

# POLITICKÉ VEDY / POLITICAL SCIENCES

Časopis pre politológiu, najnovšie dejiny, medzinárodné vzťahy, bezpečnostné štúdiá / Journal for Political Sciences, Modern History, International Relations, security studies

URL časopisu / URL of the journal: <http://www.politickevedy.fpvmv.umb.sk>

Autor(i) / Author(s): Mei-Lan Huang  
Článok / Article: Developing an Intercultural Citizenship Community: Language Identity Vs Language Education  
Vydavateľ / Publisher: Fakulta politických vied a medzinárodných vzťahov – UMB Banská Bystrica / Faculty of Political Sciences and International Relations – UMB Banská Bystrica

**Odporúčaná forma citácie článku / Recommended form for quotation of the article:**

Huang, M. 2017. Developing an Intercultural Citizenship Community: Language Identity Vs Language Education. In *Politické vedy*. [online]. Roč. 20, č. 4, 2017. ISSN 1335 – 2741, s. 90-112. Dostupné na internete: <http://www.politickevedy.fpvmv.umb.sk/archiv-vydani/2017/4-2017/mei-lan-huang.html>.

Poskytnutím svojho príspevku autor(i) súhlasil(i) so zverejnením článku na internetovej stránke časopisu *Politické vedy*. Vydavateľ získal súhlas autora / autorov s publikovaním a distribúciou príspevku v tlačenej i online verzii. V prípade záujmu publikovať článok alebo jeho časť v online i tlačenej podobe, kontaktujte redakčnú radu časopisu: [politicke.vedy@umb.sk](mailto:politicke.vedy@umb.sk).

By submitting their contribution the author(s) agreed with the publication of the article on the online page of the journal. The publisher was given the author's / authors' permission to publish and distribute the contribution both in printed and online form. Regarding the interest to publish the article or its part in online or printed form, please contact the editorial board of the journal: [politicke.vedy@umb.sk](mailto:politicke.vedy@umb.sk).

# DEVELOPING AN INTERCULTURAL CITIZENSHIP COMMUNITY: LANGUAGE IDENTITY VS LANGUAGE EDUCATION

Mei-Lan Huang\*

## ABSTRACT

In the past few decades, the study of nation/nationalism has moved rapidly from the periphery to the center of numerous scholarly fields and subfields. But the literature which examines the chronological hegemonic and ideological relationship between mono-culturalism /nation identity and language education with the change in power, in symbolic status of language, is scarce. Therefore, the purpose in this research is to analyse the relationship between the ideology of mono-culturalism and its language education among the histories of interethnic relation in Taiwan. **(Objectives)** This study was a historical analysis of the issues of the language education and language identity in Taiwan by analysing the data collection from (1) the first-hand accounts of seven key interviewees' in-depth interviews and (2) documentary data from primary and secondary sources. **(Scope)** The results demonstrate that the politics of the language education ideology has deep roots in the institutional homogeneous structure of the society, which results in the dilemma of language identity problems in Taiwan. In spite of this, in some context of the evolution of Taiwanese monocultural identity, what the theorist's paradigm case of (nation-state model) one language per country and one linguistic identity is challenged. So, the case of Taiwan shows both for and against the nation-state theory. **(Findings)** In general, the research ends by outlining some conclusions, and some implications. That is, the historical case of postcolonial Taiwan can serve as a good heuristic model for examining the histories of interethnic relation in nation identity formation (construction), and language education. **(Conclusion)**

**Key words:** language, education, identity, inter-culturalism, mono-culturalism

## Introduction

The population of Taiwan is made up of four main ethnic groups, each of which has its own language (Huang, 1995, p. 21). At the time of decolonisation, Hakka speakers were about 15% of the total population of approximately

---

\* Mei-Lan Huang is an Assistant Professor at the Chang-Gung University of Science & Technology, No. 261, Wenhua 1st Road, Guishan District, Taoyuan City (33303), Taiwan, e-mail: mhuang4220@gmail.com.

23,483,793 (as of November, 2015), speakers of the aboriginal languages were about 2.28%, Mandarin speakers, “the Mainlanders”, about 13%, and speakers of Southern-Min, the majority language, about 70 % (Demographics of Taiwan, 2017).

The four-part division by languages was parallel to a two-part division in the population and its origins between the majority “native Taiwanese” or the “non-Mainlanders”, and the minority “Chinese” or the “Mainlanders”. The clash between the so-called “Chinese consciousness (a Chinese mono-cultural identity)” and the “Taiwanese consciousness (a Taiwanese mono-cultural identity)” will play a primary role in this study.

Like many colonies in Asia, Taiwan experienced decolonisation in the 20<sup>th</sup> Century. It started with the end of Japanese occupation when Taiwan was returned to the Chinese Nationalist government (Kuomintang, KMT) in 1945, based on the Cairo Declaration of December 1943. Japan transferred the island to China’s ownership on 25<sup>th</sup> October 1945 and Taiwan officially became a part of the Republic of China (Cheng, 1991, p. 218-9; Gate, 1981; Gold, 1986, p. 49-50).

Thus, at that time, there existed in Taiwan a ruling class of Mainlanders, most of whom could speak some form of Mandarin and a lower class of people comprising Southern Min, Hakka and Austro-Polynesian speakers, and there was no way for these groups to communicate with each other except through translation. Hence, the sociolinguistic situation of the island at that time can be characterised as “diglossia without societal bilingualism” (Fishman, 1967; Tsao, 1999). The diglossia of the Japanese period when the ruling powers spoke only Japanese, was replaced by a new kind of diglossia and the new administration had a great challenge, because the pluri-ethnic and pluri-linguistic society of Taiwan was extremely delicate and needed to be handled with care (Gold, 1986, p. 49-50).

Within this context, it was not surprising that the national education system was subjected to tight KMT government control (Tsao, 1999), because language and education have always been regarded as the important pillar in group identity maintenance. **Young** and his colleagues (1992) point out that the national language played an instrumental role in unifying the peoples of Taiwan, especially KMT’s Mandarin-only language movement.

Therefore, in addition to the main theme of this study—the ideology of mono-cultural identity—there is a sub-theme concerning the tension in linguistic identity in education between these two above-mentioned major ethnic groups

in Taiwan: the majority “native Taiwanese” or “non-Mainlanders”, and the minority “Chinese” or “Mainlanders”. For it is still today an ongoing phenomenon and remains a complex issue. Furthermore, in facing a more globalised and internationalised world, a pluri-lingual and pluri-ethnic community like Taiwan needs to accept the diversity and change and shift from the dominant monolingual paradigm to “an intercultural citizenship one in which the focus is on the appreciation of multiple heritage and cultures” (Byram, 2008).

## 1 Methodology

**McCulloch** and **Richardson** (2000) argue that the rise in the growth of qualitative approaches in historical research from the historical and sociological perspectives can provide insight into understanding educational issues, and thus the researcher worked on this historical qualitative approach in order to understand the language educational issues and cultural identities.

Two major sources of data were selected to collect information needed to answer the study purposes. They were analyses of historical documentary primary and secondary sources and the first-hand accounts of seven key interviewees collected during in-depth interviews. The research interview as a tool for constructing knowledge (Kvale, 1996) implied that the interview is a continuous process of meaning creation.

**Table 1: Data Sources**

Data Collection Methods	Sources/Interviewees
I. New data collected for this research: The first-hand accounts of seven key interviewees' interviews	Language activist, nationalist, policy maker, historian, writer and literary critics or litterateur, local native language revivalist, academics, cultural counsellor, etc.
II. Documentary primary sources:	
1. Government documents including educational documents.	1. Archives and databases from National Central Library; Taipei Municipal Library; China Times Data Center; Institute of International Relations at National Cheng-chi University; Institute of Sociology, and Institute of Taiwan History Preparatory Office, Academic Sinica.
2. Newspaper editorials of the period.	

3. Public records.	2. The electronic database of Central News Agency.  3. Archives and database from several committees: the KMT's Central Committee; the Central Headquarters of Democratic Progressive Party (DPP); and the Committee for the Promotion and Propagation of the National Language (CPPNL)
4. Photographs.	
5. Newspaper articles of the period.	
6. Publication of official and unofficial accounts.	
7. Essays, poetry, stories and folklore, episodes, anecdotes.	
8. Chinese historical textbooks	
III. Secondary sources:	
1. Professional and academic journals	1. Archives and databases from National Central Library; Taipei Municipal Library; China Times Data Center; Institute of International Relations at National Cheng-chi University; Institute of Sociology, and Institute of Taiwan History Preparatory Office, Academic Sinica.  2. The electronic database of Central News Agency.  3. Archives and database from several committees: the KMT's Central Committee; the Central Headquarters of Democratic Progressive Party (DPP, i.e. Taiwan's first post-war opposition party founded in 1986); and the Committee for the Promotion and Propagation of the National Language (CPPNL)

As the table 2 indicates, the seven key interviewees who agreed to be interviewed have different backgrounds, in term of their age, gender, ethnicity, position, and residential location. They included the four ethnic categories in Taiwan: the Aborigines, Hakka, Southern-Min, and Taiwan-born Mainlanders. Linguistically and ethnically, one was Mainlander, three were Southern-Mins,

two were Hakkas, and one was Puyuma. Geographically, one was born and grew up in northern Taiwan (Yi-lan city), three in southern Taiwan (Tai-Nan city), two in central Taiwan (Xin-zhu city and Miaoli County) and one in eastern Taiwan (Hua-lian city). Their ages ranged from early fifties to late sixties. There was one female and six were males. All of them were either bilingual or multilingual.

**Table 2: Profiles of Seven Key Interviewees**

Name*	Gender	Birth Place	Ethnicity	Language speaking	Experiences	Current position	Length of interview
IP1	Male	Southern Taiwan	SMP	M/E/F/SM/J	Policy maker and Government official	Academic and Cultural counsellor	1hr 45' 48"
IW2	Male	Southern Taiwan	SMP	M/E/SM	Local language activist, Taiwanese nationalist and Professor	Professor and Linguist	2hrs 5' 41"
IF3	Male	Central Northern Taiwan	Hakka	M/E/SM/H	Policy maker, Government official and Professor	Academic and Professor	2hrs 15' 20"
IC4	Male	Central Northern Taiwan	Hakka	M/H/E	Local language revivalist and Historian and Literary critic	Historian and Literary critic	1hr 11' 40"
IM5	Male	Southern Taiwan	SMP	M/SM/E	Historian and Litterateur	Litterateur and Professor	1hr 57' 40"
IS6	Male	Eastern Taiwan	Aborigine (Puyuma)	M/E/P	Policy maker and Ethnic language revivalist	Professor and Linguist	1hr 59' 01"
IT7	Female	Northern Taiwan	ML	M/E/H	Writer and Literary critic	Writer and Literary critic	1hr 46' 19"

\* Pseudonyms used for seven key interviewees to ensure confidentiality

ML= Mainlander; SMP= Southern Min People;

M= Mandarin; SM= Southern Min; P= Puyuma; H= Hakka; E= English; F= French; J= Japanese

All interviews were recorded and fully transcribed. After the first occasion, the interviewees were sent “their text” and asked to comment upon and clarify certain issues (respondent validation). The interviews followed a semi-structured interview guide which was based on the concepts and relationships, analysed from the prior literature review. Most of the questions in this semi-structured interview had some prompts to enable the interviewer to clarify topics or questions and probes to enable the interviewer to ask interviewees to extend, elaborate, add to, provide details for, or clarify or qualify their response, and new questions that emerge in the course of interview can be added to or even replace the pre-established ones.

The researcher analysed the original data, which were mainly spoken in Mandarin language. All the data useful to answer research questions needed to be organised and translated into English when analysing and writing the results. That is, the researcher did the analysis and then translated into English the parts, which are quoted. Ethical questions related to issues such as informed consent, participant anonymity, the safe storage of data were duly considered and all the data are disclosed here by permission.

Concerning the process of data analysis, the researcher tried hard to “make sense” of the data and had a tolerance for tentativeness of interpretation until the entire analysis was completed. That is, the researcher endeavoured to get herself involved in rich engagement with the documents, transcripts, and texts that made up her raw data. After getting a sense of a whole interview, the researcher went through the data line by line, underlining and circling parts of the text in order to identify topics, concepts.

For example, the transcripts were read several times to gain a sense of key interviewees’ situations, mental process, beliefs, and actions, and the context they described. Analysis both within and between transcripts led to generation and exploration of relevant topics, concepts, themes by moving from raw data to meaningful understanding. The researcher also reviewed the field note-taking to get key interviewees’ holistic perspectives of their lived experiences and their opinions. Furthermore, the researcher looked to see whether certain words/concepts are associated with a particular range of non-verbal cues or emotive states. She also looked to see if there was a connection between the use of particular metaphors and non-verbal cues. Additionally, the researcher often returned to the research questions to question how data were connected and which issues were developing. At this point, meaningful understanding and variations began to emerge, and the researcher kept impressions of them, and

eventually the major themes emerged and served as the framework for reporting the findings and organizing the reports. Eventually, the researcher could confidently say that the analysis made sense. Although the process was tedious and time-consuming, it was also a “creative process which the researcher attempts to give readers a feeling of walking in the interviewees’ shoes” (Patton, 1990, p. 406), and seeing things from their points of view.

## **2 Constructing the Ideology of Chinese Monocultural Identity after 1945**

For the KMT government, language education was a highly political agenda after it took over Taiwan from Japan, and the promotion of a Mandarin-only movement was crucial to a project of re-socialisation, i.e., a deliberate attempt to change identifications and allegiances after the end of colonisation. There were many regulations and approaches to the promotion of Mandarin by the Taiwan Provincial Government and the Provincial Department of Education throughout the period 1945-1969. The following account is based on an analysis of documents and interviews with a group of people who had grown up at the time of the changes; for more details of methods, see below.

### **2.1 De-Japanisation and Sanitisation**

As mentioned earlier, prior to 1945, the official (national) and “high” language in Taiwan had been Japanese, while the majority “low” languages used in native Taiwanese society were the “Taiwanese” dialects (Southern-Min) and the Austronesian aboriginal languages. In contrast, the national language of China from 1911 had been Mandarin, a language akin to the Beijing dialect that most Taiwanese people did not speak. Therefore, the issue of sinicizing the native Taiwanese by the introduction of Mandarin became a major priority for the KMT ruling government who realized that they had to rely heavily on institutional forces, if they wanted to control and to achieve the desired result. Institutions such as mass education and mass media were central to such a social engineering project and language education and the intended creation of monolingualism was central in the KMT government’s cultural sanitisation. Table 3 reveals how systematic regulations to promote a dominant ideology were announced to achieve the goal of linguistic unity.

**Table 3: Extracts from Regulations for the promotion of the national language in school education from 1945 to 1969 (emphasis added)**

Events	Date	Source
1 “Taiwan Provincial Committee for the Promotion and Propagation of the National Language is formally established and national language education promotion of CPPNL must be enacted effectively.”	April 2, 1946	Education Department of the Provisional Provincial Government
2 “A special program must be adopted to spread Mandarin among the aboriginal people of the mountain tribes,... school teachers have to be established to coordinate the work of Mandarin promotion. Small libraries of books written in the phonetic alphabet must be begun in each primary school”	1956	Taiwan Provincial Government Press, 1957, Spring Volume 50
3 “All communication in the schools should use Mandarin as much as possible, and avoid dialect speaking. If students do break the regulation, they must be punished in various degrees”	May 30, 1956	Taiwan Provincial Government Press, 1966, Summer Volume 2
4 “All teacher training schools and colleges in Taiwan must initiate periodic Mandarin proficiency testing for all their students and add a required examination in Mandarin, which must be passed prior to graduation”	Beginning in 1958	Taiwan Provincial Department of Education
5 “All official institution and schools must use Mandarin during the offices/school time”	Sept. 12, 1964	The Taiwan Provincial Government

We may observe the repeated use of “have to” or “must” in the messages of these regulations and their purpose is salient: to deliberately prepare the Taiwanese people to buy into the need to support the new KMT government and to work towards the goal of language unity and a thriving new nation-state, i.e., one nation, one language and one linguistic identity.

One of the people interviewed, interviewee IP1 (a male, Southern-Min, policy maker, academic and cultural counsellor) expressed his opinion as follows:

Also, for the KMT government, school education played a decisive role in the construction, legitimacy, and imposition of an official language in the modern state.

His words show how aware he is of the cultural politics of national identity and the ideology of language education, an ideology which **Grillo** (1989) describes in theoretical terms where the use of an official language forms the essential tenet of the nation-state model of language planning (see also Kedourie, 1961/1993; Tollefson, 1995).

Concerning the issue of punishment for using dialect (mother tongue) in the third regulation of Table 1, interviewees IW2 (a male, Southern-Min, a famous Taiwanese nationalist, linguist, professor and local language activist), IM5 (a male, Southern-Min, litterateur, historian, professor and literary critic), and IS6 (a male, Aborigine, policy maker, ethnic language revivalist and professor) all have a common memory of such experiences and similar opinions:

Dialect used in my elementary school was strongly prohibited and was punished with a fine of one penny paid to the teacher. But for me, Southern-Min is a language that my ancestor left to me.... (IW2)

I had the humiliating experience of hanging a “dog card” (small board) around my neck for not speaking Mandarin.... (IM5)

We were not allowed to speak Puyuma at school or we had to be punished by having to clean the toilets, be beaten, or have the national language “card” hung on us.... We just accepted it, but I do worry about the loss of aboriginal language from generation to generation. (IS6)

Seen in this light, this is a colonialist-coloured language ideology because of its not allowing non-Mainlander students their human right to develop their dialects (or native languages) to full native mastery, to be proud of them, to be able to use their mother tongue for all purposes, both unofficial and official, and

to have their identification accepted by others. **Woodard** and his colleagues (1994) argue similarly that in colonial linguistic ideology, “language has always been the companion of empire” which entails control of speakers and their vernaculars and **Bourdieu’s** (1991) assertion that in the modern state, the educational system plays a decisive role in the construction, legitimacy, and imposition of an official language is well illustrated by what happened in Taiwan.

## 2.2 Mandarin-only Language Movement and Complete Chinese Monocultural Identity Ideology

From 1970 to 1986, the period of complete Chinese monoculturalism ideology, the KMT’s language ideology was realized through several further approaches (The MOE Bulletin; Hung, 1992, p. 48), as summarized in Table 4:

**Table 4: Extracts from Regulations of National Language Promotion from 1970 to 1986 (emphasis added)**

Events	Date	Source
1 “Non-Mandarin programmes should be decreased and that the southern Min programmes, which included soap operas, puppet shows, traditional Taiwanese operas, and commercials, should take up less than one hour per day on each channel of the three television companies (Taiwan TV, China TV, and China Station).”	December 1, 1972	The Bureau of Culture of the Ministry of Education
2 “The ratio of the use of the national language by radio broadcasts must not be less than 55%; for television, this ratio must not less than 70%. The use of dialects should decrease year by year. Those surviving traditional Taiwanese operas and puppet shows on television were forced to use Mandarin in the early 1970s.” (in article 20 of the Law of Radio Broadcasting and Television Programming (RBTP Law) which was approved by the Legislative Yuan.)	January 8, 1976	The Culture Bureau of the MOE, The Executive Yuan.
3 “To increase linguistic unity and to enhance the country’s unity and stability, draft of the Law of Language and orthography should be established as a national policy and be approved.”	October 1, 1985	The Ministry of Education

Again, there is intentional use of “should” to naturalise the ideological conviction, i.e., the goal of building Chinese monoculturalism through the national language. The issues presented include the association of the national language with high language/culture; the extension of linguistic unity; and the dominance of state power.

Interviewees recalled what this meant in practice:

The names of students who spoke dialect would be written down and reported to the teachers.... So, it was natural for me and my classmates that only at home did we have a chance to speak Southern-Min with our family or neighbours. (Interviewee IP1: a male, Southern-Min, policy maker, academic and cultural counsellor).

In addition to the punishment, students of indigenous groups were indoctrinated by the educational system with the idea that mother tongues were inelegant and that it was a shame to speak such dialects.... (Interviewee IM5: a male, Southern-Min, litterateur, historian, professor and literary critic).

The KMT government’s dominant linguistic attitude, derived from preference and prejudice, was allied with powerful protective sentiments for its own group, and thus a linguistic hierarchy of H/L language was established. Only Mandarin was dignified with the title of “language”, all non- Mandarin native languages in Taiwan, including Southern-Min, Hakka, and Austronesian aboriginal languages, were relegated to “dialects”, a marker of backwardness in elegance, crudeness, illiteracy, rurality, and low socio-economic status, which were only used at home, and was only spoken in the country-side and with the family and the neighbours. Thus, all non-Mandarin native languages were low languages according to the **Ferguson’s** (1959/1996) and **Fishman** (1967) theory of diglossia.

In summary, the promotion of Mandarin as the national language by the KMT established a linguistic hierarchy and ideology. The linguistic hierarchy corresponded to the ethnic one in the political arena, i.e., the Mainlander as dominant, and all the native Taiwanese as dominated.

### 3 Constructing the Ideology of Taiwanese Monocultural Identity after 1987

In a later but similar development on the part of the native Taiwanese oppositionists, the second half of the 1980s saw the rapid development of Taiwanese monoculturalism and monolingualism with a distinct Taiwanese ethnic colour.

#### 3.1 De- Sinicization and Taiwanization in Taiwan

In the process of “de-Sinicizing”, Taiwanese opposition activists developed the revival of native languages in the early 1980s, and there were many linguistic struggles and some debates about improving the status of native languages. Language educational struggles took place between the KMT government and the cultural intellectuals or opposition activists during the early 1980s (from 1984 to 1986) and it is clear that the intensity of the activity drew attention to the importance of both written and TV media, as summarized in Table 5:

**Table 5: Linguistic struggles and disputes between the KMT government and the oppositionist groups during the early 1980s**

	Events/Sources	Presenter	Date	Response from the KMT government
1	Draft of the Law of Language and Orthography, one article of which stated that only the national language could be used in a public meeting, official business and conversation in public domains. (China Times, October 26, 1995)	Ministry of Education (MOE)	October 25, 1985	Under the protest from the oppositionists and strong pressure, the Executive Yuan stopped establishing the Law of Language and Orthography on December 19, 1985
2	The program of news segment in Southern Min on three national TV channels. ( <i>Independent Evening Times</i> , November 02, 1987)	The DPP legislators	June 19, 1986	November 2, 1987, a twenty-minute Southern-Min news segment was added to the-existing short Southern-Min programs broadcast everyday

	Events/Sources	Presenter	Date	Response from the KMT government
3	Southern Min, Mandarin, and Hakka should be promoted as national communication languages. ( <i>Taiwan Documentary</i> , Vol. 46, No 3, September 30, 1995, p. 148)	The Opposition Activists	September 7, 1986	Rejection from the KMT government due to the Mandarin-only language policy

Sources: Adapted from Taiwan Documentary (1995); Huang (1995, 55-73); as well as Taiwan Historical Chronicle, Vol. III (1979-1988), (Li & Xue, 2001)

Interviewee IT7 (female, Mainlander, writer and literary critic) comments as follows:

For Taiwanese opposition activists to revive the native languages without using any Mandarin is crucial to the independence of the island. ...They often say: "Are students wrong if they speak dialects?" It's natural that Taiwanese people should speak Taiwanese ...But I think : Isn't this a plot to divide the country by creating the tension in the linguistic issue...?

However, despite this kind of liberal attitude, Taiwanese oppositionist intellectuals affirmed their linguistic distinctiveness and refused to use the "orthodox Chinese language" (Mandarin) in order to defend Taiwan's cultural autonomy and efforts to revive native languages have formed a significant part of "Taiwanese monoculturalism". The native language was believed to be essential to the formation of a new nation and the independence of the island. In other words, the belief that having one's own language is crucial for ethnicity was used by the Taiwanese oppositionists, and culture and language were identified with a nation-to-be and a "potential" state. Again, as with the monocultural ideology of the Mainlanders, **Grillo's** (1989) theory that the nation-state model of language planning becomes an essential tenet of the modern state system throws light on this point. Thus, it is apparent that there is a struggle over a significantly asymmetric "centre-periphery" relationship. Many

emotional discourses were used, such as “Are students wrong if they speak dialects?” “Taiwanese people should speak Taiwanese” “Taiwanese as Taiwanese, not Chinese Taiwanese” “Speak Southern-Min but not Mandarin” etc. and this well illustrates **Kedourie’s** (1961/1993) argument that language, as the cultural politics of linguistic distinctiveness, is a central mechanism in nationalist politics.

### 3.2 Complete Taiwanese Monoculturalism Ideology

In constructing a national language – “Taiwanizing” the ethnic symbol of language as testimony to a Taiwanese nation – in the second half of the 1980s (from 1987 to 1990), many different kinds of activities, movements, conferences, curriculum reforms, and teaching about native language education were promoted. Table 6 summarizes the main facts:

**Table 6: Linguistic struggles and disputes between the KMT government and the oppositionist groups in the second half of the 1980s**

	Events/Sources	Presenter	Date	Response from the KMT government
1	Hakka & Southern Min programs should be included in national TV channels	Provincial Representatives	March 28, 1987	According to Article 20 of the RBTP Law, this is not allowed by the Government Information Office (hereafter the GIO)
2	Aboriginal programs on TV channels should be established	The Aboriginal Legislators	May 14, 1987	
3	Plurilingual education and the use of Southern Min should be implemented. ( <i>Legislative Yuan Bulletin</i> , Vol. 76, 1987: 29-30)	Provincial Representatives	June 22, 1987	Rejection from the government on June 25, 1987: “we are a mono-lingual country, and it is inappropriate to implement plurilingual education.”

	Events/Sources	Presenter	Date	Response from the KMT government
4	The suppression and time limitation of the use of local native languages on the radio and TV programs in Article 20 of the RBTP Law should be deleted	Provincial Representatives	June 22, 1987	The KMT abolished the censorship of the use of local native languages on Television in May 18, 1990. ( <i>Taiwan Documentary</i> , Vol. 46, No. 3, September 30, 1995: 149)
5	Elementary and junior high schools should not punish students speaking dialects. ( <i>Taiwan Documentary</i> , Vol. 46, No 3, September 30, 1995: 148)	Taiwan Provincial government's Department of Education	August 20, 1987	
6	The First Academic Conference on the Issues of Native Language Education was held in the Academia Sinica, Taipei. ( <i>Taiwan Documentary</i> , Vol. 46, No. 3, September 30, 1995: 148)	The seven DPP (oppositionist groups) governed counties.	June 23, 1990	The purpose of this conference was to combine the wisdom and efforts of linguists in guiding the compilation of native language curriculum, textbooks instruction.
7	Seven Democratic Progressive Party (DPP) - controlled counties and districts conducted a program of teaching local languages, i.e., plurilingual education in the elementary and junior high schools ( <i>Legislative Yuan Bulletin</i> , Vol. 80, 1991: 41)	The DPP-controlled counties and districts	At the end of 1990	The KMT-controlled city or county councils usually cut plurilingual education budgets

Sources: Adapted from Hakka Issue (1987, 1990); Taiwan Documentary (1995); Huang (1995); as well as Taiwan Historical Chronicle (Li & Xue, 2001), Vol. III (1979-1988) and Vol. IV (1989-1994).

Again, in the brief period from 1987 to 1990 covered by Table 5, it is obvious that the politics of language education in Taiwan is just as complicated as many others in the world. On the one hand, the opposition activist intellectuals struggled for the recognition of Taiwanese local languages as national and official languages equal in status to Mandarin. On the other hand, they refused Mandarin, a language from the Chinese mainland considered by many opposition activists or intellectuals as the language of colonizers.

The goals of the native language movement were: (1) to revive the use of all native languages; (2) to develop local identity i.e., a Taiwanese monoculturalism ideology; (3) to upgrade the status of all native languages, i.e., to reject the official definition of Chinese local languages (i.e., the Southern-Min and the Hakka and Austronesian aboriginal languages) as a “dialect”; (4) to promote plurilingual education (Hung, 1992). One of the interviewees (a male, Aborigine, policy maker, ethnic language revivalist and professor) articulated the view of the native-language movement as follows:

People should recognize that we (the aborigines) are the “authentic” native inhabitants of the island...You know that losing our ethnic group’s language is like committing cultural suicide..... Due to this kind of sense of crisis, I strongly supported the implementation of mother tongue education or even plurilingual education in schools. (Interviewee IS6)

For IS6, mother tongue is crucial to maintaining identity and it is important for the aborigines to maintain their language and culture because “losing our ethnic group’s language is like committing cultural suicide”. **Fishman** (1967) argued that language is a very powerful ethnic symbol, which retains a sentimental and emotional grip on the group is well illustrated here (see also Edwards, 1994; Baker, 1996).

Concerning the third goal of Taiwanese native language movement, i.e. the status of all native languages, another interviewee (a major Southern-Min revivalist) spoke as follows:

If Taiwan decides to change itself into an independent country, the native language revival becomes indispensable... it is wrong that we treat Southern-Min as a dialect, not as a language.. I argue that Southern-Min is a “better” language than Mandarin is. (Interviewee IW2).

IW2 further argues that “Southern-Min, Hakka, the aboriginal languages and Mandarin are not mutually intelligible, they have their own unique cultural system, so, they are different languages”, and they can be/should be given the same status as the official language of Mandarin and used for identity. This runs counter to the ideological paradigm case of one language per country and one linguistic identity, and the usual promotion of the usage of one official language to homogenize a society and culture (Grillo, 1989). Furthermore, the ideology underlying claims about language embraced by IW2, serves the purpose of demarcating “us” and “them”—“Taiwanese” and “Mainlanders/Chinese”—and of maintaining boundaries through symbolic order (Barth, 1969).

#### 4 Constructing an Intercultural Citizenship Community: Monoculturalism/Monolingualism or Interculturalism?

Responding to the pressure of internal challenges from the oppositionists, the trend to localisation and the growth of the native Taiwanese identity, with one of the goals of the native language movement being to advocate multilingualism, efforts were made during the early 1990s by the KMT to promote native-language education to achieve “Taiwanization” or “localisation”, as can be seen from Table 7. Several linguistic events elevated the status of native language educational issues during 1990s as also summarized here:

**Table 7: Linguistic struggles and disputes between the ruling (KMT) government and the oppositionist groups during the 1990s**

	Events/Sources	Presenter	Date	Response from the KMT government
1	On the Chinese Lunar New Year's Eve, President Lee Deng-hui's talk on TV, a routine congratulatory speech to all the people in Taiwan, was presented in Mandarin, Southern Min, and Hakka symbolically. ( <i>Presidential office news</i> , 1990)	The Presidential office	January 26, 1990	This suggested that Taiwan is a plurilingual and pluri-ethnic society, and President Lee's identification with native (indigenous) languages.
*2	It was declared that all schools should no longer discriminate against dialects.	The MOE	December 22, 1990	

	Events/Sources	Presenter	Date	Response from the KMT government
3	Agreed that article 20 of the RBTP Law violated the language freedom of TV broadcasting should be deleted ( <i>Television Yearbook of the Republic of China</i> , hereafter TYB, 1991: 235)	The legislator groups	June 21, 1991	On July 14, 1993, the Legislative Yuan approved the deletion of time limitation on dialect programs.
4	The Student Society for the Promotion of Taiwanese Language and Literature was established in nine universities. ( <i>Taiwan Documentary</i> , Vol. 46, No3, September 30, 1995: 149)	Students from the Taiwanese Studies Club of nine universities.	May 3, 1992	The intention of this movement was to enhance the status of native Taiwanese languages. Students even requested the members of the Taiwan Association of University Professors to use Taiwanese languages in their instruction under appropriate situations, so the native languages could make their first autonomous step on campus.
*5	A special report, entitled "Native language Education and Homeland Materials" stated native language education materials were compiled and teachers were trained. ( <i>The MOE Bulletin</i> , Vol. 221, 1993: 39-45)	The new Minister of Education of the MOE	March 31, 1993	But native language education, included in regular teaching, should not obstruct the promotion of Mandarin. ('Mother Tongue Education', 1993, article 1 & 4)
6	The new revised Curriculum Standards were approved. Thus native language education was definitely attached to the curriculum of "Homeland culture educational activity". ( <i>The MOE Bulletin</i> , Vol. 224, 1993: 33-34)	The MOE	June 29, 1993	Elementary school students in the third through sixth grades would spend one hour a week learning one of the indigenous (native) languages, i.e. Southern Min, Hakka or an aboriginal language, and other related teaching activities about the homeland culture.

	Events/Sources	Presenter	Date	Response from the KMT government
*7	Mother-tongue education would be made compulsory in elementary school education from the 2001 academic year responding to the pressure of the trend of localisation and the growing of the native Taiwanese identity. ( <i>The MOE Bulletin</i> , Vol. 310, 2000: 43 and Vol. 311, 2000; <i>Central Daily News</i> , September 22, 2000; <i>The China Post</i> , September 22, 2000)	The MOE announced the resolutions of The Educational Re-engineering Promotion Team of the Executive Yuan.	September 21, 2000	In addition to Mandarin, elementary school students in the first through fourth grades would be required to spend one or two hours a week learning one of indigenous (native) languages - Southern Min, Hakka, or an aboriginal language. The fifth-and sixth-grade students would have reduced hours in learning their languages (i.e., native mother tongue) while beginning to study English. As for junior high school level, indigenous language classes would become optional according to the school's discretion.
*8	The Proposal of Southern Min as Taiwan's second official language, alongside Mandarin, was presented. ( <i>The Taipei Times</i> , March 10, 2002)	Legislators of Taiwan Solidarity Union (TSU), i.e. one of the opposition parties in Taiwan established on July 24, 2001.	In early 2002	Since more than 75 percent of the population in Taiwan speak or understand Southern Min, there was no reason why Southern Min could not be treated as an official language.

Sources: Adapted from *Television Yearbook of Republic of China* (1991); *Taiwan Documentary* (1995); *The Central Daily News* (2000) ; *The China Post* (2000); *The MOE Bulletin* ( 2000); *Taiwan Historical Chronicle* , Vol. IV (1989-1994), (Li & Xue, 2001); as well as *The Taipei Times* (2002).

Notes: \* indicates linguistic events related to native-language educational issues.

## **Conclusion: The Need for a Further Reform of Language and Ideology**

As mentioned earlier, from the early 1980s, the KMT government faced not only the internal challenges, but also external pressure, that is, the pressure of the economic global context and the marketing of language and education, an emerging global culture in the post-modern world. For example, the declining role of the nation-state is commonly one of the indicators of globalisation, and “the respect for and understanding of others” is desirable and even essential to “the success as individuals and communities”. Thus, in facing the external pressure, “the concept of globalisation and inter-dependence” (Harvey, 1989, p. 53) are at the forefront of thinking by Taiwan government.

Further, there was a growing recognition of apparent inadequacies of the national language teaching curricula and the Mandarin-only monolingual movement toward an internationally minded framework, that is, “an international citizenship community” (Byram, 2008) in Taiwan (cf. item 9 of Table 5 for English education). The significance of education was discussed by one interviewee (a male, Hakka, policy maker, government official and professor) as follows:

Education has an important role in preparing future citizens to live and work successfully within a globalised world. Language education practices need to catch up and mirror the post-modern world, and not the world of years gone by.... In Taiwan, though Taiwanese native languages have a widely recognised importance as ethnic symbol, they have been seen as the impediment to national unification...and to cope with the new challenges that accompany internationalisation and globalisation, Taiwanese society needs to recognise the perspectives of needs-driven and pragmatics-driven language policy, and to support that every citizen has to acquire enough English proficiency to become a qualified citizen in the coming of the global village. (Interviewee IF3)

Thus, the hegemony of the Mandarin-only promotion as an instrument to maintain and strengthen the political boundaries of the KMT government and the ideology of the ability to use the national language of Mandarin as a primary criterion of a Chinese monolingual citizenship community have been increasingly challenged.

Multilingualism has been promoted by UNESCO as a response to diversity, because it embodies the ideal of respect for diversity with concerns for societal cohesion (Giordan, 2003, p. 2). While multilingualism and multiculturalism promotes the ideas of cultural groups living side-by-side, interculturalism entails another level of cultural understanding, and it is argued a more valid response to the challenge posed by human diversity, interdependence and communication in a changing world.

In contrast to the ideologies which have succeeded each other in Taiwan, notions of global citizenship extend beyond those former colonial ideals and narrow boundaries reflected in the ideology of national language education. In addition, it has been argued that “one of the core virtues of global citizenship is a commitment to protect and uphold the cultural diversity of the global commonwealth”. This necessitates “the rejection of hegemonic or ethnocentric discourse identifying a circumscribed set of values as being universal” (Guilherme, 2007, cited from Rivers, 2013, p. 79). Besides, according to **Byram** (2008), to act interculturally is to bring into a relationship two different cultures, and world (global) citizenship education has the positive notion of “action in the world” as one of its fundamental purposes and outcomes (Byram, 2008). Thus, Intercultural Citizenship education would mean that people would be encouraged to act together with others (of other cultures in the same or another country) in the intercultural citizenship community of one country and beyond, in other countries and other languages (Byram, 2008).

Hence, as stated above, in addition to the main theme of the study—tracing the ideology of mono-cultural identity—there is a sub-theme concerning the tension in linguistic identity in education between these two above-mentioned major ethnic groups in Taiwan: the majority “native Taiwanese” or “non-Mainlanders”, and the minority “Chinese” or “Mainlanders.” For it is still today an ongoing phenomenon and remains a complex issue. But, in facing a more globalised and internationalised world, a pluri-lingual and pluri-ethnic community like Taiwan needs to accept the diversity and change and shift from the dominant monolingual paradigm to “an intercultural citizenship one in which the focus is on the appreciation of multiple heritage and cultures” (Byram, 2008, p. 162).

Seen in this light, could the next goal of Taiwanese native language education movements be to promote interculturalism under this imaginary of Taiwan as a society of plural ethnic identities?

**References:**

- BAKER, C. 1996. *Foundations of bilingual education and bilingualism*. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters Ltd., 1996. 464 p. ISBN 978-1853593581.
- BARTH, F. (ed.) 1969. *Ethnic groups and boundaries: The social organization of cultural difference*. London: George Allen & Unwin, 1969. 153 p. ISBN 978-0-88133-979-6.
- BOURDIEU, P. 1991. *Language and symbolic power*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1991. 302 p. ISBN 0 7456 0097 2.
- BYRAM, M. 1997. *Teaching and assessing intercultural communicative competence*. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters, 1997. 124 p. ISBN 9781853593772.
- BYRAM, M. 2008. *From foreign language education to education for intercultural citizenship*. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters, 2008. 288 p. ISBN 9781847690784.
- CHENG, W. 1991. The postwar takeover and reconstruction of the administrative system in Taiwan: An analysis focusing on Taiwan Provincial Administrative Executive Office. In *Thought and Words*. Vol 29, no. 4, ISSN 02588412, 217-259.
- Demographics of Taiwan*. 2017. [online]. Wikipedia. [Accessed on 30.11.2017] Available at: <[https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Demographics\\_of\\_Taiwan](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Demographics_of_Taiwan)>.
- EDWARDS, J. 1994. Language and Identities. In *Multilingualism*. London: Routledge, 1994. 276 p. ISBN 9780415120111.
- FERGUSON, C. A. 1959/1996. Diglossia. (Word. 15, 2, pp. 325-340) Reprinted in HUEBNER, T. (ed.) *Socio-linguistic perspectives, papers on language in society 1959-1994* (pp. 25-40). Oxford studies in sociolinguistics. New York and Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1996. ISBN 978-0195092912.
- GATE, H. 1981. Social class and ethnicity. In AHERN, E.M. and GATES, H. (eds.). 1981. *The anthropology of Taiwanese society*. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press. 505 p. ISBN 978-0804710435.
- GIORDAN, H. 2003. Multicultural and multi-ethnic societies. In UNESCO MOST Discussion Paper series no.1. [online] January 2005. Available at: <http://www.unesco.org/giordeng.htm>.
- GOLD, T. 1986. *State and society in Taiwan miracle*. New York: M. E. Sharpe, 1986. 176 p. ISBN 978-0873323994.
- GRILLO, R. D. 1989. *Dominant language: Language and hierarchy in Britain and France*. New York: Cambridge University Press, 1989. ISBN 9780521365406.

- GUILHERME, M. 2002. *Critical Citizens for an Intercultural world: Foreign Language Education as cultural politics*. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters, 2002. 312 p. ISBN 9781853596094.
- HARVEY, D. 1989. *The condition of postmodernity*. Oxford: Blackwell, 1989. ISBN 9780631162926.
- HUANG, S. F. 1995. *Language, society and ethnic ideology: The studies of sociolinguistics in Taiwan* (2nd ed.) (in Chinese). Taipei: Crane.
- HUNG, W. J. 1992. *Taiwan's language crisis* (in Chinese). Taipei: Chien Wei, 1992.
- KEDOURIE, E. 1961/1993. *Nationalism*. London: Hutchinson. ISBN 978-0-631-18885-8.
- KVALE, S. 1996. *Interviews: An introduction to qualitative research interviewing*. London: Sage Publication, 1996. 344 p. ISBN 978-0803958197.
- LI, Y. C. – XUE, H. Y. (eds.). 2001. *Taiwan historical Chronicle*. (3rd ed.) (in Chinese). Taipei: Institute for National Policy Research.
- MCCULLOCH, G. – RICHARDSON, W. 2000. *Historical research in educational settings*. Buckingham: Open University Press, 2000. 160 p. ISBN 978-0335202546.
- PATTON, M. Q. 1990. *Qualitative evaluation and research methods*. Newbury Park: Sage Publications, 1990. 536 p. ISBN 978-0803937796.
- RIVERS, D. J. 2013. Institutionalized Native-Speakerism: Voices of Dissent and Acts of Resistance. In HOUGHTON, S.A. and RIVERS, D.J. (eds.) 2013. *Native-Speakerism in Japan: Intergroup Dynamics in Foreign Language Education*. Bristol: Multilingual Matters, 296 p. ISBN 9781847698681.
- TOLLEFSON, J. W. 1995. *Power and inequality education*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1995. 222 p. ISBN 978-0521468077.
- TSAO, F. F. 1999. The language planning situation in Taiwan. In *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development*, Vol. 20, ISSN 1747-7557, pp. 328-375.
- WOOLARD, K. A. – SCHIEFFELIN, B. B. – KROSKRITY, P. V. 1994. Language Ideology: Practice and theory. In *Annual Review of Anthropology*, Vol. 23, ISSN 0084-6570, pp. 55-82.
- YOUNG, R. L. – HUANG, S. F. – OCHOA, A. – KUHLMAN, N. 1992. Language attitudes in Taiwan. In *International Journal of the Sociology of Language*, Vol. 98, ISSN 0165-2516, pp. 5-14.