



## Medium of instruction ideologies: accommodation of multilingualism in the bilingual regime of Navarre

Iker Erdocia

To cite this article: Iker Erdocia (2019) Medium of instruction ideologies: accommodation of multilingualism in the bilingual regime of Navarre, *Current Issues in Language Planning*, 20:3, 284-308, DOI: [10.1080/14664208.2018.1503457](https://doi.org/10.1080/14664208.2018.1503457)

To link to this article: <https://doi.org/10.1080/14664208.2018.1503457>



Published online: 03 Sep 2018.



Submit your article to this journal [↗](#)



Article views: 377



View related articles [↗](#)



View Crossmark data [↗](#)



Citing articles: 3 View citing articles [↗](#)



## Medium of instruction ideologies: accommodation of multilingualism in the bilingual regime of Navarre

Iker Erdocia 

School of Applied Language and Intercultural Studies, Dublin City University, Dublin 9, Ireland

### ABSTRACT

The management of bilingualism in the Spanish autonomous community of Navarre is a source of tension. The implementation of English medium of instruction in the public educational system has clashed with attempts to break with the linguistic territoriality regime by promoting Basque schooling. This paper brings together ideologies on English and minority languages and explores how political practice is intertwined with language policy and planning and language ideology. More specifically, it examines the institutionalization of language ideologies through language policy-making in education and, particularly, through medium of instruction. The paper begins with a description of the bilingual regime in Navarre and an examination of how ideologies have shaped and legitimized language policy in education. It then moves on to an analysis of both Basque and English medium of instruction ideologies that inform policy-making. This paper shows that the dynamics introduced by multilingualism in education have had a reinforcing effect on previous language ideologies on bilingualism and, ultimately, have aggravated the language dispute. Finally, it discusses how medium of instruction serves as a terrain for language competition and as part of a broader struggle for language policy and institutional power.

### ARTICLE HISTORY

Received 18 December 2017  
Accepted 19 July 2018

### KEYWORDS

Basque; English medium of instruction; language ideologies; minority language; multilingualism

## Introduction

English medium of instruction (EMI) is a worldwide phenomenon that has gained importance over the last decade and has become a matter of debate at the educational, political, and societal levels (Tollefson & Tsui, 2003), especially in non-Anglophone countries. The expansion of EMI, which has traditionally corresponded to top-down decisions in language policy, has been accompanied by a growth in social acceptance. This is the case in Spain, where the public is demanding EMI at an early stage in education as it is considered a fundamental skill for employability and mobility (Dearden, 2014). EMI especially affects education systems of countries with medium-sized languages (Vila & Bretxa, 2015) and might even have a more profound impact on bilingual contexts with a minority language (Doiz, Lasagabaster, & Sierra, 2014; Gorter, Zenotz, & Cenoz, 2014; Ruiz & Lasagabaster, 2010), as in multilingual Spain.

**CONTACT** Iker Erdocia  [iker.erdocia@dcu.ie](mailto:iker.erdocia@dcu.ie)  School of Applied Language and Intercultural Studies, Dublin City University, Dublin 9, Ireland

In this article, I focus on language policy and planning (LPP) in education in Navarre. This region is one of the three jurisdictions where Basque is spoken and has received relatively little attention from scholars. Navarre is an autonomous Spanish community with a bilingual regime based on a linguistic territoriality principle according to which Basque and Spanish are accommodated in territorial units. This organization has administrative implications for Basque medium of instruction (BMI) in public education. Managing language diversity has resulted in political tensions and disputes concerning opposing conceptions of language rights (Arzoz, 2008). Recently, the expansion of EMI has clashed with revitalization efforts and attempts to extend public education in Basque to the entire territory and has therefore introduced a new conflicting element in existing language ideologies.

The purpose of this paper is to explore how political practice is intertwined with language policy and language ideology. In other words, my goal is to examine the institutionalization of language ideologies through language policy-making in education and, more specifically, through medium of instruction (MI). To this end, I start by providing a contextualized overview of my theoretical framework, followed by a description of the bilingual regime in Navarre and an examination of how ideologies and politics have shaped language policy in education. This study rests on the assumption that language ideologies cannot be appropriately investigated without a deep understanding of the historical and institutional context in which they have evolved (Ricento, 2000a). I then move on to the analysis of both EMI and BMI ideologies that inform policy-making in education, and I identify their major constituents. I conclude with a discussion of my key findings and the implications they have for the conceptualization of MI ideologies.

### **Institutionalization of language ideologies**

In Navarre, the permanent political, legal, and juridical tensions created by opposing responses to bilingualism confirm that the state-level political balance and cohesion accomplished in the transition period to democracy after the authoritarian regime of Franco was never fully achieved by the subnational political bodies (Izu, 2007). Due to the fragmentation of political parties in the regional parliament, legislative, and implementing powers have always needed political alliances to be articulated. Moreover, governing arrangements have been determined to a large extent by the ‘language problem’ or, as Geertz (1973) words it, the ‘nationality problem’. Governments often result in precarious coalitions, sometimes with ideologically opposed interests, and with no correspondence in other regions or at national level. Given that, similarly to political struggle, language dispute is also ‘mediated by the institutional setting in which [it] take[s] place’ (Ikenberry, 1988, p. 222), the language regime in Navarre – understood as the ideological and institutional setting governing language policy choices (Sonntag & Cardinal, 2015) – can be considered as a matter of political contest and competition. I use the concept of institutionalization as the policies resulting from the regularization of patterns of interaction practiced by social and political agents (O’Donell, 1994).

Navarre, unlike the Basque Autonomous Community, is a setting where Basque has become ‘a highly controversial issue’ (Oroz & Sotés, 2008, p. 24) and bilingualism continues to generate a divisive debate that has not been given a completely satisfactory policy framework<sup>1</sup> (Arzoz, 2006). The dynamics between bilingual policy and language

education policy are intricately linked in this region, and they fall within what Paulston (1992) conceptualizes as the conflict paradigm, an approach to bilingual education understood in terms of the relationship between the various interest groups in a power conflict. Institutional agents provide the infrastructure for the production or reproduction of specific visions of bi-multilingualism through bi-multilingual policy (Heller, 2007). Language education, then, is about engaging in the process of production and reproduction (or suppression) of bi-multilingualism. Shohamy (2006, p. 76) goes further, defining language education as ‘a form of imposition and manipulation of language policy’ with which the authorizing bodies turn ideology into practice through education. As will be pointed out below, such terms as ‘imposition’ and ‘manipulation’ form part of the contentious debate in bi-multilingual education in Navarre and, consequently, discourse, political practice, and policy-making – including MI ideologies – are situated within Paulston’s conflict approach.

The educational phenomenon in which a given vehicular language is other than the students’ L1 has been conceptualized and labeled differently: ‘medium-instruction’, ‘content-based language education’, ‘content and language integrated learning’, ‘immersion’, ‘language for academic purposes’, etc. EMI is a part of a wider discussion including other strains of research such as English Lingua Franca and its pedagogical implications (Rubdy & Saraceni, 2006). In recent years, a number of scholars have noted the lack of conceptual clarity on research studies and have called for precision and more rigor (Cenoz, Genesee, & Gorter, 2014; Somers & Surmont, 2012). From a methodological point of view, contrasting with other approaches to bilingual education in the language-content continuum (Airey, 2016), MI is conceptualized in this study as language and content focused. Drawing on Dearden’s definition (2014), MI is used here as the utilization of a language (Basque and English) to teach most of the academic subjects in a jurisdiction where the first or dominant language of the majority of the population (Spanish) is not that given language. This working definition refers not only to English, nor to any other foreign language, but also has implications for the Basque immersion model in the major part of the territory, where Spanish is the dominant language. In the same way that MI practice is considered as specific context-dependent (British Council, 2013), the contextual factor of the debate on MI ideologies in Navarre also results in distinctive features in topics, such as the official status of Basque, the principle of linguistic territoriality and language rights. It also implies the deployment and variation of language policies in education and, ultimately, the implementation process of EMI.

Having established the autonomous community of Navarre as the institutional context and, therefore, as the analytical unit, I concentrate now on how political practice is intertwined with language policy and language ideology. Amongst the myriad of theoretical approaches to language ideology (Kroskrity, 2004; Silverstein, 1979; Woolard, 1998) and following Kroskrity’s categorization, this construct is conceptualized here as ‘the perception of language and discourse’ that is constructed for a specific group and used ‘to promote, protect, and legitimate’ political interests (2004, p. 501). Language ideologies are understood as sociopolitically structured, often normative and explicitly discursive. In other words, a discourse is a social practice (Fairclough, 2013) ‘in a process of power elaboration’ (Blommaert & Verschueren, 1998, p. 27) and influence aiming at language policy-making and enforcement. Likewise, drawing on Van Dijk’s conceptualization of ideology as ‘constituted by relevant selections of sociocultural values’ (1995, p. 248),

language ideology is considered as organic and tied to ideologies of culture and nation (Heller & Duchêne, 2007). Therefore, drawing on a critical approach to LLP (Ricento, 2000b), my focus is also one of an intersectional nature, representing discursive practices, symbolic articulations and identity conceptions of language, sociopolitical and economic viewpoints and attitudes towards bi-multilingualism, in particular, in MI.

## Background: the Basque language in Navarre

The official status of the Basque language in Navarre was first adopted in 1982 with the Act on the Reintegration and Enhancement of the *Foral Regime*<sup>2</sup> of Navarre [*Ley Orgánica de Reintegración y Amejoramiento del Régimen Foral de Navarra*]<sup>3</sup> in accordance with the constitutional acknowledgement of the ‘other Spanish languages’ (Article 3) and the delegation of their status to the Statutes of Autonomy of the communities where they coexist with Spanish. In the Preliminary Title, the Act provides for the official recognition of Spanish and Basque, yet the declaration provides for substantial differences in the status of both languages.

The principle of linguistic territoriality was one of the key elements in the negotiation of the Statute of Autonomy with representatives of the central government. This did not imply, however, that a common stance had been reached by the delegation of Navarre. Following Monreal (2001), political parties were divided with seemingly irreconcilable positions regarding the status of Basque. More specifically, right-wing parties opposed the official recognition of any language other than Spanish. Added to this, the government negotiating team was reluctant to accept the official status of Basque in the whole region. As a result, political forces in Navarre were obliged to seek consensus on this sensitive issue in order to progress in the overall agreement of the Statute of Autonomy.

Dividing the territory in linguistic zones was the final formula chosen for regulating bilingualism (see Table 1).<sup>4</sup> In other words, whereas Spanish is the official language of Navarre, the principle of territoriality applies to Basque by officially recognizing it only within the Basque-speaking area. Therefore, this language just has a partial official status. Moreover, in contrast to the categorization used in the statutes of the other bilingual communities, the Act did not define Basque as autochthonous language of Navarre (Pérez, 2006) nor did it make any reference to language rights or obligations of public bodies (Arzoz, 2006). Navarre was the only autonomous community where legislation for bilingualism became a major source of dispute.

The linguistic zoning regime<sup>5</sup> is the most critical component of the Act. Advocates of this approach, however, argue that it acknowledged and guaranteed the current sociolinguistic plurality. On the contrary, apart from corresponding to a curtailed bilingualism in

**Table 1.** Linguistic zoning regime.

| Area  | Population (%) | Linguistic model | Public education                                    |
|---|----------------|------------------|---|
| ‘Basque-speaking zone’ [ <i>zona vascofona</i> ]        | 10             | Bilingual        | BMI or SMI + a mandatory training in both languages |
| ‘Transition or mixed zone’ [ <i>zona mixta</i> ]        | 57             | Mixed            | SMI. BMI and Basque training subject to choice      |
| ‘Non Basque-speaking zone’ [ <i>zona no vascofona</i> ] | 33             | Monolingual      | SMI. Basque language restrictions (until 2015)      |

the view of a substantial minority of the political representatives, the Basque Act met with criticism from a broad range of actors, such as nationalist groups and language rights activists. From a legal point of view, the Basque Act is vague and unclear, and dependent on subordinate legislation for implementation. As a matter of fact, up to five Decree-Laws were adopted for enforcement purposes, but not without legal problems and political controversy (see Arzo, 2008). Successive regionalist governments opposed any broadening of the scope of the Act, adopted regressive policies (Arzo, 2014) and objected to normalization<sup>6</sup> (Erize, 2001). In 2003, the European Bureau for Lesser Used Languages published a report denouncing ‘the first substantial regression of policies for regional minority languages in EU Member State’.<sup>7</sup> In spite of an ongoing acceptance and positive attitude towards the promotion of Basque (Government of Navarre, 2017), those advocating for changes to the language policy found themselves in a continuous minority in the parliament for over twenty years.<sup>8</sup>

In 2015, a coalition<sup>9</sup> formed by nationalist and left-wing parties representing a slim majority took power. The shift in power relations marked a different approach to bilingual policy: in the ‘non Basque-speaking zone’, BMI would be gradually integrated in public education where numbers warranted, and Basque classes would be offered as an optional subject. Thus, Basque teaching conditions in the ‘non Basque-speaking zone’ public education were made analogous to those of the ‘transition zone’. Politically, partnership agreements were signed with the other two Basque-speaking political administrations (Basque Country and Aquitaine). Symbolically, *Euskera*<sup>10</sup> replaced the contested name *Vascuence* in the Act; official statements about language recognition became common and the first Basque-speaking president was appointed. More recently, in 2017, the parliament agreed to establish a commission to draft a new Basque Language Act.

In the current government’s rhetoric, steps towards promotion-oriented rights always account for the autochthonous nature of Basque. Although this language is not the exclusive property of Navarre,<sup>11</sup> and this is the Basque-speaking jurisdiction with the lowest favorable attitude rates towards Basque dissemination (Azurmendi, Larrañaga, & Apalategi, 2008), it is still an important part of the regional authenticity (Heller, 2010). The constant allusions to *Lingua Navarrorum* – a term first used in 1167 referring to Basque – in the political discourse seek to prove the genuineness and legitimacy of this language in Navarre (Erize, 2001). Along with Spanish, Basque is also considered a part of cultural heritage that belongs not just to a geographic area but rather to every citizen in the region. The coalition government acknowledges what they consider prudent movements in minority language policy in line with the recommendations of the European Charter for Regional or Minority Languages, although they admit the limited effect of their efforts. Predictably, revitalization efforts were heavily contested by the new opposition. In their view, the new direction in language policy seeks to promote Basque nationalism and the interests of Basque nationalists.

In regards to educational language policy, the linguistic zoning regime provided for in the Basque Act determined language availability in public education.<sup>12</sup> The Decree-Law 159/1988 establishes four linguistic models in pre-university education. Generally speaking, since the linguistic system was established, the models including both BMI and Basque training (models D and A) have doubled, whilst the SMI (model G) has been reduced by 20 percent (Government of Navarre, 2016a). Thus, from a historical perspective, parents have increasingly endorsed Basque education<sup>13</sup> although the monolingual Spanish model

has always remained the most common choice and only a minority of citizens manifest an open positive attitude toward Basque (Oroz & Sotés, 2008). However, the increasing trend towards Basque education changed a decade ago when these models' levels began to stabilize. They have remained virtually steady since then. The SMI model in turn has risen slightly in the last years. Possible reasons for that shift are a potential sociological limit for minority language education, the larger number of pupils from a migrant background<sup>14</sup> not choosing Basque models (Government of Navarre, 2014) and, particularly, the recent growing popularity of foreign language programs (English, French, and German) offered by public primary and secondary schools.

Currently, in addition to the four existing linguistic models (Basque–Spanish), there are two main foreign language programs: MECD–British Council and English Learning Program [*Programa de aprendizaje de inglés (PAI)*]. The former is a national-level program in collaboration with the British Council. Initially implemented in two schools in 1997 and 2000, respectively, the Government of Navarre tried to extend the program but it did not comply with the requirements imposed by the British Council. This obstacle did not deter the government's efforts to increase the supply of education in English. After a year long pilot project, the Department of Education designed and implemented, unilaterally, a completely new program of EMI (later renamed as PAI) emulating a limited immersion language model.

In 2009, Navarre education authorities for the first time stipulated the basis for the functioning of the program, such as methodology, curriculum development, evaluation, teacher training, and the approved public and government-subsidized private schools. It is important to note that this program is not limited to the monolingual Spanish model but it is offered in all the linguistic models.<sup>15</sup> The foreign language programs have increased significantly over the past years and are still growing. In 2017–2018, the enrollment rate went up to 68 percent of the total number of new pupils.<sup>16</sup> Ten years ago, it was four percent. Despite their popularity and favorable reception, there has been a great deal of criticism of their planning and implementation and, unsurprisingly, EMI has also become a politically contentious issue.

## Methodology

Drawing on Van Dijk's theory of ideology (1998) – according to which ideologies are the basis of social representations shared by groups and their members – I examine the content and structures of socially shared knowledge about MI. I also analyze how language ideologies are constructed and reproduced through discourse as part of the policy-making process. The period under analysis is from 2013 until 2017, when the expansion of the EMI program became more prominent and become a recurrent subject of contention. This period includes two parliamentary terms and the formation of a new government with a completely different approach to MI.

The empirical material is organized in three sets of data (see Table 2). The first set combines policy and assessment outcomes. Focusing on the current phase of the implementation process of the EMI program, I analyze both the Regional Orders and Decree-Laws passed by the current and the previous governments. I also examine the evaluation reports made by the Department of Education in the context of the political debate after the change of direction in language policy.

**Table 2.** Documents included in the analysis.

| Set   | Type of document                                     | Source   | Year      | Number of documents |
|---|--|--|-----------|---------------------|
| 1. Policy and assessment outcomes             | Decree-Laws and Regional Orders                      | Government of Navarre                                  | 2014–2017 | 4                   |
|   | Assessment reports on education and strategic plans  | Department of Education                                | 2013–2016 | 4                   |
| 2. Political activity and stakeholders' views | Transcripts of the plenary session about education   | Parliament of Navarre                                  | 2016      | 1 (43,017 words)    |
|   | Press releases, political statements, and interviews | Regional newspapers                                    | 2015–2017 | 45                  |
| 3. Media frames                               | Editorial articles                                   | <i>Diario de Navarra</i> and <i>Diario de Noticias</i> | 2015–2017 | 6                   |

The second set of data covers language policy through discourse, including parliamentary activity, political statements, and press releases. On the one hand, since parliamentary debate represents both a rhetorical-persuasive and a legislative-supervising dimension (Grad & Martín, 2003), parliamentary debates are of crucial importance for the comprehension of the language policy-making process as well as of the language ideologies underlying discourses and political strategies. For this purpose, I analyze the transcripts of the plenary session about education that took place in the Parliament of Navarre in May 2016, in which MI was the main theme. On the other hand, an extensive part of the policy activity happens beyond Parliament and is covered by media. This is particularly the case of public outcomes such as political statements and press releases issued by relevant stakeholders such as political parties and teachers' unions. This material is drawn from a keyword search for the term 'English Learning Program' [*Programa Aprendizaje Inglés, PAI*] in the only two Navarre-based newspapers: *Diario de Navarra* and *Diario de Noticias*. PAI has become a common term in the political, legal, and educational domains. For instance, a search for PAI in *Diario de Navarra* (the most read newspaper in the region) gives more than 150 results in the period under analysis. Moreover, because discussion about MI can occur without explicit reference to the phenomenon, a second search for the term 'Education' in the two regional newspapers was also carried out. This data are also expected to integrate the debate on Basque promotion planning in education with no explicit reference to EMI. It must be noted that this set of data focuses on news reporting rather than on personal perspectives and judgements about language policy-related news and hence opinion pieces were excluded. Due to the high number of results and the limited relevance of some of their contents, a selection was made focusing on the new government's language policy reorientation, the assessment reports by the Department of Education, the resolution of the High Court of Navarre, and the publication of the draft of the new Regional Order of the EMI program. This was complemented by two TV interviews with the current and former presidents of Navarre, which were to have a significant impact on subsequent language policy discussions in the media.

Finally, as mass media appear to have a relevant role in MI policy-making (Tollefson, 2015), the third set of data consists of editorial articles published in *Diario de Noticias* and *Diario de Navarra*. These newspapers have an opposite approach to bilingualism and, more broadly, they diverge in the cultural Basqueness and political articulation of Navarre. *Diario de Noticias's* editorial stance is more inclined towards the Basque nationalist agenda than that of *Diario de Navarra* (Idoiaga & Ramírez, 2002). As would be

expected, their opinion about EMI differs considerably comprising competing discursive representation of language ideologies.

I adopt a qualitative method and, more precisely, I rely on directed content analysis. Using existing theory or previous research, this approach provides predictions about the key concepts or variables of interest in the new investigation and determines relationships between codes (Hsieh & Shannon, 2005). Drawing on prior research on EMI both in Spain (Dearden, 2014) and in the Basque Autonomous Community (Doiz et al., 2014), I used a preliminary coding scheme: research-based EMI implementation; interest of public administration in EMI; English for mobility and employability; and linguistic strains affecting the ecology of languages. After multiple and in-depth readings of my corpus to locate new patterns and themes, I revised, linked and extended the initial coding categories with all the instances of MI ideologies in Navarre. Then, I reorganized the data and defined the final categories and subcategories (see Table 3). I present the findings in the next section.

## Adopting MI policies, adapting language ideologies

### *The politics of EMI implementation*

Following Spain's trend of provision of bilingual education, 'considered a vote winner by public administrations' (Dearden, 2014, p. 21), the determination of political authorities in Navarre to provide EMI education led to a prompt introduction of the new program in the previous decade. Opposition parties, most teachers' unions and minority language activists were reluctant to accept the regionalist government's intention and alleged that the sudden EMI education was an ideologically driven strategy. A widespread criticism, expressed by José Luis Mendoza (Geroa Bai), the first regional Minister of Education of the new government within a few months of entering office in 2015, is that the implementation was poorly regulated and followed no strategic planning, a claim repeatedly denied by previous authorities.

Legally speaking, the general Regional Decree-Law 24/2007, established that the Department of Education may authorize the foreign language MI as a part of curriculum in primary schools. After that, a number of Regional Orders<sup>17</sup> regulated some aspects of EMI program. However, it was not until 2014 that the first Decree-Laws<sup>18</sup> (a higher-ranking norm) were approved. In regards to planning, it was pointed out by the opposition that educational reforms were implemented without due reflection, coherence or timing. Outside parliament, some unions recommended the cancelation of EMI and drew attention to the conflict of legitimacy between the political stance of the majority in parliament

**Table 3.** Categories and subcategories underlying the data.

| Categories                                    | Subcategories  |
|---|--|
| The politics of EMI implementation            | Expansion<br>Assessment  |
| Language and the education system             | Public-private education<br>Language choice<br>Language rights |
| Values associated with languages              | Instrumental value<br>Constitutive value                       |
| The place of language in the political agenda | Competing program planning<br>Accusations of partisan use      |

and social acceptance as a result of a language program provision that was not included in the law. In a resolution issued in 2014, the High Court of Navarre ruled against a lawsuit alleging, *inter alia*, deficiencies in the recruitment of teachers (lack of language proficiency and academic qualifications) and, therefore, dismissed the appeal against the EMI program.

In spite of the complex processes and the critical factors involved in language planning (Kaplan, Baldauf, & Kamwangamalu, 2011), it is noteworthy as well that the first evaluation report made by the Department of Education was in 2013, several years after having been implemented. This report notes the small number of educational and non-academic bodies involved in program planning and calls into question the feasibility of the implementation due to problematic issues such as students with special needs and from low socioeconomic background, the lack of qualified teachers, the adoption of a B2 level for foreign language teachers, the introduction of the program in secondary schools and its restricted availability.

In 2015 the regional Minister of Education questioned the viability of the EMI program and committed himself to conducting an in-depth evaluation. According to the opposition, however, this was a politically motivated decision that would adversely affect the program. What is more, the main opposition party claimed that there was an updated assessment report contradicting and attenuating the data of the 2013 report.<sup>19</sup> Likewise, the most important newspaper in Navarre published an editorial article, denouncing the total or partial omission of this information (*Diario de Navarra*, 16 March 2016).

In 2016, a new report was released (Government of Navarre, 2016b). It aimed to compare both the scientific and linguistic competences of students attending EMI programs with students of the traditional linguistic models, including English as a compulsory subject. The results indicate that the linguistic proficiency was higher in students attending the EMI program. They also show that scientific competence is similar in both groups. Even if the authors of the report caution that group differences such as socioeconomic background and students with special needs are statistically relevant, the results were interpreted by the opposition parties not just as an endorsement of the program, but also as a disapproval of the government position. Once again, technical issues about the report and its results became a political matter. The opposition claimed that regional authorities jeopardized the EMI program and displayed ideological favoritism towards the BMI model by promoting it with public funding. By contrast, the government regretted the use of EMI as a political weapon against LPP in education arguing that it was problematic for families and was an attack on linguistic diversity.

The evaluation process continues. The results of the government study carried out in the academic year 2016–2017 show no significant changes from the previous trend.<sup>20</sup> The government has set itself the target of managing content and resources while claiming to have ensured the sustainability of the EMI program by establishing stricter conditions in its deployment. For their part, a number of teachers' unions and parent–teacher associations have recently asked for a new regulation to bestow the model status on EMI, as in the case of SMI and BMI. This change would provide regulatory stability and enhance the program's administrative, legal, economic, and teaching support. Nevertheless, despite some political parties' support for these calls and an emerging debate on the adequacy of a similar linguistic model system in the Basque Autonomous Community (Zalbide & Cenoz, 2008), EMI remains an experimental program.

A new Regional Order on the regulation on foreign language programs has been drafted. The Order brings together previous orders' core elements, adds a new article about entry and exit requirements to the program, and confers decision-making power directly on the schools. Consequently, the number of teaching hours through English is variable. Notwithstanding the Navarre government's calls for language choice with no impositions and the recognition of the advantages of multilingual educational models, the extension of EMI is not a priority for the current authorities. However, the position of the coalition government on English education policy is not unanimous. For example, two groups (Podemos-Ahal dugu and Izquierda-Ezkerra) voted in favor of some of the opposition's proposals to ensure the implementation of the compliance program and one requested modifications to the draft of the Regional Order on foreign languages. Language policy represents a defining feature in parties' agendas, and while a binary pattern based on monolithic blocs regarding languages has an explanatory character, it omits the complexities of the ideological foundations and the non-exclusive identity (Kroskrity, 2001) underpinning some political forces.

### ***Language and the education system***

Accusations of playing politics with language and criticism concerning ideological imposition stem from different conceptions of language policy as well as from the role allotted to the state-region in the educational domain. For instance, the liberal concept of freedom of choice without undue governmental interference is not solely used to support non-public schools but to deliberately criticize the government's language policy shift concerning Basque.

(1) The Partido Popular (PP) is the only one which guarantees the continuity of government-subsidized private education in Spain as we know it today because no administration can impose on parents an educational model for their children (...) regrettably, education is being used as a weapon to satisfy the interests of both the Government's parties and, naturally, a minority of citizens. What are those interests? The truth is that it is not a secret: the extension of Basque in all areas at all costs. (Javier García, Partido Popular de Navarra (PPN). Parliament of Navarre: Plenary session about education, 27 May 2016)<sup>21</sup>

It is worth pointing out that imposition here does not refer to the extension of EMI. Regarding the public-private educational systems, conservative parties (PPN and Unión del Pueblo Navarro-UPN) use principles, such as plurality, quality, and freedom as a rationale for government-subsidized private schools. These schools – commonly associated with religious orders, high socioeconomic backgrounds, and sometimes single-sex education – received up to 40 percent of new pre-enrollments in the region (School Council of Navarre, 2017). The defense of public funding for private purposes in education is based on ideological grounds and it is a matter of much controversy in Spain (Fernández & Múñiz, 2012). The current implementation policy of EMI in Navarre is utilized by politicians to give ideological support to private schools and to criticize the government coalition. After the rejection agreed by the Board of Spokespersons in the parliament to withdraw the draft of the new Regional Order regulating the EMI program, a UPN representative claimed:

(2) Those supposedly defending the public educational system are impairing it with their refusal of English and equality of opportunities. Society has to be listened to; families want

their children to study in English. (Javier Esparza, UPN. *Diario de Noticias*, 12 December 2016)

Language choice becomes, then, a part of a broader ideological debate far exceeding language education. In any event, the socioeconomic and public education arguments are included in the opposition discourse by equating EMI with social justice arguing that, socially speaking, EMI is a very important educational advancement. According to this line of argument, EMI is not currently restricted to a small elite or to the most privileged social groups but is offered to everyone, irrespective of socioeconomic background. These forces reject the current policy of assessing the EMI program to slow down its implementation and, ultimately, pupils attending public centers with fewer resources do not have complete access to English. Thus, the idea of universal availability of EMI education at almost any academic cost prevails.

Choice is also related to EMI. The opposition argues that the government refusal to introduce the EMI program in new schools on a demand-driven basis is a political measure that affects families and educational centers. The principles of equity and equal opportunity are used again but with a different purpose. The more strict conditions for new EMI schools set by the government are taken as contrary to citizens' demands, popular acceptance and the favorable stance of the educational community and, therefore, as an attack on the right to educational choice. The social demand for EMI, then, is a central point in these forces' argument. A regulation that does not follow a demand criterion is described as in the following terms:

(3) English is an open door and what you are intending is to bolt that door. However, if a crow wants to enter they will bust the door down. (María Chivite, Partido Socialista de Navarra. Parliament of Navarre: Plenary session about education, 27 May 2016)

(4) Ladies and gentlemen, on what moral authority do you reject citizens' demands? It is sincerely distressing the systematic contravention of the parents' right to choose their children's education, which in this case is English as a vehicular language (...) society and educational community in Navarre wonders why the Government is going on an anti-English crusade. This Government ignores all citizens' and families' real demand for English as this option is not allowed. (Javier García, PPN. Parliament of Navarre: Plenary session about education, 27 May 2016)

Furthermore, the opposition parties denounce double standards in language policy in education; for instance, the new provisions introduced to promote BMI in public schools in the non-Basque-speaking area – smaller class sizes, school transport, and school canteen – do not apply to current or prospective EMI students. These parties contend, on the one hand, that the resources deployed by the government are unwarranted due to the low demand for Basque schooling in that linguistic zone; unsatisfied demand is the argument used by promotion-oriented parties to justify the implementation of BMI. On the other hand, those large numbers of families choosing EMI are not guaranteed the same right. The endeavor to introduce Basque, since it is not based on demand, runs counter to other broadly accepted linguistic models and foreign language programs. Following these statements, the demand approach to the debate on language policy in education not only conceptualizes MI as a marketable commodity (Heller, 2003), nor does it determine if a language is worthy of the assigned resources, but it also confers the right status.

Freedom of choice in language education is a common argument used by the opposition parties to justify the extension of EMI, although this argument is not applicable to English as these parties oppose Basque promotion-oriented rights in those areas where Basque has no official status. Hence, those systematically refusing the introduction of Basque in public schools in the entire region now consider education in English to be a right. Conversely, according to pro government forces, the right to choose concerns autochthonous languages only. The obligation of the administration is to ensure educational provision in Basque and Spanish without undermining instruction in foreign languages. The coalition clearly states that the EMI program was politically driven and, more specifically, it was an attempt to slow down the progression and success of BMI.

Continuing with the position of the governing parties, they envisage a progressive ideal of public education with a focus on such values as social cohesion, inclusiveness, equal opportunity, equity, and justice. For instance, the representative of the party in power (Geroa Bai) advocates for a more balanced approach to language policy in education:

(5) We are committed to a public education system whose aim is to prepare citizens for a changing and more mobile society but this does not preclude knowledge and attachment to their cultural, linguistic, and social environment. (Koldo Martínez, Geroa Bai. Parliament of Navarre: Plenary session about education, 27 May 2016)

Nevertheless, prioritizing public schools does not seem to impede the government's unwavering support of private BMI *ikastola* centers in the non-Basque-speaking area as part of their promotion-oriented rights policy. The opposition argues that the coalition's discourse on equity is also in conflict with the newly introduced requirements of Basque proficiency for public-sector employment, including schoolteachers. These new measures have been widely contested by other parties, unions, and parent-teacher associations. These stakeholders claim that this requisite does not respect the principle of equality of opportunities, marginalizing both SMI and EMI candidates, nor does it correspond to the demand for Basque or the number of Basque speakers. Language requirements for civil servants are often a controversial matter in other bilingual communities in Spain (Marcos, 1995).

### **Values associated with languages**

There are challenges around the position that should or could be occupied by English and Basque in LPP. For most EMI advocates, language is conceptualized exclusively in terms of instrumental values. According to this viewpoint, the principle of maximizing utility and the instrumental interest in language as a means of communication (Rubio-Marín, 2003) should guide language provision. Language is a means to attain pursued and calculated ends, and language choice becomes, as Weber puts it, an act of 'instrumental rationality'. Excerpt (6) is an example of market-oriented discourse on language learning:

(6) It is about what language is going to provide a better future for our students. It is about assessing what language is the most required in order to have access to any job position in a world that is more and more globalized, competitive and dynamic. (Javier García, PPN. Diario de Navarra, 13 September 2017)

In a globalized economy, language is not just about the idea of achieving a cosmopolitan membership, but it also represents an element of human capital (Grin, 2001), a

framework where English becomes the ‘mode of management of global networks’ (Heller & Duchêne, 2012, p. 10). Competitiveness, social mobility and progress shift from a local level to a marketplace that attains a global dimension in which English as a lingua franca is a communication instrument across nationalities (Jenkins, 2014), as in the next example:

(7) Our students will not compete with their classmates in order to find a job but with French, English and Chinese students. It is therefore essential that our academic system is up to that of the rest of Europe. (Javier García, PPN. Parliament of Navarre: Plenary session about education, 27 May 2016)

The status of English as a global and hegemonic language monopolizes the utilitarian approach to MI. However, advocating the unquestionable predominance of English as the only rational choice undermines the position of the other foreign language programs (French and German) available in the public educational system in Navarre. For instance, as one of the regional newspapers notes,

(8) it is a paradox that in spite of sharing a 163 kilometer-long border and centuries of history with such an important language, French continues to be overshadowed in public education. (Diario de Noticias, 26 December 2016)

In addition, an instrumental position could even compromise the choice of Spanish as the only vehicular language, despite its international role as lingua franca (Crystal, 2003), when SMI has been the traditional and predominant linguistic choice in the non Basque-speaking areas.

The discourse on opportunities and profit includes not just language but, more generally, an educational model based on market values and demands. For example, responding to labor requirements is often seen as a strategy to guarantee the quality of education in Navarre. These views come alongside criticism of the Government’s attempts at extending BMI education at the expense of the EMI program. English being a central point for the purpose of employability, foreign language MI ideology shows a bias towards a particular socioeconomic conception of education, labor relations and prospects of success. Generally, the harshest critics of this ideological stance lie beyond political parties, as in the case of the nationalist union ELA:

(9) The progressive imposition of EMI is just another effect of the commodification of education and an example of linguistic colonialism, resulting in the downsizing of the BMI models. (ELA. Diario de Navarra, 3 July 2017)

For its part, the wording of the draft of the Regional Order 2016 on the regulation on foreign language programs does not dwell on ideological assumptions and it only states:

(10) Foreign language immersion programs are deemed to be in the interest of the Department of Education from both an educative and a strategic point of view.

Contrary to the perception of EMI as an indicator of progress and success (Crystal, 2003; Dearden, 2014) that could guide well-intentioned parents seeking the best future for their children, in contrast, BMI is associated with limited market value and, perhaps more importantly, determines its position in education on the basis of intrinsic values. In comparison to English, Basque is a reinforcing mechanism of identity and uniqueness. Example (11) shows the reply by the representative of the pro-independence party EH-Bildu in the parliament:

(11) The fact that school-aged children study and learn Basque will be fundamental for the future of many people who want to continue attached to this soil. This has to be respected and enhanced as by learning and communicating in Basque, Mr. Esparza (UPN), no matter how much it annoys you, we are matched with ourselves (...) with what we are because it is one of the two languages from Navarre, the oldest one: *lingua navarrorum*. (Miren Aranoa, EH-Bildu. Parliament of Navarre: Plenary session about education, 27 May 2016)

Basque activists value this language ‘as a cultural inheritance and as a marker of identity’ (Réaume, 2000, p. 251). Nevertheless, the changes introduced by the new government demanding Basque requirements for some public-sector jobs introduces an element of extrinsic value. Likewise, the new strategic plan for the Basque language (Government of Navarre, 2017) sets Basque as an ‘economic engine’ and aims to develop its potential in the productive, technological and innovative sectors.

Looking beyond the economic dimension of MI, the discourse on opportunities in relation to languages is appropriated for those advocating a more humanist approach to education. In this case, equality of opportunity is associated with values such as interculturalism, cultural identity, and freedom, integration, and social justice. In the opinion of the supporters of this approach – mainly leftist parties – this model of education requires positive discrimination policies in favor of both migrant communities from outside Spain and the Basque language. Regarding MI policy, by guaranteeing the coexistence of languages from Navarre, the education system becomes a truly integrative instrument (Urrutia, 2005).

### ***The place of language in the political agenda***

Interestingly, in spite of parties’ statements criticizing, sometimes fiercely, other parties for regulating against the other language (either Basque or English), most of them do not take a clear stand against any language in an open manner. References to values, such as cultural and linguistic pluralism, diversity and universalism are, in one way or another, included for different reasons in the rationale behind their political stance. By way of example, agents with a different conception of language policy send inclusive messages in their discourse such as ‘it is not about hating English’ and ‘we are not against Basque’.

Promoters of regional languages in both Navarre and other bilingual regions in Spain, make clear that they do not oppose foreign language learning, as in the Declaration of Sitges for regional languages (Steilas, 2017). The signatories, including the teachers’ union from Navarre recognized that foreign languages are a shared aim. That said, what they firmly oppose is the intention by policy and opinion makers to ‘manipulate the social expectations about foreign language learning in order to reduce the space of those autochthonous languages that are not yet normalized’. Following this reasoning, language learning can be compared to a zero-sum game, a situation where top-down practices favoring foreign languages affect minority languages and, more specifically, the move to foreign languages weakens local regional languages. In this same vein, in a controversial statement that has given rise to different interpretations, former President of Navarre Yolanda Barcina (UPN) admitted a correlation between the reduction in demand for BMI and the increasing provision of EMI.<sup>22</sup> Her presidency (2009–2015) was characterized by both her defense of the EMI program and her determined opposition to Basque promotion-oriented rights.

Similar to the concept of ‘linguistic imperialism’ (Phillipson, 2007), the discourse of resistance of the Declaration of Sitges denounces a ‘false plurilingualism’ in educational language policies that confines itself to a small group of European languages – the most salient one being English – and enables the prevalence of SMI. This plurilingualism omits other non-European languages and, more importantly, most students’ heritage languages. They also state that the Spanish government aims to promote trilingualism in bilingual areas using some regional languages MI: ‘we perceive a political intent towards uniformization and centralization at the expense of Galician, Basque, Catalan, Aranese, Asturian, and Aragonese’. What is most relevant in this document is the unambiguous critique of EMI policy, which is not found in the discourse of politicians. Significantly, unions are the only stakeholders openly criticizing this ideological dimension of global English (Pennycook, 2014).

The opposing view, represented by the spokesperson of UPN in the next example, maintains a legalistic approach to linguistic plurality and rejects efforts towards the expansion of bilingualism in the region:

(12) Article 9 of the Act states that Spanish is the official language in the entire region and Basque is just official in the Basque-speaking areas. Therefore, do not compare nor try to make us 100 percent bilingual as in other regions such as the Balearic Islands, Valencia, Catalonia, Galicia, and the Basque Autonomous Community. (Alberto Catalán, UPN. Parliament of Navarre: Plenary session about education, 27 May 2016)

Putting aside the distinctive character (autochthonous-foreign) of languages, a common argument of actors representing either EMI or BMI is that the implementation of the other language is an obligation designed to block one’s own language choice. Examples (13) and (14) show this kind of accusation. In the first one, a union referred to EMI as an imposition arguing that

(13) its intention is to hinder the offer of BMI. (Alfredo Lakuntza, ELA. Berria, 28 January 2016)

An analogous counter-argument (14) can be found at the other end of the political spectrum. Addressing a question to the Spanish Ministry of Education in Madrid, a Senator representing Navarre declared:

(14) The Government [of Navarre] has launched a campaign to impose BMI in the attempt to marginalize EMI. In Navarre we are facing the national construction of the Basque Country by a government that call themselves nationalist. (Francisco Yanguas, UPN. Navarra.com, 4 April 2017)

In many occasions, as with the current President of Navarre, accusations of language imposition are repeatedly denied. In an interview within a few months of entering office, Uxue Barkos (Geroa Bai) replied to this kind of allegation in vivid terms: ‘Basque imposition would be barbaric’,<sup>23</sup> stating that she would never permit it and subsequently criticizing the previous government’s LPP.

The confrontation between English and Basque in education implies different assumptions about what a language imposition stands for, as the following statement illustrates:

(15) What other attacks on pupils are we going to witness? There is an obsession not to learn another language rather than Basque. That is evident in their attempts to reduce English hours. (Ana Beltrán, PPN. Diario de Noticias, 12 December 2016)

These considerations of BMI and EMI policy as opposed to each other are also reflected in editorials of the two regional newspapers: EMI policy hampering BMI (*Diario de noticias*, 10 September 2015; 26 October 2016) and language policy in education privileging BMI and hindering EMI (*Diario de Navarra*, 16 January 2017; 24 October 2017).

Finally, whilst EMI is negatively associated with neoliberal principles by some leftist parties, as indicated above, the nationalist agenda is a major point of criticism leveled against BMI. Nationalist references to *Euskal Herria* – a term including the three Spanish and French administrative regions where Basque is spoken – Basqueness, nation building, independence, and the annexation of Navarre by the Basque Autonomous Community – are part of the discourse warning against an ethnolinguistic conception of languages and, in particular, the actual intentions of political actors promoting BMI. In this view, the fact that Basque is a linguistic heritage of Navarre as well as of other regions must not lead to a common institutional entity or single political community, which is a historic nationalist demand. Other claims regarding an ideological orientation slant, manipulation, and indoctrination in Basque schools (Ruiz, 2005) include textbooks, teachers' political affiliation and educational outcomes. These claims go beyond the scope of Navarre and include the Basque Autonomous Community and other bilingual regions in Spain (Marcos, 1995).

### Discussion: *Navarre, land of diversity ...*<sup>24</sup> Language and dispute

The contextualization of the study of MI within a historical and institutional perspective allows us to ascertain the enduring character of language ideologies. The current debate on MI policies in Navarre is a good example, since it is originally derived from the type of bilingual regime established after the restoration of democracy almost four decades ago. The process of enacting the fundamental law regulating the autonomous region reveals the importance of the historical background of a regime change, the negotiation between state and subnational political elites and the consequences of members of parliament not having reached consensus on bilingualism. Once the language regime was adapted to the new political setting, language policy debates were marked by diverging interpretations of language legislation, opposing conceptions of language rights and unsatisfied linguistic demands.

Political disputes and power relations in Navarre derive, in part, from disagreements about bilingualism. When it comes to language policy, the political debate provides a context conducive to conflict talk (Grimshaw, 1990). Parliamentary interventions and political statements can follow a 'bewildering array of trajectories' (Leung, 2002, p. 6) that result in an escalation of conflict talk. Terms such as 'imposition', 'nightmare', 'segregation', and 'sectarianism' are used to criticize and delegitimize the current government's stand on MI policy. Verbal aggressiveness is synthesized in the following statement by the opposition's spokesperson:

(16) you use education as a tool of political indoctrination [ ... ] and that is called fascism.  
(Javier García, PPN. Parliament of Navarre: Plenary session about education, 27 May 2016)

Professional politicians deliberately adapt the 'keying' or 'framing' (Goffman, 1974) of a debate on language policy in education to their communicative and electoral strategy, as the analysis of their discourses has shown. Political parties are institutions with the

capacity to influence (sub-)state structures and which attempt to aggregate interests in society (Ware, 1996). At the same time, they act as a transmission belt between citizens' interests and the state structure. In addition to the centrality of the sub-state traditions represented by the territorially limited recognition of Basque in the legal structure, parties in Navarre aim to obtain or retain power by exercising influence discursively and by institutionalizing political ideologies through MI. The extensive media coverage of language policy in education is an indicator of MI strategic significance. Other similar cases can be found at European level. For instance, the political blockage situation in Northern Ireland in 2018 arises partly from demands for the Irish Language Act and the right for education through Irish, which divides parties along traditional lines.

In this study, in spite of the necessary adaptation to multilingualism, language ideologies not only have been found to be consistent and persistent (Sonntag, 2000), but they have informed and continuously determined policies. On the basis of the above empirical evidence, rather than opening an integrative terrain for agreement, the dynamics introduced by multilingualism have had a reinforcing effect on previous language ideologies on bilingualism. On the one hand, it is not a coincidence that the previous government, consistently opposed to the revitalization of Basque in the major part of the territory, pursued the EMI program at the cost of a dubious implementation process and a negative impact in the BMI model, as acknowledged by the former President of Navarre. On the other hand, after a long period of invariable LPP, the new government coalition has brought about changes in BMI that have followed a promotion-oriented language model (Kloss, 1977). Since coming to power, the government has restricted EMI; given the wide-ranging social acceptance of this program, this restriction might be perceived as an attempt to postpone an inevitable generalization of EMI. Instead of through consensus policies, the bilingualism issue has always been solved through top-down policies supported by previously-defined political blocks, and passed – and therefore legitimized – by parliamentary majorities. With the emergence of EMI, it can be concluded that the accommodation of multilingualism is a new factor that breaks the fragile balance of bilingualism and, therefore, has major political and educational repercussions.

Moving on to the content of MI ideologies and to the analysis of the categories identified in the data, the discursive processes of language policy in education exemplified in the previous section show the reshaping of traditional language ideologies (BMI and SMI) to fit the current educational challenge posed by multilingualism. Firstly, political ideologies emerge on the rationale of language choice, leading to inconsistencies, such as referring to EMI as a right while refusing to extend access to BMI in the whole territory. Secondly, new arguments over MI are added to the existing ones. For instance, advocates of EMI argue that language provision should be guaranteed to meet demand whilst, on the contrary, it is historically justified by minority language activists for language rights, as in the case of Basque in the 'non-Basque-speaking zone'. Apart from the sociopolitical context in which bilingual education arises, MI is also inextricably bound up with the different purposes it serves (Lo Bianco, 2008). Thirdly, the dominant position of English as lingua franca introduces the local-global dichotomy in choice of language in education (May, 2008), thus exceeding and updating the previous ideological parameters of BMI and SMI. Since Spanish is left out of the current debate, the arguments used to back up each choice of language – utilitarian discourse on opportunities for

English and 'sentimental' value and national and identity marker for Basque – indicates that MI is political (Tollefson, 2015) and that MI policies are far from ideologically neutral.

Beyond these specific conceptions of language rights, which have been extensively discussed in political philosophy (Patten & Kymlicka, 2003), the MI discussion in this region has become, on the one hand, a matter of 'politics as usual', an added disagreement between the parties. On the other hand, MI is an ideological terrain of struggle for power and resources (Pujolar, 2007), in which language knowledge is central for different reasons. The recurrent allegations of coercion and incentives concerning both BMI and EMI policies are a good example of the antinomy that language polices involve (Weinstock, 2003). Ultimately, the debate on MI policy proves to be a never-ending discussion and a consequence of a long-lasting politicization of languages, but it has also reached such dizzying levels – as with the descriptions used by political spokespersons – that it might look impractical and unconstructive. In any event, the assertion that language policies have an ideological basis should not lead us to conclude that every policy decision has a political interpretation. For instance, regarding the implementation process described above, evaluating the EMI program is not a political decision made by an arbitrary government but simply a part of the policy cycle. This would avoid what Knagg (2013, p. 24) refers to as the 'policy is practice' fallacy, the assumption that 'if a national or institutional authority states that a certain context is EMI in policy statements and publicity material, then that is actually the case'. Moreover, in view of the questions raised by EMI research (i.e. actual improvement of students' English competence, possible long-term negative impact on content learning, importance of planning, and resourcing of EMI programs; Macaro, Curle, Pun, An, & Dearden, 2018), assessment is an indispensable measure that could go beyond the mere examination of students' outcomes by focusing on the teaching–learning process and how it can be improved (Cenoz et al., 2014). An evaluation of the long established school-based 'Basquization' process (Zalvide & Cenoz, 2008) involving external factors could dispel doubts concerning the possible inconsistencies of the discourse on 'normalization' (Calvet, 1993) and the similarities with less successful minority language models in terms of language use, like the Irish model (Wright, 1996), acting as an incentive of a society-wide reflection. Hence, this article calls into question the universal validity of the idea that 'language policy can only be understood in the complex contexts of language use' (Pennycook, 2000, p. 64).

Extending Phillipson's (2015) urgent call to stateless languages, further research is needed in order to address multilingualism and deploy integrative MI policies, thus ensuring harmony between English and regional languages. This is even more indispensable if the minority language is under a revival, revitalization, reverse shift, or expansion process in a sociopolitically adverse context, as in the foci of this study. Certainly, other critical issues in relation to English Lingua Franca ideologies (i.e. monolithic model, relation with native speakers and culture, descriptive-prescriptive approach, and consistencies with World Englishes; Pennycook, 2012) also apply to the MI debate in bilingual contexts. In addition to more micro-level and multilayered research focused on multilingualism (Cenoz & Gorter, 2011) informing LPP, explicit EMI policy guidelines at the EU level might be necessary to remedy divisive and poorly integrated cases, as in Navarre.

## Conclusions

In this paper, I have investigated the MI ideologies in the transition process of accommodating multilingualism in the bilingual regime of Navarre. Drawing on the construct of language regime (Sonntag & Cardinal, 2015), I have examined the institutional setting after the restoration of democracy and described the configuration of LPP in education that results from the principle of linguistic territoriality concerning Basque. I have argued that language regimes and language ideologies are historically and functionally interrelated. I have described the institutionalization of language ideologies through MI policy-making after the implementation of the EMI program in the public education system, and I have analyzed the political practice and the discursive processes by which MI policies are legitimized. I have provided evidence of how multilingualism has contributed to the deepening of previous ideologies on the bilingual regime in the region and, ultimately, has aggravated the language dispute in education. This paper expands on the idea of language conflict (Darquennes, 2011; Muller, 2010) in language policies in education and adds an ideological perspective to the linguistic tensions between EMI and stateless languages in other bilingual contexts (Cots, Lasagabaster, & Garrett, 2012; Cots, 2013).

One of the contributions of this study to the literature on language ideologies in education is the analysis of how MI serves as a terrain for language competition and as a part of a broader struggle for the power to influence language policies and, more generally, for the control of institutions. MI is not only relevant to language ideologies, but it is a crucial component in the institutionalization of political ideologies. Another contribution is to bring together ideologies on EMI and minority languages. In the case of Navarre, the opposing conceptions of language rights in relation to Basque have become even more marked since the implementation of the EMI program. In addition to the discourse on opportunities, EMI ideology has brought up issues that require more attention, such as whether or not it should be considered as a right or whether it should be made available based on demand. Its consideration as a right<sup>25</sup> and demand as criteria in public education.

If we agree to not consider English as a problem (King, Byrne, Djouadj, Lo Bianco, & Stoicheva, 2011) but we acknowledge that it might pose a threat to the balance of the world's languages (Skutnabb-Kangas & Phillipson, 1994), once multilingualism is a reality in the educational landscape and English has become an integral part of it, then two questions remain to be answered: what are the educational and wider societal implications of the centrality of English in the education system of regions with minority languages? How can we encourage and achieve a multilingualism that effectively integrates regional-state-global linguistic diversity? As stated above, language ideologies have continuously determined policies in Navarre. It is now time for new evidence to inform policy-making in education.

## Notes

1. See Harguindéguy & Itçaina (2015) for an analysis of the language regime in relation to Basque in the Western part of the Pyrénées-Atlantiques department in France.
2. *Foral* is the adjectival form for *Fuero*, a juridical term that dates back to the Middle Ages. Although this body of laws was repealed in the nineteenth century, the process of devolution and decentralization set by the Spanish Constitution restored the historical rights to both

Navarre and the Basque Autonomous Community (for a discussion, see Fernández 1985). In general terms, it is equivalent to other Statutes of Autonomy in Spain albeit with some specificities.

3. This basic institutional rule is also known as *Amejoramiento del Fuero* or LORAFNA. The term *Amejoramiento* -improvement- is rooted in the history of the institutional configuration of Navarre (Salinas, 1986). Note that terminology carefully chosen to emphasize the historicity of the region. For instance, unlike the name of other regions *Autonomous Community of ...*, the official name of Navarre *Comunidad Foral de Navarra* refers to the legal regime highlighting its historical authenticity.
4. Linguistic zoning is based on the *linguistic predominance* principle used in the Statute of Autonomy of the Valencian community. See Alcaraz (1999).
5. See De Schutter (2008) for a critique of the linguistic territoriality principle.
6. Normalization is a common term used in the Spanish context that derives from the Catalan Linguistic Normalization Law (7/1983). It refers to policies towards the reestablishment of regional languages to normal social usage.
7. See <http://www.parlamentodenavarra.es/es/tramite-documento/1036767>. Accessed 16 December 2017.
8. The only successful amendment passed in 2010 allowing four municipalities belonging to the 'non Basque-speaking zone' to change their status and become part of the 'transition or mixed zone'. As a result, the regionalist government coalition collapsed.
9. The parties in the government coalition are Geroa Bai, EH-Bildu, Podemos-Ahal dugu, and Izquierda-Ezkerra. The opposition parties are Unión del Pueblo Navarro, Partido Socialista de Navarra, and Partido Popular de Navarra.
10. Common Basque form for the Basque language.
11. Perhaps surprisingly because of its strong opposition to Basque promotion in the 'non Basque-speaking zones', the Foundational Act of the longest party in power, UPN, spells out 'Navarre, the genuine Vascons people.' See [www.upn.org/wp-content/uploads/2015/11/acta\\_fundacional.pdf](http://www.upn.org/wp-content/uploads/2015/11/acta_fundacional.pdf). Accessed 16 December 2017.
12. It is worth noting that whereas Spanish and Basque are mandatory languages in the 'Basque-speaking zone', Basque is on a voluntary basis in the 'transition or mixed zone' and only since 2015 in the 'non Basque-speaking zone' albeit with restrictions.
13. Including both BMI and Basque training. Due to the sociolinguistic situation, studies (Etxeberria 2003) show that the former (D model) is the only model ensuring a proficiency in Basque.
14. Foreign students represent 7.3 percent of the entire student body (MECD, 2017).
15. Consequently, the number of hours and subjects in the foreign language differs depending on the model, as well as on the level. In primary school, for instance, the range of minimum–maximum sessions in English is 7–12 in A/G models, whilst in the BMI model it is significantly lower: 5–9 (Regional Order 147/2016).
16. See <http://www.diariodenavarra.es/noticias/navarra/2017/05/22/exigen-programas-bristish-pai-sean-modelos-navarra-533015-300.html>. Accessed 16 December 2017.
17. 139/2009, on English language requirements for instructors; 110/2011, establishing key issues such as the CLIL methodology, curricula, class schedule and evaluation; 97/2012, modifying organizational aspects of the previous order; 32/2013, on accreditation of educational staff; and 51/2014, promoting the autonomy of primary educational centers regarding the organization of subjects.
18. 37/2014, on teaching recruitment conditions; and 60/2014, specifying the foreign language MI basic regulation and language integrated learning.
19. Neither of the two reports are public. See the following link for a summary of the report of 2015: <http://www.noticiasdenavarra.com/2016/03/15/sociedad/navarra/mendoza-acusa-a-upn-de-meter-ruido-sobre-el-pai>. Accessed 16 December 2017.
20. The report has not yet made public. See: <http://www.diariodenavarra.es/noticias/navarra/2017/10/10/el-pai-supera-una-nueva-evaluacion-del-gobierno-mejora-los-resultados-2016-555604-300.html>. Accessed 16 December 2017.

21. All extracts are originally either in Spanish or Basque and have been translated by the author.
22. See [https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=dU1rRg\\_4kUQ](https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=dU1rRg_4kUQ). Accessed 16 December 2017.
23. See <http://www.eitb.eus/es/television/programas/minuto-a-minuto/videos/detalle/3600162/video-uxue-barkosimponer-euskera-navarra-seria-salvajada/>. Accessed 16 December 2017.
24. Regional tourist Department's longstanding advertising slogan.
25. Referring to Spanish languages, the Constitutional Court (337/1994) denied the existence of a right to language choice in education.

## Acknowledgements

I would like to express my thanks to Jennifer Bruen, Mary Phelan and Kelly Routly for their insightful comments. I would also like to thank the two reviewers, whose valuable remarks helped to improve this article.

## Disclosure statement

No potential conflict of interest was reported by the author.

## Funding

This work was supported by the publication fund of the Faculty of Humanities and Social Sciences, Dublin City University.

## Notes on contributor

*Iker Erdocia* is Assistant Professor in the School of Applied Language and Cultural Studies at Dublin City University. He holds an International Ph.D. from the University of Alcalá (Spain). His research interests are primarily in the fields of language policy and the politics of language. They include multilingualism, language regimes, language ideologies, and language and conflict.

## ORCID

*Iker Erdocia*  <http://orcid.org/0000-0003-2459-1346>

## References

- Airey, J. (2016). EAP, EMI or CLIL? In K. Hyland & P. Shaw (Eds.), *Routledge handbook of English for academic purposes* (pp. 71–83). Abingdon: Routledge.
- Alcaraz, M. (1999). *El régimen jurídico de las lenguas en la Comunidad Valenciana*. Alicante: Universidad de Alicante.
- Arzoz, X. (2006). Estatuto jurídico del euskara en Navarra. In J. M. Pérez (Ed.), *Estudios sobre el estatuto jurídico de las lenguas en España* (pp. 387–416). Barcelona: Atelier.
- Arzoz, X. (2008). Políticas lingüísticas actuales en las tierras del euskara. *Revista de Llengua i Dret*, 49, 45–67.
- Arzoz, X. (2014). Legal mobilisations at the subnational level: The case of language rights in the Spanish Autonomous Community of Navarre. In D. Anagnostou (Ed.), *Rights and courts in pursuit of social change: Legal mobilisation in the multi-level European system* (pp. 53–78). Oxford: Hart.
- Azurmendi, M. J., Larrañaga, N., & Apalategi, J. (2008). Bilingualism, identity and citizenship in the Basque Country. In M. Niño-Murcia & J. Rothman (Eds.), *Bilingualism and identity* (pp. 35–62). Amsterdam: Benjamins.

- British Council. (2013). *British Council regional policy dialogue 2: The role of English in higher education: Issues, policy and practice*. Retrieved from [https://www.britishcouncil.org.br/sites/default/files/regionalpolicydialogue\\_emi.pdf](https://www.britishcouncil.org.br/sites/default/files/regionalpolicydialogue_emi.pdf)
- Blommaert, J., & Verschueren, J. (1998). *Debating diversity. Analysing the rhetoric of tolerance*. New York, NY: Routledge.
- Calvet, L. J. (1993). *La sociolinguistique*. Paris: Presses Universitaires de France.
- Cenoz, J., & Gorter, D. (2011). Focus on multilingualism: A study of trilingual writing. *The Modern Language Journal*, 95, 356–369.
- Cenoz, J., Genesee, F., & Gorter, D. (2014). Critical analysis of CLIL: Taking stock and looking forward. *Applied Linguistics*, 35(3), 243–262.
- Cots, J. M. (2013). Introducing English-medium instruction at the University of Lleida (Spain): Intervention, beliefs and practices. In Doiz, A., Lasagabaster, D., & Sierra, J. (Eds.), *English-medium instruction at universities world-wide: Global challenges* (pp. 106–128). Bristol: Multilingual Matters.
- Cots, J. M., Lasagabaster, D., & Garrett, P. (2012). Multilingual policies and practices of universities in three bilingual regions in Europe. *International Journal of the Sociology of Language*, 216, 7–32.
- Crystal, D. (2003). *English as a global language*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Darquennes, J. (2011). The contribution of academia to the further development of European language policy: Some reflections based on an analysis of the European Commission’s communications on multilingualism of 2005 and 2008. *European Journal of Language Policy*, 3(2), 141–161.
- Dearden, J. (2014). *English as a medium of instruction-a growing global phenomenon*. London: British Council.
- Doiz, A., Lasagabaster, D., & Sierra, J. M. (2014). Language friction and multilingual policies in higher education: The stakeholders’ view. *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development*, 35(4), 345–360.
- De Schutter, H. (2008). The linguistic territoriality principle – a critique. *Journal of Applied Philosophy*, 25(2), 105–120.
- Erize, X. (2001). El discurso contrario a la ‘normalización’ de la lengua vasca en Navarra (1997–2002). *Revista Internacional de Estudios Vascos*, 46(2), 661–682.
- Etxeberria, F. (2003). New challenges for bilingual education in the Basque Country. *Intercultural Education*, 14(1), 93–107.
- Fairclough, N. (2013). *Critical discourse analysis: The critical study of language*. New York, NY: Routledge.
- Fernández, T. R. (1985). *Los derechos históricos de los territorios forales*. Madrid: Civitas.
- Fernández, R., & Múñiz M. (2012). Colegios concertados y selección de escuela en España: un círculo vicioso. *Presupuesto y Gasto Público*, 67, 97–118.
- Geertz, C. (1973). *The interpretation of cultures*. New York, NY: Basic books.
- Government of Navarre (2014). *Diagnóstico: contexto sociodemográfico*. Retrieved from <https://www.navarra.es/NR/exeres/6996BF92-2C71-4F42-8C4B-6F1FE2D500FB.htm>
- Government of Navarre (2016a). *Datos sociolingüísticos de la juventud Navarra*. Retrieved from <https://www.deportejuventudnavarra.es/es/documentacion-base>
- Government of Navarre (2016b). *Informe de la evaluación de competencias y destrezas de los estudiantes del Programa de Aprendizaje en Inglés*. Retrieved from <https://www.educacion.navarra.es/>
- Government of Navarre (2017). *I Plan estratégico del euskera (2016–2019)*. Retrieved from [https://www.navarra.es/home\\_es/Actualidad/Sala+de+prensa/Noticias/2017/01/25/Aprobado+el+I+Plan+Estrategico+del+Euskera.htm](https://www.navarra.es/home_es/Actualidad/Sala+de+prensa/Noticias/2017/01/25/Aprobado+el+I+Plan+Estrategico+del+Euskera.htm)
- Goffman, E. (1974). *Frame analysis*. New York, NY: Harper & Row.
- Gorter, D., Zenotz, V., & Cenoz, J. (Eds.) (2014). *Minority languages and multilingual education*. Berlin: Springer.
- Grad, H., & Martín, L. (2003). “Civic” and “ethnic” nationalist discourses in Spanish parliamentary debates. *Journal of Language and Politics* 2(1), 31–70.
- Grimshaw, A. D. (1990). *Conflict talk: Sociolinguistic investigations in conversations*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

- Grin, F. (2001). English as economic value: Facts and fallacies. *World Englishes*, 20(1), 65–78.
- Harguindéguy, J.-B., & Itçaina, X. (2015). State tradition and regional languages in France: The Basque case. In L. Cardinal, & S. K. Sonntag (Eds.), *State traditions and language regimes* (pp. 170–188). Ottawa: McGill-Queen's University Press.
- Heller, M. (2003). Globalization, the new economy, and the commodification of language and identity. *Journal of Sociolinguistics*, 7(4), 473–492.
- Heller, M. (2007). Bilingualism as ideology and practice. In M. Heller (Ed.), *Bilingualism: A social approach* (pp. 1–22). Hampshire: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Heller, M. (2010). The commodification of language. *Annual Review of Anthropology*, 39, 101–114.
- Heller, M., & Duchêne, A. (2007). Discourses of endangerment: Sociolinguistics, globalization and social order. In A. Duchêne & M. Heller (Eds.), *Discourses of endangerment: Ideology and interest in the defence of languages* (pp. 1–13). London: Continuum.
- Heller, M., & Duchêne, A. (2012). Pride and profit: Changing discourses of language, capital and nation state. In M. Heller & A. Duchene (Eds.), *Language in late capitalism: Pride and profit* (pp. 1–21). Hoboken: Routledge.
- Hsieh, H., & Shannon, S. E. (2005). Three approaches to qualitative content analysis. *Qualitative Health Research*, 15(9), 1277–1288.
- Idoia, P., & Ramírez, T. (2002). *Al filo de la (in)comunicación. Prensa y conflicto vasco*. Madrid: Fundamentos.
- Ikenberry, G. J. (1988). Conclusion: An institutional approach to American foreign economic policy. *International Organization*, 42(1), 219–243.
- Izu, M. J. (2007). *Navarra como problema: nación y nacionalismo en Navarra*. Madrid: Biblioteca Nueva.
- Jenkins, J. (2014). *English as a lingua franca in the international university: The politics of academic English language policy*. Oxon: Routledge.
- Kaplan, R. B., Baldauf Jr., R. B., & Kamwangamalu, N. (2011). Why educational language plans sometimes fail. *Current Issues in Language Planning*, 12(2), 105–124.
- King, L., Byrne, N., Djouadj, I., Lo Bianco, J., & Stoicheva, M. (2011). New directions for multilingual policy? *European Journal of Language Policy*, 3(2), 255–272.
- Kloss, H. (1977). *The American bilingual tradition*. Rowley: Newbury House.
- Knagg, J. (2013). EMI within a global context – towards a British Council perspective. In *British Council regional policy dialogue 2, The role of English in higher education: Issues, policy and practice*. Retrieved from [https://www.britishcouncil.org.br/sites/default/files/regionalpolicydialogue\\_emi.pdf](https://www.britishcouncil.org.br/sites/default/files/regionalpolicydialogue_emi.pdf)
- Kroskrity, P. (2001). Identity. In A. Duranti (Ed.), *Key terms in language and culture* (pp. 106–109). Oxford: Blackwell.
- Kroskrity, P. (2004). Language ideologies. In A. Duranti (Ed.), *A companion to linguistic anthropology* (pp. 496–517). Malden: Blackwell.
- Leung, S. (2002). *Conflict talk: A discourse analytical perspective*. Columbia University Working Papers in TESOL & Applied Linguistics, 2(3), 1–19.
- Lo Bianco, J. L. (2008). Bilingual education and socio-political issues. In J. Cummins & N. H. Hornberger (Eds.), *Encyclopedia of language and education* (pp. 35–50). New York, NY: Bilingual Education.
- Macaro, E., Curle, S., Pun, J., An, J., & Dearden, J. (2018). A systematic review of English medium instruction in higher education. *Language Teaching*, 51(1), 36–76.
- Marcos, F. A. (1995). *Conceptos básicos de política lingüística para España*. Madrid: FAES.
- May, S. (2008). *Language rights: Linking the local and the global*. Paper presented at the international conference on globalisation and languages: Building on our rich heritage. Tokyo, Japan.
- MECD. (2017). *Datos y cifras: Curso escolar 2016/2017*. Retrieved from <https://www.mecd.gob.es/servicios-al-ciudadano-mecd/estadisticas/educacion/indicadores-publicaciones-sintesis/datos-cifras.html>
- Monreal, G. (2001). Origen de la Ley del Vasceune en Navarra. *Revista Internacional de Estudios Vascos*, 46(2), 517–543.

- Muller, J. (2010). *Language and conflict in Northern Ireland and Canada: A silent war*. Basingstoke: Palgrave.
- O'Donnell, G. A. (1994). Delegative democracy. *Journal of Democracy*, 5(1), 55–69.
- Oroz, N., & Sotés, P. (2008). Bilingual education in Navarre: Achievements and challenges. *Language, Culture and Curriculum*, 21(1), 21–38.
- Patten, A., & Kymlicka, W. (2003). Introduction: Language rights and political theory: Context, issues, and approaches. In W. Kymlicka & A. Patten (Eds.), *Language rights and political theory* (pp. 1–51). Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Paulston, C. B. (ed.). (1992). *Sociolinguistic perspectives on bilingual education*. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.
- Pennycook, A. (2000). Language, ideology and hindsight: Lessons from colonial language policies. In T. Ricento (Ed.), *Ideology, politics and language policies* (pp. 49–66). Amsterdam: Benjamins.
- Pennycook, A. (2012). Lingua francas as language ideologies. In A. Kirkpatrick & R. Sussex (Eds.), *English as an international language in Asia: Implications for language education* (pp. 137–154). Dordrecht: Springer.
- Pennycook, A. (2014). *The cultural politics of English as an international language*. London: Routledge.
- Pérez, J. M. (2006). Principios del régimen juridicolingüístico: en especial, el estatuto de oficialidad. In J. M. Pérez (Ed.), *Estudios sobre el estatuto jurídico de las lenguas en España* (pp. 249–280). Barcelona: Atelier.
- Phillipson, R. (2007). Linguistic imperialism: A conspiracy, or a conspiracy of silence? *Language Policy*, 6(3–4), 377–383.
- Phillipson, R. (2015). English as threat or opportunity in European higher education. In S. Dimova, A. K. Hultgren, & C. Jensen (Eds.), *English-medium instruction in higher education in Europe* (pp. 19–42). Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Pujolar, J. (2007). The future of Catalan: Language endangerment and nationalist discourses in Catalonia. In A. Duchêne & M. Heller (Eds.), *Discourses of endangerment: Interest and ideology in the defense of languages* (pp. 121–148). London: Continuum International.
- Réaume, D. G. (2000). Official language rights: Intrinsic value and the protection of difference. In W. Kymlicka & W. Norman (Eds.), *Citizenship in diverse societies* (pp. 245–272). Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Ricento, T. (2000a). Ideology, politics and language policies: Introduction. In T. Ricento (Ed.), *Ideology, politics and language policies: Focus on English* (pp. 1–8). Amsterdam: Benjamins.
- Ricento, T. (2000b). Historical and theoretical perspectives in language policy and planning. *Journal of Sociolinguistics*, 4(2), 196–213.
- Rubdy, R., & Saraceni, M. (2006). Introduction. In R. Rubdy, & M. Saraceni (Eds.), *English in the world: Global rules, global roles* (pp. 5–16). London: Continuum.
- Rubio-Marín, R. (2003). Language rights: Exploring the competing rationales. In W. Kymlicka & A. Patten (Eds.), *Language rights and political theory* (pp. 52–73). Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Ruiz, JÁ. (2005). Identidad y conflictos en el País Vasco. Ambiciones de poder y manipulación de la historia en una sociedad pluralista. In G. C. Aranda, & S. Salinas *Conflictos de identidades y política internacional* (pp. 153–190). Santiago de Chile: Ril.
- Ruiz, Y., & Lasagabaster, D. (2010). CLIL in a bilingual community: The Basque Autonomous Community. In D. Lasagabaster, & Y. Ruiz (Eds.), *CLIL in Spain: Implementation, results and teacher training* (pp. 12–29). Newcastle: Cambridge Scholars.
- Salinas, F. (1986). Examen crítico del Amejoramiento del Fuero de Navarra. *Revista Jurídica de Navarra*, 1, 57–86.
- School Council of Navarre (2017). *Informe del sistema educativo en Navarra, 2015-16*. Retrieved from <http://consejoescolar.educacion.navarra.es/web1/informes-del-sistema-educativo/>
- Shohamy, E. G. (2006). *Language policy: Hidden agendas and new approaches*. New York, NY: Routledge.
- Silverstein, M. (1979). Language structure and linguistic ideology. In R. Cline, W. Hanks, & C. Hofbauer, (Eds.), *The elements: A parasession on linguistic units and levels* (pp. 193–247). Chicago: Chicago Linguistic Society.

- Skutnabb-Kangas, T., & Phillipson, R. (1994). Linguistic imperialism. In R. E. Asher (Ed.), *The Encyclopedia of language and linguistics* (pp. 2223–2226). Oxford: Pergamon.
- Somers, T., & Surmont, J. (2012). CLIL and immersion: How clear-cut are they? *ELT Journal*, 66, 113–116.
- Sonntag, S. K., & Cardinal, L. (2015). State traditions and language regimes: A historical institutionalism approach to language policy. In L. Cardinal & S. K. Sonntag (Eds.), *State traditions and language regimes* (pp. 5–21). Ottawa: McGill-Queen's University Press.
- Sonntag, S. K. (2000). Ideology and policy in the politics of the English language in North India. In T. Ricento (Ed.), *Ideology, politics and language policies: Focus on English* (pp. 133–150). Amsterdam: Benjamins.
- Steilas. (2017). *Informe sobre lenguas*. Retrieved from <http://steilas.eus/es/2017/06/09/14995/>
- Tollefson, J. W. (2015). Language policy-making in multilingual education: Mass media and the framing of medium of instruction. *Current Issues in Language Planning*, 16(1–2), 132–148.
- Tollefson, J. W., & Tsui, A. B. (2003). *Medium of instruction policies: Which agenda? Whose agenda?* Mahwah: Lawrence Erlbaum.
- Urrutia, I. (2005). *Derechos lingüísticos y euskera en el sistema educativo*. Iruñea: Lete.
- Van Dijk, T. A. (1995). Discourse semantics and ideology. *Discourse & Society*, 6(2), 243–289.
- Van Dijk, T. A. (1998). *Ideology. A multidisciplinary approach*. London: Sage.
- Vila, F. X. & Bretxa, V. (Eds.). (2015). *Language policy in higher education. The case of medium-sized languages*. Bristol: Multilingual Matters.
- Ware, A. (1996). *Political parties and party systems*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Weinstock, D. M. (2003). The antinomy of language policy. In W. Kymlicka & A. Patten (Eds.), *Language rights and political theory* (pp. 250–270). Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Woolard, K. A. (1998). Introduction: Language ideology as a field of inquiry. In B. B. Schieffelin, K. A. Woolard, & P. V. Kroskrity (Eds.), *Language ideologies* (pp. 3–47). New York, NY: Oxford University Press.
- Wright, S. (ed.). (1996). *Language and the state: Revitalization and revival in Israel and Eire*. Clevedon: Multilingual matters.
- Zalbide, M., & Cenoz, J. (2008). Bilingual education in the Basque Autonomous Community: Achievements and challenges. *Language, Culture and Curriculum*, 21(1), 5–20.