).

Multiple discourses are always circulating and it is the ethnographer's job to identify which are most relevant and how they relate to language policy processes. Each context—federal, state, district, school, classroom etc.—carries its own set of dominant and alternative discourses about language education and language policy. For example, while federal discourse seemed to shift towards English dominant programs, the dominant discourse in the SDP, due in part to educators like Dixon-Marquez, was one which supported developmental bilingual education over English focused education for English Language Learners (see Freeman-Field 2004; Johnson 2007). The power of this discourse, however, waned when Sanchez entered the SDP suggesting that local discourses which promote multilingual education may be ephemeral and educators need to strike while the iron's hot, so to speak.

Discussion

The analysis of Title III reveals the multiplicity of intentions and ideologies about language (education) that engendered the policy text and the subsequent variation in interpretation by the policy creators. While I do not reject the quest for understanding authorial intentions, such intentions are impossible to pin down based on textual analysis alone. The opposite is true as well—analyses of interpretation and appropriation do not necessarily reveal some hidden agenda behind the policy text that manifest as de facto language policy. Instead, language policies may emerge from heterogeneous intentions and ideologies and may be interpreted and appropriated in varying ways—both the creation and the appropriation is often characterized by contestation and conflict. A single policy here was appropriated in contradictory ways, leading to the problematic result that a singular de jure policy is actually multiple de facto language policies. If "de facto language policy" refers to what happens at the grassroots level, regardless of the de jure policy support (Schiffman 1996), we must allow for multiple de facto results based

on the same policy which raises questions about the de jure/de facto distinction as a dichotomy.

Critical language policy approaches have enriched our conceptualization of language policy but by focusing primarily on the power invested in policy, they obfuscate agency and perpetuate the reification of policy as necessarily monolithic, intentional, and fascistic. Besides the acknowledgement that CLP should promote more democratic policies, there is not much room in these frameworks for local practices which challenge dominant discourses, engender alternative discourses and radical practices, and potentially effect social change (a criticism that is not necessarily original, cf. Davis 1999; Ricento and Hornberger 1996; Hornberger and Johnson 2007). Certainly language policies can define the limits of what is educationally normal and/or possible but, even within ostensibly restrictive language policies, there are often *implementational spaces* in the policy texts, and *ideological spaces* in schools and communities, which educators can use to provide opportunity for bilingual learners and potentially challenge dominant educational discourses (cf. Hornberger and Johnson 2007).

An ethnography of language policy foregrounds the power of educators to capitalize on these implementational and ideological spaces for multilingual education. The development or restriction of bilingual education within school districts relies on the beliefs and practices of educators and it has gone both ways in the SDP. Emily Dixon-Marquez interpreted Title III as flexible and even supportive of the SDP initiatives to maintain and develop additive bilingual programs. A shift in administrative personnel, however, led to different interpretations of how Title III monies should be used, marked by Sanchez's beliefs that Title III's focus on English was a mandate for transitional programs. *Both administrators used Title III money.* In order for the effects of Title III to be truly monolingual, at least in Philadelphia, administrators must allow themselves to be conscripted by its monolingual leanings. Local educators are not helplessly caught in the ebb and flow of shifting ideologies in language policies—they help develop, maintain, and change that flow.

Still, language policy discourses may constrain educational possibilities—some interpretations of policy will be privileged, especially those which are aligned with dominant societal discourses, while others may be obfuscated or discredited. One goal of the ethnography of language policy is to analyze how the discursive contexts within which policy decisions are made influence the interpretation, appropriation, and/or resistance at the local level of educational policy development and appropriation. The production of Title III was characterized by limiting definitions of bilingual education (espoused by Silvestre Reyes, a *supporter* of bilingual education) as necessarily transitional and this discourse influenced the resulting policy text. Yet, nothing in Title III specifically precludes any particular pedagogical approach and it is not just the policy texts but the interpretations of those texts at different language policy levels, and the discursive contexts which influence those interpretations, that determine how a policy will be implemented. Sanchez' appropriation of Title III suggests that her interpretation *was* constrained by the English-focused and transitional bilingual education discourse which ultimately put limits on what was educationally feasible in the SDP.

Traditional language policy research has tended to dichotomize language policy "creation" and "implementation", ignoring the agentive role that "implementers" play in policy appropriation. Educator interpretation of federal policy is, itself, an act of creation since it has a tremendous influence over how policy is appropriated. The goal of the ethnography of language policy is to re-conceptualize language policy as an interconnected *process* generated and negotiated through policy texts and discourse—as opposed to an authoritative product whose implementation is unvaried.

Because the community of individuals who have an impact on policy is fluid and porous, with new members coming and going, doing an ethnography of policy is a unique challenge—there is perhaps not one, but several overlapping communities, whose actions may be crucial for understanding policy processes. In this paper, I have focused on two school district administrators because they offer a unique perspective but, ultimately, we should collectively be looking at creation, interpretation, and appropriation across all the layers, from the office of the president to group work in a multilingual classroom. Of course, this is impossible for a single ethnographer—the researcher cannot be everywhere at once—which is why multiple ethnographers should work together on multi-sited ethnographies. Such collaborative research would not only provide an increasingly clearer picture of language policy processes, it would help ensure the maintenance of quality bilingual programs.

Conclusion

The ethnography of language policy is a method for linking micro-level educational practices with macro-level language policies and discourse. This method is grounded in the philosophy that critical analyses of language policy texts should be combined with empirical data collection on policy interpretation and appropriation in some local educational context. A methodological heuristic is proffered to guide data collection: To understand language (in education) policy, one must consider the (1) agents, (2) goals, (3) processes, and (4) discourses which engender and perpetuate the policy, and (5) the dynamic social and historical contexts in which the policy exists, keeping in mind that these categories are neither static nor mutually exclusive. This heuristic is not meant to be intractable or static but, hopefully, provides a series of starting points which the ethnographer may alter as needed during data collection. Using this heuristic, data are presented from an ethnography of language policy in the School District of Philadelphia to demonstrate how data collected in each of these categories can illuminate vital aspects of language policy creation, interpretation, and appropriation.

Appendix

Transcription Conventions

( ) transcription doubt
(?) unclear utterance

...	ellipsis
[	overlapping speech
[...]	transcriber comment
-	short pause
=	latching
Italics	emphatic stress

References

August, D., & Shanahan, T. (Eds.) (2006). *Developing literacy in second-language learners: Report of the national literacy panel on language-minority children and youth.* Lawrence Erlbaum and Center for Applied Linguistics.

Ball, S. J. (1993). What is policy? Texts, trajectories and toolboxes. *Discourse, 13*(2), 10–17.

Ball, S. J. (2006). *Education policy and social class: The selected works of Stephen J. Ball*. London and New York: Taylor & Francis.

Baltodano, M. P. (2004). Latino immigrant parents and the hegemony of Proposition 227. *Latino Studies, 2*, 246–253.

Bekerman, Z. (2005). Complex contexts and ideologies: Bilingual education in conflict-Ridden areas. *Journal of Language, Identity, and Education, 4*, 1–20.

Blommaert, J. (2005). *Discourse: Key topics in Sociolinguistics*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Canagarajah, S. (2006). Ethnographic methods in language policy. In T. Ricento (Ed.), *Language policy: Theory and method*. Oxford: Blackwell Publishing.

Corson, D. (1999). *Language policy in schools: A resource for teachers and administrators*. Mahwah, New Jersey: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Pubs.

Crawford, J. (2002). Education chief: Keep bilingual option open. Retrieved from http://ourworld.compuserve.com/homepages/JWCRAWFORD/DP9.htm.

Davis, K. A. (1999). Dynamics of indigenous language maintenance. In T. Huebner & K. A. Davis (Eds.), *Sociopolitical perspectives on language policy and planning in the USA*. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing Company.

Fairclough, N. (1989). *Language and power*. London and New York: Longman.

Fishman, J. A. (1964). Language maintenance and language shift as fields of inquiry. *Linguistics, 9*, 32–70.

Fishman, J. S. (1979). Bilingual education, language planning and English. *English World-Wide, 1*(1), 11–24.

Fishman, J. A. (1991). *Reversing language shift: Theoretical and empirical foundations of assistance to threatened languages*. Clevedon, UK: Multilingual Matters.

Fishman, J. A. (1994). Critiques of language planning: A minority languages perspective. *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development, 15*, 91–99.

Foucault, M. (1977). *The archaeology of knowledge and the discourse on language*. New York: Pantheon Books.

Foucault, M. (1978). *The history of sexuality volume 1: An introduction*. New Yok: Vintage Books.

Foucault, M. (1991). Governmentality. In G. Burchell, C. Gordon, & P. Miller (Eds.), *The Foucault effect: Studies in governmentality*. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.

Freeman, R. D. (1998). *Bilingual education and social change*. Clevedon, UK: Multilingual Matters.

Freeman-Field, R. D. (2004). *Building on community bilingualism*. Philadelphia, PA: Caslon Publishing.

Habermas, J. (1975). *Legitimation crisis*. Boston: Beacon Press.

Haugen, E. (1983). The implementation of corpus planning: Theory and practice. In J. Cobarrubias (Ed.), *Progress in language planning*.

Hornberger, N. H. (1988). *Bilingual education and language maintenance*. Dordrecht, Holland: Foris Publications.

Hornberger, N. H., & Johnson, D. C. (2007). Slicing the onion ethnographically: Layers and spaces in multilingual language education policy and practice. *TESOL Quarterly, 41*(3), 509–532. Special Issue on Language Policy.

Hymes, D. (1974). *Foundations in sociolinguistics: An ethnographic approach*. Philadelphia, PA: University of Pennsylvania Press.
Johnson, D. C. (2007). Language policy within and without the School District of Philadelphia. Unpublished doctoral dissertation. University of Pennsylvania.
Johnson, D. C. (2009a). Implementational and ideological spaces in bilingual education Language policy. *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism*.
Johnson, D. C. (2009b). The relationship between applied linguistic research and language policy for bilingual education. *Applied Linguistics*.
Johnson, D. C., & Freeman, R. (2009). Appropriating language policy on the local level: Working the spaces for multilingual education. In O. Garcia & K. Menken (Eds.), *Negotiating language policies in classrooms: Teachers as change agents*. Routledge.
King, K. (2001). *Language revitalization processes and prospects: Quichua in the Ecuadorian Andes*. Clevedon, UK: Multilingual Matters.
Levinson, B. A. U., & Sutton, M. (Eds.). (2001). *Policy as practice: Toward a sociocultural analysis of educational policy*. London: Ablex Publishing.
Levinson, B. A. U., Sutton, M., & Winstead, T. (2007). *Education policy as a practice of power: Ethnographic methods, democratic options*. Paper presented at the 28th Annual Ethnography in Education Research Forum. Philadelphia, PA.
Palmer, D., & Lynch, A. (2008). A bilingual educaion for a monolingual test? The pressure to prepare for TAKS and its influence on choices for language of instruction in Texas elementary bilingual classrooms. *Language Policy, 7*(3), 217–235.
Pennycook, A. (2002). Language Policy in Education: Critical Issues. In J. Tollefson (Ed.), *Language policy and docile bodies: Hong Kong and Governmentality*. Mahwah, New Jersey: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Pubs.
Pennycook, A. (2006). Postmodernism in language policy. In T. Ricento (Ed.), *An Introduction to Language Policy: Theory and Method*. Oxford: Blackwell Publishing.
Ramanathan, V. (2005). Rethinking language planning and policy from the ground up: Refashioning institutional realities and human lives. *Current Issues in Language Planning, 6*(2), 89–101.
Ricento, T. (1998). Language and politics in the United States and Canada: Myths and realities. In T. Ricento & B. Burnaby (Eds.), *National language policy in the United States*. Mahwah, New Jersey: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Pubs.
Ricento, T. (2000). Historical and theoretical perspectives in language policy and Planning. *Journal of Sociolinguistics, 4*(2), 196–213.
Ricento, T., & Hornberger, N. H. (1996). Unpeeling the onion: Language planning and policy and the ELT professional. *TESOL Quarterly, 30*(3), 401–427.
Schiffman, H. S. (1996). *Linguistic culture and language policy*. London: Routledge.
Shulman, S. (2006). *Undermining science: Suppression and distortion in the Bush administration*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
Shuy, R. (2001). Discourse analysis in the legal context. In D. Schiffrin, D. Tannen, & H. Hamilton (Eds.), *The handbook of discourse analysis*. Oxford: Blackwell.
Skilton-Sylvester, E. (2003). Legal discourse and decisions, teacher policymaking and the multilingual classroom: Constraining and supporting Khmer/English biliteracy in the united states. *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism, 6*(3&4), 168–184.
Stritikus, T. (2002). *Immigrant children and the politics of English-only*. New York: LFB Scholarly Publishing LLC.
Stritikus, T., & Wiese, A. M. (2006). Reassessing the role of ethnographic methods in Education policy research: Implementing bilingual education policy at local Levels. *Teachers College Record, 108*, 1106–1131.
Tollefson, J. W. (1991). *Planning language, planning inequality: Language policy in the community*. London: Longman.
Tollefson, J. W. (Ed.). (2002). *Language policies in education: Critical issues*. Mahwah, New Jersey: Lawrence Erlbaum Publishers.
Tollefson, J. W. (2006). Critical theory in language policy. In T. Ricento (Ed.), *An introduction to language policy: Theory and method*. Oxford: Blackwell Publishing.
Toppo, G. (2005, August 24). Is bilingual education report being downplayed? *USA Today*. Retrieved 25 March 2009, from http://www.usatoday.com/.

Wiese, A. M. (2001). *To meet the needs of the kids, not the program: Teachers constructing policy, program, and practice in a bilingual school.* Unpublished Doctoral dissertation. University of California, Berkeley.

Wiley, T. G. (2002). Assessing language rights in education: A brief history of the US context. In J. W. Tollefson (Ed.), *Language policies in education: Critical issues*. Mahwah, New Jersey: Lawrence Erlbaum Publishers.

Wiley, T. G., & Wright, W. E. (2004). Against the undertow: Language-minority education Policy and politics in the "age of accountability". *Educational Policy, 18*(2), 142–168.

Wodak, R. (1996). *Disorders of discourse*. London: Longman.

Wright, W. E. (2005). *Evolution of federal policy and implications of No Child Left Behind for language minority students.* Tempe, AZ: Language Policy Research Unit, Education Policy Studies Laboratory, Arizona State University.

Author Biography

David Cassels Johnson is assistant professor of education at Washington State University. This manuscript is a product of his dissertation, *Language policy within and without the School District of Philadelphia*, winner of the 2008 National Association of Bilingual Education dissertation competition. Recent publications can be found in *TESOL Quarterly, Applied Linguistics*, and the *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism*.