

Working Paper

Between Recognition and Hierarchy: Linguistic Diversity in Pre-service Teachers' Lesson Plans

Docente:

Sandra Liliana Rojas Molina



ÚNICA
INSTITUCIÓN UNIVERSITARIA
COLOMBO AMERICANA



Working Paper - Between Recognition and Hierarchy: Linguistic Diversity in
Pre-service teachers' Lesson Plans

Grupo de Investigación Innovation on Bilingual Education INNOBED

Categoría B Colciencias

Dirección de Investigaciones

Calle 19 No. 2ª-49, Piso 3,

Centro Colombo Americano

Teléfono: 2811777 Ext. 1291

dirinvestigacioneslic@unica.edu.co

www.unica.edu.co

DOI: xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx



Between Recognition and Hierarchy: Linguistic Diversity in Pre-service Teachers' Lesson Plans

Abstract

This working paper examines how a guided classroom project reveals pre-service teachers' understandings of linguistic diversity and sociolinguistic inequality. Conducted in a Sociolinguistics course at a teacher education institution in Bogotá, Colombia, the research analyses 11 lesson plans as situated pedagogical artifacts. Using qualitative thematic analysis with variationist and critical sociolinguistics frameworks, the study identifies patterns in the representation of linguistic diversity, the ways issues of language-based conflict and discrimination are addressed, and the pedagogical framing of language varieties. Findings reveal that pre-service teachers view linguistic diversity as a systematic and rule-governed process as well as a phenomenon linked to heritage, identity, and social inclusion. While most lesson plans move toward legitimizing 'nonstandard' varieties and addressing discrimination, some lesson plans reinforce hierarchical ideologies. The analysis also reveals a need for deeper engagement with the sociohistorical roots of stigma to avoid naturalizing inequality. The study concludes that lesson plans are useful analytic tools for revealing ideological positioning and highlights the need for a pedagogy in teacher education based on justice and transformation that validates linguistic diversity as a right.

Keywords: Sociolinguistics, linguistic diversity, language education, linguistic inequality and discrimination, pre-service teachers

Resumen

Este documento de trabajo examina cómo un proyecto guiado en el aula pone de manifiesto la comprensión que tienen los docentes en formación sobre la diversidad lingüística y la desigualdad sociolingüística. Llevada a cabo en el marco de un curso de sociolingüística en una institución de formación docente en Bogotá, Colombia, la



investigación analiza 11 planes de clase como artefactos pedagógicos situados. Mediante un análisis temático cualitativo con marcos de referencia de la sociolingüística variacionista y crítica, el estudio identifica patrones en las comprensiones sobre diversidad lingüística, las formas en que se abordan asuntos de conflicto y discriminación basados en lenguaje y el marco pedagógico de las variedades lingüísticas. Los resultados revelan que los docentes en formación consideran la diversidad lingüística como algo sistemático y regido por normas, así como un fenómeno vinculado a la herencia cultural, la identidad y la inclusión social. Si bien la mayoría de los planes de clase avanza hacia la legitimación de las variedades no estándar y abordan la discriminación, algunos refuerzan ideologías jerárquicas. El análisis también revela la necesidad de un mayor compromiso para indagar las raíces históricas del estigma para evitar naturalizar la desigualdad. El estudio concluye que los planes de clase son herramientas analíticas útiles para revelar posicionamientos ideológicos y destaca la necesidad de una pedagogía en la formación docente basada en la justicia y la transformación que valide la diversidad lingüística como un derecho.

Palabras Clave: Sociolingüística, diversidad lingüística, educación en lengua, desigualdad y discriminación lingüísticas, docentes en formación.

Introduction

In multilingual and socially stratified contexts like Colombia, future language teachers serve as primary gatekeepers of linguistic value. Across Latin America, scholars have highlighted how linguistic diversity coexists with enduring structures of social inequality that privilege dominant languages and language varieties while marginalizing others (López, 2009). Sociolinguistics courses in higher education aim not only to introduce concepts such as phonological, lexical, syntactic, and semantic variation, but also to foster critical awareness of language, power and inequality (Labov, 1972a; Hymes, 1974). Educational sociolinguistics suggests that classrooms are not only sites of socialization but also spaces where metalinguistic awareness is constructed, but where deeply rooted hierarchies may



also be unintentionally naturalized (Niño-Murcia, 2020). Within this broader context, a guided classroom project on linguistic diversity provides a semi-structured pedagogical intervention through which pre-service teachers mobilize disciplinary knowledge. At the heart of this study is the tension between the explicit legitimation of linguistic diversity and the implicit persistence of standardized ideologies.

Lesson planning, on the other hand, is one of the instructional skills that pre-service teachers should develop for their future professional practice (Romero, 2022). However, it serves as more than a professional exercise; it is a pedagogical blueprint that makes visible teachers' underlying assumptions, priorities and beliefs about linguistic 'correctness' and social validity. In this sense, a lesson plan may anticipate classroom action. Thus, if pre-service teachers conceptualize diversity as a deficit, transmission of 'standard' forms will be the rule, and their classroom may reproduce narrow and exclusionary understandings of language and linguistic practices. Conversely, if they conceptualize diversity as an opportunity, inclusion of variation, and attention to sociolinguistic realities, critical reflection will be the norm, and their future teaching might foster more equitable and reflexive language practices (Flores & Rosa, 2015).

This project then examines a guided classroom assignment in which pre-service teachers design and implement a lesson plan about linguistic diversity in an English teacher college called ÚNICA in Bogotá, Colombia. While these future language educators often intend to promote inclusive practices, their pedagogical artifacts, specifically their lesson plans, reveal a significant paradox. Even when attempting to validate non-standard varieties, pre-service teachers rely on 'standard' forms as an invisible benchmark, creating a partial and contradictory legitimation of diversity (Rodríguez-Izquierdo et al., 2020).

This paradox reflects broader ideological processes through which linguistic diversity may be celebrated rhetorically while 'standard' language forms continue to function as implicit measures of legitimacy (Del Valle, 2007; Flores & Rosa, 2015). Consequently, pedagogical efforts to recognize variation may simultaneously reproduce linguistic



hierarchies and deficit perspectives toward certain language varieties (Bettney, 2022; García & Wei, 2015).

Although a substantial body of empirical research has examined teachers' understandings and ideologies based on interviews, surveys, classroom interactions, and ethnographic observation (Bernstein et al., 2023; Ricklefs, 2023), insufficient attention has been paid to how such understandings are represented in pedagogical artifacts such as lesson plans. Recent work in Colombian teacher education has highlighted lesson planning as a space where future teachers articulate pedagogical knowledge and professional identities (Ubaque-Casallas & Aguirre-Garzón, 2020). However, little research explores how lesson plans reveal understandings of linguistic diversity and sociolinguistic inequality.

To bridge this gap, this study general objective is to examine how pre-service teachers conceptualize and pedagogically represent linguistic diversity in their lesson plans, addressing the central research question: *How do pre-service teachers conceptualize and pedagogically translate linguistic diversity into instructional decisions?* Specifically, this paper sets out to achieve three interrelated objectives:

1. To evidence the conceptualizations of linguistic diversity and language variation reflected in pre-service teachers' lesson plans (*What understandings of linguistic diversity are reflected in pre-service teachers' lesson plans?*);
2. To analyze how lesson plans incorporate and address issues of linguistic conflict, prejudice, or discrimination (*How do lesson plans address issues of linguistic conflict, prejudice or discrimination?*); and
3. To examine how selected varieties are pedagogically framed, particularly in terms of whether these representations reproduce or challenge existing language-based hierarchies (*How are selected linguistic varieties framed pedagogically in ways that may reproduce or challenge language-based hierarchies?*).



By positioning lesson plans as analytic windows into how future language educators interpret inequality in linguistically stratified societies, this paper contributes to teacher education and critical sociolinguistics. This pedagogical shift suggests possibilities for recognizing and legitimizing diverse linguistic identities within the classroom and may contribute to discussions of more inclusive and peaceful approaches to language education.

Structurally, this working paper opens with an introduction and a theoretical framework that establish the problem statement, research objectives and questions, and theoretical foundations in variationist, critical and educational sociolinguistics. The literature review then examines existing empirical research on pre-service teacher ideologies and lesson plan analysis. Next, the methodology section details a qualitative, document-based interpretive case study analyzing 11 pre-service teacher lesson plans. The paper subsequently presents its qualitative thematic findings across three core dimensions: conceptualizations of linguistic diversity, treatment of linguistic conflict, prejudice and discrimination; and the pedagogical framing of language-based hierarchies. Finally, the discussion synthesizes these themes through broader critical frameworks before the conclusion highlights key pedagogical implications, study limitations, and pathways for future research in teacher education.

Theoretical Framework

Sociolinguistics has demonstrated that linguistic variation is a defining property of language rather than an exception. Foundational research by Labov (1972b), Hymes (1972), and Fishman (1972) challenged the idea of linguistic homogeneity by showing that variation exists across and within speech communities. Particularly, Labov (1972b) demonstrated that variation is systematic and socially meaningful rather than random or deficient. From this perspective, forms that are often labeled as 'nonstandard' are rule-governed varieties associated with particular social groups. This insight shifted sociolinguistics away



from deficit-oriented views of language toward recognizing the legitimacy of linguistic diversity (Hornberger & McKay, 2010).

Understanding linguistic variation requires more than identifying differences across phonological, morphological, and lexical levels (e.g., Hualde et al., 2010; Lipski, 1994; Wolfram & Schilling, 2016). Although variationist approaches provide a systematic account of linguistic diversity, they do not fully explain how linguistic forms acquire social meaning. Such meanings emerge from ideological processes that assign value to particular ways of speaking. Understanding variation therefore requires examining not only linguistic structure but also the social conditions under which certain varieties become valued or devalued.

Bourdieu (1991) argues that linguistic forms acquire value within ‘markets’ structured by power relations. In these markets, some ways of speaking are legitimized while others are stigmatized. These processes are closely linked to language ideologies, understood as socially embedded beliefs that link linguistic forms to moral, intellectual, or cultural worth (Blommaert, 2005). From this perspective, distinctions such as ‘standard’ and ‘nonstandard’ are not neutral linguistic labels but ideological constructs that naturalize forms of linguistic authority. Accordingly, the notion of a ‘standard language’ operates as a powerful ideology that privileges some speakers while marginalizing others, leading to linguistic differences that are interpreted as indicators of social worth rather than as ordinary manifestations of variation (Lippi-Green, 2012).

Raciolinguistic perspectives also demonstrate that linguistic judgments are closely tied to racialized and social-classed perceptions (Flores & Rosa, 2015; Rosa & Flores, 2017). Speakers are often evaluated not only for how they speak, but for who they are perceived to be. Linguistic variation then becomes a site where broader social inequalities are reproduced (Alim et al., 2016; Del Valle, 2007).

These ideological processes are directly linked to linguistic prejudice and discrimination. Linguistic prejudice refers to “preconceived opinions that people can have about either an entire category of individuals based on their use of language or a



language variety and its appropriate domains of use” (O’Neill & Massini-Cagliari, 2019, p. 1). Linguistic discrimination emerges when such opinions materialize into unequal treatment (Moreno Cabrera, 2016; Bagno, 2002). These dynamics can occur in subtle and explicit ways, from the stigmatization of accents in educational settings to unequal access to social and economic opportunities.

As there are perspectives that frame linguistic diversity as a problem, there exist alternative orientations that conceptualize language as a right and as a source of identity, social participation and cultural continuity (Bell, 2014; Ruiz, 1984 as cited in McNelly, 2015). This shift is particularly relevant in contexts of linguistic marginalization, where language loss is not mainly a consequence of communicative limitations but rather the result of sustained histories of discrimination and coercion (Aguilar Gil, 2022).

These concerns are central to critical sociolinguistics, a field that explores the relationship between language and power (Heller, 2011; Niño-Murcia et al., 2020). This area of study is interested not only in documenting linguistic variation but also in understanding how particular ways of speaking become legitimized as ‘correct’, ‘educated,’ or ‘appropriate’ while others are stigmatized. Such judgements or linguistic ideologies may be produced and reinforced through social institutions such as schools, and therefore educational contexts become particularly important sites for examining these dynamics.

For this reason, educational linguistics emphasizes the integration of sociolinguistic knowledge into preparation programs for teachers. Pre-service teachers need to understand both the structural properties of variation and the social meanings attached to linguistic differences (Hymes, 1974). Teacher education should help future educators identify linguistic varieties while critically examining the social hierarchies associated with them and the consequences of linguistic prejudice in educational settings (Hornberger & McKay, 2010; Mallinson & Charity Hudley, 2010).

Without such awareness, linguistic differences may be misinterpreted as linguistic deficiency, thereby reinforcing linguistic hierarchies (Lippi-Green, 2012). Conversely,



understanding these connections can help pre-service teachers challenge standard language ideologies and foster more linguistically inclusive and socially responsive classroom practices.

Within this framework, lesson plans become key analytical sites. Rather than functioning as neutral instructional tools, they can be understood as discursive artifacts that reflect assumptions about language, knowledge, and teaching. Research has shown that curriculum documents and lesson plans reflect broader sociopolitical ideas (Herdiawan et al., 2025; Torres Escobar, 2022; Ubaque-Casallas & Aguirre-Garzón, 2020).

As pedagogical artifacts, lesson plans provide insights into how pre-service teachers conceptualize linguistic diversity and envision classroom practice. Through a standard language ideology perspective, they may also reveal how future educators position speakers of different varieties, interpret linguistic prejudice and discrimination, and translate sociolinguistic understandings into instructional decisions (Rosa & Burdick, 2017).

In sum, linguistic variation is not only a structural feature of language but also a site where social meanings, hierarchies and inequalities are produced and contested. Educational contexts play a central role in either reinforcing or challenging these dynamics. Examining lesson plans through a critical sociolinguistic lens therefore provides a valuable opportunity to explore how future teachers understand linguistic diversity and whether their pedagogical choices reproduce dominant language ideologies or support more equitable and inclusive approaches to language education.

Literature Review

Research suggests that pre-service teachers generally hold positive attitudes toward linguistic and cultural diversity, although these beliefs do not always translate into pedagogical practice. Paetsch et al. (2023), for example, found that pre-service teachers in Bavaria, Germany endorsed egalitarian views of linguistic diversity, particularly at later stages of their teacher education. However, participants often struggled to translate beliefs



into concrete classroom strategies. The study also showed that teachers with multilingual backgrounds expressed stronger commitments to language equality. Similarly, Park et al. (2024) found that reflecting on personal language histories - language as a cause of connection with roots and different emotions such as pride, shame or insecurity - helped pre-service teachers view bilingualism not only as part of their identity but also as a pedagogical resource. Together, these studies suggest that personal linguistic experiences shape how future teachers understand and engage with linguistic diversity.

Some studies in Spain and Latin America indicate that positive attitudes toward linguistic diversity often coexist with monolingual ideologies. Rodríguez-Izquierdo et al. (2020) found that teachers working with immigrant students frequently adopted monolingual beliefs - from assimilation to deficit approaches- despite recognizing the importance of inclusion. Likewise, Toledo et al. (2022) reported that in-service and pre-service teachers in Chile valued students' first languages and acknowledged their role in identity and self-esteem development yet often lacked strategies for integrating multilingualism into classroom practice. These studies highlight a persistent gap between recognizing linguistic diversity and implementing pedagogies that support it.

Several studies have examined lesson plans as artifacts that reveal teachers' beliefs and pedagogical orientations toward linguistic diversity. In Sweden, Paulsrud and Gheitasi (2024) found that pre-service teachers often adopted a language-as-a-source orientation when planning English lessons. Similarly, Elshafie and Zhang (2024) reported that pre-service teachers incorporated multilingual support such as multimodal resources, translation, and home-language use although more collaborative work and use of translanguaging practices in formative assessment remained limited. In Colombia, Ubaque-Casallas and Aguirre-Garzón (2020) showed that lesson planning functions as a space where future teachers articulate their understandings of language and pedagogy. Collectively, these studies suggest that lesson plans provide valuable insight into how pre-service teachers



conceptualize linguistic diversity and translate these understandings into classroom practices.

Taken together, the literature suggests that pre-service teachers generally recognize the value of linguistic diversity yet often find it difficult to move toward pedagogical practices that challenge language ideologies. Studies of lesson planning indicate that lesson plans can provide important evidence of how future teachers conceptualize language diversity and multilingualism in practice. However, limited research has examined how pre-service teachers represent sociolinguistic variation and linguistic inequality within lesson plans, particularly in Latin American contexts. Addressing this gap is one of the central aims of this study.

Methodology

Research Approach and Design

This study follows a qualitative research approach suitable for investigating how individuals construct meanings, beliefs, and interpretations within specific educational contexts (Creswell & Poth, 2018). It is designed as a document-based and interpretive case study (Merriam & Tisdell, 2016) that aims at generating an in-depth, contextualized understanding of a bounded educational phenomenon through central data. The study is carried out in a specific university context, within a limited timeframe and pedagogical intervention, and with lesson plans treated as pedagogical texts that reflect pre-service teachers' knowledge, beliefs, and ideological positioning regarding language and linguistic diversity.

Research Context and Participants

The study was conducted in an undergraduate English teacher education program at Institución Universitaria Colombo Americana (ÚNICA) in Bogotá, Colombia. Participants were pre-service teachers enrolled in a Sociolinguistic course who completed a guided classroom



project involving the design and implementation of lesson plans on linguistic diversity. The dataset consisted of 11 lesson plans produced as part of this project.

Lesson plans were selected through purposive sampling to ensure both analytical depth and diversity of representations. To be included, lesson plans had to be produced as part of the Sociolinguistic course project, explicitly address linguistic diversity or variation, contain sufficient pedagogical detail including objectives, instructional procedures, activities, assessment, and materials, and have been submitted between 2024 and 2025. Lesson plans were excluded if they did not engage with sociolinguistics concepts, lacked essential instructional components, failed to meet project requirements, or had been produced before January 2024.

The guided project required pre-service teachers to progress through a three-stage pedagogical process. First, they selected an English- or Spanish-based linguistic variety and investigated its structural features including its phonetic, phonological, lexical, morphological, and syntactic characteristics. Second, they examined a case of sociolinguistic conflict or linguistic discrimination associated with the selected variety and reflected on possible responses to such situations. Finally, they designed and implemented a lesson plan synthesizing the sociolinguistic insights developed through the semester sharing their final proposals with peers during a classroom presentation.

The lesson plans and their corresponding implementation were assessed based on a 12-criterion rubric on a 1.0-5.0 scale. The rubric measured core pedagogical mechanics including explicit language and content objectives, warm-up routines, targeted vocabulary presentation, content, delivery, scaffolding and integrated assessment. Content specifications required pre-service teachers to address both internal linguistic characteristics (phonetics, phonology, lexico-semantics, morphology, or syntax) and sociolinguistic realities of the selected language variety such as language policy, prestige, diglossia, societal attitudes, discrimination and educational roles. Process engagement (draft revision and



feedback incorporation) and oral and written language performance were also assessed.

All the lesson plans were published in an open-access course blog (Rojas-Molina, 2020), which served as the source of data for the present study.

Data Analysis

The lesson plans constitute the primary unit of analysis in this study. Each lesson plan was analyzed as a representation of how pre-service teachers conceptualized linguistic variation and linguistic diversity and how these understandings were reflected in lesson objectives, instructional activities, and materials. Lesson plans were treated not only as instructional documents but also as discursive artifacts through which pre-service teachers expressed assumptions about language, linguistic diversity, and pedagogical practice.

To answer the research questions, the data were analyzed using thematic analysis (Bowen, 2009; Braun & Clarke, 2006). The process began with repeated readings of the lesson plans to familiarize myself with the data and generate initial codes. Codes were applied to meaningful units of analysis including lesson objectives, instructions, materials, and assessment tasks.

The coding framework combined deductive and inductive approaches. Deductive codes derived from the research questions and theoretical framework and included categories such as conceptualization and representation of variation, orientations toward linguistic diversity (problem, deficit, resource, or right), representations of 'standard' and 'nonstandard' varieties, and references to sociolinguistic conflict, linguistic prejudice or discrimination. At the same time, new codes were incorporated where recurrent patterns or unexpected conceptualizations emerged from the data (Charmaz, 2014).

The codes were then grouped into broader themes that captured recurring patterns across the lesson plans. Theme development involved several iterative rounds of comparison and refinement to ensure that themes were internally coherent and distinct from one another. Themes were reviewed to identify possible tensions between lesson



objectives, activities, and materials. Finally, themes were interpreted through the lens of variationist and critical sociolinguistics, paying particular attention to how linguistic diversity was framed, valued, problematized or connected to issues of inequality and discrimination.

Analytic consistency and interpretive traceability were ensured by implementing several strategies. Codes were clearly defined and documented in a codebook, which served as a reference for maintaining consistency across lesson plans. The data were revisited to refine codes, categories, and themes as the analysis progressed. Analytic memos were also maintained to document emergent insights, theoretical connections, and interpretive decisions. Finally, illustrative excerpts from the lesson plans were used to support and substantiate the thematic interpretations presented in the findings.

Ethical considerations were addressed throughout the research process. Informed consent from all participants was obtained. It was made clear that participation was voluntary and unrelated to course evaluation. Confidentiality was protected by making all lesson plans anonymous. Interpretations were grounded in the data and developed with the aim of representing participants' perspectives accurately and respectfully. Although the lesson plans are publicly available through the course repository cited in the references, each document was assigned an internal identifier (e.g., LP-Andalusian, LP-San Andrés Creole). These identifiers are used throughout the findings and discussion sections to reference specific lesson plans while maintaining consistency and avoiding unnecessary repetition of bibliographic information.

Finally, this study presents some limitations that should be acknowledged. While the relatively small and context-specific sample allows for in-depth analysis, it may have limited the range of perspectives represented in the dataset. Also, as a single-case study conducted within one teacher education program, the findings are not statistically generalizable, but rather analytically transferable to similar contexts. Finally, as participants' work is shaped by the instructional context of an assignment, the way linguistic diversity is framed may align



more closely with the course's expectations rather than with actual classroom practices.

Findings

This study examined how pre-service teachers conceptualize and pedagogically represent linguistic diversity through the analysis of 11 lesson plans. The language varieties chosen by pre-service teachers were: Andalusian Spanish (Andaluz), Chilean Spanish, Singlish (Singaporean English), Chabacano (Filipino Spanish based Creole), Yopará or Jopará (linguistic phenomenon born from contact between Guaraní and Spanish in Paraguay), Jamaican Creole, Cuban Spanish, Creole from San Andrés Island in Colombia, Palenquero (Spanish based Creole in San Basilio de Palenque, Colombia), and Taglish (Tagalog and English in Philippines). Drawing on a thematic analysis, the findings reveal a range of understandings about language variation, linguistic prejudice, and discrimination, as well as the different ways such understandings are translated into pedagogical practices. Categories and themes are presented as well as evidence from the lesson plans to support ideas. Lesson plans were written in both English and Spanish, allowing pre-service teachers to draw on their preferred language so that linguistic proficiency did not impede their ability to demonstrate conceptual understanding. For this paper, examples or evidence that are originally in Spanish have been translated into English by the author.

Conceptualizations of Linguistic Diversity in Pre-service Teachers' Lesson Plans

The analysis of pre-service teachers' lesson plans reveals multiple conceptualizations of linguistic diversity and language variation. Overall, these conceptualizations suggest that linguistic diversity is predominantly framed as a legitimate and meaningful phenomenon, rather than a deficit. The findings are organized into five main perspectives.

Linguistic Diversity as Systematic Variation

Across all lesson plans, linguistic diversity is primarily conceptualized as systematic linguistic variation. Pre-service teachers generally represent language varieties as structured systems characterized by identifiable phonological, morphological, lexical, and



syntactic features. This finding aligns with Labov's (1972b) view of linguistic variation as rule-governed rather than random.

This orientation is evident in lesson objectives that emphasize the recognition and description of linguistic features. For example, one lesson aims to help students "understand and describe the main linguistic features of Cuban Spanish, such as pronunciation patterns and vocabulary" (LP-Cuban Spanish), while another focuses on recognizing "the phonological and morphological variations of San Andrés Creole compared to Standard English" (San Andrés Creole lesson plan). Similarly, the Yopará lesson plan seeks students to "identify three linguistic characteristics of Guaraní that may influence the use of linguistic codes in Yopará" (LP-Yopará), whereas the Andalusian lesson plan focuses on identifying features such as *seseo*, *ceceo*, *heheo*, *neologisms*, *lexical shortening* and *syntactic changes*" (LP-Andalusian).

The same pattern appears in instructional activities. Most lesson plans require students to identify, compare, describe, or interpret linguistic features of the selected variety. Activities include examining the use of the particle *dem* in Jamaican Creole, comparing Chabacano verbs with their Spanish equivalents, analyzing lexical expressions from Cuban Spanish, and describing grammatical features of Palenquero. Taken together, these activities position linguistic diversity primarily as an object of structural analysis, with particular attention to phonological and lexical variation.

Linguistic Diversity as Identity, Heritage, and Belonging

A second prominent conceptualization frames linguistic diversity as a marker of identity and cultural belonging, aligning with sociocultural linguistics – a framework coined by Bucholtz and Hall (2005) – which understands language as a semiotic resource through which social identities are constructed and negotiated. Several lesson objectives explicitly connect language varieties to issues of heritage, community, and social meaning. In these cases, linguistic forms are not only treated as structural systems but also as symbolic resources that reflect cultural values and group membership: "Students will write a reflection about the identity-defining significance of the Yopará for the Paraguayan people"



(LP-Yopará), “To reflect on linguistic discrimination in the classroom through the analysis of Chilean Spanish, recognizing the importance of valuing linguistic varieties as part of identity, inclusion and social peace” (LP-Chilean Spanish), “Students will be able to describe how Taglish is connected to social issues such as prestige, discrimination, and identity in the Philippines” (LP-Taglish). These objectives position linguistic diversity within a broader sociocultural dimension that extends beyond the analysis of linguistic structure.

The selection of audiovisual materials also reinforces this perspective. Several lesson plans incorporate media that portray language as intertwined with cultural practices, highlighting its role in expressing collective identity, fostering social cohesion, and sustaining cultural traditions. This approach positions linguistic diversity within broader sociocultural and affective dimensions. In the lesson plan about Yopará, for example, a video used to introduce the variety (Recetas de mi tierra, 2021) presents a traditional recipe not only as a cultural artifact but also as a linguistic and an affective bond. By bringing both Guaraní and Spanish within an everyday cultural practice, the video illustrates how language helps to Paraguayan community cohesion, sense of belonging and cultural resistance.

Linguistic Diversity as Hybridity and Language Contact

A third perspective conceptualizes linguistic diversity as the product of hybridity and language contact as evidenced by the selection of varieties such as Yopará, Chabacano, Taglish and Singlish. This stance dialogues with Garcia and Wei (2015), by framing varieties not as mixtures of separate languages, but as manifestations of an integrated and dynamic linguistic repertoire that speakers flexibly mobilize to make meaning. The lesson plans emphasize the coexistence and interaction of multiple linguistic resources such as borrowing, codeswitching, and structural blending, suggesting an understanding of language as fluid, evolving, and adaptive.

Linguistic Diversity through Legal and Policy Frameworks



Some lesson plans approach linguistic diversity from a legal and policy-oriented perspective, aligning with scholarship that frames language as a site of governance, regulation, and rights (Skutnabb-Kangas, 2000). From this perspective, linguistic diversity is constructed not only as a sociocultural phenomenon but also as an object of institutional recognition and control. Some lesson plans explicitly reference language-related legislation or governmental initiatives, framing linguistic diversity in terms of rights, legitimacy, and state intervention. For instance, objectives such as “To analyze linguistic discrimination in education and explore strategies to promote respect and recognition of the Creole, in accordance with Ley 1381 de 2010” (LP- San Andrés Creole), and “To encourage critical reflection on the “Speak Good English Movement” policy implemented by the Singaporean government and its implications for language discrimination and linguistic diversity” (LP-Singlish) position language within broader policy discourses.

Linguistic Diversity as a Resource for Inclusion and Social Harmony

Another recurring conceptualization presents linguistic diversity as a tool for fostering inclusion, respect, and social cohesion, resonating with perspectives in critical and peace-oriented sociolinguistics that positions language as central to the construction of more equitable social relations. Lesson objectives within this category emphasize critical reflection on linguistic discrimination and promote the valuing of diverse language practices as a means of achieving social harmony. For instance, objectives such as “To reflect on linguistic discrimination in the classroom through the analysis of Chilean Spanish, recognizing the importance of valuing linguistic varieties as part of identity, inclusion and social peace” (LP-Chilean Spanish), and “To analyze linguistic discrimination in education and explore strategies to promote respect and recognition of the Creole, in accordance with Ley 1381 de 2010” (LP-San Andrés Creole) frame linguistic diversity as a resource for ethical engagement and coexistence. These ideas are also aligned with critical pedagogy (Freire, 1970) which emphasizes dialogue and critical consciousness as pathways of social transformation.

A note on Legitimation of Linguistic Diversity



Across the dataset, a consistent trend is the legitimization of linguistic diversity. Most lesson plans present language varieties as valid linguistic systems with historical, cultural, and social significance. Rather than framing variation as error or deviation from a norm, pre-service teachers tend to adopt a sociolinguistic stance that recognizes variation as natural and meaningful. In this sense, the lesson plans are prone to align with critical sociolinguistic traditions that challenge the privilege of standardized norms and instead emphasize the legitimacy of diverse linguistic repertoires (Niño-Murcia et al., 2020).

Tension with Standard Language Forms

Despite this generally affirmative stance, a small number of lesson plans reveal an underlying tension between recognizing diversity and maintaining ‘standard’ language norms. This is evident in objectives that explicitly compare ‘nonstandard’ varieties to a dominant or standardized form, thereby framing diversity in relation to an external norm rather than as inherently legitimate. Examples include objectives such as “to recognize the phonological and morphological variations of San Andrés Creole compared to Standard English” (LP-San Andrés Creole), “Students will recognize Chabacano as a variety of Spanish”, or “Students will compare and build up phrases in Chabacano and Spanish” (LP-Chabacano). While these objectives acknowledge linguistic diversity, they also suggest that such varieties are understood through their relationship to a standardized language. From a sociolinguistic perspective, this orientation may reproduce what Wolfram & Schilling (2016) describe as the ‘principle of linguistic subordination’, whereby non-standard varieties are implicitly evaluated as deficient. As a result, the legitimacy of these varieties may appear to derive less from their own linguistic systems and more from their proximity to a recognized standard.

Due to this orientation, the critical potential of diversity-oriented pedagogies may be limited. When linguistic varieties are presented mainly as interesting or exotic cultural differences rather than as forms of language embedded in unequal social relations, there is a risk of what Said (2023) describes as the folklorization of language. From this perspective, the challenge is not only to recognize linguistic diversity but also to address the



power relations that shape the experiences of discrimination and violence faced by its speakers.

In summary, pre-service teachers' lesson plans reflect a multifaceted understanding of linguistic diversity. While systematic variation remains to be the dominant framework, additional perspectives—identity, hybridity, policy, and social inclusion—enrich this understanding. Importantly, the overall orientation tends toward validating linguistic diversity, although traces of 'standard' language comparison indicate that traditional hierarchies have not been entirely displaced.

Treatment of Linguistic Conflict, Prejudice and Discrimination

The following are the themes emerging from the dataset to account for the ways lesson plans address issues of language-based conflict, prejudice or discrimination.

Explicit Treatment of Linguistic Discrimination

This theme is related to those moments in which lesson plans move beyond implicit awareness to directly name, define, and problematize language-based inequality as a central social or pedagogical concern through objectives, examples and critical reflection. Several lesson plans (e.g. Singlish, San Andrés creole, Chilean Spanish, Cuban Spanish) include the word 'discrimination' in their objectives which means that pre-service teachers' intentions while thinking about teaching the topic of linguistic diversity is to move from a descriptive perspective to a more analytical and critical stance. The Chabacano lesson incorporates a specific segment where linguistic discrimination is defined, and discrimination towards Chabacano speakers is exemplified. The core of the Singlish lesson presents an example of institutional discrimination by referring to the 'Speak Good English Movement', a government policy designed to suppress Singlish in favor of 'standard English'. The lesson plan highlights that there are advertising campaigns that ridicule Singlish to discourage its use and



workshops in schools or workplaces to encourage ‘correct English use’ prompting critical examination of how language policies marginalize ‘nonstandard’ varieties.

It is important to mention that not all lesson plans have the same level of explicitness. While a few present discrimination as an object of inquiry or a central topic of analysis, others address it more indirectly through themes such as attitudes, stereotypes, prestige, or identity. The lesson plan on Chilean Spanish, for example, analyses anonymized comments from YouTube and social media that contain linguistic violence directed at the Chilean accent and ask students to reflect upon stereotypes and prejudices. Several lessons (Cuban Spanish, Singlish, Chilean Spanish) also use a comparative approach between formal media and spontaneous speech to explore how the use of varieties in certain domains (e.g. news) sound ‘better’ to the ear and have more positive attitudes than in other domains like street where prejudices appear. This implicitly teaches that ‘prestige’ is a social construct rather than a reflection of linguistic quality and highlights how institutions like mass media reinforce discrimination by excluding specific varieties. This shift toward an explicit critical engagement with language-based inequality, enters into dialogue with critical sociolinguistics (Heller, 2011), framing language as embedded in power relations.

Deconstructing the Stigma of a ‘Broken Language’

Across the lesson plans, there is a clear effort to challenge the views that label ‘nonstandard’ varieties as ‘inferior’, informal’ or ‘bad’ versions of ‘standard’ or more prestigious varieties, placing these findings in dialogue with variationist (Labov, 1972a) as well as with more critical views of language (Heller, 2011). Objectives such as “To analyze how linguistic attitudes influence the prestige of the Andalusian dialect, by identifying associated biases and reflecting on their impact on the social and cultural perception of this linguistic variety” (LP- Andalusian), and “to reflect on linguistic discrimination in the classroom through the analysis of Chilean Spanish, recognizing the importance of valuing linguistic varieties as part of identity, inclusion and social peace”(LP- Chilean Spanish) suggest that pre-service teachers are interrogating how prestige is socially constructed and ideologically



sustained. Similarly, the Singlish lesson plan explicitly challenges the dominance of so-called standard English by inviting students to “foster an understanding that English exists in diverse forms beyond the so called ‘standard varieties’” (LP-Singlish). Finally, along the content of the lesson plans, San Andrés Creole is framed as “having its own grammar system” (LP-San Andrés Creole) and Taglish is stated as “a patterned and systematic linguistic variety”, explicitly mentioning that “it is not random code-mixing” (LP-Taglish).

Everyday Experiences of Linguistic Discrimination

Several lesson plans illustrate that linguistic prejudice and discrimination happen in everyday life and have social and emotional consequences. Some materials present real-life cases of verbal aggression linked to language use. For example, the lesson plan about Cuban Spanish presents a case of a Cuban Uber driver in Texas who experienced racist attacks and verbal abuse related to his accent and limited English proficiency (Univision, 2025).

The concern with linguistic discrimination is also reflected in the reflection activities included in the lesson plans. Across some of them, pre-service teachers usually make the audience reflect upon their own biases and stigmas, trying to connect personal experiences with broader forms of social prejudice. In the Chilean Spanish lesson plan, for instance, students discuss whether they have heard jokes or comments about the Chilean accent and how these have affected them. Similarly, in the Taglish lesson plan, students are encouraged to reflect on how fair is to judge people’s intelligence based on the language they speak.

Other lesson plans explore the emotional effects of language stigma more directly. In the Andalusian lesson plan, students are required to examine how prejudices influence the perception and intellectual competence of the speakers while in the Palenquero lesson plan, students are asked to analyze feelings of shame or social pressure associated with the use of the variety. Likewise, the Yopará lesson plan presents a reflection upon a conflict between viewing the language as a symbol of multiculturalism and inclusion versus seeing it as something dangerous to national roots. Taken together, these decisions while planning a



lesson position language not only as a means of communication but also as a site of social inequality and lived experience (Heller, 2011).

Institutional Conflict and Policy-Based Discrimination

A couple of plans examine how official government actions or institutional norms can reinforce social hierarchies and marginalize speakers of certain varieties. In the Singlish lesson plan, students are instructed to make “a critical reflection on the Speak Good English Movement policy implemented by the Singaporean government” (LP-Singlish) and its implications for linguistic diversity. In San Andrés lesson plan, students are explicitly asked to analyze linguistic discrimination in educational contexts by exploring the Native Languages Act 1381 (Congreso de la República de Colombia, 2010) that establishes the legal framework for the recognition, protection, and promotion of the linguistic rights of ethnic groups with their own linguistic traditions. Finally, in the lesson plan about Taglish, there is a discussion about government decisions and omissions that have made English a symbol of prestige and that have caused “children to grow up distancing themselves from their own language in favor of professional opportunities” (LP-Taglish). Finally, Chilean Spanish lesson plan draws attention to linguistic rights as human rights and emphasizes inclusion and anti-discrimination.

To summarize, the treatment of linguistic discrimination in these lessons plans moves between an explicitly critical stance, directly naming discrimination and framing it as an object of inquiry through definitions and some examples, and a more indirect way of approaching language-based conflict through lens of attitudes and prestige. Some lessons also show a significant friction between the academic recognition of ‘nonstandard’ varieties as legitimate linguistic systems and the lived reality of their speakers, who face ‘broken language’ stigmas, verbal aggression and emotional challenges. Furthermore, the data highlights the conflict between institutional marginalization where governments and media exclude certain varieties and the pedagogical attempt to foster social justice, something that forces speakers to navigate between the value of their mother tongue and the social



hierarchies that punish its use. The lesson plans then represent a partial yet significant shift toward a more critical and socially oriented view of linguistic conflict and discrimination.

Pedagogical Framing of Language-Based Hierarchies

This category has to do with the strategies used in lesson plans to open the session, secure retention, engage students in reflection and discussion, and assure their agency or transformative intentions.

Objectives and Warm-ups

All lesson plans include objectives that are explicitly provided to and commented on with students as well as warm-ups that activate prior knowledge and attitudes. These pedagogical strategies are not just tasks requirements but ideological goalkeepers that determine what is considered valid knowledge and whose voices will be heard even before the core of the instruction begins.

In relation to the objectives, some lessons position language varieties as legitimate linguistic systems. For example, the objective “to identify the rules of Singlish” (Singlish LP) presents the variety as rule-governed rather than deficient and challenges the hierarchy that suggests that only ‘standard’ languages have rules. Other objectives focus more directly on social attitudes toward language. In the Cuban Spanish and Andalusian lesson plans, through expressions in the objectives like ‘identify prejudices’ (Cuban Spanish LP) or ‘explain social attitudes’ (Andalusian LP), students are asked to identify prejudices and explain social attitudes linked to the varieties. With these objectives, students are encouraged to examine both linguistic features and social issues surrounding varieties.

As for the warm-ups in the lesson plans, some of them act as disruptors since most students may enter the classroom with the internalized belief that the ‘standard’ is the only correct way to speak. The warm-ups activate students' prior knowledge and experiences. In the Chilean Spanish plan, students discuss how jokes or comments about the accent make them feel bringing personal experiences and emotions into the conversation. The



Taglish and Yopará lesson plans start by asking students to guess or share what they already know about the variety, something that frames the students as co-constructors of knowledge. Similarly, in the lesson plan about the Jamaican Creole, stereotypes are brought to the surface right in the warm-up activity through a video that references the idea of ‘broken English’ (Jamaican Patwah Academy, 2024) and by creating an opportunity to critically explore such beliefs. By centering students’ experiences, emotions, and prior knowledge as starting points for the learning process, the lesson plans resonate with critical pedagogy (Freire, 1970).

Awareness Raising Tasks

A recurrent feature across the lesson plans is the use of awareness-raising activities that introduce language varieties as distinct linguistic systems. These activities typically invite students to identify linguistic features and to situate the variety within its geographical, cultural, or historical context. A notable characteristic of this approach is the frequent use of authentic materials including songs, interviews, videos, news articles, and literary texts. This preference reflects an understanding of language as a social practice embedded in everyday life and identity construction (Bucholtz & Hall, 2005). It also aligns with research suggesting that authentic materials expose learners to naturally occurring language and help connect classroom learning with the sociocultural contexts in which language is used (Gilmore, 2011).

In the Jamaican Creole lesson plan, for instance, a video on the real story behind the Jamaican accent (Jamaican Patwa Academy, 2024), a BBC article about people reclaiming Jamaican Patwa (Roberts, 2024) and a song by Sean Paul, a Jamaican rapper, singer and songwriter (Atlantic Records, 2010) serve as a way to research the terms ‘Pidgin’ and ‘Creole’ as sophisticated linguistic systems, vehicles for global and cultural influence, and symbol of identity. Similarly, in the Yopará lesson plan, pre-service teachers decided to show various Paraguayan artists voices such as the music group Revolber (Gramo Ideas, 2018) and an interview to the poet Cristino Bogado (Vacchetta, 2023) talking about samples of rejection and acceptance towards the variety. In the same line, this lesson plan provides



students with a song, a poem, and a tale to identify Spanish and Guaraní samples of language.

Across the dataset, authentic materials serve not only as sources of linguistic examples but also as resources for connecting language varieties to the communities and social experiences in which they are used. Linguistic diversity is then presented as an ordinary and meaningful aspect of everyday communication rather than an isolated linguistic phenomenon.

Reflective Questions and Discussions

All lesson plans incorporate guided reflection prompts and discussion questions that encourage students to examine the social meanings attached to linguistic varieties. Rather than focusing exclusively on linguistic features, these activities invite learners to consider issues of legitimacy, prestige, identity, and language attitudes.

Several lessons address questions of linguistic legitimacy. For example, the Taglish lesson asks students to debate whether this variety should be considered a 'real way of speaking' or merely an informal practice. The same lesson later explores how Taglish and Spanglish challenge traditional notions of linguistic correctness and hierarchy. Similarly, the Jamaican Creole lesson prompts students to respond to a BBC statement suggesting that Patwa should be recognized as 'the Jamaican language'.

Other lesson plans focus on language attitudes and identity. In the Andalusian lesson, students identify common prejudices associated with the variety and discuss how such attitudes influence its social and cultural prestige. Likewise, the Yopará lesson requires students to reflect on the cultural and identity value of the variety considering tension between those who view it as a symbol of inclusion and those who perceive it as a threat to "pure" Guaraní. The Palenquero lesson plan extends this reflection by asking students to consider why languages disappear and to identify social or cultural factors affecting language use based on interviews with elders and youth.



Overall, these activities position students as active interpreters of the social value of linguistic forms rather than as passive recipients of linguistic information. Through discussion and reflection, students are encouraged to examine the assumptions underlying judgements about correctness, prestige, and legitimacy. This finding suggests that many pre-service teachers move beyond a purely structural treatment of linguistic diversity and create opportunities for critical engagement with language-related beliefs and attitudes.

This orientation is consistent with critical sociolinguistic perspectives that view classrooms as spaces where linguistic hierarchies can be either reproduced or challenged (Heller, 2011). It also resonates with Bucholtz and Hall's (2005) argument which emphasizes that language is a resource for identity construction shaped through interaction and ideological positioning. At the same time, while these discussions open important spaces for critical engagement, their transformative potential ultimately depends, as Heller (2011) and Zavala (2019) point out, on how deeply they move beyond opinion-sharing toward sustained analysis of the historical, political, and economic processes that produce linguistic inequality.

Recognizing but Not Historicizing Stigma

Although lesson plans invite students to reflect and discuss language attitudes, prestige, stereotypes, and prejudices, fewer engage critically with the historical and structural conditions that produce linguistic stigma. As a result, linguistic discrimination is often presented as a matter of individual attitudes rather than because of broader relations of power. This tendency may limit opportunities for students to examine the social processes through which some varieties become legitimized while others are marginalized.

Several lesson plans illustrate this tension. The Andalusian lesson plan asks students to identify prejudices associated with the variety and reflect on their effects on social perception. However, the activities do not explore the historical centralization of linguistic authority in Madrid or the class-based dynamics that have contributed to the stigmatization of southern varieties in Spain. Similarly, the lesson plan about Chabacano emphasizes the linguistic evolution of the variety but provides limited attention to the colonial



hierarchies of the Spanish Empire in the Philippines. In the Palenquero lesson plan, students are asked why languages disappear, yet the discussion is not explicitly connected to the historical marginalization of Afro-Colombian communities or to broader processes of structural exclusion.

A similar pattern may be observed in the Singlish lesson plan. While students discuss the 'Speak Good English Movement', the lesson does not substantially examine the political and economic motivations underlying language standardization policies in Singapore. Consequently, the promotion of standard English may appear as a neutral linguistic choice rather than as a policy linked to particular social and economic interests.

Across the lesson plans, linguistic stigma is acknowledged but not always historicized. Students are encouraged to recognize prejudice, yet they are less frequently invited to examine why particular varieties became stigmatized in the first place or how such evaluations are connected to historical, political, and economic structures. This pattern reflects what Bourdieu (1991) conceptualizes as the misrecognition of linguistic capital where dominant varieties appear inherently superior rather than socially privileged. It also resonates with Zavala's (2019) critique that educational approaches to linguistic diversity may celebrate difference while leaving underlying inequalities largely unquestioned.

Overall, this finding suggests that awareness of linguistic diversity does not necessarily lead to a critical understanding of linguistic inequality. Without addressing the sociohistorical roots of stigma, pedagogical efforts can risk reproducing the hierarchies that need to be questioned and challenged. Tackling the issue of the 'why' behind linguistic discrimination is therefore essential to move beyond recognition toward a more transformative and justice-oriented understanding of linguistic diversity.

Discussion



This study examined how pre-service teachers conceptualize and pedagogically represent linguistic diversity, address language-based conflict, prejudice, and discrimination, and frame language hierarchies within their lesson plans.

Regarding conceptualizations of diversity, the findings align with foundational sociolinguistic perspectives that view language variation as systematic, rule-governed, and socially meaningful rather than deficient (Labov, 1972a). Through the lesson plans, linguistic diversity is most frequently represented through phonological, lexical, and grammatical features, reflecting a strong influence of descriptive and variationist sociolinguistics. At the same time, findings suggest that many pre-service teachers move beyond a purely structural view of language to frame linguistic diversity through the lens of sociocultural linguistics (Bucholtz & Hall, 2005) and culturally sustaining practices (Paris & Alim, 2017), thereby validating students' linguistic repertoires as resources for identity and belonging. This tendency indicates an effort to position linguistic diversity as a resource rather than as a problem.

More critically oriented perspectives are also present, although less consistent. Some lesson plans highlight processes of language contact and hybridity, reflecting awareness of language as fluid and dynamic rather than bounded and monolingual (García & Wei, 2014). Some lesson plans also situate linguistic diversity within legal and policy frameworks, acknowledging its connection to institutional structures and sociopolitical contexts (Skutnabb-Kangas, 2000; Pennycook, 2021). However, these critical dimensions are not always fully developed. While linguistic diversity is generally legitimized, standard language ideologies continue to operate as implicit points of reference revealing an ongoing tension between inclusion and linguistic hierarchy (Lippi-Green, 2012).

With respect to linguistic conflict, prejudice, and discrimination, the data illustrate that many pre-service teachers explicitly address linguistic inequality in their lesson plans. Through reflective discussions, critical questions, and analyses of language attitudes, students are invited to examine how certain varieties are associated with prestige



while others are stigmatized. These practices are consistent with approaches to critical language awareness and critical sociolinguistic perspectives, which view language not as a neutral means of communication but as a site where power relations, social hierarchies, and ideological struggles are constructed and challenged (Fairclough, 1992; Alim, 2010; Blommaert, 2010).

The data demonstrate that while some plans utilize high-level explicitness, others employ an indirect but equally potent approach by interrogating ‘prestige’ as a social construct. In several lesson plans, pre-service teachers challenge deficit perspectives indirectly by presenting stigmatized varieties such as Taglish, Yopará, and Jamaican Creole as legitimate and systematic linguistic systems. By doing so, they disrupt common assumptions that label these varieties as deficient, broken, incorrect, or incomplete (Bautista, 2004).

The inclusion of real-world cases of linguistic discrimination strengthens this critical orientation. Examples involving verbal aggression or accent stigmatization, such as the case of the Cuban Uber driver or the marginalization of the Andalusian accent, connect micro-level social interactions with macro-level institutional policies and linguistic rights. Collectively, these findings suggest that many pre-service teachers are attempting to create classroom spaces where linguistic diversity is recognized, respected, and discussed as a matter of social justice. This orientation is consistent with educational approaches that promote dialogue, inclusion, and respect for linguistic differences as important conditions for more equitable social relations (Oxford, 2013).

Finally, as for the pedagogical framing of linguistic diversity, lesson plans generally position regional and minority varieties as legitimate linguistic systems rather than as problems to be corrected. By utilizing lesson objectives, warm-up activities as ‘ideological goalkeepers,’ and reflective discussions, pre-service teachers encourage students to engage with linguistic diversity as a valuable social and cultural resource. This orientation challenges deficit perspectives of language and aligns with approaches that seek to legitimize linguistic difference and broaden students’ understandings of language variation (Lippi-



Green, 2012). In addition, the use of reflective discussion activities positions students as ‘co-constructors of knowledge,’ challenging the traditional ‘banking’ model of education where the teacher is the only knowledgeable person and authority of ‘standard’ language (Freire, 1970).

At the same time, the findings reveal an important limitation. While many lesson plans challenge negative attitudes toward stigmatized varieties, they less frequently examine the historical and structural processes that produce such stigma. Cases such as Chabacano, Andalusian Spanish, and Palenquero illustrate how linguistic diversity is often recognized without a more in-depth analysis of the colonial, political, or racialized dynamics that contributed to its marginalization. Without engaging in these discussions to raise sociopolitical consciousness and examine why certain varieties are delegitimized, there is a danger that students view ‘standard’ varieties as inherently superior or more logical, rather than as varieties “backed by an army and a navy” (Weinreich, as cited in Romaine, 2000) and so that linguistic inequality be naturalized.

This tension suggests that legitimizing linguistic diversity does not automatically lead to a critical understanding of linguistic inequality. As Bourdieu (1991) argues, dominant varieties often appear naturally superior when the social conditions that sustain their prestige remain invisible. Consequently, moving toward a more transformative pedagogy requires greater attention to the sociohistorical roots of linguistic stigma. Such an approach may help ensure that linguistic diversity is not treated merely as an exotic curiosity, or reduced to a process of folklorization (Said, 2023). Instead, it encourages an understanding of linguistic diversity not only as a cultural resource but also as a site of political struggle and active resistance against linguistic hierarchies (Kubota, 2004; Flores & Rosa, 2015).

Conclusion



This study explores the persistent gap between pre-service teachers' sociolinguistic training and their practical ability to challenge standard language ideologies in pedagogical artifacts. Overall, the findings demonstrate that while future language educators actively validate linguistic diversity as an asset and address overt prejudice, they remain situated in a space between recognition and hierarchy- frequently legitimizing non-standard varieties without fully interrogating the socio-historical structures that produce linguistic marginalization.

By demonstrating how lesson plans function as critical discursive artifacts where language ideologies are reproduced, negotiated, and challenged, this paper contributes to both critical sociolinguistics and teacher education. Methodologically, it shows that structured planning tools and rubrics can serve as sites of pedagogical agency, enabling pre-service teachers to translate critical theories into actionable, inclusive practices that promote linguistic justice. However, to move from superficial celebration toward true linguistic justice, teacher education programs must explicitly integrate historical, political, and ideological analyses of language. Sociolinguistic coursework should include descriptive variationism but also, and most importantly, move beyond to equip pre-service teachers with specific evaluation rubrics and instructional tasks that prompt learners to question power dynamics, historicize stigma, and actively transform scenarios of linguistic inequality.

This study is limited by its context-specific sample of 11 lesson plans from a single teacher education program as well as its reliance on intended rather than enacted classroom practices. Future research could expand the dataset across institutions and incorporate classroom observations, teacher reflections, and students' perspectives to better understand how these conceptualizations are validated in practice. Longitudinal studies examining how pre-service teachers navigate language hierarchies once they enter full-time teaching would further illuminate the long-term impacts of critical sociolinguistic preparation. Ultimately, transforming language education requires moving beyond the mere recognition of diversity



toward a sustained, critical engagement with the institutional power structures that shape how language is valued in society.

References

- Aguilar Gil, Y. E. (2022). *Ä ä: Manifiestos sobre la diversidad lingüística*. Almadía.
- Alim, H. S. (2010). Critical language awareness. In N. H. Hornberger & S. L. McKay (Eds.), *Sociolinguistics and language education* (pp. 205-231). Multilingual Matters. <http://2017s.pbworks.com/w/file/fetch/120158307/04-Language%20Education.pdf>
- Alim, H. S., Rickford, J. R., & Ball, A. F. (2016). *Raciolinguistics: How language shapes our ideas about race*. Oxford University Press.
- Atlantic Records. (2010, February 17). *Sean Paul - Get Busy/Like Glue (Official Video)* [Video]. YouTube. <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=oPQ3o60vg0w>
- Bachman, L. F. (1990). *Fundamental considerations in language testing*. Oxford University Press.
- Bagno, M. (2002). *Preconceito lingüístico—o que é, como se faz* (16th ed.). Loyola.
- Bautista, M. L. S. (2004). Tagalog-English code-switching as a mode of discourse. *Asia Pacific Education Review*, 5(2), 226-233. <https://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/EJ720543.pdf>
- Bell, A. (2014). *The guidebook to sociolinguistics*. Wiley Blackwell.
- Bernstein, K. A., Anderson, K. T., Close, K., & Rodríguez Martínez, S. (2023). Teacher beliefs about multilingual learners: How language ideologies shape teachers' hypothetical policymaking. *International Multilingual Research Journal*, 17(3), 191-219. <https://doi.org/10.1080/19313152.2023.2182094>
- Bettney, E. (2022). Examining hegemonic and monoglossic language ideologies, policies, and practices within bilingual education in Colombia. *Íkala, Revista de Lenguaje y Cultura*, 27(1), 249-270. <https://doi.org/10.17533/udea.ikala.v27n1a12>
- Blommaert, J. (2005). *Discourse. A critical introduction*. Cambridge University Press.
- Blommaert, J. (2010). *The sociolinguistics of globalization*. Cambridge University Press.

- Bourdieu, P. (1991). *Language and symbolic power*. Harvard University Press.
- Bowen, G. A. (2009). Document analysis as a qualitative research method. *Qualitative Research Journal*, 9(2), 27-40.
- Braun, V., & Clarke, V. (2006). Using thematic analysis in psychology. *Qualitative Research in Psychology*, 3(2), 77-101.
- Bucholtz, M., & Hall, K. (2005). Identity and interaction: A sociocultural linguistic approach. *Discourse Studies*, 7(4-5), 585-614.
- Creswell, J. W., & Poth, C. N. (2018). *Qualitative inquiry and research design: Choosing among five approaches* (4th ed.). SAGE Publications.
- Charmaz, K. (2014). *Constructing grounded theory* (2nd ed.). Sage.
- Congreso de la República de Colombia. (2010, January 25). Ley 1381 de 2010: Ley de Lenguas Nativas [Law 1381 of 2010: Native Languages Act]. *Diario Oficial* No. 47.603. https://lenguasyliteraturasnativas.caroycuervo.gov.co/publicaciones/2023/08/Ley_1381_2010_proteccion_lenguas_nativas.pdf
- Del Valle, J. (Ed.). (2007). *La lengua, ¿patria común?: ideas e ideologías del español*. Iberoamericana / Vervuert.
- Elshafie, M., & Zhang, J. (2024). Pedagogical translanguaging in content areas: Exploring pre-service teachers' lesson plans for emergent bilinguals. *Education Sciences*, 14(7), 702. <https://doi.org/10.3390/educsci14070702>
- Fairclough, N. (Ed.). (1992). *Critical language awareness*. Longman.
- Fishman, J. A. (1972). *The Sociology of Language: An interdisciplinary social science approach to language in society*. Newbury House Publishers.
- Flores, N., & Rosa, J. (2015). Undoing appropriateness: Raciolinguistic ideologies and language diversity in education. *Harvard Educational Review*, 85(2), 149-171.
- Freire, P. (1970). *Pedagogía del oprimido*. Siglo XXI Editores.
- Gramo Ideas. (2018, noviembre 7). *Gramo / Revolver / Cultura jopará* [Archivo de Video]. YouTube. <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=e3rHREt5kvk&t=12s>



- García, O., & Wei, L. (2015). *Translanguaging: Language, bilingualism and education*. Palgrave Macmillan.
- Gilmore, A. (2007). Authentic materials and authenticity in foreign language learning. *Language Teaching*, 40(2), 97–118.
- Heller, M. (2011). *Paths to post-nationalism: A critical ethnography of language and identity*. Oxford University Press.
- Herdiawan, R. D., Nurhidayah, Y., Asteka, P., Pamungkas, T., & Agustin, H. M. (2025). Discursive practices in teachers' lesson plan documents: A critical discourse analysis study of pedagogy and ideology in learning. *Journal of English Education and Teaching*, 9(2), 356-373. <https://ejournal.unib.ac.id/JEET/article/view/42639/17539>
- Hornberger, N. H., & McKay, S. L. (Eds.). (2010). *Sociolinguistics and language education*. Multilingual Matters.
- Hualde, J. I., Olarrea, A., Escobar, A. M., & Travis, C. E. (2010). *Introducción a la lingüística hispánica* (2nd ed.). Cambridge University Press.
- Hymes, D. H. (1972). On communicative competence. In J. B. Pride & J. Holmes (Eds.), *Sociolinguistics: Selected readings* (pp. 269-293). Penguin.
- Hymes, D. H. (1974). *Foundations in sociolinguistics: An ethnographic approach*. University of Pennsylvania Press.
- Jamaican Patwah Academy. (2024, March 9). *The REAL story behind the Jamaican accent* [Video]. YouTube. <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=JMTN1uo7iAc>
- Kubota, R. (2004). Critical multiculturalism and second language education. In B. Norton & K. Toohey (Eds.), *Critical pedagogies and language learning* (pp. 30–52). Cambridge University Press.
- Labov, W. (1972a). *Sociolinguistic patterns*. University of Pennsylvania Press.
- Labov, W. (1972b). *Language in the inner city: Studies in the Black English vernacular*. University of Pennsylvania Press.



- Lippi-Green, R. (2012). *English with an accent: Language, ideology, and discrimination in the United States* (2nd ed.). Routledge.
- Lipski, J. M. (1994). *Latin American Spanish*. Longman.
- López, L. E. (2009). Pueblos, culturas y lenguas indígenas en América Latina. In I. Sichra (Ed.), *Atlas sociolingüístico de pueblos indígenas en América Latina* (Vol. 1, pp. 19–99). FUNPROEIB Andes.
- Mallinson, C., & Charity Hudley, A. H. (2010). Communicating about communication: Multidisciplinary approaches to educating educators about language variation. *Language and Linguistics Compass*, 4(4), 245–257.
- McNelly, C. (2015) Language Learning Policy through the Lens of Language as a Problem, as a Right, and as a Resource. *NABE Journal of Research and Practice*, 6:1, 5-26, DOI: 10.1080/26390043.2015.12067782
- Merriam, S. B., & Tisdell, E. J. (2016). *Qualitative research: A guide to design and implementation*. Jossey-Bass.
- Moreno Cabrera, J. C. (2016). *La dignidad e igualdad de las lenguas. Crítica de la discriminación lingüística*. Alianza Editorial.
- Niño-Murcia, M., Zavala, V., & De los Heros, S. (Eds.). (2020). *Hacia una sociolingüística crítica. Desarrollos y debates*. Instituto de Estudios Peruanos (IEP).
- O'Neill, P., & Massini-Cagliari, G. (2019). Linguistic prejudice and discrimination in Brazilian Portuguese and beyond: Suggestions and recommendations. *Journal of Language and Discrimination*, 3(1), 32-62. <https://doi.org/10.1558/jld.37344>
- Oxford, R. L. (2013). *The language of peace: Communicating to create harmony*. Information Age Publishing.
- Paetsch, J., Heppt, B., & Meyer, J. (2023). Pre-service teachers' beliefs about linguistic and cultural diversity in schools: The role of opportunities to learn during university teacher training. *Frontiers in Education*, 8. <https://doi.org/10.3389/feduc.2023.1236415>



- Paris, D., & Alim, H. S. (2017). *Culturally sustaining pedagogies: Teaching and learning for justice in a changing world*. Teachers College Press.
- Park, H., Zong, J., Polat, N., & Schallert, D. L. (2024). Bilingual/ESL pre-service teachers' heritage language and language identity: Evidence from multimodal literacy autobiographies. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 137, 104775.
<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tate.2024.104775>
- Paulsrud, B., & Gheitasi, P. (2024). Embracing linguistic diversity: Pre-service teachers' lesson planning for English language learning in Sweden. *Education Sciences*, 14(12), 1326. <https://doi.org/10.3390/educsci14121326>
- Pennycook, A. (2021). *Critical applied linguistics: A critical reintroduction*. Routledge.
- Recetas de mi Tierra. (2021, 29 de septiembre). *Jopara pypara espantar a karai octubre* [Video]. YouTube. <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=vAH4GSBaY-w>
- Ricklefs, M.A. (2023). Variables influencing ESL teacher candidates' language ideologies. *Language and Education*, 37 (2), 229-243.
- Roberts, C. (2024, September 26). *The people reclaiming Jamaican Patwa*. BBC Future. <https://www.bbc.com/future/article/20240926-the-people-reclaiming-jamaican-patwa>
- Rodríguez-Izquierdo, R. M., González Falcón, I., & Goenechea Permisán, C. (2020). Teacher beliefs and approaches to linguistic diversity: Spanish as a second language in the inclusion of immigrant students. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 96, 103035. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tate.2020.103035>
- Romaine, S. (2000). *Language in society: An introduction to Sociolinguistics*. Oxford University Press.
- Rojas-Molina, S. (2020). *Language and peace*. Blog Personal.
<https://slrojasmo.wixsite.com/website-1/blog>



- Romero, X. (2022). *Teaching lesson planning* [Working paper]. Institución Universitaria Colombo Americana (ÚNICA). <https://unica.edu.co/wp-content/uploads/2022/06/WP-Teaching-Lesson-Planning.pdf>
- Rosa, J., & Burdick, C. (2017). Language ideologies. In O. García, N. Flores, & M. Spotti (Eds.), *The Oxford handbook of language and society* (pp. 103–124). Oxford University Press.
- Rosa, J., & Flores, N. (2017). Unsettling race and language: Toward a raciolinguistic perspective. *Language in Society*, 46(5), 621–647.
<https://doi.org/10.1017/S0047404517000562>
- Said, K. (2023). The grammar of folklorization: An integrated critical discourse analysis of the linguistic depiction of Amazigh social actors in selected Moroccan EFL textbooks (1980s- present). *Cogent Education*, 10(2), 2240162.
<https://doi.org/10.1080/2331186X.2023.2240162>
- Skutnabb-Kangas, T. (2000). *Linguistic genocide in education—or worldwide diversity and human rights?* Lawrence Erlbaum.
- Toledo, G., Lizasoain, A., & Cerda, K. (2022). Pre-service and inservice teachers' language ideologies about non-Spanish-speaking students and multilingualism in Chilean classrooms. *Journal of Teacher Education and Educators*, 11(1), 83-104.
- Torres Escobar, A. C. (2022). English learning: Pedagogical discourses, challenges, and perspectives. *Universal Journal of Educational Research*, 10(3), 205-214. <https://www.hrpub.org/download/20220228/UJER3-19526023.pdf>
- Ubaque-Casallas, D. F., & Aguirre-Garzón, E. (2020). Re-signifying teacher epistemologies through lesson planning: A study on language student teachers. *Profile: Issues in Teachers' Professional Development*, 22(2), 131-144.
<https://doi.org/10.15446/profile.v22n2.80687>
- Univision. (2025, October 9). *Pasajeros ofenden a conductor de Uber por no saber inglés y video se vuelve viral en TikTok*. Univision. <https://www.univision.com/local/austin->



[kakw/tiktok-uber-video-viral-cubano-ingles-ice-estados-unidos-policia-discriminacion-redes-sociales](#)

Vacchetta, M. (2023). Poesía Paraguaysis. Entrevista a Cristino Bogado. *Analytica del Sur Psicoanálisis y Crítica*, 13. <https://analyticadelsur.com.ar/lo-real-del-sintoma/>

Wolfram, W. & Schilling, N. (2016). *American English: Dialects and variation* (3rd ed.). Wiley Blackwell.

Zavala, V. (2019). Justicia sociolingüística para los tiempos de hoy. *Íkala, Revista de Lenguaje y Cultura*, 24(3), 455–472. <https://doi.org/10.17533/udea.ikala.v24n03a08>

Statement on the use of Artificial Intelligence Tools

This working paper adheres to the principles of transparency, academic integrity, and human authorship, but makes use of Artificial Intelligence tools such as *Connected papers* to find scientific articles related to a particular (sub) topic, *ChatGPT* or *Gemini* for both editorial support and formatting citations and references according to APA 7. Some more academically driven vocabulary was also searched through these tools.

