

THE COMBINATION OF CRITICAL DISCOURSE ANALYSIS AND ETHNOGRAPHY IN LANGUAGE POLICY AND PLANNING STUDY: A LITERATURE REVIEW

Jiayi Shi

j.shi2@ncl.ac.uk

Abstract

This literature review starts with an introduction to Language Policy and Planning (LPP) study. By reviewing the current trend in LPP study, it sets to find a chance for the combination of critical discourse analysis and ethnography. While ethnography provides researchers the chance to analyze agency, or the roles that local practitioners play in language policy process; Critical Discourse Analysis (CDA) provides the researchers within LPP with the theoretical foundation for dealing with the other part of the tension, namely structure, or a critical theoretical focus on power and ideology in macro policies.

Key words: Language Policy and Planning, Critical Discourse Analysis, Ethnography

1. Introduction

This literature review begins with an introduction to Language Policy and Planning (LPP) study. It will show that the current work on LPP characterizes a) an understanding of LPP as a social construct engendered and continuously shaped by the socio-political and historical contexts in which it exists; b) the tension between structure and agency, or between the critical theoretical focus on power and ideology in macro policies and an ethnographic understanding of the roles that local practitioners play in language policy process; c) an emphasis on the agentive power of micro policy agents in policy creation, interpretation and appropriation (e.g. Corson 1999; Johnson 2013; Tollefson 2006). The combination of critical discourse analysis (CDA) and ethnography is introduced, which addresses the traditional language policy research for neglecting the LPP as social construct that is grounded in and engendered by national

and regional contexts, dichotomizing policy and practice, and for ignoring the agentive role of local participants.

2. Development of the Language Policy and Planning study

2.1 Early LPP approaches

Language policy and planning found its earliest tradition long way back the history, with the emergence of nation states in the 17th and the 18th centuries. New nations chose national language for their citizens, in order to spread laws and create uniformity. Yet, the theoretical and systematic study of LPP in academia started around 1960s (Johnson 2013). It gets through several major changes, consequently, the direction of the field has changed several times as well (Ricento 2006a; Ricento 2006b; Johnson 2013).

The concept of ‘language planning’ was first introduced by Haugen (1959, p. 8). He used the concept to define ‘the activity of preparing a normative orthography, grammar, and dictionary for the guidance of writers and speakers in a non-homogeneous speech community’. In his definition, language planning focused on the form of the language, which later developed into the concept of ‘corpus planning’ by others (e.g. Kloss, 1969; Johnson, 2013). Indeed, the focus on form of the language had been a tendency in early linguistic tradition, since it reflects attitudes about ways in which languages are learned.

Haugen (1959) provided several planning steps to follow: Firstly, selection of a norm (i.e. selecting a language variety for a particular context). It is worth mentioning that the norm often is the variety of those speakers who are the most politically powerful, such as the London accent or Mandarin used by Beijing Han people. Secondly, codification-development of an explicit (usually written) form. Thirdly, implementation- attempt to spread the language form. Fourthly, elaboration- continued updating of the language variety to meet the needs of the modern world. Selection and implementation are status planning, since they reflect the decision procedures and spread procedures of a language. Codification and elaboration are corpus planning, since they are about standardization and development of a certain language.

The four steps in Haugen (1983) entirely put spotlight on the macro-level policy. The selection and codification were designed as a government job, with a consequence that those at the top got to decide what was acceptable and desirable officially. Even

the popularization of the selected norm in grassroots was taken as implementation, which was taken as a government order to follow. The updating of the language variety was also taken as a government response to the changing society. In other words, the interpretation, adjustment, alteration and appropriation of the language policy in lower levels were not the focus of the early LPP study.

Such a focus on the macro level in the early LPP study was manifested in the work of another field pioneer. Rubin (1977, in Johnson 2013, p. 31) stated that ‘language planning is deliberate language change, that is, changes in the systems of a language code or speaking or both that are planned by organizations established for such purposes or given a mandate to fulfill such purposes’. In Rubin’s definition, language planning was understood as deliberate (intentional and covert) behavior conducted and guided by established organizations (some governing institutions). In this sense, language planning was believed and taken as top-down and intentional action in the early period of the LPP study.

2.2 LPP as a social construct

The early approach in LPP study laid solid foundation for further research, but it invited heated criticism as well (e.g. Cooper 1989; Schiffman 1996). Dominated by a structuralist or positivist epistemology, the early approach overlooked the sociopolitical context in which the language is planned.

Dell Hymes’ ethnography of speaking (1962) timely inspires scholars in LPP to rethink about the social, political and economic contexts of the LPP. Hymes’ ethnography of speaking borrows from the ethnographic tradition within anthropology. He believes that linguistics should not just focus on form or texts. Instead, he supports long-term participant observation within a community and a commitment to inductive discovery. McCarthy (2011) notes that notion of communicative competence is fundamental to the field of LPP. It is manifested in today’s focuses on the interaction between language planning and particular ways of speaking as well as the analyses of language policy as a sociocultural phenomenon (Johnson 2013, p. 32).

Schiffman (1996), for instance, starts to see language policy as a social construct. According to him, LPP is a social construct that rests on other conceptual elements, such as belief systems, attitudes, values, prejudices, religious strictures, etc. He refers the package of these conceptual elements as linguistic culture, which works as culture baggage that speakers bring to their dealings with language from their contexts.

Spolsky's (2004) work is another example of the understanding of LPP as a social construct. He distinguishes between three components of LPP in a society: (1) its language practices, or the habitual selection of varieties that form language repertoire; (2) its language beliefs or ideology, or beliefs about language use; and (3) any intentional language management. Language practice and ideology are not necessarily intentional or planned. They can be implicit as well, for they are the habitual choices people make that form the linguistic culture of that context. The third refers to the traditional conceptualizations of LPP as intentional and government-oriented LPP. It is explicit and overt. In this sense, LPP is not only the matter of the intentional policy documents produced by the national government. It is also about the habitual selection and acceptance of languages in local area, which is always covert, implicit but can be substantial. In another occasion, Spolsky (2012, p. 5) eloquently points out that a national or official language management does not guarantee observance, just as speed limits do not guarantee that all cars abide by them.

In this sense, language policy is not only about the explicit policy documents provided by the national government. It is also about the local adaptation, habitual choices and language attitudes of the public. For instance, no matter how vigorously the national government tries to implement English education, it probably means nothing more than a subject for a community that has no use of English at all in their daily life. Another example would be parents' attitudes towards English education. If they believe learning English equals vocabulary memorization or drills, they would probably see games in communicative teaching as a waste of time. To sum up, language policy includes explicitly written policy texts but also language practice and ideology among local policy agents. The latter might be implicit, so it is researchers' job to probe into informants' daily life to identify their habitual selection of the language and language attitudes. A close ethnographic study is needed to provide careful LPP research that does not make causative claims about implicit language practice and language ideology.

2.3 Critical Language Policy

The later development of LPP found a strong impact from critical sociolinguistics, which focuses on the relationship between language and power. More specifically, it focuses on how social structure and discourses form and inform individual behavior. Tollefson (2006) groups this branch within LPP as critical

language policy (CLP). CLP draws heavily on critical theory and critical discourse analysis (CDA). It argues that the discourses of language policies can hegemonically normalize and legitimize what is acceptable and thinkable, while concomitantly delimiting others. Such an understanding of language policy soon attracted discussion on linguistic rights and problems to individuals (e.g. Johnson 2011; Ricento 2006a).

There was discussion on orientations of language planning. Ruiz (1982, p. 2), for instance, argued that orientations are basic to language planning because ‘they delimit the ways we talk about language and language issues...they help to delimit the range of acceptable attitudes towards language, and to make certain attitudes legitimate. In short, orientations determine what is thinkable about language in society’. Focusing on the way society treats minority language for majority language acquisition, Ruiz proposed three orientations of language planning in education. A language-as-problem orientation treats minority languages as problematic roadblocks for the linguistic and cultural assimilation for majority language education. In a language-as-right orientation, minority language students learn the majority language while maintain their mother tongue. A language-as-resource orientation celebrates linguistic diversity and regards multilingual education as resources to the society.

Ruiz (1982) is one example of critical study within LPP. Numerous studies have taken the assumption that language policies had ideological orientations. They argue that language policies create social inequality among dominant and minority language users. As a result, CLP determines to fulfill several purposes: it eschews apolitical LPP approaches and acknowledges that policies often create and sustain various forms of social inequality, and that policy-makers usually promote the interests of dominant social groups. Furthermore, it seeks to develop more democratic policies that reduce inequality and promote the maintenance of minority languages. CLP is used to examine indigenous and minority language maintenance and education. For instance, Hill and May (2011) document the process that indigenous Maori language is revitalized by full immersion education among minority language users. The revitalization movement generated from grassroots helps to recognize Maori as one of New Zealand’s official languages (1987), after a period in which Maori was declining due to colonization and assimilationist policies.

CLP promotes democratic policies and champion the rights of linguistic minorities. Yet, it has been criticized for being too deterministic and underestimating

the power of local agency (Johnson 2011; Ricento and Hornberger 1996). Pennycook (2006) advocates what Foucault (1982, p. 92) argues, ‘the focus is on how power circulates across various contexts, within micro-level practices and discourses’. He (Pennycook 2006, p. 65) argues that LPP study should reveal how policies create inequality that takes the focus off ‘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’. In other words, the power of local/micro level practices and discourses is what intrigues the ethnographers in LPP study.

2.4 Ethnography of language policy

Ethnography is widely used in sociology, sociolinguistics, material culture study, and communication studies (Atkinson et al. 2007). There are several kinds of ethnography, such as classic ethnography, feminist ethnography, postmodern ethnography and critical ethnography (e.g. Atkinson et al. 2007; Blommaert and Jie 2010; McCarty 2011a, 2011b). The differences of these types of ethnography vary in the stand of researchers, methods, focus, etc. For instance, critical ethnography, not only like other kinds of ethnography that try to speak *about* the participants, attempts to speak *for* the participants in the same time. Besides, the characterization of kinds of ethnography is not clear-cut. A feminist ethnography, for instance, can also have a critical point of view about the discrimination and repression encountered by the participants. Since it is impossible and unnecessary to cover a complete overview of ethnography and its methods, I will focus on ethnography in LPP instead.

According to Creswell (1998, p.18), ‘ethnography is a description and interpretation of a cultural or social group or system. The researcher examines the group’s observable and learned patterns of behavior, customs and ways of life.’ In this definition, Creswell points out several characteristics of ethnography. In the first place, ethnography is an understanding and description of how participants understand certain things in their lives, such as interaction, policy, rituals, behaviors, events and customs. Secondly, in order to form this understanding, the ethnographers need to spend an extended period of time with research participants and try to make sense of what is being studied through the participants’ eyes. Blommaert and Jie (2010) further characterize ethnography as: a. what is being studied is context bound, which requires the ethnographers being immersed in a culture to better understand the observed people and events; b. the informants must believe they can speak freely and for themselves,

which requires the ethnographers develop good rapport with the participants; c. ethnographers understand what is studied as a complex web of meaning that is depended upon its context.

Ethnography of language policy has seen a major development in the last decade. Addressing the limitation within CLP and traditional LPP, it is widely used by scholars to examine agents and contexts across the multiple layers of language policy creation, interpretation and appropriation. It marries a critical focus on the power of marginalizing policy with a focus on agency (Hornberger and Johnson 2007, 2011). In other words, it focuses both on the macro policy discourses as well as recognizes the power of local agency to exert influence to the LPP. Sercombe (2006, 2008, 2010), for instance, provides detailed ethnographic presentation of interpretation and implementation of national LPP in local district. Focusing on Penan, a minority community in Brunei, Sercombe finds that the language behavior of local Penan community (Sukang Village) is relatively stable or unaffected by the national LPP that prescribes Malay and English as the institutional languages. Meanwhile, Sercombe provides a critical perspective of the macro or national LPPs and points out that they help to sustain the benefits and interests of the dominant groups. Penan children would have poor school performance since they have very limited use of Malay and English outside schools, which also limits their performance in classroom interaction. There are also ethnographic works that analyze multilingual education (e.g. Canagarajah 2006), language education and maintenance (e.g. McCarty 2009) and English language policy in local contexts (e.g. Ramanathan 2005).

In these ethnography language policy studies, the agentic roles of teachers are put under spotlight. They exert their influence through their teaching methods, teacher talk and assessment methods. Ricento and Hornberger (1996) refer the multiple layers in policy process as an onion of language policy. They metaphorically argue that local schools and teachers, the inside, micro and real-context of LPP, are the spiciest in the multiple layers of the LPP process. Hornberger and Johnson (2007, p. 509) believe that the interpretation and implementation provide local schools and teachers ‘an implementational and ideological space’ for supporting multilingualism as a resource for students. An ideological space is the empowerment of bilingual teachers to take ownerships of language policy processes and implement language policy in a way that benefits bilingual learners.

These studies have proved to provide empirical evidence that facilitates our understanding of policy processes all over the world. They also provide detailed description of policy processes to promote minority and indigenous languages in schools and society. Most importantly, I believe, is their contribution of theoretical and conceptual orientation that combines the macrolevel policy and microlevel practice. Johnson (2013b), for instance, delves into the school district of Philadelphia to study the power relationship across different educational contexts. He finds that the locus of power is not just contained in the policy text alone, but is enacted, interpreted and implemented in micro-level practices and discourses. His methods contain participants observation, analyses of interaction and interviews. He also finds that although some people behave as they are told to, a group of teachers resist dominant and marginalizing discourses. Cincotta-Segi (2011) conducted an ethnographic work on language policy and education in the Lao People's Democratic Republic. He finds that although the national government has prescribed Lao as the official and legitimate language being used in education settings, teachers use other minority languages in teaching to suit their class contents, students' background and teaching methods. Sercombe (2010) also provides evidences that teachers, as policy interpreters and implementers, also help to sustain and facilitate the top-down language policies in assimilating the hegemonic intentions of those in authority. When teachers use primarily Malay and English to teach, it largely restricts the chance of participation from minority students.

Through the discussion in section 2, I have gradually presented the ongoing trend of LPP study. It features in a) an understanding of LPP as a social construct formed by the linguistic culture of the specific contexts (section 2.1); b) a tension between structure and agency, or between a critical theoretical focus on power and ideology in macro policies and an ethnographic understanding of the roles that local practitioners play in language policy process (section 2.2); c) an emphasis on the agentive power of micro policy agents in policy creation, interpretation and implementation (section 2.3 & 2.4). In the next section, I will present principles of critical discourse analysis (CDA). While ethnography provides researchers the chance to analyze agency, or the roles that local practitioners play in language policy process; CDA provides the researchers within LPP with the theoretical foundation for dealing with the other part of the tension, namely structure, or a critical theoretical focus on power and ideology in macro policies.

3. Critical Discourse Analysis (CDA)

3.1 A Brief Introduction of CDA

One of the dominant tenets of CDA is its belief that language is social practice, meaning discourse can both sustain and reproduce the social status quo and it can contribute to transform it (Fairclough, 2010). As Fairclough and Wodak (1997, p. 258) state, describing discourse as social practice implies a dialectical relationship between a particular discursive event and the situation(s) and social structure(s), which frame it: the discursive event is shaped by them, but it also shapes them. Discourse is socially constitutive as well as socially conditioned- it constitutes situations, objects of knowledge, and the social identities of the relationship between people and groups of people.

Fairclough (2001) believes that since CDA analyzes discourse practices as socially conditioned and socially constitutive events, the word 'critique' denotes the interconnections and chains of cause and effects. Wodak and Meyer (2009) seem to agree with Fairclough when they argue that it is for CDA's particular perspective on discourse that the term 'critical' is used. It focuses not on linguistic unit per se but in studying social events in a problem-oriented and multidisciplinary manner. In other words, CDA is critical for its aims in demystifying discourse and power relations underneath the discourse.

The concept of power is a central notion in CDA, because discourse is socially consequential thus entwined in social power (Fairclough and Wodak 1997). Power is signaled not only by grammatical forms within text, but also by a person or a group of people's control of a social occasion. As result, discursive practices can produce and reproduce unequal power relations between races, classes, genders and other majorities and minorities. CDA is critical also because it intends to produce both 'enlightenment and emancipation by creating awareness in social agents of their own needs and interests' (Wodak 1989 in Perez-Milans 2013, p. 2). It analyzes 'power' as central condition in social life that is manifested and challenged in discourse. As Wodak argues (2001, p. 11): 'language indexes power, expresses power, is involved where there is a contention over and a challenge to power. Power does not derive from language, but language can be used to challenge power, to subvert it, to alter distributions of power in the short and long term.' It is CDA's aim to point out the hidden power relations behind the

discursive practices and challenge unequal power relations in making conventionalized and stable discursive practices.

With its fluid and fast developing methodologies and theories, 'discourse' in CDA might mean different things to different scholars according to their slightly different theoretical or methodological preferences. Wodak emphasizes the understanding of 'discourse' as 'structures of knowledge manifested in different kinds of (oral/written) genres and texts that have their own communicative conventions (i.e. linguistic features and organization) and ways of implying meaning' (Perez-Milans 2013, p. 2). Van Dijk's definition of discourse is more inclusive. He defines discourse as a communicative event, 'including conversational interaction, written texts, as well as associated gestures, face work, typographical layout, images and any other 'semiotic' or multimedia dimension of signification' (van Dijk 2001, p. 98).

It is safe to say then that in CDA, discourse refers not only to texts, but also to the social process of creating meaning. To use Bhatia's words (2013, p.3), 'discourse, then, is the end product of the creation and interpretation of semiotic variables.' Multimodal approaches to CDA have enriched the methodological tools available to CDA researchers. The recent development in CDA has embraced video-recordings, interviews and other ethnographical tools as data to analyze. Lin (2013, p. 2) provides an interesting example. The Playmobil toy for 'ethical family box' contains a family of four with the same brown skin and identical hair color; whereas its white family counterparts come with four figures with distinct hairstyles and clothes which suggests individuality.

3.2 CDA and Policy Discourse

Since CDA focuses on social problems and unequal social structures, one of the focal points for CDA in political settings is the analysis of the politician and those in power. CDA analysts target the discursive reproduction of dominance through the discourse of the powerful people as the main data to analyze.

CDA, in this sense, focuses on two aspects of the politician's discourse: revealing the unequal power and discrimination in politician's discourse and creating guidelines for future conduct by powerful groups. As Wodak (2001, p.10) writes, CDA 'often chooses the perspective of those who suffer, and critically analyses the language use of those in power, who are responsible for the existence of inequalities and who also have the means and opportunity to improve conditions'.

In the first place, CDA focuses on the discrimination and unequal power relations that are created, reinforced in discourse of those in power. For instance, the early work of van Dijk critically analyzes the reproduction of ethnic stereotypes. He points out that compared to popular racism, elite racism provide both discursive resources and cognitive frameworks for the reproduction of radicalized identities in every talk of the popular masses. As the result, the discourse of the elite serves the purpose of radicalizing and discriminating the marginalized groups in society.

CDA also points out that politician and those in power have more access to media, which is the result of their powerful influence and strengthens their ability to take control through discourse. For this research, the early work of CDA focused on news discourse. The recent CDA has focused on political texts as speeches, interviews, public meetings, radio phone-ins, constitutions, debates, manifestos and treaties (Wodak and Meyer 2009). Wodak (2010), for instance, focuses on the European parliament debates and meetings, in which she investigates on issues such as unemployment, the constructions of European identities, racism, immigration and unemployment. Their approach is ethnographic as well. According to Wodak and Meyer (2009), ethnography provides the analysts the opportunity to venture *backstage*, which gives insight into ‘politics as a profession’ and into the complexity of political decision-making.

It is worth pointing out that it is not always a question of ‘heroes and villains’ (van Dijk 1993, in Flowerdew 2013, p. 1), although the gatekeepers control the discourse. The powerful might not aware of their use of language and their abuse of discourse. It is CDA’s job to reveal such naturalization. In a lot of cases, the embodying taken-for-granted discrimination and marginalization in naturalized discourse is more subtle but severe, since it might easily control people’s mind (van Dijk 2001).

Finally, CD analysts always have a more or less explicit political agenda, yet CDA is not always about negative evaluation of the discrimination and control in the discourse of the powerful. It also seeks a positive outcome. Some recent studies have focused on providing guidelines for future language use by powerful groups. In particular, Wodak has aimed to help provide neutral and correct language for communication between those traditionally more powerful and the less privileged, such as doctors/patients, men/women and interviewer/interviewees (Perez Milans 2013).

The use of CDA in language policy studies also focuses on issues of power as it is enacted, reproduced, reinforced, and challenged in policy discourses (Mahboob and Paltridge 2013). It analyzes how power is constructed and exercised through language and also helps to provide guidelines for better conduct without oppressive practices.

Critical language policies, as I have mentioned in section 2.3, draws on the principles of CDA to analyze the policies, regulations and practices related to the use and functional distribution of languages. Tollefson (2006, p. 42) points out three interrelated meanings of 'critical' language policies: '(1) it refers to work that is critical of traditional, mainstream approaches to language policy research; (2) it includes research that is aimed at social change, such as fighting against discrimination and marginalization of the minority language users; (3) it refers to research that is influenced by critical theory, and the researchers also need to be critical of their existence and position in the study.

One of the focal point of analysis for critical language policy is to examine the function and dominance of English worldwide. Phillipson (1992, in Mahboob and Paltridge 2013, p.2) claims that: 'it (critical language policy study) attempts to contribute to an understanding of the ways in which English rules, who make the rules, and what role the English teaching profession plays in promoting the 'rules' of English and the rule of English.' In his *Linguistic Imperialism*, Phillipson (1992) criticizes the way English plays a crucial role in the maintenance of power structures in a postcolonial context.

Some scholars analyze the relationship between English and development. According to many policies given by developing countries, English is the language of national development. Pennycook (1999) argues that the relationship between English and development is tenuous at best. In the first, the development of English is often at the cost of the local languages. Secondly, English education in these countries is always of low quality and efficiency. Finally, English education always use up limited resources which could be spent on educating female students or other marginalized groups, or other crucial developmental projects.

To sum up, CDA is actively used in policy discourse analysis. It seeks to find the unequal power relations in social structures and provide positive solutions. The crucial components of CDA that I have analyzed above concur with the focus of

ethnography of language policy that I have analyzed in section 2. In the next section, I will analyze the possibility and benefits of combining the two approaches.

4. Combination of CDA and Ethnography of Language Policy

In the previous section, I have analyzed some crucial components of CDA, such as focusing on language as social practice, aiming social justice, focusing on context of language use and analyzing power and ideology in society. These features concur with the focus of ethnography of language policy that I have analyzed in section 2. I summarize the common features of CDA and ethnography of language policy as follows:

In the first place, both CDA and ethnography of language policy focus on the contextual impact on the language use. To CDA, discourse is a social practice that is socially constituted as well as socially conditioned (Wodak 1996). It focuses on a dialectical relationship between the discourse and situations, institutions and social structures that frame it. The discourse is affected by the surrounding social structures and in turn helps to sustain the social status quo. According to ethnography of language policy, language policy is a social construct that is bounded in and shaped by the linguistic culture, which is a set of contextual elements such as language repertoire, beliefs, attitudes, social systems, etc. It is about people's habitual choices, belief systems and management shaped by the contexts. On the other hand, the language policy helps to sustain the status quo by regulating and setting the boundaries for people to think and believe what is acceptable and unacceptable (Ruiz 1984; Schiffman 1997; Spolsky 2004). In sum, the context shapes and is sustained by the discourse. The dialectical relationship between discourse (language policy) and contexts is the focus for both CDA and ethnography of language policy.

Secondly, both CDA and ethnography of language policy focus on the language use as a fluid concept that involves multimodal data that is shaped by and continuously shape the specific contexts. To CDA, discourse involves the semiotic variables that can be in written, oral, and other multimodal modes. For ethnography of language policy, language policy is not just about the written or spoken form of texts prescribed by the macro policy makers. It is also about the multimodal data that can be retrieved from other semiotic forms, such as rituals, pictures, posters, etc.

Thirdly, both CDA and ethnography of language policy focus on the multiple layers of social agents in language use. CDA intends to find out the way discourse

constitutes situations, social identities of and relationships between people. In other words, it is interested in the way the dominant groups use discourse to maintain control and hegemony over the less powerful ones. As a result, CDA looks into the relationship between people and groups of people. For ethnography of language policy, policy process is the ongoing negotiation among policy agents in the process of policy creation, interpretation and appropriation. It particularly aims to find out the agency power of the micro-level in exerting influence on the policy process.

Fourthly, both CDA and ethnography of language policy is keen to reveal inequality and control in the power relationship embedded in language use. In other words, both of them have the element of ‘critique’ in the core. CDA aims at investigating social inequality that is embedded, legitimized and sustained in policy discourse. It also wants to raise people’s awareness of their language use, which is too often underestimated for its production, maintenance, and change of social relations of power (Fairclough 2001). Ethnography of language policy also critically focuses on the tension between structure and agency, or between macro policy (its hegemonic power and control) and micro agency power in exerting influence in the process of policy interpretation and appropriation (Johnson 2011, 2013).

For the four common features above, I see a good chance to marry the two approaches together to research in language policy and planning (LPP). I propose that a language policy mechanism can be seen as:

a). Social construct bounded in and shaped by the regional and national contexts. It sustains the status quo in return. Language policy is not a set of stable documents written by the macro language policy makers. It changes according to the contexts and continuously shape the contexts in return. It is researchers’ job to examine the dialectical relationship between the contexts and the language policy.

b). An ongoing process involving the multiple layers of policy agents in policy creation, interpreting and appropriation. This process involves policy creation, interpretation and appropriation. It is worth recognizing that creation, interpretation and appropriation happens in very layer of policy agents. For instance, a teacher says ‘no mandarin in English classes’ is creating of a de facto policy carries out in that specific context. Since LPP is multi-layered, it then requires a multi-sited ethnography that accounts the policy creation, interpretation and appropriation in multiple settings, such as education bureaus, schools, classrooms, teacher offices, etc.

c). The ongoing negotiation among layers of policy agents, including national government, regional government, the society, general public, schools, teachers, parents and students. The macro-level policy makers are national government, whereas the micro level policy agents are the local governments, schools and teachers. There is a tension between the macro policy and micro practice. Researchers can examine the tension between the structure and agency, which merits more attention in current LPP studies (as mentioned in section 2).

d). Social construct that serves the interest of the dominant groups, which should be critically addressed for its embedded inequality, power relationship, hegemony and control. In other words, researchers can carry on the spirit of CDA and ethnography of language policy, by revealing the power relationship manifested, sustained and reinforced in the discourse.

e). Creation and production of semiotic variables. In other words, policy discourse are the written or oral policy texts that are generated by the national government but also other semiotic variables, such as posters on campus, photographs, interviews and other ethnographic data. Researchers can examine the way multimodal semiotic variables also help to sustain and reproduce the social status quo and contribute to transforming it.

The combination provides researchers with a ‘zoom in’ and ‘zoom out’ perspective to examine both the macro and micro LPP. Through CDA, researchers are able to become more familiar with the national and official regulations and texts that set the boundaries for LPP. Through ethnography, researchers can see how the LPP is implemented or abandoned in local contexts. For instance, researchers can look into the implementation or abandon of the LPP in local schools. In other words, LPP is followed in certain ways but not the others. Researchers can delve into the constraints and rationales for the local creation, interpretation and appropriation of the ELEP in different situations.

In the second place, within ethnography approach, researchers can choose both quantitative methods and qualitative methods such as questionnaires, interviews, classroom observation, and field notes to investigate the local context,. This again provides researcher a ‘zoom in’ and ‘zoom out’ perspective to see the smaller details in real education settings and a bigger picture for more schools and teachers. For instance, my ethnographic work in a Chinese primary school helps me to realize some issues

within local context that would not be identified had not I conducted the ethnographic work in the first place. After I talked to the local administrators and teachers, I began to have basic ideas about the contextual constraints that hamper the English language education policy in local community, such as class sizes, student numbers, and lack of English language exposure beyond the classrooms. In some cases, English teachers need to teach one to three subjects other than English, such as moral education classes, calligraphy classes, etc. English teachers' teaching of other subjects have a big effect on their English teaching, for, one point in particular, teachers would shoulder a lot of workload and distract their time on preparing English classes. Drawing on this observation, I add a question on teachers' workload other than English classes in my refined questionnaire. The mixed methods provide me with the broad purposes of breadth and depth of understanding. Had I not conducted the ethnographic study and without an awareness of ethnographic methods, I might conceivably ask questions according to what I think is important, rather than what the informants consider important.

5. Conclusion

This literature review is confined within the boundaries of currently emerging trends in LPP study. It supports the belief that: A. Language policy implementation and adjustment should be examined in contextual reality and mechanism. Language policy is bounded in and shaped by the contextual reality and mechanism, which is also the cultural baggage a speech community brings in dealing with language policy. B. Every decision in LPP goes through the process of creation, interpretation and appropriation. The examination of the language policy is not complete unless we know how does the lower level interpret and appropriate the LPP decisions made in upper level. This tension between structure and agency, between macro-level policy and micro-level policy practice, is trendy in current LPP studies. C. The micro-level policy agents, namely the local schools, teachers and officials, also exert their influence in LPP process. The process of policy creation, interpretation and appropriation happens in each level. The agency power of the micro level should not be underestimated.

This literature review further proposes a research design that answers the call within current LPP field. The combination of CDA and ethnography of language policy is introduced, based on the common features of the two: a. both focus on the contextual impact on the language use; b. both focus on the language use as a fluid concept that

involves multimodal data that is shaped by and continuously shape the specific contexts; c. both analyze the multiple layers of social agents in language use; d. both are keen to reveal inequality and control in the power relationship embedded in language use. Drawing on the principles of CDA and ethnography of language policy, a language policy can be examined as a. Social construct bounded in and shaped by the regional and national contexts; b. An ongoing process involving; c. the multiple layers of policy agents in policy creation, interpreting and appropriation; d. Social construct that serves the interest of the dominant groups, which should be critically addressed for its embedded inequality, power relationship, hegemony and control; e. Creation and production of semiotic variables.

To sum up, this literature review has proposed the combination of CDA and ethnography to understand the language policy and planning in a given community. It answers the call within the current LPP studies, which is interested in the tension between structure and agency. More empirical findings are persuaded, for they will complement the theoretical rigor in the field of LPP. It will also increase our knowledge on how language policies are created, interpreted and appropriated.

Reference

- Atkinson, P. et al. (2007) *Handbook of ethnography*. London: Sage Publications.
- Bhatia, A. (2013) Critical discourse analysis: history and new developments. *The encyclopedia of applied linguistics*, p.1-8.
- Blommaert, J. and Jie, D. (2010) *Ethnographic fieldwork: A beginner's guide*. Bristol: Multilingual Matters.

Canagarajah, S. (2006) Ethnographic methods in language policy. In: Ricento, T. (ed.) *An introduction to language policy: Theory and method*. Malden: Blackwell, p. 153-169.

Cincotta-Segi, A. (2011) Signalling L2 centrality, maintaining L1 dominance: Teacher language choice in an ethnic minority primary classroom in the Lao PDR. *Language and education* 25(1), p. 19-31.

Cooper, R. L. (1989) *Language planning and social change*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

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

Creswell, J. W. (1998) *Qualitative inquiry and research design: Choosing among five traditions*. London: Sage.

Fairclough, N. and Wodak, R. (1997) Critical discourse analysis. In: Van Dijk, T. (ed.) *Discourse as social interaction*. London: Sage, p. 258- 284.

Fairclough, N. (2001) *Language and power* (second edition). London: Longman.

Fairclough, N. (2010) *Critical discourse analysis* (second edition). London: Longman.

Flowerdew, J. (2013) Critical analysis of political discourse. In: Chapelle, C. A. (ed.) *The encyclopedia of applied linguistics*. London Blackwell Publishing.

Haugen, E. (1983) The implementation of corpus planning: Theory and practice. In: Cobarrubias, J. and Fishman, J. (eds) *Progress in language planning: International perspectives*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter, p. 269-289.

Hill, R. and May, S. (2011) Exploring biliteracy in Maori-medium education: An ethnographic perspective. In: McCarty, T. L. (ed.) *Ethnography and language policy*. New York: Routledge, p. 161-183.

Hornberger, N. H. and Johnson, D. C. (2007) Slicing the onion ethnographically: Layers and spaces in multilingual language education policy and practice. *TESOL Quarterly* 41 (3), p. 509-532.

Johnson, D. C. (2011). Critical discourse analysis and the ethnography of language policy. *Critical discourse studies* 8(4), p.267-279.

Johnson, D. C. (2013a) *Language policy*. Basingstoke, UK. Palgrave Macmillan.

Johnson, D. C. (2013b) Positioning the language policy arbiter: Governmentality and footing in the school district of Philadelphia. In: Hult, F. M. and King, K.A. (eds) *Educational linguistic in practice: Applying the global locally and the local globally*. Bristol: Multilingual Matters, p. 221-243.

- Lin, A. (2013) Critical discourse analysis: overview. In: Chapelle, C. A. (ed.) *The encyclopedia of applied linguistics*. London Blackwell publishing.
- Mahboob, A. and Paltridge, B. (2013) Critical discourse analysis and critical applied linguistics. In: Chapelle, C. A. (ed.) *The encyclopedia of applied linguistics*. London Blackwell publishing.
- McCarty, T.L. (2009) Schools as strategic tools for Indigenous language revitalization: Lessons from Native America. In: Hornberger, N.H. (ed.) *Can schools save indigenous languages? Policy and practice on four continents*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan, p. 161-179.
- McCarty, T.L. (ed.) (2011a) *Ethnography and language policy*. London: Routledge.
- McCarty, T.L. (2011b) Introducing ethnography and language policy. In: McCarty, T.L. (ed.) *Ethnography and language policy*. London: Routledge, p. 1-28.
- Ramanathan, V. (2005) Rethinking language planning and policy from the group up: Refashioning institutional realities and human lives. *Current issues in language planning* 6(2), p. 89-101.
- Pennycook, A. (2000) The social politics and the cultural politics of language classrooms. In: Hall, J. and Eggington, W. (eds) *The sociopolitics of English language teaching*. Clevedon: Multilingual matters, p. 89-103.
- Pennycook, A. (2006) Postmodernism in language policy. In: Ricento, T. (ed.) *An introduction to language policy: Theory and method*. Malden: Blackwell Publishing, p. 60-76.
- Pérez-Milans, M. (2013) Wodak, Ruth. In: Chapelle, C.A. (ed.) *The encyclopedia of Applied linguistics*. London: Blackwell Publishing.
- Phillipson, R. (1992) *Linguistic*. New York: St. Martin's.
- Ricento, T. K. and Hornberger, N. H. (1996) Unpeeling the onion: Language planning and policy and the ELT professional. *TESOL Quarterly* 30, p. 401-427.
- Ricento, T. (ed.) (2006a) *An introduction to language policy: Theory and method*. Malden, MA: Blackwell publishing.
- Ricento, T. (2006b) Language policy: theory and practice- an introduction. In: Ricento, T. (ed.) *An introduction to language policy: Theory and method*. Malden, MA: Blackwell Publishing, p. 10-23.
- Ruiz, R. (1984) Orientations in language planning. *NABE Journal* 8(2), p. 15-34.
- Schiffman, H. F. (1996) *Linguistic culture and language policy*. London: Routledge.

Sercombe PG. (2006) The Eastern Penan Language of Borneo. In: Shin, C. et al. (eds) *Reflections in Borneo Rivers: Essays in honour of Professor James T. Collins*. Pontianak: STAIN Pontianak Press, p.1-34.

Sercombe, P.G. (2008). Small worlds: the language ecology of the Penan in Borneo. In: Creese, A. and Martin, P. W. (eds) *Encyclopedia of language and education Vol. 9, Ecology of language*. Amsterdam: Kluwer, p. 183-193.

Sercombe, P. G. (2010) Language and education: The experience of the Penan in Brunei. *International journal of educational development* 30, p. 625–635.

Spolsky, B. (2004) *Language policy*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Spolsky, B. (2012) *The Cambridge handbook of language policy*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Tollefson, J. W. (2006) Critical theory in language policy. In: T. Ricento (ed.) *An introduction to language policy: Theory and method*. Malden, MA: Blackwell Publishing, p. 42-59.

Van Dijk, T. (2001) Critical discourse analysis. In: Schiffrin, D. et al. (eds) *The handbook of discourse analysis*. Oxford: Blackwell, p. 352-371.

Wiley, T.G. (2002) Assessing language rights in education: a brief history of the U.S. Context. In: Tollefson, J. W. (ed.) *Language policies in education: critical issues*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum, p. 39-64.

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

Wodak, R. and Meyer, M. (2009) *Methods of critical discourse analysis*. London, England: Sage.

Wodak, R. (2010) Communicating Europe: Analyzing, interpreting and understanding multilingualism and the discursive construction of transnational identities. In: Duszak, A. et al. (eds) *Globalization, discourse, media: In a critical perspective*. Warsaw: Warsaw University Press, p. 17-60.