

Chapter 15

Stirring the Onion

Educators and the Dynamics of Language Education Policies (Looking Ahead)

Ofelia García and Kate Menken

The layers of the onion that make up the field referred to by different terms—*language planning* (Cooper, 1989; Eastman, 1983; Ferguson, 2006; Fishman, 1971; Fishman, Ferguson, & Das, 1968; Haugen, 1959, 1966; Kaplan & Baldauf, 1997; Kennedy, 1983), *language policy* (LP; Corson, 1999; Ricento, 2006; Shohamy, 2006; Spolsky, 2004; Tollefson, 2002), and *language policy and planning* (LPP; Fettes, 1997; Hornberger, 2006; Hornberger & Ricento, 1996) or *language policy and language planning* (LPLP; Wright, 2004)—have been well described by Hornberger and Ricento (1996). But it is time to stir the onion as it is cooked by those who “language,” softening and blending the layers alongside each other. It is time, as Hornberger (2006) herself has said, to integrate perspectives. This book specifically looks at how educators stir the onion by locating ideological and implementational spaces within their own practices (Hornberger & Ricento, 1996), as it shifts the emphasis of the field from government official education policies that are handed down to educators to those that educators themselves enact in classrooms and in interaction with a myriad other factors.

The field of LP has evolved in the last half a century. Even from the beginning, the language-planning approach that focused on solving language problems of developing nations and finding solutions to social problems created by language differences (Fishman et al., 1968; Jernudd & Das, 1971) was questioned in the title of Rubin and Jernudd’s influential book of 1971, *Can Language be Planned?* In defending the designation LPP, Hornberger (2006) reminds us that language planning—an activity to promote systematic linguistic change in a community of speakers and usually undertaken by government—and language policy—the ideas, laws, regulations, rules and practices intended to achieve planned language change in society (Kaplan & Baldauf, 1997)—are linked but yet have important and distinctive roles, even though their relationship is not linear. The complex dynamism between the components have led Spolsky (2004) to refer to the activity only as “language policy” with three components: (1) language practices or the habitual patterns of languaging; (2) language beliefs or ideology about languaging; (3) language management or planning as specific efforts to modify or influence languaging.¹

