

## **TAIWAN LANGUAGE-IN-EDUCATION POLICY: SOCIAL, CULTURAL, AND PRACTICAL IMPLICATIONS**

Elizabeth Hubbs  
*University of Arizona*

*In recent years, Taiwan language-in-education policy has greatly transformed and become the subject of much research (Oladejo, 2006; Sandel, 2003; Tsao, 1999). Previously, monolingual policies under Japan and the Kuomintang<sup>1</sup> demonstrated that language was a symbolic tool to build nationalism and create social hegemony (Bourdieu, 1991). After these policies faded out in the early 1990s, Taiwan began to incorporate multilingual education, promoting internationalization through English as a foreign language and Taiwanisation through the introduction of local and indigenous languages in schools (Beaser, 2006; Sandel, 2003). The paper examines the launching of these two movements in education by discussing their development through history, current policy implementation, and the linguistic orientations of the surrounding communities. Rather than draw conclusions, the study ends by asking how indigenous scholarship and knowledge can be further integrated and validated in Taiwan's education system, and how critical perspectives can be used to understand language policy and indigenous education in an increasingly globalized world.*

### **INTRODUCTION**

The field of language planning and policy (LPP) in Taiwan has received significant attention over the past twenty-five years (Sandel, 2003). During this time frame, Taiwan has shifted from a country that promoted a monolingual national language policy, to one that seeks to develop societal multilingualism and internationalization. This shift has sparked an increasing interest for researchers to document and characterize the changes, development, and implementation of current LPP in Taiwan (Sandel, 2003; Wu, 2011). As the country aims to become competitive by increasing their opportunities for global trade and advancement, the government has placed curricular emphasis on the teaching of English as a foreign language (EFL). At the same time, the government aims to continue Mandarin education, as well as to promote the teaching of the country's indigenous and local languages. Balancing these languages in education, however, becomes problematic as both Taiwan's history and underlying ideologies are in conflict with the policies currently in place. The present paper specifically considers Taiwanese perspectives on the current educational situation by addressing three key questions regarding the historical development, research, and implementation of Taiwan language policy:

1. What ideologies have shaped LPP throughout Taiwan's history since 1894?
2. How are Taiwan's local languages situated socially in regards to linguistic ideologies and policy implementation in education?
3. How does the local language policy interact with local EFL policy?

This study is framed through an ecological perspective of second language acquisition (SLA). Before addressing the historical development of LPP, first Taiwan will be contextualized historically and geographically. Second, key terms within an ecological framework will be defined, describing how particular theories have shaped research on LPP. Next, historical literature is presented to chronicle the development and change in Taiwan's language policy since 1894. The literature describes and critiques the historical background and ideologies that may have shaped Taiwan's previous language policies. Finally, the current language policy is discussed by citing and analyzing studies on how students, parents, and teachers perceive the relationship between language and education, as well as the effects of policy implementation. These studies demonstrate changes in language ideologies as well as reflect the problematic interaction between EFL and indigenous classroom instructional time within the policy. Despite its changes throughout history, it is argued that the current policy persists in contributing to the marginalization of Taiwan's indigenous groups.

### ***Taiwan's Population and Geography***

Known to the Portuguese explorers as *Ilha Formosa* (Beautiful Island), Taiwan is currently one of the most popular destinations for EFL teachers in East Asia (Thomson, 2012). This island, however, is quite small and only covers an area the size of Maryland and Delaware combined. Located off the southeastern coast of China in the middle of the South China Sea and the Pacific Ocean, Taiwan's original inhabitants are of Austronesian descent and share similarities with other ethnic peoples from nearby islands (Beaser, 2006). According to historical ethnographies, the Austronesians have been in Taiwan for 5,000 years, and currently consist of over fourteen tribes and three major language groups—Atayalic, Tsouic, and Paiwan (Ferrell, 1969; Tse, 2000). These language groups are divided regionally throughout the island: Paiwan in the southeast, Atayal in the north, and Tsou in the central areas (Ferrell, 1969; Tsao, 1999; Tse, 2000). The Austronesians are now referred to as Taiwan's aboriginal or indigenous peoples (Council of Indigenous Peoples [CIP], 2011).

Starting in the 17<sup>th</sup> century, two groups from China arrived in Taiwan—the Minnan (閩南) and Hakka (客家)<sup>2</sup> (Beaser, 2006). Over the course of time, these two groups were considered the “local” population of Taiwan. After residing alongside the aborigines for 200 years, Minnan, now called Taiwanese, became the most spoken language on the island (Sandel, 2003). In 1894, the Japanese came to Taiwan, claiming it as their first colony

(Sandel, 2003). After the end of World War II, the Japanese lost the island, and a Mandarin speaking group from China arrived as a result of the Chinese Revolution (P. Chen, 2001; Feifel, 1994; Scott & Tiun, 2007; Tsao, 1999). This group is the most recent addition to Taiwan's population and is often referred to as Mainland Chinese.

As of the 2010 census data, there are approximately 23 million people in Taiwan. The Taiwanese/Minnan group is the largest, composing 72% of the total population, Hakka is 12%, Mainland Chinese are 14%, and indigenous groups are 2% (P. Chen, 2001; CIP, 2011; Scott & Tiun, 2007). Although the largest percent of the population is Taiwanese, the country's national language in the country is Mandarin, and all other languages (Taiwanese/Minnan, Hakka, and all fourteen indigenous languages) are simply referred to as *bentuyuan* (本土語) or local languages (Sandel, 2003; Sandel, Chao, & Liang, 2006).

## THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK OF LPP

### *Language Planning and Policy*

Before addressing the research questions regarding Taiwan's situation, the study is situated through a description of LPP definitions and SLA theory. A basic premise of LPP is that language holds symbolic values that maintain or change relationships between various groups in society through the potential imposition of hierarchical and hegemonic structures (Cooper, 1987, 1989; Fairclough, 1989; Haarmann, 1986). Language, therefore, can become highly politicized. In regions speaking more than one language, specific languages, dialects, or varieties can be given prestigious rankings, or values, over others (Cooper, 1989; Haarmann, 1986; Louw-Potgieter & Giles, 1988). Language planning and policy is a specific manner of assigning language rankings and functions within society. Generally, scholars agree on three types of LPP: acquisition, status, and corpus planning (Cooper, 1989; Hornberger, 1994, 2008; Ricento, 2006; Wiley, 1996). Acquisition planning, the most recent addition to LPP, is concerned with what languages are being taught, acquired, or maintained; status planning focuses on the positioning, recognition, and designation of languages, and corpus planning involves the reform, creation, and modification of linguistic forms (Wiley, 1996). Taiwan's current policies are specifically concerned with acquisition planning, as educators are faced with what languages to teach or help students maintain (CIP, 2011).

Although scholars disagree on what exactly LPP is, Cooper's (1989) definition is adopted here, as it was one of the first frameworks to include acquisition planning. Cooper's (1989) definition considers language orientations, stating that LPP is heavily influenced by the society and ideologies surrounding it. Cooper (1989) describes language planning and policy as the attempt to solve a language problem through the conscious effort to alter or change the linguistic functions and forms of a society. Ultimately,

LPP is defined as who plans what for whom and how. In this definition, “who” is considered an authoritative figure or agency; “what” is the use, behavior, or form of language; “whom” is a particular linguistic group; “how” is the treatment of language within the policy (Cooper, 1989). When institutions write specific policies, language orientations shape their planning goals (Cooper, 1989). Since the 1990’s, there has been a profusion of research on the relations between LPP and language orientations, ideologies, and ecology (Ricento, 2006). In his highly influential work on LPP orientations, Ruíz (1984) discussed three possible perspectives that shape LPP. These three orientations view language either as a social and linguistic problem, a basic human right, or a resource that represents a particular knowledge system or world-view (Ruíz, 1984). The proposed orientations influence policy makers and their goals. Policies can be utilized to maintain or revitalize languages, to create unity or division through political alliances, to better the economy through international trade, or to promote the education and socialization of students (Hornberger, 2006; Wiley, 1996; Wu, 2011). Language planning and policy, therefore, demonstrate that language goals, orientations, and ideologies are constantly active in causing social change and transformation.

### *Language Ideologies*

As a result of the increasing attention to language ideologies (orientations) within LPP, this study situates itself within the socio-cultural view of SLA, recognizing the deep connection between culture and language (Hornberger, 2006; Ricento, 2006; Risager, 2006; Wiley, 1996). In particular, an ecological approach is adopted. An ecological approach implies that language interacts with its environmental surroundings, including society, culture, and its users (Eastman, 1975; Haarmann, 1986; Hornberger, 2006; Kramsch, 2002; McCarty, Romero-Little, Warhol, & Zepeda, 2009; Ricento, 2006; Risager, 2006). In this perspective, language serves two functions: it is both a linguistic code and a social behavior (Wiley, 1996). The linguistic code and social behavior construct symbolic values and ideologies that have the potential to influence and affect the surrounding environment (Bourdieu, 1991; Tollefson, 1991).

Ideologies have become a central component in the creation and implementation of LPP (Spolsky, 2004). Linguistic ideologies, or orientations, reflect the beliefs that people have regarding the value of language within society (Bourdieu, 1991; Hornberger, 2006). Language ideologies are defined as the underlying set of beliefs, ideas of power and social processes, assumptions, and common sense that a person or society has in regards to language and its users (Fairclough, 1989; Feifel, 1994; McCarty et al., 2009; Sandel, 2003; Spolsky, 2004; Tollefson, 1991; Wiley, 1996). Often, language ideologies are thought of as part of psycho-sociological research, because they are drawn from peoples’ attitudes and opinions of language and policies in their surrounding environment (Baker, 2006). How people and governments perceive language is crucial to understanding LPP, as it provides contextualization to how and why different laws and policies come into

existence (Baker, 2006; Feifel, 1994; Gudy-Kunst, 1988; Hornberger, 2006; McCarty et al., 2009). In the context of Taiwan, ideologies are important in both the present and historical context because they provide the backdrop for the beliefs and perceptions people have regarding “norms.” These beliefs also shape how people relate language to cultural, ethnic, and social identity in Taiwan (Feifel, 1994; Gudy-Kunst, 1988; McCarty et al., 2009).

### ***Ethnicity and Language***

A final theoretical construct to understand, especially in light of Taiwan language policy, is the relationship between language itself and how language is used to categorize ethnic and indigenous groups. Defining ethnicity and indigeneity by way of language can prove controversial. In his discussion on language and symbolic power, Bourdieu (1991) reminds researchers that defining concepts such as ethnicity and race is a blurry approach. Often, classifying people within particular groups creates problems arising from close associations between ethnicity and social class. Distinct ethnic divisions also lead to the formation of minority and majority power groups (Tollefson, 1991; Wiley, 1996). With the increased promotion of language as a right and resource of the community, as well as declarations by both the United Nations (UN) and United Nations Educational Scientific and Cultural Organization (UNESCO) that language is a basic human right, it is necessary to unpack the complex relationship between ethnicity and language (cf. Ruíz, 1984; UN, 2007; UNESCO 2003, 2007).

According to UNESCO (2003, 2007), language diversity is an essential component of human heritage, ethnicity, and culture. In Taiwan, language and its diversity are heavily charged due to the presence of numerous indigenous groups on the island (CIP, 2011). Indigeneity is a delicate topic that has received recent attention in discussions of language policy and rights. For example, in 2007, the UN revised the Indigenous Peoples Declaration of 1948, stating that all indigenous groups have the right to promote their language and culture free from discrimination (UN, 2007). This declaration, however, leads to the question: which ethnic groups are considered indigenous? For this paper, ethnicity is defined based on self and group identification regarding membership. Self and group identification are fundamental components of indigeneity as discussed by both Gee (2011) and Merlan (2009). Biology alone does not define an indigenous group, and one must be accepted as part of a particular tribe based on both their individual (self) membership and the approval of the tribal community (CIP, 2011; Feifel, 1994; Gee, 2011; Merlan, 2009). Specifically, indigeneity is defined as a relational identity (Merlan, 2009). This means that indigenous groups are defined by their relationships with the other social and ethnic groups residing in the same area. For example, in Taiwan, the indigenous groups are considered the original inhabitants of the country because they lived there before colonizing groups and other immigrants came—they are distinctly defined compared to other people groups (Merlan, 2009). This paper takes the position that indigenous groups are equal to all other ethnic groups in Taiwan

(Mahuika, 2008; Shih, 2010). Although each tribe in Taiwan is characterized differently and has distinct linguistic, cultural, and historical features, they will be referred to together as indigenous peoples. The various tribes are not thrown together under one term out of disrespect, but referred to as indigenous peoples because this term is officially recognized by the government and commonly appears in official Taiwan policies (CIP, 1998, 1999, 2011). Clearly, ethnicity and indigeneity are difficult to define, and Taiwan indigenous groups and scholars continue to argue over what terms to utilize (Shih, 1999; Shih & Loa, 2008). These problems, however, demonstrate the continual need to critically analyze and explore these terms and their relationship in Taiwan and in the greater understanding of language ecology. The following historical review of Taiwan LPP indicates the need for a better understanding of ethnicity and indigeneity and the connotations these terms carry.

## **HISTORICAL LPP IN TAIWAN**

### ***Japanese Colonization: 1894-1945***

Like many countries, Taiwan was subject to multiple waves of colonization. At brief periods between the 17<sup>th</sup> and 19<sup>th</sup> century, small groups of Dutch, Spanish, Portuguese, and Chinese came to Taiwan. The contacts with these groups, however, did not result in the formation of explicit language policies (Beaser, 2006; P. Chen, 2001; Ferrell, 1969; Friedman, 2005; Gold, 1986; Hsiau, 1997; Sandel, 2003; Scott & Tiun, 2007; Tsao, 1999; Wei, 2006; Wu, 2011). The arrival of the Japanese in 1894 marked the first period of long-term colonization and official LPP in Taiwan. Beginning in this era, the protectorate government viewed the multilinguality of the island as problematic.

As Japan's first colony, Taiwan became a platform for policymakers to "prove" themselves by demonstrating that they could successfully manage their colony, increase their wealth, and build military strength (P. Chen, 2001; Wei, 2006). Japan viewed Taiwan's indigenous and local languages through a language-as-problem orientation, and desired to suppress these "dialects" through the complete assimilation into their culture through universal Japanese education (cf. Ruiz, 1984; Sandel, 2003; Wei, 2006). Japanese language-in-education policies were seen by Japanese rulers as a way to maintain the unchallenged hegemony of their government and foster national identity through the complete integration of Taiwan into their empire (Gold, 1986; Tsao, 1999; Wei, 2006). These policies started in 1895 and were developed constantly until 1945 (Tsao, 1999). If children were caught speaking their own language during school, they would be punished, forced to kneel in the sun, and hit by the teacher (Hsiau, 1997). The new policy caused the government to take particular interest in the indigenous groups; the Japanese saw them as "barbarians" and created educational centers specifically designed to teach them the national language (C. Chen, 2011). Also, in the early 1900s, the government instituted a name-changing

campaign: citizens were no longer allowed to utilize their original Taiwanese, Hakka, or indigenous names, and had to take Japanese names instead (Scott & Tiun, 2007). In the years before the Second World War, all non-Japanese languages were to be taken out of Taiwan completely. In 1937, small sections of Chinese were taken out of the newspapers, leaving Japanese only in print material (Tsao, 1999). A final goal during this period was the Japanese speaking family campaign, with the aim of driving out all home languages except Japanese (Tsao, 1999). People who did not speak the national language were deemed “second class citizens” (Wei, 2006). Combined, these campaigns resulted in confusion throughout Taiwan, with slightly less than 50% of the population speaking Japanese and the rest maintaining their own languages (Oladejo, 2006).

### ***Rule of the Kuomintang (KMT): 1945-1987***

The second wave of monolingual policy arrived in 1945 with the completion of the Second World War. Japan lost its colony, and the Kuomintang (KMT) nationalists from China fled to Taiwan as a result of governmental revolutions and the establishment of the People’s Republic of China (PRC). With these political changes, a new “elite” group formed in Taiwan—Mainland, Mandarin speakers (Beaser, 2006; C. Chen, 2011; S. Chen, 2006; S. Huang, 2000). The official language policy under KMT rule was similar to Japanese policy, except with the added imperative of de-Japanization (Hsiau, 1997; Wei, 2006). Japanese, local, and indigenous languages were deemed illegal in the public sector, while Mandarin was made the new, national language, or the GuoYu (國語). Similar to policy under the Japanese, speaking a non-official language during school was punished severely. Also, Mandarin Promotion Groups were established to teach the GuoYu to aborigines due to their “primitiveness” (L. Huang, 2004; Wu, 2011). The government labeled languages other than Mandarin as “dialects,” viewing them as unpatriotic detriments to society (S. Chen, 2006; Hsiau, 1997; Wu, 2011). Adding to the sentiment of patriotism, the KMT decided to engage in corpus planning by developing a more prestigious Mandarin; this was done by cultivating the GuoYu through language workshops, educational improvements, and the standardization of traditional Chinese characters (Kaplan & Tse, 1982; Wei, 2006; Yeh, Chan, & Cheng, 2004). Despite these policies, pockets began to develop among Taiwanese, Hakka, and indigenous groups who would hold secret meetings, risking their lives to practice and teach their own languages (Beaser, 2006). Ultimately, language policies under KMT rule were broadly founded on the belief that one language meant one nation, and that through a more standardized Mandarin, Taiwan, the newly established Republic of China, would prove superior to the PRC (Wei, 2006).

### ***Japanese and KMT Ideologies***

After reviewing the language policies and campaigns under Japan and the KMT, it is important return to the theoretical foundations of LPP and

critically analyse what ideologies and beliefs may have shaped these situations. Also, an understanding of these ideologies provides insight into why Taiwanese citizens have labeled their LPP history prior to 1987 as “oppressive” (L. Huang, 2004). Comparing the historical literature with theoretical orientations towards language policy, there are two constructs that may have influenced and shaped the policies under both Japan and the KMT: language as symbolic power (Bourdieu, 1991) and linguistic orientations (Ruíz, 1984).

First, as discussed by Bourdieu (1991), language is an instrument of symbolic power. During the Japanese and KMT eras in Taiwan, language symbolically represented the power of the government, as various groups were either legitimized or delimited through the policies in place. The language of the ruling group was the only “official” language, symbolizing the elite social class and intelligentsia (Bourdieu, 1991). Non-official languages were “primitive” and needed to be stamped out by the government. Essentially, the accepted, national language became a symbol of the ruling groups’ dominance, by creating social and economic hierarchies (Bourdieu, 1991; Fairclough, 1989; Hsiao, 1997; Wiley, 1996). Japanese, and later Mandarin, became the standard languages in Taiwan, reflecting the ideal of a perfect and unified state (S. Huang, 2000). A preferred, national language created a hierarchical system by devaluing other languages and terming them as “backwards.” In Hsiao’s (1997) reflection on dominance and hierarchy in Taiwan LPP, he states that non-legitimized languages were:

[D]evaluated as a dialect. It [was] seen as a marker of backwardness, crudeness, illiteracy, low socio-economic status, rurality, and so forth. In contrast, Mandarin as the national language [became] a symbol of modernity, refinement, literacy, urbanity, high socio-economic status and the like (p. 308).

Aside from establishing social hierarchies, linguistic policies were established because of the desire to build nationalism through political unity. In establishing power, both Japan and the KMT were influenced by the goals of increasing their economy, boosting education levels, and achieving national unity (S. Chen, 2006; Cobarrubias, 1983; Wiley, 1996). Therefore, language, as a symbolic tool, played a specific role in this ecological system as it provided a way to define social relationships, build political identity, and create linguistic hegemony (Bourdieu, 1991; Gold, 1986; Gottlieb & Chen, 2001; Haarmann, 1986). Through these historical language policies in Taiwan, all citizens were to speak either Japanese or Chinese, highlighting the assumption that one language represents one nation, and all other languages are problematic (Hinton, 2003; Hornberger, 1998, 2002; Hornberger & Johnson, 2007; Hult, 2010).

Ultimately, scholars believe that in LPP nothing is done out of neutrality, and linguistic assimilation in the case of Japan and the KMT was undertaken with specific goals: to build a nation, to boast empire and power,

and to develop national linguistic and cultural unity (Hinton, 2003; Wiley, 1996). A second component that may have influenced these policies is the role of linguistic orientations. Bearing in mind the work of Ruíz (1984, 2010), the policies discussed above viewed language as an issue to be solved due to the threat multilingualism posed to the country's unification. Often, monolingual policies develop because of specific perceptions regarding the role of language in society (McCarty et al., 2009). For example, the attitude that multilingualism was problematic and indicated a weaker society appeared in both Japan and the KMT's language campaigns. Both of these policies foreclosed access to local and indigenous peoples while maintaining power for elite and educated groups (Combs & Nicholas, 2012; Hsiau, 1997; Louw-Potgieter & Giles, 1988; Mahuika, 2008). The suppression of local languages created new groups of literate people in Taiwan, which further led to the belief that certain people were unintelligent, second-class citizens. During these eras, policy was established based on specific linguistic ideologies held by the ruling groups on what should happen in society (Hsiau, 1997). The other two orientations, that language is a right and resource of the community, were disregarded under Japanese and KMT policies (Ruíz, 1984).

### ***Towards Multilingualism: Democratization in Taiwan***

After 1987<sup>3</sup>, the KMT began to dissolve and the country's political situation changed from a republic under martial law to a democratic government (Beaser, 2006; C. Chen, 2011, S. Huang, 2000). With political changes, views towards language gradually transformed, and new language-in-education policies began to be developed to celebrate diversity and multilingualism. The major changes included creating groups to promote and support rights of the communities; in particular, the Council of Indigenous Peoples (CIP) was established in 1996 to discuss issues of cultural preservation, language maintenance, and tourism (CIP, 2011). Also, politicians began utilizing their native language, such as Taiwanese or Hakka in political speeches, seeing this as a demonstration of freedom and promotion of multilingualism. New language-in-education policies were termed an embracement of all identities, meaning that students would no longer be punished for speaking their own languages during school (C. Chen, 2011). Mandarin was still the official medium of instruction (MOI), but local and international languages were increasingly added to the curriculum. In 1993, policy makers decided that at least one hour per week in all elementary schools must be dedicated to local language instruction (Beaser, 2006; C. Chen, 2011; Ministry of Education [MOE], 2011). Local language instruction became an umbrella term for education in Taiwanese, Hakka, and the fourteen indigenous languages. English also became important as an international language, and was to be taught starting in the fifth year of public education (P. Chen, 2001; S. Chen, 2006; MOE, 2011).

These language policy changes demonstrate an ideological shift in the country. Previously, languages other than Mandarin were problematized. Under the current policy, all languages are framed as rights and resources of

the community that reflect cultural identity (P. Chen, 2001; S. Chen, 2006; cf. Ruíz, 1984). This change has been referred to as Taiwanisation (台灣化), because it attempts to replace wrongs of the past with basic linguistic and human rights through the validation of Taiwanese, Hakka, and indigenous languages in public spheres and education (Scott & Tiun, 2007). Along with local languages, English became a prime component of the new policies, causing Taiwan to simultaneously launch into a local and international language movement. Policies and curricula were established and discussed starting in the 1990's, and officially implemented in 2001 (Sandel, 2003). English, initially intended to be taught in fifth grade, was moved to third grade; many county schools, however, decided that English was extremely important in the education of their students, and moved instruction to first grade or kindergarten (Su, 2006). English received significant attention from the MOE, with numerous hours per week dedicated to instruction. When comparing English to the one hour per week of local language education, it becomes evident that internationalization is preferred over Taiwanisation. To sum up the newest language policies in Taiwan, Mandarin remains the MOI, receiving the most instructional time in multiple subjects throughout elementary and secondary education; English is taught starting at the latest in grade three (although exposure and classes start as early as grade one) and is taught multiple times a week, with a heavy presence in tertiary education. There are national English exams for students, as well as a large number of cram schools<sup>4</sup>, private preschools, and kindergartens dedicated to instruction. Local languages are taught one hour per week during primary education, and the “majority” local language (i.e. the most widely spoken) of the surrounding community is taught (Wei, 2006).

### ***Attitudes and Social Orientations***

After a lengthy review of policies both past and present, along with ideological orientations towards these policies, the remainder of this paper addresses how the current policies are framed within Taiwan by specifically considering the societal attitudes of teachers, parents, and students toward languages in education. Secondly, classroom implementation problems within the current policy are addressed, specifically: how are resources and time being delegated to these languages? The literature indicates a discrepancy between the internationalization of English and the Taiwanisation of education through local and indigenous language promotion in schools. This discrepancy leads to the question of whether Taiwan can equally promote English, Mandarin, local languages, and indigenous languages.

### ***Societal Orientations towards Languages in Education***

Despite the rapid and recent changes in Taiwan LPP, the past ten years have yielded only a handful of research studies conducted on the emerging situation of Taiwanisation and internationalization. A majority of these studies look at two issues—the orientations of language use in the

country and the implementation of current policies in education. Looking first at the studies on societal orientations, there is a tendency for Mandarin and English to be viewed as the most favorable languages to learn in school. In a detailed survey on language use after democratization, Beaser (2006) discovered that the GuoYu still dominated as the most prevalent language in society. Beaser's (2006) questions mostly focused on the adolescents, as she believed that understanding their beliefs towards language would demonstrate the future of language use for subsequent generations in Taiwan. Mandarin, to the younger generation, was "relaxing." Teenagers heard Mandarin on television and considered it the common language in the country's academic spheres and the media (Beaser, 2006). Also, English usage was popular for teenagers, as it appeared in frequent code-mixing in popular music. The remainder of this survey focused on how teenagers' preference for Mandarin and English may lead to the gradual decline of local languages. Beaser (2006) concludes that one hour of local language instruction may not be enough to promote the indigenous languages. The conclusion that Taiwanese is declining due to the preference for English and Mandarin leads one to wonder to what extent these students are conscious of language policies and whether their attitudes have an impact on the MOI (Beaser, 2006). A problem with her survey, however, was that it only focused on teenagers from Mandarin and Taiwanese speaking backgrounds and did not include Hakka or indigenous perspectives. The inferences drawn from the survey are thus limited to considering the perspectives and promotion of Taiwanese as one of the taught local languages.

In another study, Chen, Yang, Ho, and Wang (2012) conducted similar research on language orientations, except that they included indigenous perspectives. Their ethnographic study considered the relationships between ethnic identity and indigenous students' perspectives towards education. Students from seven different tribes in the Taiwan Ali-Mountain groups were observed and interviewed; all students received education in mainstream schools. These students stated that receiving education through the MOI of Mandarin was beneficial, and that they would utilize it to incorporate modern knowledge into their traditional knowledge. In particular, these students desired to build upon their traditional knowledge systems and wanted to see more opportunities to incorporate their linguistic and cultural funds of knowledge in the classroom. The students also felt that they were constantly stereotyped by their non-indigenous peers; they heard their peers comment that people from their tribes could only sing and dance and could not be successful in school (Chen et al., 2012). Of all the interviewed students, indigeneity was seen with pride; students enjoyed learning about mainstream culture, but only if they could utilize it to help their own peoples, cultures, and languages. While this particular ethnography focused on connections between culture and education, it proves useful in understanding attitudes in relation to the situational context of language policy. First, it reveals that negative stereotypes of the inferiority of indigenous peoples (This reflects both present and historical ideas that aboriginal peoples are considered primitive and

second class citizens). Also, the language, culture, and identity connections are closely related. For students, navigating identity in multiple language and cultural knowledge systems is convoluted, and ideologies often compete with one another. If Mandarin remains the MOI, indigenous students must learn how and when to utilize their native languages. Overall, this study presents the need to reconsider the role of local and indigenous languages in policy by developing innovative ways to incorporate them for longer periods of time in the educational curriculum.

Two final studies to consider consist of interviews with community members about views towards languages in the “new” Taiwan (Sandel et al., 2006 and Su, 2006). First, Sandel et al. (2006) found that in urban areas with smaller indigenous populations, people thought that Mandarin should naturally be the MOI and mother tongue (MT) of students, while people in rural areas with larger indigenous and local language populations thought that Mandarin should not be the MT of students. Adults in rural areas often explained that Taiwanese, Hakka, and indigenous languages were artifacts of cultural heritage; they were intimate languages that should not be taught through books or school, because they should be transmitted by family and relatives (Sandel et al., 2006). Su’s (2006) study interviewed and observed EFL elementary teachers, focusing on perspectives of English and education. Classroom teachers (all local Taiwan citizens) thought that English was beneficial to society and had the potential to increase student performance in other subjects; English was also a way to reinforce globalization and help students find better jobs after graduating. The interviewed teachers demonstrated hesitation towards teaching English in lower grades, because it had the potential to take away from time spent with local and indigenous languages (Su, 2006). Although these two studies focus on different populations and attitudes towards different languages, we can draw a few important conclusions from them. First, English and Mandarin are clearly receiving more attention in the implementation of language-in-education policy. Secondly, views towards local and indigenous languages continue to be fraught with problems. English teachers feel that local languages are not taught enough, and some parents believe they should be taught at home and not transmitted through schools. Resulting from these varying and opposing viewpoints, it becomes difficult to determine how to best move forward with LPP in Taiwan.

### ***Implementation Problems: Classroom Space***

Other studies resulting from the new language-in-education policies in Taiwan focus on policy implementation through classroom practices. Primarily, these studies look at two questions: how much time and resources are devoted to each language, and why does English receive more attention? In both Chang (2005) and C. Chen’s (2011) ethnographic studies on language instruction in Taiwan public schools, it was discovered that Mandarin was given the most teaching hours and resources, followed by English, and then local languages. At times, school observations revealed that local language classes did not have any books or materials, and were converted into forty

minute per week cultural classes (C. Chen, 2011). But, for both English and Mandarin classes, observations showed heavy usage of PowerPoint, songs, and textbooks. In English classes, textbooks were often imported from other countries, there were foreign teachers, and “trendy” communicative language teaching methods were utilized (C. Chen, 2011). The amount of resources dedicated to English education represents the government’s outlook that internationalization will provide opportunities for socioeconomic advancement, thus seen as beneficial for students (S. Chen, 2006). In comparison, indigenous and local language classes usually lacked a specific pedagogical method, only taught isolated vocabulary lists, and often had non-native speakers of the target language teaching the course. Discrepancies were also found between urban and rural schools: less funding and resources, especially technology, were given to rural schools with higher indigenous populations (Chang, 2005). Teacher attrition also proved problematic in schools with larger numbers of indigenous students. The lack of understanding on how to incorporate indigenous and local funds of knowledge (Moll, Amanti, Neff, & Gonzalez, 1992) in the classroom was a common reason non-indigenous teachers left these schools (Chang, 2005).

The reviewed studies demonstrate that more focus is given to Mandarin and English education over local languages. This represents a continuation of ideological conflicts in Taiwan. Similar to the previous policies, the GuoYu is perceived with greater importance, especially as it is common in the media, has a standardized form, is utilized in technology, and is the primary MOI (Beaser, 2006; Hsiao, 1997). The fact that instruction time is decreased in certain schools from one hour to forty minutes per week for local languages also reflects their value in education: Mandarin is still considered superior. Does the lack of standardized and written languages, texts, resources, and innovative pedagogical methods portray how policy makers and educators view local languages? Is a weekly cultural class enough? Also, the use of CLT, imported textbooks, and foreign teachers reflects the view of English as a global language (Crystal, 1997; Eastman, 1975; Krashen, 2003). According to Krashen (2003), Taiwan has been swept away by “English Fever.” This is reflected in the curricular emphasis on English at all levels of education. Another important point of consideration is that of linguistic equality within the country’s policies. Taiwan has adopted the orientation that language is a societal right and should be equally promoted in the education system. In the handbook on education as published by the Minister of Education, Ching-ji Wu (MOE, 2010), Taiwan is becoming an increasingly liberal country and education must be a way to bring transformation in society. As a societal right, the MOE stresses that the needs of the communities must be met, and this is done through promotion of equal treatment in educational policies (MOE, 2010). This equality appears, for example, in the Educational Act for Indigenous Peoples, a policy aiming to “safeguard” the rights of indigenous and local populations by incorporating them into the national curriculum (CIP, 1998). This does not mean, however, that education and society’s ideologies towards language are conflict-free

(Hornberger, 1998; Liao, 2000). With the prevailing, negative stereotypes towards aboriginal students, along with high attrition rates of teachers in rural schools, the idea of indigeneity in Taiwan may be “tolerated” rather than promoted (Shih, 2010). Thus, the “new” ideas of equality in Taiwan LPP may simply mask persisting problems by creating provisions in the policies, but not implementing them well.

## FUTURE RESEARCH

In looking towards future research on Taiwan LPP, it is necessary to continue exploring and analyzing critically the discrepancies between community perspectives, policy texts, and policy interpretations, and implementation (Hornberger & Johnson, 2007). The MOE and CIP may need to consider further development regarding language in education. Specific questions include: what languages should be taught, for what purposes, to what levels, and what resources should be given to these classes (Tsao, 1999). Furthermore, research should consider cross-cultural implementation of language teaching and its potential in Taiwan education. The discrepancies between rural and urban education, with regards to teacher attrition and resource allotment, reveal potential cultural and linguistic misunderstandings of educators. Ethnographic classroom research can help build culturally responsive curriculum, model ways to incorporate funds of knowledge, decrease ethno-linguistic marginalization, and challenge the status quo of policy implementation (Lin, Icyech, & Kuan, 2008; Mahuika, 2008; Moll et al., 1992; Scott & Tiun, 2007; Shih, 2010). If language policies cannot be changed, can researchers and educators develop more transformative teaching methods to harness students’ cultural and linguistic resources and literacy practices? Workshops could be developed to build bridges between mainstream education and local, indigenous communities, thus assisting teachers in deconstructing stereotypes and negative perspectives towards more rural areas.

Finally, due to the lack of research on the Taiwan LPP with respect to EFL teachers working there, further studies should address more broadly and definitively how local, international, and indigenous languages are perceived in Taiwan. Interviews and ethnographic studies on indigenous communities and schools can provide insight on how people interact with the multiple languages in their country. Ethnographic language policy research offers a way to explore how varying interpretations, implementations, resistance, and perspectives allow for and restrict access to multilingual space in education (Hornberger & Johnson, 2007). By researching indigenous perspectives, pedagogy can be developed to better integrate multiple funds of knowledge during local language teaching time (Moll et al., 1992). Case studies in these communities could also explore how indigenous students learn language and perceive education. These studies can then be related to understanding how local and indigenous languages interact with English in communities and in curriculum: how do the various population groups in Taiwan feel towards

simultaneous Taiwanisation and internationalization? Comparative studies between indigenous and English classrooms in specific schools would also add further insight to these remaining questions. If “English Fever” continues, investigations should examine how foreign EFL teachers relate to and perceive current language-in-education policies in Taiwan (Krashen, 2003). Are foreign teachers aware of these policies? How can they be better equipped to teach in Taiwan? How can foreign EFL teachers better understand indigenous cultures when they work in rural schools?

Clearly, there are many directions and unanswered questions for future research in both socio-cultural and pedagogical studies. Not all of these questions can be answered immediately, but by beginning to think critically about history, language ideologies, current policies, implementation difficulties, pedagogical resources, and language attitudes, a deeper understanding of the complex relations between language, culture, and education can be developed. The situation of language policy in Taiwan is multi-faceted, but continual research on the different cultural groups can lead to gradual discovery of the place of indigenous and local knowledge within language teaching, and the understanding of possibilities for multilingual education around the globe.

## REFERENCES

- Baker, C. (2006). Psycho-sociological analysis in language policy. In T. Ricento (Ed.), *An introduction to language policy: Theory and method* (pp. 10-23). Malden, Ma: Blackwell Publishing.
- Beaser, D. (2006). The outlook for Taiwanese language preservation. *Sino-Platonic Papers*, 172, 1-40.
- Bourdieu, P. (1991). *Language and symbolic power*. (G. Raymond & M. Adamson, Trans.). Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press.
- Chang, C. L. (2005). Translating policies into practice: Culturally appropriate practices in an Atayal Aboriginal kindergarten program in Taiwan. *Childhood Education*, 81(6), 355-359.
- Chen, C. K. (2011). *Multi-language education for indigenous children in Taiwan*. (Doctoral dissertation). University of Northern Colorado, Greeley, Colorado.
- Chen, P. (2001). Policy on the selection and implementation of a standard language as a source of conflict in Taiwan. In N. Gottlieb & P. Chen (Eds.), *Language planning and language policy: East Asian perspectives* (pp. 95-110). Richmond, VA: Curzon.
- Chen, S. (2006). Simultaneous promotion of indigenous and internationalisation: New language-in-education policy in Taiwan. *Language and Education*, 20(4), 322-337.
- Chen, S. H., Yang, C. C., Ho, H. F., & Wang, L. P. (2012). Ethnic identity and career aspiration of the Taiwanese indigenous students in the era of globalization. *Asian Social Science*, 8(10), 23-28.

- Cobarrubias, J. (1983). Ethical issues in status planning. In J. Cobarrubias & J. A. Fishman (Eds.), *Progress in language planning: International perspectives* (pp. 41-86). Berlin, Germany: Mouton Publishers.
- Combs, M. C., & Nicholas, S. E. (2012). The effect of Arizona language policies on Arizona indigenous students. *Language Policy, 11*(1), 101-118.
- Cooper, R. L. (1987). Planning language acquisition. In P.H. Lowenberge (Ed.), *Language spread and language policy: Issues, implications, and case studies* (pp. 140-151). Washington, D.C.: Georgetown University Press.
- Cooper, R. L. (1989). *Language planning and social change*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Council of Indigenous Peoples. (2010). *Advancing the overall development of indigenous communities*. Retrieved from [www.apc.gov.tw](http://www.apc.gov.tw)
- Crystal, D. (1997). *English as a global language*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.
- Eastman, C. M. (1975). *Aspects of language and culture*. San Francisco, CA: Chandler and Sharp Publishers.
- Ebrey, P. B. (1996). *The Cambridge illustrated history of China*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.
- Fairclough, N. (1989). *Language and power*. New York: Longman.
- Feifel, K. E. (1994). *Language attitudes in Taiwan: A social evaluation of language in social change*. Taipei, Taiwan: The Crane Publishing Co.
- Ferrell, R. (1969). *Taiwan aboriginal groups: Problems in cultural and linguistic classification*. Taipei, Taiwan: Institute of Ethnology Academic Sinica.
- Friedman, P. K. (2005). *Learning "local" languages: Passive revolution, language markets, and Aborigine education in Taiwan*. (Doctoral dissertation). Temple University, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania.
- Gee, J. P. (2011). *An introduction to discourse analysis: Theory and method* (3rd ed.). New York, NY: Routledge.
- Gold, T. B. (1986). *State and society in the Taiwan miracle*. Armonk, NY: M.E. Sharpe.
- Gottlieb, N., & Chen, P. (2001). Language planning and language policy in East Asia. In N. Gottlieb & P. Chen (Eds.), *Language planning and language policy: East Asian perspectives* (pp. 1-20). New York, NY: Routledge.
- Gudy-Kunst, W. B. (Ed.). (1988). *Language and ethnic identity*. Clevedon, UK: Multilingual Matters.
- Haarmann, H. (1986). *Language in ethnicity: A view of basic ecological relations*. Berlin, Germany: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Hinton, L. (2003). Language revitalization. *Annual Review of Applied Linguistics, 23*(1), 44-57.
- Hsiau, A. C. (1997). Language ideology in Taiwan: The KMT's language policy, the Tai-yu language movement, and ethnic politics. *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development, 18*(4), 302-315.

- Hornberger, N. H. (1998). Language policy, language education, language rights: Indigenous, immigrant, and international perspectives. *Language in Society*, 27(1), 439-458.
- Hornberger, N. H. (2002). Multilingual language policies and the continua of biliteracy: An ecological approach. *Language Policy*, 1, 27-51.
- Hornberger, N. H. (2006). Frameworks and models in language policy and planning. In T. Ricento (Ed.), *An introduction to language policy: Theory and method* (pp. 24-41). Malden, Ma: Blackwell Publishing.
- Hornberger, N. H., & Johnson, D. C. (2007). Slicing the onion ethnographically: Layers and spaces in multilingual education policy and practice. *TESOL Quarterly*, 41(3), 509-532.
- Huang, L. M. (2004). Strategies in revitalizing indigenous languages in Taiwan. Department of Applied Foreign Languages at Shih Chien University. Paper Presentation at the North American Taiwan Studies Conference in Hawaii, June 17-20, 2004.
- Huang, S. (2000). Language, identity, and conflict: A Taiwanese study. *International Journal of the Sociology of Language*, 143, 139-149.
- Hult, F.M. (2010). Introduction. *International Journal of Sociology of Language*, 2012(202), 1-16.
- Kaplan, R. B., & Tse, J. K. (1982). The language situation in Taiwan (The Republic of China). *The Linguistic Reporter*, 25(2), 1-5.
- Kramsch, C. (2002). How can we tell the dancer from the dance? In C. Kramsch (Ed.), *Language acquisition and language socialization: Ecological perspectives* (pp. 1-5). London, UK: Continuum.
- Krashen, S. (2003). Dealing with English Fever. In English Teachers' Association Taiwan (Eds.), *Selected papers from the twelfth international symposium on English teaching* (pp. 100-108). Taipei, Taiwan: Crane Publishing Company.
- Kuomintang. (2013). *Party's history*. Retrieved from <http://www.kmt.org.tw>
- Lei, W. (1999). 'Cram school or counseling?' *Shishuo*, 132, 12-13.
- Liao, C. C. (2000). Changing dominant language use and ethnic equality in Taiwan since 1987. *International Journal of the Sociology of Language*, 143(1), 165-182.
- Lin, Y. R., Icyech, L., & Kuan, D. W. (2008). Indigenous language-informed participatory policy in Taiwan: A socio-cultural perspective. In D.V. Rau & M. Florey (Eds.), *Documenting and Revitalizing Austronesian Languages*, (pp. 134-161). Honolulu, HI: The University of Hawai'i Press.
- Louw-Potgieter, J., & Giles, H. (1988). Imposed identity and linguistic strategies. In W. B. Gudykunst (Ed.), *Language and ethnic identity* (pp. 105-130). Philadelphia, PA: Multilingual Matters.
- Mahuika, R. (2008). Kaupapa Māori theory is critical and anti-colonial. *MAI Review*, 3(4), 1-16.
- May, S. (Ed.). (1999). *Indigenous community-based education*. Clevedon, UK: Multilingual Matters.

- McCarty, T. L., Romero-Little, M. E., Warhol, L., & Zepeda, O. (2009). Indigenous youth as language policy makers. *Journal of Language, Identity, and Education*, 8(1), 291-306.
- Merlan, F. (2009). Indigeneity: Global and local. *Current Anthropology*, 50(3), 303-333.
- Ministry of Education. (2010). Education in Taiwan: Education pamphlet. Retrieved from <http://www.edu.tw>
- Moll, L. C., Amanti, C., Neff, D., & Gonzalez, N. (1992). Funds of knowledge for teaching: Using a qualitative approach to connect homes and classrooms. *Theory into Practice*, 31(2), 132-141.
- Oladejo, J. (2006). Parents' attitudes towards bilingual education policy in Taiwan. *Bilingual Research Journal*, 30(1), 147-170.
- Rickards, J. (2005, August, 10). Taiwanese have indigenous roots. *The China Post*. Retrieved from <http://www.chinapost.com.tw/taiwan/detail.asp?ID=66709&GRP=B>
- Ricento, T. (2006). Language policy: Theory and practice—An introduction. In T. Ricento (Ed.), *An introduction to language policy: Theory and method* (pp. 10-23). Malden, Ma: Blackwell Publishing.
- Risager, K. (2006). *Language and culture: Global flows and local complexity*. Clevedon, UK: Multilingual Matters.
- Ruíz, R. (1984). Orientations in language planning. *NABE Journal*, 8(2), 15-34.
- Ruíz, R. (2010). Re-orienting language as resource. In J. Petrovic (Ed.), *International perspectives on bilingual education: Policy, practice and controversy* (pp. 155-172). Charlotte, NC: Information Age.
- Sandel, T. L. (2003). Linguistic capital in Taiwan: The KMT's Mandarin language policy and its perceived impact on language practices of bilingual Mandarin and Tai-Gi speakers. *Language in Society*, 32(4), 523-551.
- Sandel, T. L., Chao, W. Y., & Liang, C. H. (2006). Language shift and language accommodation across family generations in Taiwan. *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development*, 27(2), 126-147.
- Shih, C. F. (1999). Legal status of indigenous peoples in Taiwan. Paper presented at the International Aboriginal Rights Conference, Taipei, Taiwan.
- Shih, C. F. (2010). Academic colonialism and the struggle for indigenous knowledge systems in Taiwan. *Social Alternatives*, 29(1), 44-47.
- Shih, H. C., & Loa, L. S. (2008). Seqiq recongnized as 14<sup>th</sup> tribe. *Taipei Times, Taiwan*. Retrieved from <http://www.taipeitimes.com>
- Spolsky, B. D. (2004). *Language policy*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.
- Su, Y. C. (2006). EFL teachers' perceptions of English language policy at the elementary level in Taiwan. *Educational studies*, 32(3), 265-283.
- Scott, M., & Tiun, H. K. (2007). Mandarin-only to Mandarin-plus: Taiwan. *Language Policy*, 6(1), 53-72.

- Thomson, J. (2012). The 10 best cities to teach English in Asia. *Teaching Careers in Asia*. Retrieved from <http://www.teachergig.com>
- Tollefson, J. W. (1991). *Planning language, planning inequality: Language policy in the community*. New York: Longman.
- Tsao, F. F. (1999). The language planning situation in Taiwan. *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development*, 20(4-5), 328-375.
- Tse, J. K. (2000). Language and a rising new identity in Taiwan. *International Journal of the Sociology of Language*, 143, 151-164.
- United Nations. (2007). *Indigenous peoples, indigenous voices: Declaration on the rights of indigenous peoples*. Oxford, UK: Hart Publishing.
- United Nations Educational Scientific and Cultural Organization (UNESCO). (2003). *Language vitality and endangerment*. Paris, France: UNESCO Documents.
- UNESCO. (2007). Endangered languages. Retrieved from <http://www.unesco.org/new/en/culture/themes/endangered-languages/>
- Wei, J. M. (2006). Language choice and ideology in multicultural Taiwan. *Language and Linguistics*, 7(1), 87-107.
- Wiley, T. G. (1996). Language planning and policy. In S. L. McKay & N. H. Hornberger (Eds.), *Sociolinguistics and language teaching* (pp. 103-147). Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.
- Wu, M. H. (2011). Language planning and policy in Taiwan: Past, present, and future. *Language Problems and Language Planning*, 35(1), 15-34.
- Yeh, H. N., Chan, H. C., & Cheng, Y. S. (2004). Language use in Taiwan: Language proficiency and domain analysis. *Journal of Taiwan Normal University: Humanities and Social Science*, 49(1), 75-108.

## Notes

---

<sup>1</sup>The Kuomintang, or 中國國民黨, refers to the Chinese Nationalist party that traces its origins to the Sino-Japanese War of 1894. The Chinese Civil War, beginning in 1927, was fought between the Kuomintang and the Communist Party of China, 中國共產黨, as a result of an ideological shift between nationalist and socialist political ideas. The Kuomintang, however, did not win in China, and claimed the island of Taiwan. The Republic of China was established in Taiwan, while the People's Republic of China was founded in the mainland (Kuomintang, 2013). (Note that this is a simplification of the history of the war between the two parties).

<sup>2</sup>Historically, many Hakka and Minnan peoples are related to the Han people groups in Mainland China (Ebrey, 1996; Rickards, 2005). Identity of these people groups, however, is also composed of culture, language, and community practices that extend beyond genetic identity. Debates remain on the differences between these groups.

<sup>3</sup>The democratization of Taiwan started in 1987; this began with the lifting of martial law (C. Chen, 2011). The creation of education policies was a process that took place over many years. Although democratization began in 1987, programs, interest groups, and policies were developed through the following decade.

<sup>4</sup> Sending students to cram schools or academies is a common practice in various East Asian countries, including Taiwan, South Korea, Japan, and Hong Kong. Referred to in Taiwan as *buxiban* (補習班), cram schools are thought of as supplementary learning facilities outside of private or public schools. These schools are designed for students to attend to gain extra instruction, as well as help prepare students for the rigorous demands of preparing for university studies (Lei, 1999).