Editorial

Kate Menken[1] · Miguel Pérez-Milans[2]

We would like to inform you about recent changes in the Journal's editorial team. Helen Kelly Holmes has completed her term as Co-Editor-in-Chief, and will be moving onto other endeavors. We are deeply grateful to Helen for her leadership and tireless service to the Journal and field as a whole, and for the many ways she has supported Kate over the past year as she transitioned into the position of Co-Editor-in-Chief. Helen will continue to be involved in this transition period until March 2020, and we will work with all current authors to ensure a smooth transition without interruptions. We also thank the Springer teams in the Netherlands and in India, and the Editorial Board for their support and guidance through these changes in editorship.

We are delighted to announce that after a search for an international leader in the field, Miguel Pérez-Milans has now replaced Helen as Co-Editor-in-Chief. Miguel is Associate Professor of Applied Linguistics at the Centre for Applied Linguistics in the Department of Culture, Communication and Media at University College London, UK. His language policy scholarship has extended to Madrid, London, Mainland China and Hong Kong, and he has served as Co-Editor of *Language, Culture and Society* (you can read more about Miguel here: https://mpmilans.wordpress.com).

Additionally, Alsu Gilmetdinova is now serving as Co-Editor of Book Reviews and Associate Editor of *Language Policy* with Sarah Catherine Moore. Alsu is Associate Professor in the Department of Foreign Languages at Kazan National Research Technical University in Kazan, Russia. Her research focuses on language education policies in Russia, particularly for minoritized groups such as the Tatars, and she has also studied language policy in U.S. schools.

Moving forward, we are reminded daily of the urgency of work in language policy. We have seen the repression of linguistic and other forms of diversity internationally, for example in the expansion of populist and nationalist right-wing governments (e.g., Brazil, Hungary, or the United States), where the policy

✉ Kate Menken
  kmenken@gc.cuny.edu

[1] The City University of New York, New York, USA

[2] University College London, London, UK

decisions of leaders are rooted in the promotion of homogeneity. This is in spite of the reality that, in most places around the world, multilingualism is a part of everyday life amidst globalization and mass migration. Language policy scholars have begun to acknowledge the complex and dynamic languaging practices of bilinguals, which is emblematic of a broader shift in thinking wherein multilingualism—rather than monolingualism—has become the accepted norm. This is part of the 'multilingual turn' (May 2013) that is impacting the field, and scholarship from this paradigm has been a strong trend in *Language Policy* in recent years.

But if once demystification of language as a neutral or natural entity disrupted a long-standing focus on efficient systematization of autonomous linguistic and cultural systems—and the political economies of colonization and middle class based modern nation building that such a focus enabled, researchers are now advocating for sustained efforts that continue to destablize our very disciplinary gaze and the histories that come with it. Such a lens necessitates researchers' permanent vigilance in unsettling the epistemic traces of long-standing projects of capitalism, colonialism and white supremacy in their own work, inclusive of research on language policies in schools (Fanon 1967; Smith 2012; Tupas 2004; Harvey 2005; Simpson 2007; Rivera Cusicanqui 2012; Heller and McElhinny 2017; Rosa and Flores 2017; Flores and Chaparro 2018). It seems a decolonizing attitude is therefore unavoidable in order to create the reflexive conditions for disinventing existing ways of doing language policy research (see Blommaert 1996; Heller 2018).

Topics such as the commodification of language, raciolinguistics, language policing, language securitization, semiotic approaches to language policy, and the expansion of what "counts" as language have also emerged prominently in the journal in recent years. They are informed by wider theoretical and epistemological shifts that have nuanced prior understandings of power away from its conceptualisation as something located in one place (e.g. a governmental body) and exercised against the population's will via policy-making, towards a more diffuse, anonymous network that is not limited to state politics alone. In so doing, they too call us to keep extending our locus of analysis to less-explored spaces (such as that of the family) where individuals' daily practices of (self)policing contribute to (re)institute and shape larger societal structures. In education, this allows for considerations of students and their families/communities as language policy actors with the potential to introduce new logics and alternative forms of knowledge that may challenge the status quo (even if to generate new ones).

These directions are just a few among many other avenues that would deepen understandings both of what language policy is as well as what it does, and that are challenging and unsettling the discipline in critical ways. In the coming years, we will continue to further the research perspectives like these that Helen Kelly Holmes, Ofelia García, and previous Journal editors nurtured. Our point here is not to suggest that we only seek research in these areas, but rather quite the opposite: to make the point that new ideas and perspectives are welcome and encouraged. Such new understandings open spaces to further press the boundaries of the field and reconsider what it is that we are actually fighting for, and we look forward to receiving contributions to the journal that will challenge us to do so.

We also strive to increase the visibility of the journal and the field, and welcome in new voices and thinking. We plan to move beyond the traditional article format by experimenting with online environments where *Language Policy* has not yet had much presence, especially because this would increase the accessibility of the journal around the world. In the next few months, we will continue assembling the editorial team with whom we will work very closely, reflecting our commitment to continuity and renewal, and extending our geographical and sub-disciplinary reach.

We very much look forward to receiving your submissions for publication. We are seeking manuscripts that help build a sound theoretical understanding of language policy, as well as reviews of relevant new books. We continue to need referees to review articles, so if you have not received an article to review recently or would like to be added to our list of reviewers, then kindly let us know, and be sure your information is up to date in our electronic system.

We look forward to working with you all in this exciting new phase for *Language Policy*.

References

Blommaert, J. (1996). Language planning as a discourse on language and society: The linguistic ideology of a scholarly tradition. *Language Problems & Language Planning, 20,* 199–222.

Fanon, F. (1967). *Black skin, white masks*. New York: Grove Press.

Flores, N., & Chaparro, S. (2018). What counts as language education policy? Developing a materialist anti-racist approach to language activism. *Language Policy, 17*(3), 365–384.

Harvey, D. (2005). *A brief history of neoliberalism*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Heller, M. (2018). Socioeconomic junctures, theoretical Shifts: A genealogy of language policy and planning research. In J. W. Tollefson & M. Pérez-Milans (Eds.), *The Oxford handbook of language policy and planning* (pp. 35–50). Oxford: OUP.

Heller, M., & McElhinny, B. (2017). *Language, capitalism, colonialism. Toward a critical history*. Toronto: Toronto University Press.

May, S. (2013). *The multilingual turn: Implications for SLA, TESOL, and bilingual education*. New York/London: Routledge.

Rivera Cusicanqui, S. (2012). Ch'ixinakax utxiwa: A reflection on the practices and discourses of decolonization. *The South Atlantic Quarterly, 111*(1), 95–109.

Rosa, J., & Flores, N. (2017). Unsettling race and language: Toward a raciolinguistic perspective. *Language in Society, 46*(5), 621–647.

Simpson, A. (2007). Ethnographic refusal: Indigeneity, 'voice' and colonial citizenship. *Junctures: The Journal for Thematic Dialogue, 9,* 67–80.

Smith, L. T. (2012). Research through imperial eyes. In L. T. Smith (Ed.), *Decolonizing methodologies: Research and indigenous peoples* (pp. 44–60). London & New York: Zed Books Ltd.

Tupas, R. (2004). The politics of Philippine English: Neocolonialism, global politics, and the problem of colonialism. *World Englishes, 23*(1), 47–58.