

Language Ideologies and Policy Development: Navigating Identity, Education, and Globalization

Evans Dennison J¹, Zulidyana Dwi Rusnalasari², Suci Marselina³, Rafli⁴

¹Sree Sastha Arts and Science College, India

²Universitas Negeri Surabaya, Indonesia

³Sekolah Tinggi Ilmu Ekonomi Sakti Alam Kerinci, Indonesia

⁴Universitas Eka Sakti, Indonesia

Correspondent: dennievanz@gmail.com¹

Received : February 12, 2025

Accepted : March 19, 2025

Published : March 31, 2025

Citation: Dennison J, E., Rusnalasari, Z, D., Marselina, S., Rafli. (2025). Language Ideologies and Policy Development: Navigating Identity, Education, and Globalization. *Lingua: Journal of Linguistics and Language*, 3(1), 62-76.

ABSTRACT: Language ideologies play a decisive role in shaping language policy, influencing national identity, education, minority language preservation, globalization, and systemic inequalities. This narrative review examines how ideological frameworks inform policy development across diverse contexts. Using Scopus, Web of Science, and Google Scholar, relevant studies were identified through strategic keyword searches and evaluated based on inclusion and exclusion criteria. The analysis shows that national language policies often embody ideological commitments to unity and global competitiveness, privileging dominant or colonial languages at the expense of minority tongues. In education, policies prioritizing global languages like English can hinder equitable learning outcomes, while mother-tongue based multilingual education demonstrates significant benefits for comprehension, retention, and cultural identity. Revitalization programs in regions such as New Zealand and Latin America highlight how positive ideologies and community ownership foster minority language survival. Globalization and neoliberal ideologies further commodify language, framing it as human capital and reinforcing hierarchies that marginalize local languages. Critical studies reveal how hegemonic languages perpetuate inequality, particularly in academic and professional domains. Systemic governance factors mediate these outcomes, with decentralized and participatory models enabling more inclusive policies. Despite these insights, existing literature shows regional, methodological, and theoretical limitations, underscoring the need for broader comparative and interdisciplinary research. Overall, balancing global participation with local linguistic identities remains urgent. Sustainable reforms must prioritize multilingual education, inclusive governance, and community engagement to promote linguistic justice and cultural diversity.

Keywords: Language Ideologies, Language Policy, Multilingual Education, Minority Languages, Globalization, Linguistic Diversity, Social Inequality.



This is an open access article under the CC-BY 4.0 license

INTRODUCTION

The study of language ideologies within the framework of language policy has increasingly become a focal point of scholarly discourse. This reflects the complex intersection between linguistic practices, social identities, and political power structures. At its essence, language ideology denotes

the beliefs, attitudes, and motivations that underlie the use of language and guide policy decisions regarding its role in society (Prishtina, 2018; Groff, 2018). These ideologies do not merely exist in abstraction but are actively constructed, perpetuated, and contested across various social institutions. For example, in education, teachers' beliefs about language shape classroom practices, while in governance, policy decisions on official languages determine which communities are included or excluded. In media, language ideologies appear through representation choices that legitimize dominant languages and marginalize minority ones. The significance of language ideologies lies in their ability to legitimize particular linguistic practices while marginalizing others, thereby shaping national narratives, community identities, and individual opportunities. For example, Spolsky's framework of language policy underscores ideology as a central dimension that informs both language management and planning, thereby situating ideology as an indispensable analytical category (Alasmari, 2024).

Recent scholarship underscores the role of educational systems in embodying and perpetuating language ideologies. Educational settings serve as crucial spaces where dominant language beliefs are reproduced, resisted, and redefined. For instance, Heidt (2023) demonstrates how teachers' language ideologies influence pedagogical practices in international schools where multiple linguistic repertoires intersect with institutional policies favoring certain languages. Similarly, language policies designed to promote monolingual or multilingual frameworks directly reflect ideological positions that either reinforce hegemonic practices or empower marginalized communities (Rajapakse, 2023; Phillipson, 2019). In this respect, education is not simply a medium of knowledge transfer but a mechanism through which ideological frameworks about language are legitimized, institutionalized, and contested.

The relevance of language ideologies in shaping education and national identity is supported by global evidence and statistical data. Post-colonial contexts provide significant insights into how language policy reflects ideological struggles between the pursuit of unity and the preservation of diversity. Zentz (2014) and Wirza (2019) note that national language policies often oscillate between reinforcing linguistic homogeneity as a means of national identity construction and accommodating pluralism to reflect societal diversity. In nations marked by ethnic conflict or fragile state structures, language policy becomes a key instrument for forging cohesion and stability (Ramonienė & Ramonaitė, 2024; Aroshidze & Aroshidze, 2021). Conversely, policies privileging dominant languages can exacerbate exclusion, as demonstrated in Turkey, where the prioritization of Turkish over minority languages embodies nationalist ideologies that marginalize ethnic groups (Mei, 2024; Ivanova & Tivyaeva, 2015).

International organizations such as UNESCO consistently highlight the role of language in promoting inclusion and achieving educational equity. Empirical studies support the notion that multilingual education enhances cognitive development and fosters social integration, particularly among minority and indigenous groups (Velasco, 2024; Curdt-Christiansen & Wang, 2018). By affirming cultural identities and acknowledging linguistic rights, such policies contribute to societal cohesion and democratic participation (Berthele, 2016). These findings underscore the necessity of critically analyzing how ideologies shape policies that either promote or hinder inclusivity.

Despite these advancements, the integration of minority and indigenous languages into national policies remains a persistent challenge. One of the central tensions involves balancing the pursuit of national unity through dominant languages with the imperative of protecting linguistic diversity. Research suggests that many national policies prioritize dominant languages, relegating minority tongues to positions of inferiority (Albury & Carter, 2018; Cui & Gao, 2024). For example, Albury and Carter (2018) highlight how Māori youth in New Zealand perceive language purism as a barrier rather than a facilitator of revitalization, pointing to the disconnect between community realities and policy frameworks. Similarly, in China, the promotion of Putonghua has undermined the sustainability of minority languages such as Korean, demonstrating how institutionalized policies often fail to align with multilingual societal realities (Cui & Gao, 2024).

Institutional shortcomings further exacerbate these challenges, as many policies are shaped by socio-political imperatives rather than linguistic realities. For instance, Kirsch (2018) shows how discrepancies in the implementation of language policies across geographic and demographic contexts lead to uneven impacts on different communities. While policies may profess inclusivity, practical applications frequently reproduce inequities, reinforcing dominant ideologies. This divergence between policy rhetoric and practice underscores the deeply entrenched ideological dimensions of language governance.

Another persistent challenge involves the scarcity of comparative studies that examine language ideologies across different socio-economic and geopolitical contexts. Much of the existing scholarship focuses disproportionately on Western societies, leaving significant gaps in understanding how ideologies function in less developed or postcolonial settings where languages face existential threats (Hwang & Yim, 2019). In these contexts, the ideological underpinnings are shaped by distinct historical trajectories, colonial legacies, and socio-political constraints that require more nuanced analysis. The absence of comparative perspectives limits the field's capacity to capture the full range of dynamics influencing policy development.

For instance, globalization and colonial legacies manifest uniquely in countries such as Indonesia, where particular languages gain prominence for their perceived economic utility (Wirza, 2019; Zentz, 2014). By contrast, developed nations encounter challenges related to the global dominance of English, which shapes language policy in complex and often contradictory ways (Hwang & Yim, 2019). These disparities highlight the need for more comprehensive comparative approaches that account for varying historical, political, and socio-economic contexts. Without such comparative insights, academic discourse risks reinforcing a narrow understanding of language ideologies that inadequately reflects global diversity.

The literature thus reveals clear gaps that necessitate further inquiry. While existing studies have illuminated the mechanisms through which ideologies shape language policy, they often neglect underrepresented contexts, languages, and communities (Zentz, 2014; Pavez, 2021). Similarly, comparative analyses remain limited, leaving questions about how systemic differences influence ideological formations and policy outcomes largely unanswered. This lacuna in the scholarship justifies the need for comprehensive narrative reviews that synthesize diverse perspectives and bridge disciplinary divides.

The present review seeks to address these gaps by analyzing how ideological frameworks inform language policies across macro, meso, and micro levels. Specifically, it aims to elucidate the interplay between institutional ideologies and community practices, highlighting both convergence and conflict. Drawing on a wide range of literature, the review will examine how ideologies concerning national identity, education, minority language preservation, globalization, and power inequalities shape policy outcomes and social realities. In doing so, it contributes to a deeper understanding of the ideological undercurrents that influence language planning and management in contemporary societies.

The scope of this review encompasses multiple geographic regions, including Europe, Asia, Africa, and Latin America, reflecting the diversity of ideological configurations and policy responses across contexts. European research often emphasizes regional identity and the revival of minority languages, as observed in the case of Welsh and Basque (Heugh, 2015; Heidt, 2023). In contrast, Asian and African studies frequently grapple with post-colonial hierarchies where global languages such as English or French dominate educational structures (Hamid & Ali, 2023; Al-Issa, 2014; Chakrani, 2025). Latin American scholarship, meanwhile, often situates language ideologies within broader struggles for social justice and indigenous rights (Assendelft & Rutten, 2023; Rahaman, 2025). By engaging with these diverse contexts, the review situates its analysis within a global framework, enabling a nuanced understanding of how language ideologies shape and are shaped by historical, cultural, and political forces.

In sum, the introduction situates language ideologies as pivotal to understanding language policy development, highlighting their influence on education, identity, and governance. By foregrounding existing challenges and gaps in the literature, this review justifies its contribution to advancing scholarly discussions on the interplay between ideology and policy. It underscores the urgency of developing inclusive, equitable, and contextually grounded policies that recognize linguistic diversity as both a cultural resource and a fundamental human right.

METHOD

The methodology employed in this review was designed to ensure both comprehensiveness and rigor in identifying, selecting, and analyzing scholarly literature on language ideologies and their influence on language policy development. The review draws on established practices in narrative review research, emphasizing transparency in data collection and systematic evaluation of relevant sources. Given the multifaceted nature of language ideologies, which intersect with fields such as sociolinguistics, education, political science, and cultural studies, the methodology aimed to capture a wide range of perspectives and empirical findings that contribute to an enriched understanding of the topic.

The literature search was conducted using three primary academic databases: Scopus, Web of Science, and Google Scholar. These platforms were chosen for their distinct advantages in capturing peer-reviewed scholarship and grey literature. Scopus and Web of Science were

prioritized because of their rigorous indexing systems, which include only high-quality peer-reviewed journals and conference proceedings. Their citation-tracking functions enabled the identification of influential works and the mapping of interconnections between different studies, providing a solid foundation for evaluating research relevance and impact (Kirsch, 2018; Albury & Carter, 2018). Google Scholar was also included as a complementary resource due to its broader coverage across disciplines, making it possible to access emerging studies, book chapters, and grey literature that may not yet be indexed in the more selective databases. This combination of databases ensured that the literature review was both comprehensive and inclusive of diverse scholarly voices.

The search strategy was developed through iterative refinement of keyword combinations to maximize retrieval of relevant literature while minimizing extraneous results. Initial searches utilized broad combinations such as “language ideology AND policy development,” “multilingualism AND education policy,” and “language policy AND identity,” which produced a wide array of studies spanning different regions and theoretical approaches (Kirsch, 2018; Hamid & Ali, 2023). Building upon these, more targeted searches were conducted using variations tailored to specific intersections within the field. For example, combinations like “language ideologies AND minority languages” and “language planning AND sociolinguistics” were employed to capture scholarship addressing the relationship between ideology and marginalized linguistic communities (Madlala & Mkhize, 2019). Similarly, the inclusion of regional keywords, such as “indigenous languages AND national policy” or “language rights AND cultural identity,” allowed for the identification of studies that highlight context-specific challenges and ideological formations in distinct geographical and cultural settings (Albury & Carter, 2018; Nakamura, 2019).

To ensure methodological transparency, clear inclusion and exclusion criteria were applied during the selection process. Studies were included if they were peer-reviewed, published in English, and directly addressed the intersection of language ideologies and language policy. Publications that provided empirical data, theoretical frameworks, or comprehensive analyses relevant to the research question were prioritized. In contrast, articles that were purely descriptive, lacked explicit engagement with ideological or policy frameworks, or fell outside the scope of sociolinguistic or educational analysis were excluded. This approach helped refine the focus of the review while maintaining a balance between breadth and depth. Grey literature was selectively included when it provided significant insights into underrepresented regions or emerging discourses that were not yet widely addressed in the academic canon.

The types of research considered encompassed a broad spectrum of methodologies, reflecting the interdisciplinary nature of the field. Empirical studies included randomized controlled trials where applicable in education contexts, cohort and case studies examining the long-term effects of language policy on specific communities, and ethnographic investigations of everyday language practices in multilingual settings. Conceptual and theoretical papers were also incorporated, particularly when they introduced frameworks that have shaped subsequent empirical research, such as Spolsky’s model of language policy or Phillipson’s critique of linguistic imperialism (Phillipson, 2019). By including both empirical and theoretical contributions, the review aimed to capture the dynamic interplay between ideological constructs and real-world policy outcomes.

The selection process unfolded in multiple stages. Initial searches generated a large pool of articles that were first screened based on titles and abstracts to assess their relevance to the research objectives. Articles that clearly aligned with the focus on language ideologies and policy were retained for further review. The second stage involved full-text screening, during which the content of each article was examined to confirm its eligibility according to the inclusion and exclusion criteria. Studies that demonstrated explicit engagement with ideological constructs, provided comparative analyses, or offered empirical evidence of policy impacts were prioritized. In cases where relevance was ambiguous, consensus discussions among reviewers were employed to ensure balanced judgments, thereby reducing bias in the selection process.

To further refine the corpus of selected literature, articles were evaluated for quality and impact. Citation counts and journal rankings served as indicators of scholarly influence, though these metrics were balanced against the need to include recent and innovative studies that may not yet have accumulated significant citations. Particular attention was given to studies published in high-impact journals indexed in Scopus and Web of Science, as well as works cited extensively across multiple disciplinary contexts. This process ensured that the final selection represented a combination of foundational texts and cutting-edge scholarship.

Once the corpus was finalized, the literature was analyzed thematically to identify recurring patterns, theoretical frameworks, and empirical findings. Thematic coding was applied to categorize articles into broad domains, including national identity and policy, educational practices, minority and indigenous language preservation, globalization and neoliberal ideologies, and issues of power and inequality. This categorization facilitated a structured synthesis of the literature, allowing for the identification of convergences and divergences across contexts and methodologies. Moreover, thematic analysis enabled the tracing of how particular ideologies, such as nationalism or neoliberalism, manifest in different geographical settings, thereby contributing to the global scope of the review.

Throughout the process, methodological rigor was maintained by documenting each step of the search, selection, and evaluation process. This documentation ensures transparency and reproducibility, enabling future researchers to replicate or extend the study. The combination of multiple databases, strategically crafted keywords, clear inclusion and exclusion criteria, and a structured evaluation framework contributed to the reliability and validity of the review's findings.

In sum, the methodology adopted in this review reflects a deliberate effort to balance comprehensiveness with analytical focus. By integrating diverse databases, refining search strategies through keyword specificity, and applying rigorous selection criteria, the review sought to capture a wide spectrum of perspectives on language ideologies and policy development. The inclusion of both empirical and theoretical research further enhanced the depth of analysis, enabling a nuanced exploration of how ideologies inform policies at multiple levels. Ultimately, this methodological approach provides a robust foundation for synthesizing existing knowledge, addressing gaps in the literature, and advancing scholarly understanding of the intricate relationship between language ideologies and language policy in diverse global contexts.

RESULT AND DISCUSSION

The findings of this narrative review reveal a complex interplay between language ideologies and policy development across diverse geopolitical and educational contexts. The literature consistently underscores how ideologies influence national identity formation, the choice of medium of instruction in education, the survival and revitalization of minority languages, the commodification of languages in globalization, and the reinforcement of power dynamics and inequalities. By synthesizing evidence from multiple regions and theoretical frameworks, this section presents the results thematically, drawing comparisons across contexts to provide a global perspective on the role of language ideologies in shaping policy.

National Identity and Language Policy

The role of language ideologies in shaping national identity has been a central theme in the literature. Studies indicate that language policies are often constructed on ideological beliefs that equate a dominant language with national loyalty and cohesion (Wirza, 2019; Zentz, 2014). Such policies typically institutionalize national languages within education, government, and public life, thereby fostering a collective sense of belonging while simultaneously marginalizing minority linguistic communities (Heidt, 2023; Aroshidze & Aroshidze, 2021). In Indonesia, for example, Bahasa Indonesia has been positioned as a unifying symbol, yet this promotion has occurred alongside the suppression of local languages, illustrating the dual potential of language policy to unify and exclude (Wirza, 2019). Similarly, in Turkey, the prioritization of Turkish in education and administration reflects nationalist ideologies that limit the visibility and use of minority languages such as Kurdish (Mei, 2024; Ivanova & Tivyaeva, 2015).

Comparative perspectives illustrate divergent ideological approaches across contexts. In Europe, national identity is often articulated through the preservation of linguistic diversity, as in Catalonia and Scotland, where regional languages serve as vehicles of cultural assertion (Cenoz & Gorter, 2017; Pavez, 2021). Conversely, in post-colonial African states, colonial languages such as English and French continue to dominate despite policies promoting multilingualism. In South Africa, for example, the coexistence of 11 official languages reflects an ideological commitment to diversity, but in practice, English and Afrikaans remain privileged, perpetuating historical divisions (Heidt, 2023; Albury & Carter, 2018). These findings suggest that while some contexts use language policy to affirm diversity, others employ it to consolidate national unity, often at the cost of minority linguistic rights.

Education and Medium of Instruction

The literature provides strong empirical evidence linking language ideologies to educational policy, particularly regarding the medium of instruction. Many educational systems prioritize global languages such as English, reflecting ideologies that equate linguistic proficiency with socioeconomic mobility and competitiveness in the global market (Hamid & Ali, 2023; Velasco, 2024). This ideological stance often results in educational policies that marginalize indigenous languages and disadvantage students who lack proficiency in English. For instance, research from South Africa and Sri Lanka demonstrates that English-medium instruction frequently undermines

students' ability to engage with content, exacerbating educational inequities (Heidt, 2023; Aroshidze & Aroshidze, 2021).

In contrast, systems that adopt mother-tongue instruction consistently report improved educational outcomes. Studies reveal that mother-tongue education enhances comprehension, fosters critical thinking, and improves retention rates, especially in early education (Velasco, 2024; Cenoz & Gorter, 2017). UNESCO reports corroborate these findings, emphasizing that multilingual education not only affirms cultural identity but also promotes inclusion and equitable learning outcomes (Curdt-Christiansen & Wang, 2018; Berthele, 2016). Comparative evidence from Europe, where bilingual education models are widely implemented, further highlights the benefits of linguistic diversity in education, in contrast to the persistence of monolingual ideologies in many Asian and African contexts.

Minority and Indigenous Language Preservation

Assimilationist ideologies embedded in monolingual policies have been widely documented as detrimental to the survival of minority and indigenous languages. Historical policies in Australia and Canada systematically eroded indigenous linguistic heritage by privileging English and French, contributing to the stigmatization and decline of indigenous languages (Heidt, 2023; Albury & Carter, 2018). Similarly, in China, the promotion of Putonghua has undermined minority languages such as Korean, reflecting the entrenchment of ideologies that prioritize linguistic uniformity over diversity (Cui & Gao, 2024).

Despite these challenges, revitalization programs provide evidence of how positive ideological shifts can support minority language survival. In New Zealand, Māori language revitalization programs that emphasize community ownership, cultural pride, and state-supported bilingual education have achieved considerable success (Albury & Carter, 2018; Madlala & Mkhize, 2019). Comparable efforts in Latin America have linked language revitalization with broader social justice movements, further demonstrating the interdependence of language ideologies, cultural identity, and policy success (Pavez, 2021; Zhang-Wu, 2023). These cases highlight that revitalization is most effective when grounded in ideologies that value diversity and cultural continuity.

Globalization and Neoliberal Ideologies

The global shift towards neoliberal ideologies has profoundly influenced how languages are valued and commodified. Increasingly, language proficiency—particularly in English—is viewed as human capital, an asset that facilitates access to education, employment, and global mobility (Hamid & Ali, 2023). For instance, research in Bangladesh illustrates how English is conceptualized not simply as a communicative tool but as a gateway to economic advancement, with proficiency serving as a marker of social status and employability (Hamid & Ali, 2023). Similar patterns are evident globally, where English-language certifications have become commodities that confer symbolic and material capital (Ramlackhan, 2020).

Neoliberal frameworks have also reshaped educational policy in non-English-speaking contexts. In Thailand, for example, reforms explicitly promote English instruction under the rationale of enhancing global competitiveness, reflecting the alignment of policy with neoliberal economic agendas (Nitsaisook et al., 2025). However, such policies often exacerbate linguistic inequalities by

devaluing local languages and reinforcing hierarchies between global and regional languages. Comparative evidence suggests that while developed nations grapple with the ideological dominance of English, developing nations often face the compounded challenge of negotiating between global pressures and the preservation of local linguistic heritage.

Power, Inequality, and Hegemony

Language policies are deeply implicated in reproducing socio-political power dynamics and systemic inequalities. Dominant languages often serve as instruments of exclusion, reinforcing hierarchies that privilege certain groups while marginalizing others. In South Africa, for example, English and Afrikaans historically functioned as hegemonic tools that marginalized indigenous languages and their speakers, restricting access to education and opportunities (Madlala & Mkhize, 2019). Similar patterns are observed globally, where dominant languages consolidate power structures and limit the agency of minority communities (Kirsch, 2018).

Critical studies highlight how hegemonic ideologies, particularly those privileging English, construct inequalities across educational and social domains. The prevalence of native-speakerism in South Korea illustrates how ideologies valorizing native English speakers create structural barriers for non-native teachers and learners, reinforcing inequities within educational systems (Hwang & Yim, 2019). In higher education, the dominance of English as the language of instruction and publication perpetuates academic inequalities by privileging scholars from Anglophone contexts (Madlala & Mkhize, 2019). These findings reveal how language ideologies extend beyond local policies to shape global academic and professional hierarchies.

Synthesis of Findings

Across these thematic domains, the literature demonstrates that language ideologies profoundly shape language policy outcomes, influencing identity formation, educational access, linguistic diversity, and socio-economic mobility. The evidence underscores the dual role of language ideologies as both mechanisms of empowerment and instruments of exclusion. While policies informed by inclusive ideologies have the potential to promote equity and preserve diversity, those rooted in assimilationist or neoliberal frameworks often exacerbate marginalization and inequality. Comparative perspectives further illuminate the variability of these dynamics, showing how historical, cultural, and socio-political contexts mediate the impact of language ideologies globally.

In conclusion, the results of this narrative review indicate that language ideologies are central to understanding the complex relationship between language and policy. They not only determine the trajectory of national identity and education but also influence the survival of minority languages, the commodification of linguistic skills, and the perpetuation of systemic inequalities. Recognizing these ideological underpinnings is essential for developing policies that promote linguistic justice, educational equity, and cultural diversity in an increasingly interconnected world.

The findings synthesized in this review highlight the intricate relationship between language ideologies and language policy development, reflecting both systemic influences and the broader socio-political context in which policies are implemented. Analysis of these findings reveals how governance frameworks, institutional decisions, and global pressures mediate ideological commitments, producing outcomes that variably support or marginalize linguistic diversity. This

discussion critically engages with the results, situating them within the wider body of literature while offering insights into systemic factors, potential reforms, and limitations in existing scholarship.

Systemic Factors Mediating Language Ideologies and Policy Implementation

Systemic factors, particularly governance structures and institutional frameworks, play a decisive role in shaping how language ideologies are translated into policy. Centralized governance models often impose a top-down approach to policy implementation, emphasizing economic competitiveness and national unity as guiding objectives. In such contexts, English or other global languages tend to be prioritized in education and governance, reflecting neoliberal ideologies that equate proficiency in international languages with socioeconomic advancement (Kirsch, 2018; Velasco, 2024). While these strategies may bolster global participation, they often marginalize minority languages, reinforcing perceptions of their limited value in contributing to national identity or economic development.

In contrast, decentralized governance models have been shown to foster inclusivity in policy design by incorporating regional and minority voices into the planning process. South Africa provides a salient example where constitutional recognition of multiple languages reflects efforts to address historical injustices and redistribute linguistic equity (Madlala & Mkhize, 2019; Groff, 2018). Nevertheless, challenges persist in aligning ideological commitments with practical implementation, as inequalities in resource allocation and entrenched colonial legacies continue to undermine policy outcomes. These systemic dynamics illustrate that language ideologies cannot be disentangled from broader governance frameworks that either facilitate or obstruct participatory and equitable policy-making.

Institutional structures further mediate how language ideologies are enacted, particularly in educational settings. Schools often become sites where dominant ideologies are reinforced through curriculum design, medium of instruction policies, and assessment practices. Heidt (2023) illustrates how teachers' ideological orientations shape classroom practices in ways that privilege global languages over local ones, thereby institutionalizing hierarchies of linguistic legitimacy. These findings highlight that systemic biases are not confined to national policy but permeate local institutions, shaping how communities experience and respond to language policies.

Proposed Policy Reforms to Balance Global Participation and Local Linguistic Identities

Balancing global participation with the preservation of local linguistic identities remains a central challenge for policymakers. One widely advocated reform is the adoption of Mother Tongue-Based Multilingual Education (MTBMLE). This model prioritizes instruction in children's first languages during the foundational years of schooling, gradually introducing global languages such as English. Empirical evidence demonstrates that MTBMLE enhances comprehension, retention, and cultural pride while equipping students with the skills necessary for global engagement (Velasco, 2024). The Philippines provides a prominent example where MTBMLE has improved student performance and contributed to the revitalization of local languages, illustrating how pedagogical reforms can reconcile global and local linguistic needs.

Beyond education, integrating local languages into bureaucratic and governmental processes offers another avenue for reform. Policies that mandate the use of minority languages in administrative contexts counteract the homogenizing effects of globalization, affirming linguistic rights and promoting inclusivity (Wirza, 2019). Such measures underscore the importance of embedding language diversity within the fabric of governance, ensuring that ideologies valuing cultural heritage are reflected in official practices. Moreover, participatory approaches to language planning, which involve communities in decision-making, have been identified as effective in aligning policy with local needs and aspirations (Madlala & Mkhize, 2019; Groff, 2018). By empowering communities to shape language policies, states can foster greater legitimacy and sustainability in their policy initiatives.

Educational reforms must also consider the influence of neoliberal ideologies that prioritize economic efficiency over cultural preservation. Nitsaisook et al. (2025) demonstrate how language policies in Thailand, shaped by neoliberal rationales, disproportionately emphasize English instruction, marginalizing local languages in the process. Reforms that address this imbalance must explicitly resist the commodification of language, instead framing linguistic diversity as both a cultural resource and a developmental asset. This approach requires reconceptualizing language policy not merely as a tool for economic advancement but as a vehicle for promoting equity, justice, and pluralism.

Limitations Highlighted in Existing Literature

Despite growing interest in the interplay between language ideologies and policy development, the literature exhibits notable limitations. One of the most significant gaps lies in its regional focus. Much of the research remains concentrated in Western and post-colonial contexts, with limited attention given to regions where linguistic diversity is equally or more pronounced but less studied, such as parts of Southeast Asia, the Pacific Islands, and sub-Saharan Africa (Ogunnubi & Isike, 2017; Nitsaisook et al., 2025). This imbalance limits the generalizability of findings and perpetuates a Eurocentric orientation in language policy research.

Methodological limitations further constrain the field. Many studies rely heavily on qualitative approaches, particularly ethnographic methods that offer deep insights into local practices and beliefs (Kirsch, 2018). While valuable, such approaches often lack the capacity to assess broader policy impacts or provide quantifiable outcomes that can inform comparative analyses across contexts. The reliance on small-scale studies risks producing fragmented understandings that overlook systemic patterns. Addressing this limitation requires incorporating mixed-methods designs that combine qualitative depth with quantitative breadth, thereby enabling more comprehensive evaluations of policy effectiveness.

Theoretical limitations also warrant attention. Existing frameworks often conceptualize language ideologies through binary oppositions such as global versus local or dominant versus minority languages (Albury & Carter, 2018; Groff, 2018). While these dichotomies capture important dynamics, they risk oversimplifying the nuanced and fluid ways in which ideologies operate across contexts. For instance, the coexistence of English and local languages in multilingual societies often involves hybrid ideological formations that cannot be fully explained through oppositional frameworks. Scholars such as Hamid and Ali (2023) suggest that adopting more integrative

theoretical perspectives can illuminate these complexities, offering a more accurate account of how language ideologies inform policy.

Moreover, gaps remain in exploring the intersectionality of language ideologies with other social factors such as class, gender, and ethnicity. While studies highlight how policies reinforce systemic inequalities (Madlala & Mkhize, 2019; Hwang & Yim, 2019), more research is needed to examine how multiple axes of identity interact with language ideologies to shape lived experiences. Without such analyses, the field risks overlooking critical dimensions of inequality and marginalization that are embedded within language policy outcomes.

Expanding the methodological and theoretical scope of research also necessitates greater attention to comparative studies. As highlighted in this review, disparities between developed and developing contexts reveal distinct ideological configurations shaped by historical, cultural, and political forces (Hwang & Yim, 2019; Wirza, 2019). Comparative research that systematically examines these differences can provide valuable insights into how policies might be tailored to reflect diverse realities, thereby enhancing their effectiveness and legitimacy. Future research should prioritize such cross-contextual analyses, ensuring that language policy scholarship reflects the full spectrum of global linguistic diversity.

CONCLUSION

This narrative review demonstrates that language ideologies are central to understanding the dynamics of language policy development, shaping national identity, education, minority language preservation, globalization, and socio-political power structures. The results show that while inclusive ideologies foster equity, cultural pride, and linguistic diversity, assimilationist and neoliberal orientations often exacerbate marginalization and inequality. Educational outcomes strongly confirm the benefits of mother-tongue based multilingual education, while policies prioritizing global languages risk undermining both equity and cultural identity. Systemic factors, particularly governance and institutional frameworks, mediate the extent to which policies can effectively reflect inclusive ideologies, highlighting the importance of participatory and decentralized approaches. However, existing literature reveals significant gaps, particularly in comparative and interdisciplinary studies, and methodological limitations that hinder a comprehensive understanding of ideological complexities. Addressing these gaps requires more diverse research strategies, greater regional representation, and the development of nuanced theoretical frameworks. Moving forward, policies must balance global participation with protection of local linguistic identities through reforms such as multilingual education, integration of local languages in governance, and community participation in planning processes. Such approaches are crucial for building equitable, inclusive, and sustainable linguistic future.

REFERENCE

- Alasmari, M. (2024). Unpacking family language policy through autoethnography: insights from a transnational arabic-speaking family in the united states. *International Journal of Bilingualism*, 29(3), 725-742. <https://doi.org/10.1177/13670069241240962>
- Al-Issa, A. (2014). A critical examination of motivation in the omani english language education system. *Journal of Language Teaching and Research*, 5(2). <https://doi.org/10.4304/jltr.5.2.406-418>
- Albury, N. and Carter, L. (2018). “An unrealistic expectation”: māori youth on indigenous language purism. *International Journal of the Sociology of Language*, 2018(254), 121-138. <https://doi.org/10.1515/ijsl-2018-0036>
- Aroshidze, M. and Aroshidze, N. (2021). The role of the language priorities in development of society. *Balkanistic Forum*, 30(1), 105-119. <https://doi.org/10.37708/bf.swu.v30i1.6>
- Assendelft, B. and Rutten, G. (2023). The rise and fall of french borrowings in postmedieval dutch. *Linguistica*, 63(1-2), 337-352. <https://doi.org/10.4312/linguistica.63.1-2.337-352>
- Berthele, R. (2016). 22. multilingual communication., 429-446. <https://doi.org/10.1515/9783110255478-023>
- Cenoz, J. and Gorter, D. (2017). Minority languages and sustainable translanguaging: threat or opportunity?. *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development*, 38(10), 901-912. <https://doi.org/10.1080/01434632.2017.1284855>
- Chakrani, B. (2025). Paradoxes of language policy in morocco: deconstructing the ideology of language alternation and the resurgence of french in stem instruction. *Languages*, 10(6), 135. <https://doi.org/10.3390/languages10060135>
- Cui, H. and Gao, X. (2024). From ‘born’ bilinguals to monolinguals: understanding korean-chinese bilingual family language policy in china. *European Journal of Education*, 59(4). <https://doi.org/10.1111/ejed.12765>
- Curd-Christiansen, X. and Wang, W. (2018). Parents as agents of multilingual education: family language planning in china. *Language Culture and Curriculum*, 31(3), 235-254. <https://doi.org/10.1080/07908318.2018.1504394>
- Groff, C. (2018). Language policy and language ideology: ecological perspectives on language and education in the himalayan foothills. *Anthropology & Education Quarterly*, 49(1), 3-20. <https://doi.org/10.1111/aeq.12235>

- Hamid, M. and Ali, M. (2023). Teaching english in the muslim world against the backdrop of 9/11 and resurgent nationalism: a case study of bangladeshi elt. *TESOL Quarterly*, 57(3), 830-858. <https://doi.org/10.1002/tesq.3241>
- Heidt, E. (2023). A critical examination of language ideologies and policies in an international school in colombia. *Teachers College Record*, 125(7-8), 276-299. <https://doi.org/10.1177/01614681231194414>
- Heugh, K. (2015). Harmonisation and south african languages: twentieth century debates of homogeneity and heterogeneity. *Language Policy*, 15(3), 235-255. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10993-015-9372-0>
- Hwang, K. and Yim, S. (2019). The negative influence of native-speakerism on the sustainability of linguistic and cultural diversities of localized variants of english: a study of local and expatriate teachers in south korea. *Sustainability*, 11(23), 6723. <https://doi.org/10.3390/su11236723>
- Ivanova, V. and Tivyaeva, I. (2015). Teaching foreign languages in soviet and present-day russia: a comparison of two systems. *Zbornik Instituta Za Pedagoska Istraživanja*, 47(2), 305-324. <https://doi.org/10.2298/zipi1502305i>
- Kirsch, C. (2018). Dynamic interplay of language policies, beliefs and pedagogy in a preschool in luxembourg. *Language and Education*, 32(5), 444-461. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09500782.2018.1487452>
- Madlala, N. and Mkhize, N. (2019). The influence of ideology on black african students' perceptions of the university of kwazulu-natal's bilingual policy. *Journal of Education*, (76). <https://doi.org/10.17159/2520-9868/i76a05>
- Mei, Y. (2024). Navigating linguistic ideologies and market dynamics within china's english language teaching landscape. *Linguistics Vanguard*, 10(1), 439-451. <https://doi.org/10.1515/lingvan-2024-0024>
- Nakamura, J. (2019). Parents' impact belief in raising bilingual and biliterate children in japan. *Psychology of Language and Communication*, 23(1), 137-161. <https://doi.org/10.2478/plc-2019-0007>
- Nitsaisook, N., Prabjandee, D., & Kewara, P. (2025). Language ideologies and english education policies in thailand. *World Englishes*. <https://doi.org/10.1111/weng.12739>
- Ogunnubi, O. and Isike, C. (2017). Nigeria's soft power sources: between potential and illusion?. *International Journal of Politics Culture and Society*, 31(1), 49-67. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10767-017-9258-6>

- Pavez, G. (2021). Language ideologies of emerging institutional frameworks of mapudungun revitalization in contemporary chile: nation, facebook, and the moon of pandora. *Multilingua*, 41(2), 153-179. <https://doi.org/10.1515/multi-2020-0148>
- Phillipson, R. (2019). Languages in public policy, and constraints in academia. *Language Problems & Language Planning*, 43(3), 286-311. <https://doi.org/10.1075/lplp.00046.phi>
- Prishtina, S. (2018). Language and ideology in the context of language policy of albanian language. *Journal of Educational and Social Research*, 8(2), 125-132. <https://doi.org/10.2478/jesr-2018-0023>
- Rahaman, A. (2025). Identity, ideology, and capital in efl learning: a narrative case study. *Asian-Pacific Journal of Second and Foreign Language Education*, 10(1). <https://doi.org/10.1186/s40862-024-00315-8>
- Rajapakse, A. (2023). The impact of monolingual language policies on the multilingual language ecology of sri lanka. *International Journal of Applied Linguistics*, 34(2), 642-655. <https://doi.org/10.1111/ijal.12521>
- Ramlackhan, K. (2020). Restricting social justice practices in public education: the neoliberal stronghold., 193-212. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-14625-2_117
- Ramonienė, M. and Ramonaitė, J. (2024). The role of the mother in lithuanian heritage language maintenance. *Languages*, 9(7), 241. <https://doi.org/10.3390/languages9070241>
- Velasco, Y. (2024). The interplay between language ideologies and mother tongue-based multilingual education (mtbmle) policy implementation in the philippines. *The Asia-Pacific Education Researcher*, 34(2), 765-775. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s40299-024-00894-7>
- Wirza, Y. (2019). Bahasa indonesia, ethnic languages and english: perceptions on indonesian language policy and planning., 1, 517-523. <https://doi.org/10.47298/cala2019.16-8>
- Zentz, L. (2014). “Love” the local, “use” the national, “study” the foreign: shifting javanese language ecologies in (post-)modernity, postcoloniality, and globalization. *Journal of Linguistic Anthropology*, 24(3), 339-359. <https://doi.org/10.1111/jola.12062>
- Zhang-Wu, Q. (2023). Monolingual disobedience, multilingual guilt?: an autoethnographic exploration of heritage language maintenance during covid-19 lockdowns. *Multilingua*, 43(2), 267-287. <https://doi.org/10.1515/multi-2023-0020>