

Interview

In Conversations with Scholars on Contemporary Issues and Research Agendas in Language Ideologies

Madhukar KC * 
Arizona State University

Prem Phyak 
Columbia University

Ian Cushing 
Manchester Metropolitan University

Ruanni Tupas 
University College London

Sender Dovchin 
Curtin University

Bedrettin Yazan 
University of Texas, San Antonio

Nelson Flores 
University of Pennsylvania

Received: August 08, 2023
Accepted: August 28, 2023
Published: September 20, 2023
doi: [10.5281/zenodo.8365037](https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.8365037)

Research in language ideologies emerged as a significant field of inquiry, especially in the early work of linguistic anthropologists. Yet, there are a multiplicity of issues related to language ideologies that need grave attention; for example, to understand the complexities of political, social, and symbolic associations of language(s) and their users in the contemporary unsettling worlds. This paper features some key researchers whose research and scholarship largely center around language ideologies. They together highlight some of the key contemporary issues around language ideologies as a field of inquiry and

underline some important future research agendas moving forward. The six scholars, who represent different geographical and research contexts (e.g., the UK, Europe, North America, South Asia, and Southeast Asia), have graciously offered their perspectives on the significance of utilizing language ideologies as a theoretical lens in the contemporary language education research and illuminating some future research agendas. Based on brief yet meaningful conversations with these scholars, this paper lays out nine research strands of language ideologies that need critical attention.

Keywords: identity construction; language ideologies; raciolinguistic ideologies; research agenda; teacher education; translanguaging

1. INTRODUCTION

Language ideologies, which are the “beliefs, feelings, and conceptions about language structure and use, which often index the political economic interests of individual speakers, ethnic and other interest groups, and nation-states” (Kroskrity, 2010, p. 192), is not a recent phenomenon. The interest among researchers in studying language ideologies gained significant momentum during the 1970s and 1980s, as evidenced in the scholarly contributions in the field of linguistic anthropology. Some linguistic anthropologists (e.g., Michael Silverstein, Susan Gal, Jane Hill, Kathryn A. Woolard) and their earlier scholarships set precedents for language ideological work in the early

* Madhukar KC, Department of English, Arizona State University, Tempe, 1102 S. McAllister Avenue Room 170, Tempe, AZ 85281, the U.S.A., madhukar@asu.edu

twenty-first century. Several other scholars, such as sociolinguists (e.g., Jan Blommaert, Rosina Lippi-Green, James Milroy and Lesley Milroy) and linguistic anthropologist (e.g., Paul V. Kroskrity), devoted their interests in exploring language ideologies in the broader educational and institutional policies and practices (Kroskrity, 2004). Although the language ideology works started off from the linguistic anthropological approach, it has emerged as a significant interdisciplinary or multidisciplinary field of study, encouraging scholars from various disciplines (e.g., educational linguistics, sociolinguistics, [critical] applied linguistics).

This field of inquiry has motivated scholars to investigate the nuances of language ideologies: for example, the politics of language ideologies and their impacts on pedagogical practices, the broader educational and other institutional discourses, and policies and practices in both K-12 and tertiary education. The attention to language ideology research has flourished substantially and has become one of the prominent areas of research agendas, as evident in numerous publications of edited volumes, conference presentations, and special issues documenting varied issues of language ideologies. For example, the formation of an independent strand, Language and Ideology (LID), by the American Association of Applied Linguistics (AAAL) underlines the significance of research around language ideologies. Similarly, the launch of the Journal of Education, Language, and Ideology (JELI) adds to the significance of understanding and researching various language ideologies, thereby aiming to “publish rigorous scholarship that advances inquiries in issues related to ideology, language, and education.” The relationship between any aspect of language(s) and the underlying ideologies may be explicit or implicit, and thus, needs empirical or conceptual analyses employing a variety of methods—quantitative, qualitative, or mixed. To this end, based on conversations with six scholars whose works center around language ideologies, this paper attempts to bring to the fore different contemporary issues and future language ideologies research agendas, along with some theoretical and methodological issues that importantly intersect with language ideologies.

I (Madhukar) invited and engaged in meaningful conversations with six researchers, representing different research contexts (e.g., Global South contexts, such as Mongolia, Nepal, and Philippines as well as the Global North, such as the US, the UK, and Australia), research agendas, and theoretical orientations. Each of the six distinguished guest scholars brings a unique array of research and scholarly pursuits, all of which are shaped by their comprehension of and commitment to tackling language ideologies across a range of educational and research settings. The overall purpose of this conversation was to include the voices of a broad range of researchers and understand their perspectives on language ideologies; that is to understand language ideology research in different research contexts. The six esteemed guest scholars include (listed alphabetically by the last name): Ian Cushing (Manchester Metropolitan University, UK); Sender Dovchin (Curtin University, Australia); Nelson Flores (University of Pennsylvania, USA); Prem Phyak (Columbia University, USA); Ruanni Tupas (University College London, UK); and Bedrettin Yazan (University of Texas, San

Antonio, USA). I asked all six scholars the following overarching questions: 1) What are the contemporary issues related to language ideologies in broader (language) education? 2) How do/will you center language ideologies in your research agenda moving forward?

The following section includes their responses to the question. While the interview with Sender Dovchin was conducted via Zoom, the rest were collected in written responses. All responses are reported verbatim, with some minimal edits for length.

2. INTERVIEWS

2.1 Ian Cushing's Response

My research is inspired by a network of academics, teachers, and activists whose work has sought to challenge the colonial, anti-Black and white supremacist logics which have long shaped education policy, especially in England (e.g., Coard 1971; Sivanandan 1981). Their work has taught me how the stigmatization of racially marginalized children's language is reflective of the ways in which they are stigmatized in broader society, and how this stigmatization was a design feature of British colonialism. Challenging language ideologies is thus part of anti-colonial efforts.

Despite what mainstream educational linguists continues to claim, the route to racial justice lies not in marginalized communities modifying their voice so that it becomes more 'standard' or more 'academic' but lies in dismantling the very structures which have created normative notions and categories of language in the first place. This theory of change connects issues of language discrimination, injustice and struggle to broader anti-racist and anti-colonial struggles and refuses to see issues of language and race as separable. I see this broader focus as the only way in which raciolinguistic ideologies might be challenged and academics can avoid posing solutions which rely on colonial, white supremacist and deficit-based logics which assume the problem is located within the language practices of marginalized communities and their purported lack of the right kind of language, or even any language at all (Flores & Rosa 2022).

These principles shape my own research agenda, which has exposed how raciolinguistic ideologies are deeply embedded into England's education policy in ways which pose that racialised children and teachers lack adequate language, display limited vocabularies, and are in need of emergency remediation programs and interventions which seek to modify their language (Cushing, 2022a). Yet my work has repeatedly shown that white, middle-class speakers avoid being categorized in these ways – even when their language is audibly comparable to racialized and working-class speakers. Exposing these raciolinguistic double standards is a fundamental way of articulating the inequalities that persist in schools.

Central to my work and the methodologies I employ is in locating the origin points of these raciolinguistic ideologies in British colonialism and meticulously tracing them

through to academic knowledge production and into classrooms. This involves carrying out archival work, fieldwork in classrooms, interviews with teachers and children, and corpus-assisted work on language-in-education policies. For example, my recent projects (Cushing 2022b, 2023) have traced how British colonizers in the 1700 and 1800s would regularly perceive the vocabulary of Black African speakers as ‘limited’ and ‘lacking’, and these framings were then used to justify language-based oppression and eradication (see also Willis, 2023). I then traced how these very same raciolinguistic logics were central to 1960s US-UK educational psychology academic knowledge production and the emergence of deficit discourses, which were later renewed in 2010s education policy as part of a racial justice and liberal progress narrative. My collaborations with Julia Snell (Cushing & Snell 2023; Snell & Cushing, 2022) have shown how these logics underpin school inspection procedures in England, where racially marginalized teachers and children are perceived to display non-standardized and non-academic language practices and then enregistered as cognitively inferior, badly behaved, unprofessional, and unwilling to learn. In Cushing (2022b), I showed how these processes of raciolinguistic policing are part of a broader architecture and longer history of anti-Black surveillance that racially marginalized speakers in schools experience (see also Browne 2015).

Whilst the specific articulation of raciolinguistic ideologies may change over time and space, the underlying logics remain the same. Therefore, educational linguists wishing to push back against raciolinguistic ideologies must first interrogate the underlying logics which inform their own work. Too often I have seen academics who purport to be politically progressive and motivated by social justice concerns but whose scholarship reproduces the very same deficit-based logic they claim they are disrupting. Too often I have seen academics pose classroom solutions which ultimately required marginalized communities to modify their language. And too often I have seen academics celebrating this kind of work being used to inform education policy and then using this recognition to advance their own careers. A future research agenda then, must assume a critical stance on how raciolinguistic ideologies underpin contemporary academic knowledge production and expose how education policy makers are simply a mouthpiece for the deficit logics which pervade so much academic scholarship.

2.2 Sender Dovchin’s Response

I think examining the issues of language ideology is very important, especially in applied linguistics. Language ideologies have always been at the center of my studies, and it will always be in conceptualizing my work. According to Arjun Appadurai, there are 6 different scapes, and one of them is ideoscape, which is the belief system, ideas, ideologies, and a combination set of concepts (Dovchin, 2018). And I agree with Appadurai’s argument that these ideologies or ideoscapes are one of the moving factors of today’s globalization. As scientists and researchers, we conceptualize our own ideas and ideologies in our research based on our data. Language ideologies are influenced by

political moral, and cultural interests, and are shaped by certain cultural and social settings. While some language ideologies are recognized and widely celebrated, some other language ideologies are explored further and criticized.

My research is focused on the theoretical frameworks of translanguaging, translingual discrimination, linguistic racism, and so forth. And these ideas and frameworks are strongly shaped by language ideologies implicitly and explicitly. I theorize my work through the language ideologies provided by my research participants, emerging from their social experience, lived experience, their attitudes, interests, meta linguistic practices, and other people's languages.

Basically, there are two main language ideologies emerging from my research participants in relation to my own theoretical frameworks: 1) linguistic dystopia; 2) linguistic utopia (Dovchin, 2018). The ideology of linguistic dystopia is basically about language destruction: the language being destroyed, contaminated, and imperialized, which I refer to as dark ideologies about language. For example, when somebody from a Global South background whose English is not their first language comes to an Anglo-Saxon country like Australia, they speak their first language and then they also speak English in an accent and non-standard way, and such kind of English can be pathologized. My works primarily center on translanguaging, translingual discrimination, and linguistic racism (Wang & Dovchin, 2022) that aim to combat such ideology of linguistic dystopia that promotes the notion of the standardization of language.

Similarly, another is linguistic utopia, which is the celebration of language. So translanguaging is also about celebrating the speaker, celebrating the speaker's identity, translingual, and marginal speakers. To implement translanguaging as a theoretical framework is to attend to equity, inclusion, and social justice (Barrett & Dovchin, 2019). But when we celebrate translanguaging and the identity of the translingual speakers, we should not forget about the other side of the coin—the ideology of linguistic dystopia. These two should always go together. So, we would not be biased by just one ideology: we should always think interconnectedly. We need to remind ourselves that language ideologies are not confined merely to ideas or beliefs because they can actually be extended and practiced in real life practices. When we investigate language ideologies, we need to be very careful and critical because they can be acted and practiced. For example, if English language teachers believe in one language ideology (e.g., standard British or American English) and just stick to that ideology in the classroom, that is an enactment of the strong ideology of standardization. But if language teachers believe that translanguaging is empowering non-English speakers, it is also another ideology being enacted. So, for me, language ideology is the core—core to applied linguistics, core to our thinking—not only in theory but also in practice.

When we talk about language ideologies, we always must be really open about embracing and welcoming different pluralistic language ideologies to our thinking. For example, some researchers purely focus on linguisticism or linguistic imperialism. As

applied linguists, we really need to move beyond just looking at one language ideology, but rather looking at both utopia and dystopia, both pessimistic and optimistic views of language ideologies, and think critically as critical applied linguists and then conceptualize our framework. When we conceptualize our framework based on different pluralistic language ideologies, then we will have practical research applicable to real life. It is significant to hear the voices of our research participants because what they are saying to us basically represents some ideologies of language. So, we need to remind ourselves that these people are also providing us with ideas of these ideologies based on their own experiences. What I am trying to say is we have to be very open open-minded in terms of different language ideologies. As a researcher myself, I do not really celebrate the language ideology, or I do not harshly criticize or stand against it. I try to stand in between and try to think and figure out about language ideologies. I always like to ask questions: what does this mean? Where does it come from? How does it inform our teaching and research practices? And I do not have to agree or disagree on these questions. Rather we need to critically observe to tell our readers that this is what is happening. Here is this kind of ideology, and there is another kind. Moreover, we need to ask what we think about it rather than just being very political.

2.3 Nelson Flores' Response

All representations of language are ideological. There is no representation of language that emerges from nowhere. They all emerge within specific sociohistorical contexts and are aligned with specific political agendas. To not recognize this basic point can be especially dangerous when researchers and educators espouse social justice but fail to locate the language ideologies that inform their work within their sociohistorical contexts. This can result in people ironically espousing social justice while inflicting harm on the communities they purport to support.

To date, my research has focused on the ways that this irony has played out in the education of racialized communities. I have examined the ways that contemporary framings of racialized communities as coming from less linguistically rich homes and needing remediation upon their arrival to school parallel earlier European colonial representations of racialized communities as having less evolved language practices as part of their dehumanization. This may be a relatively easy pill to swallow for educational linguists who have often positioned themselves as offering an alternative to these deficit perspectives. Yet, the solutions that many educational linguists propose, which are typically focused on teaching racialized students to use standard language practices when appropriate, have also inherited this colonial history by placing the onus of social transformation on racialized communities while failing to account for the ways that the white listening subject has overdetermined racialized communities to be engaged in nonstandard and inappropriate language practices in ways that are not aligned with their linguistic performance in a straightforward way.

This insight has tremendous implications for educational linguistics. Historically, race has often been treated as peripheral to the field, which primarily focused on ethnicity. Instead, the term ethnolinguistic was and continues to be commonly used in the field in ways that often treat ethnicity as primordial in ways that gloss over the histories of colonialism that have produced ethnoracial categories and their relationship to one another. The move from ethnolinguistic to raciolinguistic helps to center examining the ways that these colonial histories continue to shape contemporary debates. My worry is that this conceptual move will be interpreted as a specialized intervention done by “those people” perhaps under a new disciplinary approach of “raciolinguistics” with little to no implications for educational linguistics or (applied) linguistics more generally. This is a trend that I will continue to resist since my whole point has always been that the entire field of (applied) linguistics needs to grapple with the ways that the representations of language that undergird it have inherited longstanding colonial logics. That is, it is not enough to study raciolinguistic ideologies out there in the world and is, indeed, hypocritical to do so while refusing to critically interrogate them in our own backyard.

While my research has focused primarily on the relationship between race and language in education, I think the implications of my argument extend beyond race. Race was not the only classification system developed within the context of European colonialism that sought to sort humanity into naturalized hierarchies and did not emerge in isolation from these other classification systems. One such overlapping classification system stemmed from heteronormativity that naturalized the heterosexual nuclear family as the primary familial arrangement, framed gender as biological and binary and same gender love as an aberration. In my future research, I hope to further explore the role of language ideologies in the production of this heteronormativity both historically and in the present and the implications of this for education.

To be clear, I think that race must be central to any approach to the study of language ideologies in education—and indeed central to any approach to the study of language and my conceptual move towards a focus on heteronormativity should not be interpreted as abandoning a focus on race. Indeed, the discursive construction of heteronormativity was historically and continues to co-construct with race with racialized communities overdetermined to be gender and sexual deviants from these ideals. My hope is that by examining this interrelationship I will be able to bridge the gap between those who adopt a raciolinguistic perspective who often treat issues of gender and sexuality as secondary and those who work in queer linguistics who often treat issues of race as secondary. My goal would be to place the insights from both into the mainstream of (applied) linguistics such that it becomes necessary to consider these issues when studying language.

I also plan to stay committed to thinking through the implications of this work specifically for educational linguistics. Indeed, the fact that translanguaging has risen to such prominence in the field without incorporating insights from trans studies is more

not just a missed opportunity for learning from the knowledge and experience of trans people. In a society built on cisnormativity it may reify longstanding colonial logics that have sought to pathologize, police, and eliminate trans bodies. Translanguaging, as a theory of language and a pedagogical stance that positions itself as seeking to promote social justice through the transgression of socially constructed linguistic borders, has a great deal to learn from trans studies and its focus on centering the knowledge and experience of people who transgress socially constructed gender border and vice versa. I look forward to exploring this relationship in more depth in the future in the hopes of imagining more inclusive educational practices not just for bi/multilingual people and/or trans people but for everybody.

2.4 Prem Phyak's Response

I take language ideology as a framework to unpack, resist, and transform unequal power relations, social injustice, and the erasure of Indigenous/minoritized languages and epistemologies in education and the public sphere (Phyak, 2021). For me, language ideology is a critical tool to create a dialogic space with communities to analyze the historicity of the erasure of Indigenous/minoritized languages for advocacy and activism to transform unequal language policies and practices. I use the concept to build critical multilingual awareness and transformative agency of Indigenous youths, teachers, and communities for creating multilingual school spaces, policies, and practices.

My scholarship on language ideology builds on my personal life experiences as a multilingual Yaakthung Indigenous speaker. For instance, I have experienced schooling that had banned the use of Indigenous languages by imposing a one-nation-one-language ideology. Not only have I experienced learning challenges, but I have also struggled to make sense of everyday interactions in school spaces. These experiences serve as an impetus for enriching my critical perspectives about language policies and multilingualism in education. I particularly focus on how linguistic nationalism, neoliberalism, and colonial ideologies have contributed to the erasure of Indigenous and minoritized languages. Rather than taking it just as a theory, I consider language ideology as a form of critical praxis that embraces the actions, advocacy, and activism of Indigenous/minoritized language communities to resist unequal language policies shaped by colonial ideologies. As a praxis, language ideology represents agency, voice, and struggle of the historically oppressed communities and recognizes their tension(s) and collective power to resist oppressive policies that affect their sociocultural, political, and ecological dimensions of being.

Linguistic anthropologists, sociolinguists, applied linguists, and educational linguists have employed language ideology to critique sociopolitical assumptions and values about languages (e.g., Cavanaugh, 2020; Kroskrity, 2009; Liddicoat & Taylor-Leech, 2015). Linguistic nationalism, neoliberalism, colonialism, and racism/raciolinguistic ideologies have received much attention in the study of language in relation to political

economic conditions (e.g., Flores & Rosa, 2015; Kubota, 2016; Mar-Molinero, 1994). Yet, one major contemporary issue I have observed in the field is how we can use language ideology as a transformative tool to engage and collaborate with historically marginalized communities to create equal language policies and practices. There is a paucity of discussion on how holistically oppressed communities can be engaged in understanding, resisting, and transforming macro language ideologies that shape the conditions of linguistic oppression. Taking language ideology as a praxis, my work focuses on engaging Indigenous communities, teachers, and youths in the exploration, analysis, and transformation of sociopolitical conditions that build unequal power relations of languages (Davis & Phyak, 2017). For me, language ideology remains at the center of transformative language policies. Critical engagement with language ideology builds collaborative space for becoming critical and reflexive about the sociopolitical meanings and impacts of macro ideologies in the life of Indigenous/minoritized language communities.

While centering language ideology in my research, I pay attention to countering and transforming subtle forms of ‘deficit ideology’ (Gorski, 2011) that form the conditions of linguistic oppressions. In the context of the Global South, particularly in Indigenous communities, deficit views about Indigenous languages and communities are deeply rooted in the history of colonial ideologies. Since modern education policies and practices are shaped by Western colonial values, epistemologies, and ideologies of language, Indigenous communities, mainly youths, are not only deprived of learning their home languages but also, and more importantly, inculcated with deficit perspectives about Indigenous languages. Indigenous youths hardly find their home languages in school curricula, pedagogy, and assessment. The erasure of Indigenous languages has forced Indigenous youths to develop deficit views about their own heritage languages.

In my research, I use language ideology as a praxis for engaging youths, in collaboration with teachers and communities, to analyze the conditions of their own linguistic oppressions and transform them collectively by building ideological awareness for activism and advocacy. My experience tells that centering language ideology offers spaces for dialogue with Indigenous and minoritized language communities to unpack the conditions of linguistic oppressions and resist them collectively to create multilingual communities and school spaces. For me, it is important to engage Indigenous/minoritized language communities in analyzing and understanding deficit ideologies reproduced in language policies and practices and promote Indigenous values, beliefs, and epistemologies of languages that are liberatory and equal. This process involves participatory and decolonial approaches (Phyak, 2021; Phyak et. al., 2021) to research and long-term collaboration and commitment for transformative deficit ideology and creating socially just language policies.

2.5 Ruanni Tupas' Response

For the past decade or so, work on the internationalization of education has put a spotlight on language-in-education policies, foremost of which, of course, is English as Medium of Instruction (EMI). Initially, I was confused about the sudden surge of work on EMI, with the work somehow giving the impression that EMI is a hot or new topic. I probably was not the only one confused about this since the issue of English as medium of instruction has always preoccupied scholars working on or coming from erstwhile colonized countries and communities. In fact, EMI as a colonial and postcolonial question has taken center stage in nation-building projects. Slowly I began to realize that the recent surge of work on EMI has been due largely to the heightened role of English in the internationalization of education, with many universities in Europe, for example, rebranding themselves as 'global' centers of education by introducing English as medium of instruction in many of their subjects. English has also 'entered' the educational systems of countries, which have not had direct colonial engagement with English-speaking colonizers. EMI at the moment is not only the concern of scholars but is a serious topic of debates in policymaking around the world.

I mention EMI in my discussion of language ideologies because one thing I notice in a lot of work in this area is the decontextualized nature of investigating 'contemporary' language ideologies and practices today. We highlight problematic views of language in the classroom today, sometimes relating them to the central role of neoliberal economics in the governance of everyday life, but a lot of times we fail to historicize these views. There has been a relative absence of sustained engagement with the central role of colonialism and colonality in the study of language ideologies and practices. Neoliberal EMI today is not and should never be disconnected from its colonial moorings, because colonality and neoliberalism are intricately linked. Language ideologies such as native speakerism and monolingualism have received much attention in recent scholarly work, but while it is correct in raising awareness of their insidious (neoliberal) nature, what is missing is a deep historical contextualization of the ideological configurations of these beliefs.

Native speakerism and English-only stances accompanying EMI in the radically different contexts of Indonesia and Norway, for example, may be understood in terms of differentiated engagements and experiences of these two countries (one in the Global South and the other in the Global North) with neoliberal globalization. However, language ideologies in these two different social contexts are inextricably linked with native speakerism and English-only ideologies and practices in postcolonial educational systems such as that of the Philippines and India through the phenomenon of 'global coloniality' (Mignolo, 1999, p. 40). The colonial logic of domination and control sustains the architecture of unequal racialized relations and knowledge production which governs the world today except that this is mobilized through the infrastructures of neoliberal globalization.

In other words, language ideologies of Standard Language, native speakerism, monolingualism, English-only, and subtractive and deficit multilingualism, among others, are deeply embedded in the neoliberal mobilization of EMI, teacher education, textbook production, and classroom practices. However, such mobilization operates on the premise that these language ideologies are racialized, gendered, and classed, and can be traced back to the beginnings of colonial oppression when the imposition of colonial languages was justified on grounds that the subjugated peoples and their languages and cultures were useless, primitive, and inferior racially to their White colonizers.

It is for these reasons that I persistently aim to center the coloniality of language ideologies in my work. Note that I use the term ‘coloniality’ because in many responses to my work, even in the context of language teacher education which has brought me to several countries for teacher training and workshops, there is a pushback against this kind of critical inquiry because, according to many, colonialism is already ‘a thing of the past’. There is a systemic refusal among scholars and educators, except those engaged in raciolinguistic work and historiography of ideas, to confront the enduring impact of colonialism on our lives. Such refusal, in fact, is I argue the workings of neoliberalism as it continues to silence intersecting histories of oppression, racism, sexism and economic marginalization in order to mask the mobilization of racialized labor in the name of capital and profit. Our investigations into language ideologies are – and perhaps should be – investigations into what histories are inscribed into these ideologies. Even with our varied life trajectories, language ideologies connect us all through the architecture of global coloniality.

2.6 Bedrettin Yazan’s Response

I have been interested in language ideologies in my research program because looking at ideologies helps my theoretical orientation to conceptualize professional learning, identity, agency, and emotions from a critical perspective. I position myself as a language teacher educator, former language teacher, and researcher of language teacher education. I conduct research to make better sense of my practices as a teacher educator and contribute to critical teacher education and innovation in language teaching. Transitioning and transforming into a language teacher is intriguing to me. I would like to better understand (1) how teachers make that transition, construct an identity, enact that identity, and negotiate new identities through discourse and practice, (2) how they assert agency in their identity construction, and (3) what emotion labor they experience. In the past several years, I have begun asking similar questions about language teacher educators through my autoethnographic work: for example, how do we become language teacher educators? What is language teacher educators’ identity construction like?

For a long time, colleagues in applied linguistics have researched how language ideologies impact language learners’, users’, teachers’, and teacher educators’ identities

and practices. I have learned a lot from that research which contributed to my current conceptualization of language learning, teaching, and teacher education. I think we will continue researching language ideologies because (1) they are mostly unspoken, unwritten, and invisible; (2) people in power benefit from maintaining certain ideologies through their discourses and practices; and (3) language ideologies evolve and intersect with other ideologies, as long as they keep benefitting powerholders and maintaining their privileged status. Informed by previous research, I think trying to make ideologies visible to individuals who are impacted by (and perhaps contributing to the maintenance of) those ideologies could be an effective starting point.

In my current practice as a teacher educator and researcher in language teacher education, one of my goals is to work with teachers to identify dominant ideologies in their sociopolitical context and reflect on their orientation in relation to those ideologies. Bartolomé's (2004) concepts of "political and ideological clarity" are helpful for me to make sense of the impact of ideologies on the personal, professional, and political dimensions of language teaching at the intersection of micro, meso, and macro levels of social activity. To gain political clarity, I expect teachers to become deeply conscious of "the sociopolitical and economic realities that shape their lives and their capacity to transform such material and symbolic conditions" (p. 98) and understand the connection between macro-level sociopolitical factors and micro-level classroom practice and experience. To gain ideological clarity, I expect teachers "to identify and compare their own explanations for the existing socioeconomic and political hierarchy with the dominant society's" (p. 98) and understand their own ideological orientation which might be contributing to the structural inequities [also see Sah & Uysal, 2022 for a recent study on ideological and political clarity of teachers in the US].

When I responded to calls for more programmatic innovations and research on the ways identity should be integrated into language teacher education practices (De Costa & Norton, 2017; Varghese et al., 2016), I focused mainly on the issue of identity. And I call those practices identity-oriented teacher education which, however, is impossible and incomplete without bringing in the discussion of emotions, agency, and ideologies. Especially because I would like to situate language teaching in the sociopolitical context from a "critical language teacher education" perspective (Hawkins & Norton, 2009), I foreground language ideologies in theorizing teacher learning, identity, emotions, and agency. In practice, I help teachers gain "political and ideological clarity" (Bartolomé, 2004), which could open the space for them to explicitly reflect on their identity construction and assert agency to chart new contours of identity for themselves towards becoming more critical language teachers.

I need to note that in the process of implementing identity-oriented teacher education practices as a teacher educator, I question my own political and ideological clarity and reflect on my identities, especially when I give examples for teachers from my own professional life. One of the activities that I (and reportedly teachers I worked with) have found useful is critical autoethnographic narrative (CAN) in which teachers narrate

and analyze their language-related stories from life's history to understand how they construct identities, experience emotion labor, and assert agency vis-à-vis ideologies in sociopolitical contexts. Although introducing a new genre to teachers is always challenging, I think they finally appreciate engaging in such a scaffolded self-conversation and self-analysis to have a clearer sense of their situatedness in the context and future identity construction.

Using CAN, I scaffold the process of analyzing teachers' stories to make the ideologies visible and make connections between micro-level classroom activity, meso-level institutional policies, and macro-level sociopolitical dynamics. As I have found CAN an effective activity for my practice as a teacher educator, not only for teachers but also for myself to gain more political and ideological clarity for my identities, I hope to keep using it in my teacher education. And hence, I believe language ideologies will keep being an important component in my pedagogy and research.

3. CONCLUSION: KEY ISSUES AND RESEARCH AGENDA

The conversation with all six scholars provided us with insights into the contemporary issues and future research agendas around language ideologies that need careful and critical attention moving forward. The various research agendas have been summarized below. All these different contemporary issues and future research agendas can be developed and addressed through a multiplicity of research questions and research designs. Moreover, as researchers, we should be considering the questions Gal and Irvine (2019) pointed out, "What are the 'sites' of ideologies, where do they 'live,' and where can one find them in empirical investigations?" In this regard, it is important to consider The Douglas Fir Group's (2016) transdisciplinary framework that states that language ideologies influence various factors, such as language planning and policies, access to education, investment, identity, and agency that exist at the individual, family, community, institutions, and national levels. The six scholars together highlight the following strands of language ideology research:

- Nature of language ideologies and their impacts
- Historicity of language ideologies
- Evolving and Intersecting ideologies
- Raciolinguistic ideologies/practices
- Language ideology as a tool/framework
- EMI and language ideologies
- Inclusive educational practices
- Enactment of ideologies in teaching and research practices
- Critical issues of/in language ideologies

First, Sender Dovchin reminds us, as (critical) applied linguistics researchers, to ask questions in relation to the nature of language ideologies, the impact of language

ideologies and the factors shaping/influencing language ideologies. Moreover, the research questions should aim at investigating the micro-level (classroom activity), meso-level (institutional policies), and macro-level (sociopolitical dynamics) dynamics to understand the underlying language ideologies, as argued by Bedrettin Yazan. Citing Bartolomé's (2004) concepts of "political and ideological clarity," he points out the broader impacts of language ideologies on the personal, professional, and political dimensions of language teaching as these pluralistic ideologies are influenced and shaped by the political moral, and cultural interests in various sociocultural settings. Furthermore, he presents an identity-oriented lens and critical autoethnographic narrative as theoretical frameworks to investigate various underlying pluralistic ideologies that are evolving and intersecting with other ideologies and concepts, such as professional learning, identity, agency, and emotions from a critical viewpoint in the broader conceptualization of language learning, teaching, and teacher education. Another important research agenda would be to investigate the historicity of language ideologies. As Ruanni Tupas notes, we need to ask questions that would allow us to understand the deep historical contextualization of the ideological configurations of beliefs around various issues, such as colonialism and global coloniality of language ideologies, neoliberalism, native speakerism, monolingualism, English-only policies, ideologies of standard Language, neoliberal EMI, that are perpetuated by explicit and implicit language ideologies. Likewise, Prem Phyak makes a substantial argument about how colonial ideologies, such as Western colonial values and epistemologies have shaped modern education policies and practices, and how such deficit perspectives and discriminatory ideologies have affected Indigenous youths, their heritage language, and literacies.

Another important research agenda/strand of raciolinguistic ideologies and practices would help us understand the intersection of race and language in education. In this regard, Nelson Flores, whose research is primarily grounded in and informed by raciolinguistic framework, succinctly states, "All representations of language are ideological. Race must be central to any approach to the study of language ideologies in education—and indeed central to any approach to the study of language." Flores extends his research beyond the relationship between race and language to further explore the role of language ideologies in the production of heteronormativity that rationalizes the colonial logics of pathologizing, policing, and eliminating trans bodies. Thus, there is a need for critical attention to consider the relationship of language, race, gender, and sexuality in language education. Adding to this research strand, Ian Cushing urges us to locate the origin points of such raciolinguistic ideologies in (British) colonialism that have promoted inequalities in schools and marginalization of racialized English speakers through raciolinguistic logics and policing. Understanding such raciolinguistic ideologies encourages us to ask questions about how deficit-based discourses emerge and get promoted in language-in-education policies that racially marginalize teachers and students as well, who are perceived as cognitively inferior, badly behaved, unprofessional, and unwilling to learn. As critical language teachers and researchers, we

need to investigate the roots and impacts of such discriminatory raciolinguistic ideologies/practices for promoting equity, diversity, inclusion, and social justice in broader language education through meticulous research works, such as examining archival work, fieldwork in classrooms, interviewing racially marginalized teachers and students, and corpus-assisted work on language-in-education policies, as stated by Ian Cushing.

Centering language ideologies in his research, Prem Phyak, a multilingual Yaakthung youth himself, offers a language ideology as a tool/framework that allows him to unsettle issues related to inequity and injustice facing Indigenous youths, especially in the Global South context in Indigenous communities. He proposes that language ideology is more than a tool/framework—a transformative tool that has the potential to empower Indigenous youths, transform discriminatory language policies and practices, create multilingual spaces within and beyond school spaces. Furthermore, he envisions language ideology as a praxis for engaging Indigenous youths to reclaim their languages and literacies through the ideological awareness of advocacy and activism, which can be achieved through participatory and decolonial approaches to research for resisting deficit ideologies and for promoting Indigenous and minoritized languages, literacy practices, and epistemologies in the school and public spaces. Likewise, Ruanni Tupas discusses the contemporary issues in his research underpinning the relationship between EMI and language ideologies due to the growth of internationalization of higher education, especially in European nations, which he calls the neoliberal mobilization of EMI. He asserts EMI as a colonial and postcolonial project, which continues to perpetuate the ideology of standard language, native speakerism, and monolingualism under the veil of the neoliberal mobilization of EMI, teacher education, textbook production, and classroom practices, which he refers to as the coloniality of language ideologies. Therefore, his arguments make much sense in that it is essential to investigate the remnants of colonialism and coloniality while examining various language ideologies and practices, especially in the postcolonial educational systems. More specifically, he urges researchers to critically unpack all such language ideologies that continue to produce unequal racialized relations, unequal language status (e.g., unequal Englishes [Tupas, 2015]) and the production of (academic) knowledge.

Another set of important questions we need to be asking relates to maintaining inclusive educational practices. Due to the existing raciolinguistic ideologies and practices, explicit and implicit pluralistic ideologies, bi/multilingual learners and teachers, and trans people have been gravely disadvantaged in the broader language education and the neoliberal educational contexts. Thus, scholars (e.g., Nelson Flores, Ian Cushing, Sender Dovchin, and Bedrettin Yazan) point out the necessity of embracing theoretical frameworks, such as translanguaging, raciolinguistic perspective, and critical teacher education to ensure inclusive educational opportunities for everyone. These issues corroborate with the last research strand/agenda that needs attention to scrutinizing critical issues of/in language ideologies, and many of these issues have unfortunately received meager attention, mainly within the higher education contexts and various

other research contexts. The future research agenda in language ideologies should, thereby, ask how various ideologies emerge, operationalize, influence, and impact various other factors, in addition to observing and examining language ecology in the glocal contexts by simultaneously exploring the issues related to identity, agency, and emotions of learners and teachers. We need to be investigating how different pluralistic language ideologies are enacted in teaching and research practices, as highlighted by Sender Dovchin.

THE AUTHORS

Madhukar KC (Madhu) is a PhD student in Linguistics and Applied Linguistics Program and a first-year writing instructor in the writing programs at Arizona State University, Tempe. His research interests broadly include World Englishes, multilingualism, second language teacher/learner identity and emotions, non-native English teachers' identities and professional development, language ideologies, advocacy for professional equity, L2 writing, TESOL, teacher education, critical pedagogy, and social justice. He served as the Coordinator for the *Advocacy, Community Building, and Inclusion Strand* at the *TESOL International Convention* in 2023 and 2024. Currently, he is serving as the Vice President of *Arizona TESOL*.

Ian Cushing is Senior Lecturer in Critical Applied Linguistics at Manchester Metropolitan University, UK. His work traces raciolinguistic ideologies over time and space, from their colonial roots through to academic knowledge production and into contemporary classrooms. He was the recipient of the *2022 UK Literacy Association Brenda Eastwood* prize for his work on language and discrimination in schools. His 2021 article in literacy on raciolinguistic surveillance in schools won the *2023 UKLA/Wiley Research in Literacy* award. His monograph, *Standards, Stigma, Surveillance: Raciolinguistic Ideologies and England's Schools* won the *2023 British Association of Applied Linguistics book award*.

Sender Dovchin is a Director of Research, a Principal Research Fellow and an Australian Research Council Fellow at the School of Education, Curtin University, Australia. Dovchin is an Editor-in-Chief of the *Australian Review of Applied Linguistics*. She was identified as the *Top Researcher in the field of Language & Linguistics* under The Humanities, Arts & Literature of The Australian's 2022 Research Magazine, and Top 250 Researchers in Australia in 2022. Her research pragmatically contributes to the language education of culturally & linguistically diverse population in Australia and Global South, providing a critical view to accommodate the multiple co-existences of linguistic diversity in a globalized world. She has authored numerous articles in international peer-reviewed journals and has authored 11 books with international publishers with topics covering linguistic racism & linguistic inclusion.

Nelson Flores is Associate Professor in Educational Linguistics at the University of Pennsylvania. He is an affiliated faculty with the Center for Latin American and Latinx Studies and the Director of the Ph.D. program in educational linguistics at UPenn. His research examines the intersection of language, race, and the political economy in shaping U.S. educational policies and practices. He has been the recipient of many academic awards including a 2017 Spencer Postdoctoral Fellowship, the 2019 *James Alatis Prize for Research on Language Planning and Policy in Educational Contexts*, 2020 *Graduate Center of the City University of New York Graduate of the Last Decade Award* and the 2022 *AERA Early Career Award*.

Prem Phyak is an Associate Professor at Teachers College, Columbia University. His research areas include language policy, multilingualism and multilingual education, social justice and activism, Indigenous language education and decolonial theories. He has co-authored the books *Engaged Language Policy and Practices* and *Multilingual Education in South Asia*. He has published papers in various journals such as *Language Policy*, *The Modern Language Journal*, *Language in Society*, *Applied Linguistics Review*, *Multilingua*, and *Journal of Language, Identity and Education*.

Ruanni Tupas is Associate Professor of Sociolinguistics in Education at the Institute of Education (IOE), University College London. His work concerns issues in Unequal Englishes, multilingual education, and the politics of knowledge production. He is an Associate Editor of the *International Journal of the Sociology of Language*. He was awarded as the 2009 *Andrew Gonzalez Distinguished Professional Chair in Linguistics and Language Education* by the Linguistic Society of Philippines (LSP). He was chosen by IOE's Research for the Real World as one of the 'Best of 2021' for his work on multilingualism and Pinoy Pop.

Bedrettin Yazan is Associate Professor in the Department of Bicultural-Bilingual Studies at the University of Texas at San Antonio. His research focuses on language teacher learning and identity, collaboration between ESL and content teachers, language policy and planning, and world Englishes. Methodologically he is interested in critical autoethnography, narrative inquiry, and qualitative case study. His recent work has appeared in *Language Teaching Research*, *TESOL Quarterly*, *Linguistics and Education*, *Language Learning Journal*, and *Pedagogy, Culture, and Society*. He is currently serving as the co-editor of *TESOL Journal* and associate editor of *International Multilingual Research Journal*.

REFERENCES

- Barrett, T. A., & Dovchin, S. (Eds.). (2019). *Critical inquiries in the sociolinguistics of globalization*. Multilingual Matters.
- Bartolomé, L. I. (2004). Critical pedagogy and teacher education: Radicalizing prospective teachers. *Teacher Education Quarterly*, 31(1), 97–122.

- Browne, S. (2015). *Dark Matters: On the surveillance of Blackness*. Duke University Press.
- Cavanaugh, J. R. (2020). Language ideology revisited. *International Journal of the Sociology of Language*, 2020(263), 51–57. <https://doi.org/10.1515/ijsl-2020-2082>
- Coard, B. (1971). *How the West Indian child is made educationally sub-normal in the British school system*. New Beacon Books.
- Cushing, I. (2022a). *Standards, stigma, surveillance: Raciolinguistic ideologies and England's schools*. Palgrave Macmillan.
- Cushing, I. (2022b). Word rich or word poor? Deficit discourses, raciolinguistic ideologies and the resurgence of the 'word gap' in England's education policy. *Critical Inquiry in Language Studies*. Advance online publication. <https://doi.org/10.1080/15427587.2022.2102014>
- Cushing, I. (2023). The 'knowledge rich' education project and the endurance of whiteness: a raciolinguistic perspective. *Educational Linguistics* 2(1), 51–71. <https://doi.org/10.1515/eduling-2022-0018>
- Cushing, I., & Snell, J. (2023). The (white) ears of Ofsted: A raciolinguistic perspective on the listening practices of the schools inspectorate. *Language in Society*, 52(3), 363–386. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0047404522000094>
- Davis, K. A., & Phyak, P. (2017). *Engaged language policy and practices*. Routledge.
- De Costa, P. I., & Norton, B. (2017). Introduction: Identity, transdisciplinarity, and the good language teacher [Guest editorial]. *Modern Language Journal*, 101(S1), 3–14. <https://doi.org/10.1111/modl.12368>
- Dovchin, S. (2018). *Language, media and globalization in the periphery: The linguascapes of popular music in Mongolia*. Routledge.
- Flores, N & Rosa, J. (2022). Undoing competence: coloniality, homogeneity, and the overrepresentation of whiteness in applied linguistics. *Language Learning*. Advance online publication. <https://doi.org/10.1111/lang.12528>
- Flores, N., & Rosa, J. (2015). Undoing appropriateness: Raciolinguistic ideologies and language diversity in education. *Harvard Educational Review*, 85(2), 149–171. <https://doi.org/10.17763/0017-8055.85.2.149>
- Gal, S., & Irvine, J. T. (2019). *Signs of difference: Language and ideology in social life*. Cambridge University Press.
- Gorski, P. C. (2011). Unlearning deficit ideology and the scornful gaze: Thoughts on authenticating the class discourse in education. In R. Ahlquist, P. Gorski and T. Montaña (Eds.), *Assault on kids: How hyper-accountability, corporatization, deficit ideologies, and Ruby Payne are destroying our schools* (pp. 152–173). Peter Lang.

- Hawkins, M., & Norton, B. (2009). Critical language teacher education. In A. Burns and J. C. Richards (Eds.), *The Cambridge guide to second language teacher education* (pp. 30–39). Cambridge University Press.
- Kroskrity, P. V. (2004). Language ideologies. In A. Duranti (Eds.), *A companion to linguistic anthropology* (pp. 496–517). Blackwell.
- Kroskrity, P. V. (2009). Language renewal as sites of language ideological struggle: The need for ideological clarification. In J. Reyhner and L. Lockard (Eds.), *Indigenous language revitalization: Encouragement, guidance and lessons learned* (pp. 71–83). Northern Arizona University.
- Kroskrity, P.V. (2010). Language Ideologies – Evolving Perspectives. In Jurgen Jaspers, J.-O. Östman and J. Verschueren (Eds.), *Society and language use* (pp. 192–211). John Benjamins. <https://doi.org/10.1075/hoph.7.13kro>
- Kubota, R. (2016). Neoliberal paradoxes of language learning: Xenophobia and international communication. *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development*, 37(5), 467–480. <https://doi.org/10.1080/01434632.2015.1071825>
- Liddicoat, A. J., & Taylor-Leech, K. (2015). Multilingual education: The role of language ideologies and attitudes. *Current Issues in Language Planning*, 16(1-2), 1–7. <https://doi.org/10.1080/14664208.2015.995753>
- Mar-Molinero, C. (1994). Linguistic nationalism and minority language groups in the ‘new’ Europe. *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development*, 15(4), 319–328. <https://doi.org/10.1080/01434632.1994.9994574>
- Mignolo, W. D. (1999). Philosophy and the colonial difference. *Philosophy Today*, 43(S), 36–41. <https://doi.org/10.5840/philtoday199943Supplement46>
- Phyak, P. (2021). Subverting the erasure: Decolonial efforts, indigenous language education and language policy in Nepal. *Journal of Language, Identity & Education*, 20(5), 325–339. <https://doi.org/10.1080/15348458.2021.1957682>
- Phyak, P., Rawal, H., & De Costa, P. I. (2021). Dialogue as a decolonial effort: Nepali youth transforming monolingual ideologies and reclaiming multilingual citizenship. In K. Heugh, C. Stroud, K. Taylor-Leech and P. I. De Costa (Eds.), *A sociolinguistics of the South* (pp. 155–170). Routledge.
- Sah, P. K., & Uysal, H. (2022). Unbiased but ideologically unclear: Teacher beliefs about language practices of emergent bilingual students in the U.S. *Linguistics and Education*, 72, Article 101126. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.linged.2022.101126>
- Sivanandan, A. (1981). From resistance to rebellion: Asian and Afro-Caribbean struggle in Britain. *Race & Class* 23(2/3), 111–152. <https://doi.org/10.1177/03063968810230020>
- Snell, J., & Cushing, I. (2022). “A lot of them write how they speak”: policy, pedagogy, and the policing of ‘non-standard’ English. *Literacy*, 56(3), 199–211. <https://doi.org/10.1111/lit.12298>

- The Douglas Fir Group. (2016). A transdisciplinary framework for SLA in a multilingual world. *The Modern Language Journal*, 100(S1), 19–47. <https://doi.org/10.1111/modl.12301>
- Tupas, R. (Ed.). (2015). *Unequal Englishes: The politics of Englishes today*. Palgrave Macmillan.
- Varghese, M. M., Motha, S., Park, G., Reeves, J., & Trent, J. (2016). In this issue [Guest editorial]. *TESOL Quarterly*, 50(3), 545–571. <https://doi.org/10.1002/tesq.333>
- Wang, M., & Dovchin, S. (2022). “Why should I not speak my own language (Chinese) in public in America?”: Linguistic racism, symbolic violence, and resistance. *TESOL Quarterly*. Advance online publication. <https://doi.org/10.1002/tesq.3179>
- Willis, A. I. (2023). *Anti-Black literacy laws and policies*. Routledge.