

Hsin Jung Yeh

22322511

Diversity, Equity and Inclusion: Are
Linguistic Rights Respected in Taiwan?

Trinity College Dublin

MPhil in Applied Intercultural Communications

2023

Supervised by Dr Yairen Jerez Columbié

I declare that this dissertation has not been submitted as an exercise for a degree at this or any other university and that it is entirely my own work.

I agree that the Library may lend or copy this dissertation on request.

Signed:

Hsin Jung Yeh

Date: 05/07/2023

Abstract

Diversity, Equity and inclusion: Are linguistic rights respected in Taiwan?

Hsin Jung Yeh

The objective of this dissertation is to examine how Taiwanese authorities protect linguistic rights and embody the diversity, equity and inclusion (DEI) perspectives in the policy documents *Bilingual 2030* (National Development Council et al., 2021) and *National languages development plan 2022-2027* (Ministry of Culture et al., 2022). As language planning and policy in Taiwan shift according to different types of political regimes and ideologies, linguistic rights do not always fall within the scope of human rights, and some groups are excluded. Therefore, it is important to study whether linguistic rights are supported in the current language planning and policy. Employing a qualitative research approach, this research firstly reviews the Taiwanese socio-historical context and its ethnolinguistic composition and takes Ruiz's (1984) language planning orientations framework to look at the

transformation of language attitude in Taiwan. This dissertation then comparatively analyses two policy documents and discusses the four domains where the linguistic rights are applied: public services, encouragement measures in the community, education, and technology use and media. The critical discourse analysis is used to explore the similarity and differences between two selected documents, investigating the presence and absence of diversity, equity and inclusion perspectives, as well as identifying what language ideology is presented in the current language policies. This research argued that the language ideology has shifted from language-as-problem to language-as-right and language-as-resource orientation, since the concept of language equality was taken into account in some measures stated in the policies. However, neither of the two policies fully supports linguistic rights from the perspective of DEI.

Acknowledgements

I would like to sincerely thank my supervisor Dr. Yairen Jerez Columbié, for her support, encouragement and consistent assistance. I am glad to work with her and draw inspiration when having her classes and discussing with her. I would also like to thank Dr. Théophile Munyangayo for his great lectures and help. They offered interesting and meaningful courses throughout the school year. My life in Trinity College Dublin and Ireland won't be complete without my wonderful classmates in Applied Intercultural Communications. We are from different countries and cultural backgrounds, spending our lives pursuing our dreams in Ireland. It truly makes our intercultural communications in the class so amazing and unforgettable. Last but not least, I am grateful for having support from my family. Thanks for encouraging me to fly over more than 6000 miles and across 7 time zones to Ireland to finish my study and explore the world. I know that you will always be my best supporters.

One year is neither long nor short. Leaving home for a year is long, but it is not enough to aspire after knowledge and explore the world in a year.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

1. Introduction	1
1.1 Research question.....	1
1.2 Methodology	2
1.3 Justification	2
2. Literature Review	3
3. Methodology.....	6
4. Historical and ethnolinguistic backgrounds with language policy changes.....	9
4.1 <i>Ethnolinguistic composition in Taiwan</i>	10
4.2 <i>Monolingualism between 1945 and 1987</i>	11
4.3 <i>Democratisation, Taiwanisation and globalisation influence on LPP</i>	12
5. Discussion on applying linguistic rights through LPP in Taiwan	13
5.1. <i>Public services</i>	14
5.2 <i>Encouragement measures in the community</i>	16
5.3 <i>Education</i>	17
5.4 <i>Technology use and media</i>	20
6. Conclusion	22
7. Limitations and future research	23
8. Bibliography	24
Appendix 1: Bilingual 2030 policy approaches	32
Appendix 2: National languages development plan 2022-2027 programmes.....	33

Abbreviations

DEI: Diversity, Equity and inclusion

LPP: Language planning and policy

UNESCO: United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization

1. Introduction

There has been a rising awareness in recent years of the importance of linguistic rights in the overall context of human rights. However, inequitable language use has long been at the heart of many conflicts, and they pose a threat to remain so in the absence of a well-established system of language equality (Riagáin, 1998). Before exploring the language equality, it is necessary to explain linguistic rights. Linguistic rights should be considered inalienable human rights, which can be defined at an individual and collective level. At the individual level, everyone identifies their mother tongue positively and is respected by others. One has the right to learn in their mother tongue at basic education level and is allowed to use mother tongue in the public. At the collective level, on the other hand, it refers to the right to establish and maintain their ethnolinguistic identity and access to political affairs of the state. It also implies the governmental financial support in at least culture, education, religion, information and social affairs realms. Restrictions on these rights above can be viewed as an infringement of linguistic rights (Rannut, 2010, pp. 1-2).

Since linguistic struggles exist, a language policy may be a solution to conflicts resulting from language issues. However, it is also believed that the outcome of language policy is highly relevant to nation's building strategy – a monolingual or multilanguage society (Wu, 2021). Taiwan's society is shaped and governed by different powers; consequently, this country has experienced monolingualism and multilingualism. With the different national building strategies, the language planning and policy vary, so the issue of linguistic rights is treated differently as well.

1.1 Research question

This dissertation answers the question from the lens of diversity, equity and inclusion (DEI) perspectives: Whether the current language policies in Taiwan support linguistic rights and embody the DEI framework?

What is DEI? According to Birnbaum (2022), the main purpose of DEI framework is to create fairer outcomes and experiences for underrepresented groups such as providing resources, and gaining support from historically dominant populations for these initiatives, including programmes to eliminate prejudice and increase cultural awareness. In this framework, the term *Equity* deals with removing systemic barriers and biases to

ensure all individuals have equal access and opportunity. *Diversity* is embracing, recognising and valuing differences. *Inclusion* means everyone feels valued, welcomed and respected (Wolbring & Nguyen, 2023).

1.2 Methodology

Taking Taiwan's language policy as a case study, this research reviews the history of language policy and takes Ruiz's (1984) language planning orientations framework to study how language attitude changes in Taiwan, which helps to explain if linguistic rights and DEI perspectives are taken in account in the policy. Two selected language policy documents – *Bilingual 2030* and *National languages development plan 2022-2027* will be scrutinised by means of document analysis in the compare manner. Then, employing critical discourse analysis to identify what language ideology is presented in the current language policy. The analyses on language policy will be discussed in four different areas where the linguistic rights are applied, including technology use and media, education, encouragement measures in the community and public services.

1.3 Justification

Taiwan (also officially titled the Republic of China), whose language policy is a good case study to investigate linguistic rights. First, Taiwan has had a wide diversity of language policies throughout time, according to different types of political regimes from foreign colonial powers to democracy, with the arrival of Dutch in 1624, Japanese Empire in 1895 and eventually the beginning of democratisation in 1987 (Jacobs, 2013). Second, cultural and/or national identity shift reflects language policy making, especially the dispute between de-Sinicization and Taiwanisation¹. Last but not least, Taiwan has been a migrant-receiving country since the Dutch occupation in the sixteenth century until today's globalised population flow (Wang, 2011). Taiwanese population consists of various ethnic groups and permitted foreign residents. Thus, language policy issues are not limited to matters of minority language users, indigenous people and immigrants, all within the state are the consumers of human rights (Thornberry, 1991).

¹ Both localisation and Taiwanisation can interpret the process of transforming China-centred paradigm into Taiwan-centred ideology. Jacobs (2005) supports using Taiwanisation as he points out that localisation may mislead readers into believing Taiwan is a local government in China. Makeham & Hsiao (2005) also states that 'uniqueness of Taiwanese culture, history and society should be interpreted from viewpoints of Taiwanese, and the pursuit of being a distinct nation-state status from political perspectives.' In this research, I use 'Taiwanisation' to highlight Taiwan-centred ideology and particularity of Taiwanese society.

The previous linguistic rights research in Taiwan primarily focused on Japanese colonial generation and post-World War II, along with political reforms and their effects in the late 1980s and early 1990s. Whereas the studies on examining linguistic rights in DEI framework under current language policies are still few. In the following chapters, this research introduces the literature to reveal the significance of linguistic rights, followed by the frameworks and methods applied in the research to meet the research goals. In Chapter 4, there is an informative context and development of language policy in Taiwan. Then, the findings of language policy documents in order to study how government creates public services that are procedurally fair, accessible of high and equal quality for all groups and that promote positive outcomes by respecting linguistic rights will be discussed in Chapter 5 (Johnson & Svara, 2015). This dissertation concludes with an assessment of DEI in today's language planning and policy, along with the research gap and future implications of linguistic rights practices in Taiwan.

2 Literature Review

This chapter reviews some literature to find out what language is, how it works with humans and the society, as well as why the rights of language use is important. It is said that 'in many sociolinguistic studies and policy documents, linguistic rights are increasingly discussed as human rights in the trends of international human rights advocacy over the last decades' (Pupavac, 2012, p. 24).

To explore linguistic rights in a more detailed manner, Kloss (1977) proposed two types of linguistic rights, namely tolerance-oriented rights and promotion-oriented rights. Tolerance-oriented rights reveal the country refrains from interfering in minority groups' efforts to make use of their mother tongues in private fields like religious activities and secular associations. On the contrary, promotion-oriented rights entail the promotion of ethnic languages by state in administrative, legislative and educational institutions (Kloss, 1977, pp. 25-26). It is the reason why many countries provide extensive linguistic rights protection, which suggests the growing international awareness of this right. Unlike religion, language cannot stay in the private domains because collective political institutions need at least one language, inevitably resulting in a privileged language or some languages over others (Morales-Gálvez, 2022). Thus, provisions that protect people against linguistic discrimination appear in nearly one-third of constitutions around the world (Gromacki, 1992, p. 519). I argue along the lines of Morales-Gálvez and Gromacki's

viewpoints that language issue is a public agenda regardless of political regimes, and it may have higher language recognition in a country where linguistic discrimination is prohibited. However, in the Constitution of the Republic of China, language equality is yet to be affirmed. In the Additional Article 10 of the Constitution of the Republic of China (1997): 'The State affirms cultural pluralism and shall actively preserve and foster the development of aboriginal languages and cultures.' The cultural rights fall within the field of human rights, while linguistic rights are not in this scope. In other words, the linguistic rights are deduced from cultural pluralism instead of language equality.

In the increasing linguistic rights research, the common ground is the language-based perspectives that surround topics on individual and group identity, and self-determination in a globalisation world (Peled, 2014). One issue interests researchers is the connections between language, culture and identity. Some scholars agreed that culture is a collection of broad concepts, and that language is a part of culture (Trueba & Zou, 1994). Similarly, Zemliansky and St. Amant (2008) also explained that culture is 'set of attitudes, values, beliefs and behaviours shared by groups or individuals but that differs for every person, and that is passed down from one generation to the next' (p. 663). Therefore, Street (1993) believed that ' "culture" should be a verb as it is an active process of meaning-making.' For sociolinguistic researchers, language usually marks social identity and it becomes a justification for in-group and out-group distinctions (Brubaker, 2003).

Lai's (2011) research discussed the correlation between language and identity markers and conducted a survey on Hong Kong students' language attitudes and cultural identities after the sovereignty of Hong Kong returned to China in 1997. As the language of coloniser and local dialect, English and Cantonese have been used for years in governmental institutions, businesses, education and community. After 1997, Mandarin was introduced into Hong Kong, transforming this city into a trilingual environment – Mandarin, Cantonese and English. This study revealed that more than half of participants identified themselves as Hongkongers, while those considered as Chinese were approximately 15%. For Hongkongers, Cantonese is highly valued as a symbol of Hong Kong identity and culture, as well as a tool to demarcate a cultural boundary that makes Hong Kong unique. In Chinese participants' opinions, Mandarin symbolises national identity and that can maintain solidarity. Cantonese has been the dominant language in Hong Kong over the past decades. This phenomenon shows the cultural choice of citizens,

and the power of culture overshadowed coloniser's language and national language of home country (Leung & Lee, 2006). Lai's research shows that the development of language and culture are inextricably linked. Language is also a verb that actively changes like culture does, along with the user's language attitude and language ideology are converting under different circumstances.

Skutnabb-Kangas (1998) stated 'language becomes a supplementary or alternative means to control, exert power and reproduce existing unequal power relations.' As we can see some ethnic languages have been legalised in some regions and countries, such as Irish in Ireland, Catalan in Catalonia and Hakka language in Taiwan. Dominant languages are highly supported by territorial or national language policies for a long time, allowing them to be used in formal and public domains. Hence, they tend to be associated with greater social mobility and communicative reach. While the minority languages are just the opposite. To make up for the insufficient legal support, legislative recognition and improvement for relevant language services of minority languages are necessary (May, 2015, 2018). Thus, it is undoubted that official language policy plays a significant role in influencing how public views languages. The implementation is important for multilingual development as it takes resource allocation and future language change into consideration (McGroarty, 1996). As Oakes and Peled (2017) suggested the need for a common public language and a concept of intercultural minority language rights for social cohesion. The concept features social cohesion, fairness for all, active policies for linguistic integration and openness to future social changes. These studies deal with the role of official language policy in language-power relationship and potential measures for minority language protection. One notion is similar to DEI perspectives that an inclusive society embraces diversity and fairness where minority languages are respected even if one dominant language is commonly spoken.

Another issue interests researchers is the language ecology. Hornberger (2002) showed that language ecology underpins multilingual language policy, in which language is understood to live and evolve with other languages in an eco-system. It also interacts with socio-political, economic and cultural environment, as well as its possible loss if environmental support is inadequate. It is reported that 42% of languages are at risk of dying out because of economic and or cultural discrimination in most places. Where languages are safer, is often thanks to organised language planning and its use in

education (Cunningham et al., 2006, p. 2). In international law, the Declaration on Rights of Persons Belonging to National or Ethnic Minorities Article 4 (1992) affirms that ‘States shall take measures to create favourable conditions to enable persons belonging to minorities to express their characteristics and to develop their culture, language, religion, traditions and customs.’ Based on this notion, Joel Spring (2000) emphasized the importance of cultural and linguistic rights as a key component in universal rights to education. He focused particularly on the educational position of indigenous peoples whose languages and cultures are almost extinct. In order to defend minority language speakers’ linguistic rights and shed light on reasons of language loss, I have a convergence idea with Ruiz’s (1984), who argued that ‘language is a resource to be managed, developed and conserved, stressing that treating minority languages community is an important source of expertise’ (p. 28). Ruiz’s resource orientation entails the need for formal language policy in a region or country, while I partly disagree with viewpoints of Cunningham et al, since an organised language planning may cause language loss as well, such as language assimilation policy.

The previous research manifests the complexity of language between culture, identity, socio-political contexts and education, just to name a few. Today, linguistic rights are set in the international agenda and codded in international covenants and domestic statutes. It is widely accepted that the government is obligated to take positive measures to promote linguistic rights, and ensure them to actually achieve results (Grin, 2005). In other words, transforming equality under the law into equality in fact (Ferraro, 2018).

3 Methodology

This dissertation mainly relies on qualitative research approaches, most specifically on critical discourse analysis, to discuss the presence or absence of equity, diversity and inclusion perspectives in language policies in Taiwan. I will compare and contrast two policy documents: *Bilingual 2030 (National Development Council et al., 2021)* and *National languages development plan 2022-2027 (Ministry of Culture et al., 2022)* in order to better understand how Taiwanese government realises DEI in different areas through language policies. In addition, language planning will be used as a referential framework to disclose the direct causational relationship between decisions made by those in power and the actual results of programmes (Liddicoat & Baldauf, 2008). Next, employing critical discourse analysis to investigate the role of discursive practice in the

maintenance of the social world, including those social relations that involve unequal relations of power (Jørgensen & Phillips, 2002).

Bilingual 2030 policy aims to boost English proficiency and international competitiveness while it aroused concern and query about its necessity, feasibility, and legitimacy in many circles, since its introduction lacks paying attention to the socio-cultural influences and cultural identity stemming from language shifts. Thus, it is necessary to examine links between the English bilingual policy in non-English speaking countries among policies (Chang, 2022). As bilingualisation policy underscores internationalisation and applies language-as-resources orientation, some people argue that development of English education and national languages may contradict each other and become unbalanced (Song, 2020). On the other hand, *National languages development plan 2022-2027* affirms the government's active responsibility to integrate resources and introduce comprehensive language development strategies regarding the revival and transmission of endangered local languages (Ministry of Culture et al., 2022). Data is derived from official websites of government departments, including the Ministry of Culture and National Development Council. The analysis centres on how linguistic rights are applied in different corners of people's life.

Using documents as data helps the researcher to uncover the insights according to social, economic, political, and cultural influences of the time and place of documents' creation (Gross, 2018). Thus, document analysis is an instrument to investigate the awareness of linguistic rights reflected in language planning and policy at different times in Taiwan. The significance of the documents may be located in the historical circumstances of production and in any possible social functions, interpretations, effects and uses that connected with them (Wharton, 2006). Similarly, Codd (1988) also indicated that an essential task for policy analysis is to examine those effects and reveal the ideological processes which lie behind the production of the text. Thus, it is suggested that the analysis of policy documents could be construed as a type of textual deconstruction. In this dissertation, document analysis unveils the ideology of language policy, and expectations and praxis of language equality in Taiwan.

Through language planning and policy (LPP) activities, we can realise the direction of change envisioned, such as officialization, revival or maintenance (Hornberger, 2006). LPP is a process of ideas, beliefs, regulations and practices intended to achieve a planned

change in language use in communities. This framework encompasses three language management activities – Corpus planning, status planning and acquisition planning (Cooper, 1989; Kaplan & Baldauf, 1997). In Cooper's (1989) definition, status planning means 'deliberate efforts to influence the allocation of functions among a community's language' (p. 99); acquisition planning refers to 'organised efforts to promote the learning of a language' (p. 157). This research applies status planning and acquisition planning to study linguistic rights.

Although the importance of linguistic rights protection is generally admitted and valued, the rights promotion and cultural diversity are often criticised because of the moral-orientated objectives. Despite linguistic rights supporters who justify their claims with economic arguments or other reasons, their motivations are not strong enough to stand the objections (Grin, 2005). In response to the arguments above, this dissertation applied Ruiz's (1984) language planning orientations framework in favour of linguistic rights. It is not only a lens through which we study policy implementation, but also explains exactly how language policy and ideology change in Taiwan. As Ruiz (1984) indicated orientations refer to 'a complex of dispositions toward language and its role, and toward languages and their role in society' (p. 16). It propels the formulation of language problems, development of policies and interpretation of policies for practice (De Jong et al., 2016).

Ruiz (1984) conceptualised his framework as a heuristic approach and described the framework as the foundation of language studies and language policy. He induced language-as-problem, language-as-right and language-as-resource. Language-as-problem advocates multilingualism causes problems and problems resulting from language and language use must be solved. Language-as-right is concerned with protection of human rights and marginalised people. It sees language identification as a fundamental human rights. Language-as-resource considers bi/multilingualism as a resource in language community (Kaveh, 2022). Orientations have something to do with language attitudes in that they create the framework where attitudes are formed: they help to define the scope of permissible language attitudes and give certain attitudes legitimacy. In short, orientations determine what is thinkable about language in society (Hornberger, 2016).

The purpose of critical discourse analysis in this research is to target the similarity and difference between two policy documents and reflect relationships between social

practices and language ideology in the language policy in Taiwan, and what language equality and linguistic rights mean to Taiwanese people as well. As critical discourse analysis explains the connections between linguistic practices, changes of hegemony and ideology, it helps understand the social issues intervened by prevailing ideology and power relationships (Blommaert & Bulcaen, 2000). Fairclough (1992) builds a social theory of discourse and provides a methodological blueprint for critical discourse analysis in practice. He then elaborated on three dimensions to analyse discourse, one of which is discourse-as-social-practice. That is, the ideological impacts and hegemonic processes where discourse is a feature. The hegemony is built through the formation of alliances and the integration of classes and groups. As a result, 'the articulation and rearticulation of orders of discourse is correspondingly one stake in hegemonic struggle' (Fairclough, 1992, p. 93). The way where discourse is being displayed, rewritten and respoken demonstrates the emergence of new discourse orders, struggles over normativity and resistance against regimes of power. Discourse is both constitutive and conditioned; however, it is an unclear power object in contemporary society, and critical discourse analysis seeks to make it more transparent and visible (Blommaert & Bulcaen, 2000, pp. 448-449). The content of discourse aims to find out how the world is ascribed meaning discursively and what social consequences this has (Jørgensen & Phillips, 2002).

Furthermore, if the value of linguistic rights can be explained based on DEI perspectives, it is because that 'LPP under political liberalism should guarantee the equal basic rights and liberties of all citizens, regardless of linguistic identity and language they use' (Bonotti, 2017). On one hand, defining and measuring DEI have implications for society so that it can facilitate smooth functioning and decrease conflicts and discord among diverse individuals (Chaudhry, 2023). On the other hand, there are some clear strategies to claim inequities, namely admitting problems, prioritizing fairness, being more diverse, engaging historically underrepresented populations, and guaranteeing equitable treatment and opportunity (McCandless et al., 2022). As a result, this research takes DEI framework to reveal existing language/ethnic inequality and unbalanced language ecology, shedding light on guaranteed linguistic rights in public fields of each language user.

4 Historical and ethnolinguistic backgrounds with language policy changes

This chapter discusses the evolution of language policies from post-World War II to

present and ethnolinguistic composition in Taiwan. The objective is to show how language policy and social change interact with each other. First, I start with ethnolinguistic composition, and then introduce social backgrounds and relevant language policies at different times in the subsequent subsections.

4.1 Ethnolinguistic composition in Taiwan

Culturally and ethnically speaking, this island is a multi-ethnic society where four main ethnic groups living here: Hoklo, Hakka, the indigenous people, and mainlanders (those who came to Taiwan after Chinese Civil War in 1949). According to Hakka Affairs Council (2021), Hoklo people make up 71.3% of the total population, Hakkas count for 15.7%, mainlanders are 5%, indigenous people have 3%, immigrant residents are nearly 2.4%, and the rest is others. Hoklo, Hakka and mainlanders are classified as Han descendants, who reach about 92% population in total. Concerning the language use, Mandarin Chinese (hereafter Mandarin), Hoklo, Hakka and indigenous languages are main languages spoken in Taiwanese society. Although Hoklo population is much more than other ethnic groups, Mandarin (66.4%) is the lingua franca and Hoklo (31.7%) follows, but only 1.5% population speaks Hakka as the dominant language (Executive Yuan, 2020). Also, the Ministry of Culture (2022) refers to language vitality indicator from United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization (UNESCO), showing statistics that vitality of Hoklo is 'definitely endangered'; Hakka and indigenous languages are 'severely endangered', and the latter is even on the brink of 'critically endangered'. It is believed that local languages² like Hoklo, Hakka and indigenous languages are the victims of 'Mandarin Chinese Only Policy', and the number of their speakers does not match the number of people who are ethnically to be (Huang, 2007). In short, Taiwan is not a monolingual nor a monocultural society, although the co-existence of various ethnic groups enriches the linguistic environment, multilingualism has not always been favoured throughout Taiwanese history (Chen, 2010; Huang, 2001). The past extreme language policy caused trauma and a seemingly monolingual society, and that is the reason why today's government launches various LPP to guarantee multicultural and multilingual development. The history of language policy and ideology shifts will be introduced in the

² I am aware that Hoklo and Hakka do not originate from Taiwan either. However, 'local languages' in this dissertation means Hoklo, Hakka and indigenous languages to stress their longer history in Taiwanese society, in contrast with Mandarin which is brought to Taiwan in 1949.

following sections.

4.2 Monolingualism between 1945 and 1987

Japan, as a colonial government, handed over Taiwan to the Republic of China government in 1945 at the end of World War II, when nationalist party Kuomintang was in power. However, Kuomintang government suffered a Waterloo against the Chinese Communist Party in the civil war in China, forcing it to move to Taiwan island in 1949 (Wu, 2009). In this wave of immigration, the authorities and a great number of Mandarin-speaking people migrated to Taiwan, which significantly and naturally affected Taiwan's language ecology and ensuing language policy (Wu & Lau, 2019). After settling down in Taiwan island, the ruling party initiated an assimilationist language policy, with the aim of achieving dual goals – the elimination of the Japanese culture and establishment of a China-centred ideology (Hsiau, 1997). Mandarin was promoted as national language and local languages were progressively banned from being used (Scott & Tiun, 2007). In 1956, 'Mandarin Chinese Only Policy' was completely put into operation in a more intense way through a series of large-scale approaches. For instance, all civil servants were required to speak Mandarin during the office hours (Hsiau, 1997). In daily life, speaking local languages in either private or public would be punished, and the speakers would be assumed as people from low socioeconomic status. Even in court, Mandarin was the only language that was spoken. Also, using native languages was harshly limited to a very little proportion in mass media and the usage proportion was forced to reduce annually (Ang, 1992; Wu, 2021). Missionary was forbidden to preach in the Romanisation system and any other non-Mandarin languages (Tiun, 2013).

At this moment, language becomes a supplementary instrument to consolidate power, which brings about tremendous negative effects upon language ecology and language attitudes among local languages and their speakers. However, the then authorities still valued English education. In schools, Mandarin was the sole medium of instruction, yet English was the exception. It was not only a foreign language subject in middle schools but also the core subject in the entrance exam. English education was legally allowed and gained more attention, as Taiwan's economy highly depended on export (Tse, 1987).

For ruling party, language unification means cultural and ethnic integration, and native Taiwanese languages were viewed as barriers to social cohesion and establishment

of Chinese nationalism (Ang, 1992). Resulting from the enforcement of 'Mandarin Only Policy' for decades, this assimilationist measure ensures Mandarin's dominant position in almost all domains where local languages last survive, such as community and religion, and Mandarin is spoken by nearly 90% Taiwanese population (Clyne, 1998; Huang, 2000). It is obvious that LPP was based on language-as-problem in this generation, and some ethnic groups' linguistic rights were deprived, triggering off social movements when political climate became more tolerant.

4.3 Democratisation, Taiwanisation and globalisation influence on LPP

Due to international pressure and domestic appeals, the long-imposed martial law was lifted in 1987, propelling progressive yet rapid liberalization and democratisation. This democratisation was accompanied by Taiwanisation movement (Dupré, 2017). Since then, people began to advocate linguistic rights and maintain local languages, with the promotion of ethnic rights and Taiwan-centred ideology (Huang, 2001). The bottom-up pursuit of language equality got responses from the government, who then launched LPPs to save local languages and achieve ethnic equality. This change is best illustrated by the incorporation of linguistic differences into the national education programme. In 2001, vernacular education, such as Hoklo, Hakka and aboriginal languages, was supported by the central government in the form of bilingual education and preservation initiatives (Liao, 2000; Tse, 2000). Also, politicians spoke local languages like Hoklo or Hakka in their speeches, which symbolised freedom and promotion of multilingualism (Hubbs, 2013).

In the name of multilingualism and multiculturalism, the government has started to focus more on Hakka and aboriginal people and their needs, including cultural and language promotion, media policy, identity rights and so on (Wang, 2007). However, these practices are still quite limited to save local languages, as many of them remain uncommonly used in many domains (Chen, 2020). As a result, the *Development of National Languages Act* was introduced, with its basic initiatives to break down the superiority-inferiority differentiation between Mandarin and other languages and realise substantive ethnic equality (Dupré, 2016). The act is a powerful driving force to fulfil linguistic rights and offers top-down ambition to ensure the development of national languages.

In addition to local language education, English has long been taught in schools, but it became more and more popular and highly demanded in the twenty-first century.

Given its status as a global language and first choice in international communication, enhancing public's English ability was the priority for Taiwanese authorities for manpower development and international competitiveness (Chen, 2013). Taiwanese government has launched Mandarin-English bilingualism policy to accelerate the advancement of English nationwide. Since Taiwan has never been a colonial territory of an English-speaking country nor an English-speaking country, this blueprint may be understood as economic manoeuvring and Ruiz's language-as-resource concept (Hsu, 2021). In fact, language-as-resource has multidimensionality since language and language education are viewed as a key source of identity, cultural recognition and assets for individual and community success from political and economic perspectives (De Jong et al., 2016).

Taiwan has been and continues to be the battlefield of linguistic struggles. These are the outcomes of immigration and colonial rule that both pull apart and push together various ethnic groups on the island (Sandel, 2003). Its complicated and bitter historical experience has left the country with this diverse ethnolinguistic heritage (Tsao, 1999). Examining language planning orientations framework, the history of LPP in Taiwan shows the shift from language-as-problem ideology in monolingual policy to language-as-right and language-as-resource in the democratic society. However, English education is a special case throughout the entire LPP, because it is always highly valued no matter in what generation. Driven by political and commercial needs, English overshadows the power consolidation even under 'Mandarin Only Policy', since it was not considered as a problem. As a result, English education policy tends to be associated with language-as-resource orientation.

5 Discussion on applying linguistic rights through LPP in Taiwan

Language provisions are often meant to create social cohesion between cultural groups and they are the principal methods to accommodate linguistic and cultural diversity to build unity (Sacks, 2000). From a decision makers' point of view, language provisions regulate public authorities' decision to promote minority languages being used and the extent to which linguistic rights are recognized within the public domain, or civic realm of the nation-state (May, 2015). The objective of the policy of *Bilingual 2030* (2021) is to ensure that Taiwanese people achieve a basic or good command of English use to meet Taiwan's greatly increasing demands for Mandarin-English bilingual talents in the global supply chain labour market, as well as creating a friendly environment for

international companies and investors. On the other hand, *National languages development plan 2022-2027* (2022) seeks to revive and preserve the endangered local languages and sign language by means of raising people's language awareness and providing supportive measures. The national languages refer to, according to the policy document, sign language and natural languages used by various ethnic groups in Taiwan. In the following sections, I demonstrate the results of my research. In the analyses, there are four areas where linguistic rights are promoted, along with the ideology of language-as-right and language-as-resource orientations practised.

5.1. Public services

One of government's top priorities is to provide various public services to its citizens, hence, the public administration is responsible not only for blaming the social inequalities but also take active, diverse, inclusive and helpful actions to remedy social injustice and build up fairer systems (Gooden, 2015). To fulfil the obligations, *National languages development plan 2022-2027* includes a variety of public services to satisfy every ethnic population's demand in many aspects, whereas the measures stated in the *Bilingual 2030* are a precondition for increasing English proficiency.

The policy document of *National languages development plan 2022-2027* shows that services in multiple languages should be provided by governmental agencies, and the services have to vary according to the attributes and characteristics of the region. Planned measures involve guides in various national languages and other facilities that could meet non-Mandarin speakers' needs in the public places. This gives Mandarin speakers an opportunity to experience different cultures and minority language speakers can also enjoy the linguistic rights and public services that the potential obstacles become possibly lowered.

Another initiative in the same policy is to increase the manpower of local language and sign language personnel in health-care facilities through education and training. It entails much more than other issues and it is critically important since everyone has the right to enjoy fair treatment in health care. In this regard, linguistic rights are regarded as an inalienable fundamental human right, the access to health care without discrimination is a component of social justice as well. Since Mandarin and Hoklo are the top two commonly spoken languages in Taiwan, the government stress the projects on increasing the number of Hakka language speakers in the medical field and the establishment of

friendly healthcare systems for Hakka groups in particular. Even if most Hakka people are familiar with Mandarin, those who speak Hakka as their dominant language can still claim their linguistic rights in public spheres. In fact, this initiative reflects the language-as-right orientation, which defends the right to use one's own language in public field without being discriminated against even as a minority (Córdoba Serrano & Diaz Fouces, 2018). In this dissertation, DEI in health care realm centres on the accessibility of fair opportunity to medical treatments from which everyone can benefit regardless of their first language, ethnicity, or cultural background. As a matter of fact, not only Hakka people are facing the potential inequality in medical services, so are the aboriginal populations. Scholars pointed out that the existing resources and policy propaganda are not sufficient to facilitate the doctor-patient communication and create an unprejudiced healthcare environment (Pan, 2020; Yi Maun & Hsu, 2016). Therefore, the government must take action in training local language speakers and enhancing medical personnel's cultural competence, along with providing multilingual assistance in medical institutions.

Likewise, an inclusive environment cannot be completed without renaming the places and historic sites in local languages, particularly in the regions where indigenous and Hakka populations are dominant. Giving geographical names in minority languages can be interpreted as an implementation in line with DEI framework that manifests the respect for multiculturalism and can also be considered a mark of identity and cultural recognition. Since 1995, indigenous people were allowed to name after themselves in their own mother tongue rather than using Mandarin as other Han populations (Hsu, 2007). Now the geographical names in indigenous languages and Hakka are in progress, enriching the linguistic landscapes and making stronger cultural and historic links between people and territories. As Mandarin remains de facto lingua franca in Taiwan, therefore, the places and streets should be named after in Mandarin to take care of linguistic rights of Mandarin speakers. However, other names in minority languages show the realisation of linguistic rights and inclusiveness in a multicultural sociolinguistic context.

Bilingual 2030 and *National languages development plan 2022-2027* share and differ in building a language testing mechanism to evaluate the LPP and people's language ability. Both indicate the significance of testing mechanism. Thus, the government endeavours to increase the affordability and accessibility of language testing systems to meet people's needs, such as more examination halls and more frequent examinations.

According to official statements from *Bilingual 2030*, the price of English proficiency tests provided by the foreign language institutions may be a financial burden for those who simply want to understand their learning outcomes. As a result, the state offers subsidies to people in disadvantaged situations and develops a more affordable English testing system in cooperation with domestic language education institutions, relieving the financial burden and making English learning available to all. People have the freedom and right to take part in language tests, and the policy ensures allocating resources to underprivileged individuals and creating a favourable environment for everyone who wants to evaluate his/her English proficiency.

Unlike the measures in *Bilingual 2030*, the practices in *National languages development plan 2022-2027* are to improve an officially recognised language testing system and offer incentives to promote the will to learn. Also, the government aims to provide online and physical learning materials, frequent language tests and online test systems to increase the quality of certification. The practice embraces ethnic and language diversity and places every ethnic group in an equal position. However, there is no solution to deal with the potential problems that candidates would have, including having difficulty taking online tests, struggling to pay the fees, getting correct and instant test information and so on.

5.2 Encouragement measures in the community

National languages are losing their vitality except Mandarin. Therefore, even if in the private fields, the government takes positive measures from the perspectives of promotion-oriented rights, rather than staying passively as tolerance-oriented rights entail.

As shown in the *National languages development plan 2022-2027*, local language users are encouraged to speak their mother tongues and engage in language self-learning in the families and communities to raise the awareness of language use in daily life in addition to creating the community where the linguistic landscape is beneficial to local language developments. The initiative stems from the sense of crisis of language shift from local languages to Mandarin in the family due to the long-term 'Mandarin-Only Policy' that severely affected people's language attitudes. As linguist Krauss (1992) considered that languages will extinct if they are no longer being passed down from parents to their children. Consequently, to revivify language vitality and secure language

equality, the exceptional supportive measures must be put into practise as inspiration and upholders for endangered local languages. This could boost local language use in parent-child interactions and enable family and community to become the first places where children learn languages, intensifying the functions of family education in terms of local language transmission. Also, it enriches the language and cultural diversity in communities and establishes a social context in which multiple languages co-exist in harmony, then the younger generations would extend their use of mother tongues from private fields to the public.

In contrast with *National languages development plan 2022-2027*, *Bilingual 2030* utilises different methods to enhance students' English skills and ultimately bring English into their daily life. Unlike *National languages development plan 2022-2027* relies on family education and inclusive environment establishment, bilingualisation policy expects to generalise English language from formal to private fields by means of formal schooling. English supremacy ideology stresses how English skills can help to increase global competitiveness in a Mandarin-speaking nation like Taiwan. However, the policy document does not mention other national languages apart from Mandarin. That is, the bilingualism refers to Mandarin and English in this policy ideology. This dissertation does not deny the significance of English and its role in a multilingual and multicultural society; however, it is exactly because Taiwan endeavours to create an open environment for language development that the government should not intervene in the language used in private domains with top-down measures.

5.3 Education

Formal schooling has long been the venue to carry out LPP, and the authorities tend to invest considerable resources in formal schooling. Therefore, both language policies address the significance of education in terms of language development. It is noted that ideology and attitude affect the policy making. The national strategic purposes of *Bilingual 2030* are shown at the beginning of the policy document, English is seen as a resource, hence the government put its emphasis on higher education rather than basic education. On the other hand, *National languages development plan 2022-2027* looks at the rights to learn one's mother tongue in basic education, building on language-as-right that all national languages spoken in Taiwan should be considered equally.

In *Bilingual 2030*, the government selects some colleges and universities as models

that will be publicly funded and supported by language teaching professionals, but, on the other hand, they are asked to assist other schools in developing bilingualisation. Secondly, schools are expected to coach students to reach a particular level of English proficiency that enables them to understand the knowledge in all-English courses. Also, schools are expected to encourage students to register in a certain number of all-English modules. Conversely, the government merely adopts an encouraging stance in terms of local language acquisition in higher education, according to *National languages development plan 2022-2027*. That is, it is not highly supported as English education is. Instead, the policy centres on basic education and learning in the community. For instance, establishing a learning environment in preschool education where local languages are spoken and used as a medium of instruction, training local languages or sign language instructors in basic education to enhance the number of linguistic professionals and their professionalism, as well as sponsoring teachers to achieve language ability certification. In fact, the practice in basic education and preschool education reflects the fulfilment of linguistic rights at the individual level, namely, a person has the right to learn in their mother tongue at the basic education stage and is allowed to openly use the mother tongue.

DEI studies in higher education arise people's attention to investigate educators' responsibility for realising DEI values on campus. Some scholars explained that 'higher education leaders should be able to embody and display the essential values of DEI framework, and should enable the entire campus communities can articulate the contributions of and the rewards benefited from an inclusive learning and working environment' (Worthington et al., 2014). However, in the blueprint of *Bilingual 2030*, this bilingualisation policy neither satisfy linguistic rights nor embody DEI framework in terms of higher education learning. If English is privileged in schools, it may cause a crowding out effect that other foreign languages and local language learners could be marginalised. It could lead to possible uneven resource distribution and hindrance for students' opportunity to pursue knowledge in different domains. Besides, in the practice of selecting model institutions in bilingualisation policy, teachers and students in different schools are placed in a hierarchy, where the inequality and unbalance substantially exist and people at the bottom of the system are the least to get the resources. Archer (2007) also argued that the formalisation of institutional hierarchy reduces the construction of an

equitable form for student diversity, i.e., a system where all students are equally valued and have access to resources with equal status.

One of the differences between policies in education field is the way of establishing partnerships and who leads the exchange programmes. In *Bilingual 2030*, higher education institutions actively establish international collaboration programmes with schools in English-speaking countries to promote reciprocal bilingual and intercultural exchanges. Indeed, the partnership strategy allows students to have more opportunities to conduct cross-cultural communication and embrace different cultures in the globalised age, yet it may also cause the aforementioned unbalanced resource distribution phenomenon. In the policy document of *National languages development plan 2022-2027*, however, there are no language and cultural exchange projects in schools but in seminars to promote the vitality of minority languages. Since many local languages are on the edge of extinction, the state actively takes part in the promotion of local languages and cultures, along with the value of linguistic rights. Examining through the lens of DEI, the government-led academic exchange activities manifest that the main purpose of governmental behaviours is to eliminate the discrimination against language and culture, taking the notion of promotion-oriented rights to guarantee the advancement of language development. In conclusion, the originator of interschool partnerships is higher education schools with the purpose of learning English with English native speakers, whereas it is at the national level that the government organise seminars to revive local languages.

One similarity is that both policy documents discuss civil servants' language ability, not only to have a demonstration effect but also to improve the quality of public service. *Bilingual 2030* seeks to boost civil servants' English proficiency through a series of language education programmes in the workplace, as the government considers the basic command of English is as essential as technology skills. This initiative could be regarded as the praxis of language-as-resource which enables the authorities to realise policy goals. Likewise, the acquisition planning of Hakka and aboriginal languages in administrative institutions is highlighted in *National languages development plan 2022-2027* as well. People are even required to achieve a certain level of language, especially those who are taking charge of ethnic affairs. Indeed, the similarities between the two policies are the objectives of ameliorating the service quality and cultivating bilingual human resources. Yet they still have different meanings on linguistic rights protection and DEI praxis.

Language-as-resource orientation in *Bilingual 2030* and its application could not only lead to political and economic success, but the practices also protect the linguistic rights of foreign residents in Taiwan to some extent since linguistic rights are seen as universal values that everyone should not be excluded. On the contrary, the protective measures of Hakka and aboriginal languages are based on language-as-resource orientation that makes sure public services can be reached to non-Mandarin speakers and lower the language barriers in public sectors.

Mandarin, sign language and other local languages remain the majority of Taiwanese citizens' languages used in daily life, while the English is still a foreign commodity for Taiwanese even if its instrumental value cannot be underestimated. This is why people argued that the policy of *Bilingual 2030* may be contradictory to the initiatives of *National languages development plan 2022-2027* when *Bilingual 2030* was announced. Some worried that English education would be prioritised over the acquisition of local languages and retard the development of national languages. As a result, it is necessary to acknowledge that 'English is one major and powerful resource in the world, but it can only be complementary to that of other languages in a culturally and linguistically diverse context' (Bamgbo, 2003, p. 429). In other words, an inclusive language environment should be able to accommodate foreign languages and national languages instead of replacing each other.

When discussing application of linguistic rights in education, *National languages development plan 2022-2027* could involve more broadly than that *Bilingual 2030* does. The DEI perspectives on *National languages development plan 2022-2027* are partially accomplished. It seems that the authorities only recognise the value of ethnolinguistic equality and diversity, creating a friendly environment for different ethnic groups. But the language of disabled people and some particular mechanisms to reach an equal outcome are seemingly excluded from the agenda. On the other side, the strategies in *Bilingual 2030* policy cannot completely embody DEI concepts either. Despite the authorities subsidising underprivileged groups in various aspects to make foreign language education more accessible to them, the biggest controversial measure is selecting model examples among higher education schools. This measure disregards the DEI concepts and even results in more possible negative effects.

5.4 Technology use and media

In this regard, both policies highlight teaching and learning through technology and multimedia, optimising multimedia networks for language development, as well as remarking on the government's special obligation to invest financial and human resources in disadvantaged areas. However, there are still differences between the two. *Bilingual 2030* centres on digital learning, while National languages development plan 2022-2027 also looks at the spread of national languages in mass media.

The core values of media in *National languages development plan 2022-2027* are the production and release of various types of mass media, including audio-visual media products, music, broadcast, printed media and other multimedia publications for sign language and local language users, so as to protect their freedom of speech and the right to know, transmitting their cultural identities and languages. As a result, the restriction on local languages in the mass media is one of the impediments that culture and language awareness cannot be spread popularly. If local language or sign language users can approach media and technology to send and receive messages in their own languages, it means their linguistic rights are protected at both individual and collective levels. As their languages and cultures are widely respected and allowed to be learned and circulated in the public spheres, avoiding them from being isolated from exploring cultural diversity and participating in public affairs owing to the lack of media channels. However, in terms of the guarantee in audio-visual media, the document does not mention the time allocation of media channels for different national languages. Seeing through the perspectives of DEI, there should be a deliberately designed mechanism that treats the issue of media broadcast visibility in non-discriminatory approaches, otherwise, the time proportion of media channels in different languages may become unevenly distributed or be monopolised by the dominant language.

In addition to digital learning, *Bilingual 2030* policy sees technology as a bridge to narrow urban-rural disparities. Students from rural areas where the learning resources are not as abundant as in metropolitans can still access online English learning materials given by government and language institutions. In this policy document, however, the authorities only stress the assistance of students struggling with finance, underestimating the importance of special needs of people with disabilities, such as sign language people's needs in digital learning. Not only the equipment but also the teaching methods should be taken into consideration when the learners are sign language users. Auxiliary

techniques are particularly essential in digital learning because of their audio-visual features, including subtitles, sign instructions and other tools that can facilitate sign language communication.

Diversity is not limited to ethnic and linguistic pluralism, but it also includes the multiculturalism between physically healthy people and those with disabilities. Even if technology and media can be shared by everyone no matter a person's background, underprivileged people or minority languages should be offered more resources or even the priority when the technology is the medium of instruction. Since the opportunity to use digital learning system varies from person to person, which does not realise the DEI perspectives. Therefore, the government should be able to guarantee an equitable process to approach digital learning materials and develop a tolerant mechanism so that no one is left behind.

6 Conclusion

Taiwan's complicated historical and international experiences have caused swinging language policy throughout its history. Nowadays, it is believed that LPP in Taiwan has shifted from language-as-problem notion to language-as-right and language-as-resource orientations, trying to recover the language ecology and protect linguistic rights of each local language speaker. That is the reason cultural pluralism and collective ethnicity rights are recognised in the Constitution, resulting in a variety of policies to develop national languages and foreign languages. Indeed, both *Bilingual 2030* and *National languages development plan 2022-2027* reflect multiculturalism and the government's ambition to promote the linguistic rights, however, neither of them completely embodies DEI perspectives. Concerning the linguistic rights protection, it leaves much to be desired.

One objective of *Bilingual 2030* is to attract foreign attention to achieve political and economic goals through comprehensive educational processes, especially in higher education. However, inequality and resource scarcity do exist in higher education, and policy initiatives widen the gap. Even if some special measures and equipment are given to underprivileged people, they cannot deal with the intersectionality that hinders students from becoming bilingual. What's more, the policy document does not describe how English and Mandarin can reinforce each other to truly realise bilingualisation rather than prioritising English. English seems to be placed in a higher position than Mandarin and other national languages and be seen as a pathway to cross-cultural understanding

and internationalisation. Unequal language status narrows the concept of diversity and intensifies the stereotype that all foreign-looking people are English speakers (Linkov & Lu, 2017). The policymakers should bear in mind that bilingualisation policy should not neglect the existence of various languages in Taiwan, and Mandarin-English bilingualism may erase the multilingual reality and deprive non-Mandarin speakers of linguistic rights when implementing bilingualisation education.

National languages development plan 2022-2027 protects linguistic rights and its measures are built upon DEI perspectives, but these measures lay stress on ethnic issues rather than body diversity and sign language. DEI framework does not merely elaborate on prejudice and discrimination against ethnicity, it also examines the broader concepts of human diversity and language equality that linguistic rights should be under protection whatever their forms of communication. Paradoxically, despite facing definite extinction, Hoklo gains less attention and insufficient institutional support than Hakka and indigenous languages since the number of Hoklo speakers far surpasses other language users. In the irregular situation where a large number of Hoklo people but a few speakers exist at the same time, Hoklo revival is a particular issue in Taiwan and it deserves treatment from the perspective of DEI because national languages development practices must be made according to language vitality and language attitude among users instead of relying on number of speakers.

Despite it being challenging to conduct internationalisation and Taiwanisation in the meantime, LPP should be designed and carried out in non-discriminatory methods so that no one's linguistic rights are sacrificed. As English is not the native language in Taiwan, we have to link foreign languages and national languages rather than discuss them respectively in order to create a social context where these languages and their speakers feel welcomed and respected, embodying the real cultural pluralism coded in the Constitution.

7 Limitations and future research

The research covers the analyses of bilingualisation and national languages development, but the research is not without limitations. As this dissertation cannot evaluate the effects of the two policies since they were just put into operation shortly before and are still ongoing. As a result, future research may focus on whether the national languages and English language advance thanks to *National languages*

development plan 2022-2027 and Bilingual 2030. Alternatively, does the LPP of Taiwanisation and internationalisation clash with each other and cause destruction to both sides? Likewise, it is also important to study how the government avoids Mandarin and English supremacy when conducting bilingual policy and bears in mind the living spaces of other national languages in the name of language diversity and ethnic equality as well. This dissertation simply discusses the linguistic rights of Taiwanese citizens; however, it does not explore the linguistic rights of foreign residents dwelling in Taiwan, especially the foreign females of international marriages from Southeast Asia who greatly influence socio-cultural landscapes in Taiwanese society. As Taiwan regards itself is a multicultural and inclusive country, immigrants' linguistic rights should also be under protection and find the balance between immigrants' linguistic rights and their duty to adapt to society.

8 Bibliography

- Additional Articles of the Constitution of the Republic of China. art. X, § 11. 1997. Republic of China.
<https://law.moj.gov.tw/ENG/LawClass/LawAll.aspx?pcode=A0000002>
- Ang, U. J. (1992). *Taiwan yuyan weiji [Language crises in Taiwan]*. Avanguard Publishing House. <https://books.google.ie/books?id=edy6AAAAIAAJ>
- Archer, L. (2007). Diversity, equality and higher education: a critical reflection on the ab/uses of equity discourse within widening participation. *Teaching in Higher Education*, 12(5-6), 635-653. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13562510701595325>
- Bamgbo, A. (2003). A Recurring Decimal: English in Language Policy and Planning. *World Englishes*, 22(4), 419-431.
<https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-971X.2003.00310.x>
- Birnbaum, H. J. (2022). *Interdependent Values Render Diversity Equity and Inclusion Initiatives More Successful* (Publication Number 29170172) [Doctoral dissertation, Northwestern University]. ProQuest Dissertations & Theses A&I. United States -- Illinois.
<https://www.proquest.com/docview/2674326234?pq-origsite=gscholar&fromopenview=true>
- Blommaert, J., & Bulcaen, C. (2000). Critical discourse analysis. *Annual review of Anthropology*, 447-466.
- Bonotti, M. (2017). Political liberalism, linguistic diversity and equal treatment. *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development*, 38(7), 584-594.
<https://doi.org/10.1080/01434632.2016.1192179>

- Brubaker, B. L. (2003). *Language attitudes and identity in Taiwan* [Unpublished master's thesis, University of Pittsburgh]. <http://d-scholarship.pitt.edu/id/eprint/9190>
- Córdoba Serrano, M. S., & Diaz Fouces, O. (2018). Building a Field: Translation Policies and Minority Languages *International Journal of the sociology of language*, 2018(251), 1-17. <https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1515/ijsl-2018-0001>
- Chang, Y. J. (2022). (Re) Imagining Taiwan through "2030 Bilingual Nation": Languages, Identities, and Ideologies. *Taiwan Journal of TESOL*, 19(1), 121-146.
- Chaudhry, S. (2023). Measuring diversity, equity and inclusion: a holistic approach. *Development and Learning in Organizations: An International Journal*, 37(2), 4-6. <https://doi.org/10.1108/DLO-04-2022-0068>
- Chen, A.-h. (2013). An Evaluation on Primary English Education in Taiwan: From the Perspective of Language Policy. *English Language Teaching*, 6(10), 158-165. <http://dx.doi.org/10.5539/elt.v6n10p158>
- Chen, S. C. (2020). Language policy and practice in Taiwan in the early twenty-first century. In *Language Diversity in the Sinophone World* (1 ed., pp. 122-141). Routledge.
- Chen, S. C. (2010). Multilingualism in Taiwan. *International Journal of the sociology of language*, 2010(205), 79-104. <https://doi.org/doi:10.1515/ijsl.2010.040>
- Clyne, M. (1998). Multilingualism. In F. Coulmas (Ed.), *The handbook of sociolinguistics* (pp. 301-314). Blackwell Publishing.
- Codd, J. A. (1988). The construction and deconstruction of educational policy documents. *Journal of education policy*, 3(3), 235-247.
- Cooper, R. L. (1989). *Language planning and social change*. Cambridge university press.
- Cunningham, D., Ingram, D. E., & Sumbuk, K. (2006). *Language diversity in the Pacific: Endangerment and survival* (Vol. 134). Multilingual matters.
- Declaration on the Rights of Persons Belonging to National or Ethnic, Religious and Linguistic Minorities, (1992). <https://www.ohchr.org/en/instruments-mechanisms/instruments/declaration-rights-persons-belonging-national-or-ethnic>
- De Jong, E. J., Li, Z., Zafar, A. M., & Wu, C.-H. (2016). Language policy in multilingual contexts: Revisiting Ruiz's "language-as-resource" orientation. *Bilingual Research Journal*, 39(3-4), 200-212. <https://doi.org/10.1080/15235882.2016.1224988>

- Dupré, J. F. (2016). Legislating language in Taiwan: from equality to development to status quo. *Language Policy*, 15(4), 415-432. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10993-015-9376-9>
- Dupré, J. F. (2017). Culture Politics and Linguistic Recognition in Taiwan. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9781315629490>
- Fairclough, N. (1992). *Discourse and Social Change*. Cambridge, England: Polity Press. <https://elib.tcd.ie/login?url=https://www.proquest.com/books/discourse-social-change/docview/58252805/se-2?accountid=14404>
- Ferraro, G. (2018). *Linguistic Rights of Minorities. A Comparative Analysis of the Existing Instruments for the Protection of the Linguistic Rights of Minorities at International and European Levels* [Unpublished master's thesis, The University of Padua]. <http://hdl.handle.net/20.500.12608/25179>
- Gooden, S. T. (2015). *Race and social equity: A nervous area of government*. Routledge.
- Grin, F. (2005). Linguistic human rights as a source of policy guidelines: A critical assessment. *Journal of Sociolinguistics*, 9(3), 448-460. <https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1360-6441.2005.00300.x>
- Gromacki, J. P. (1992). The protection of language rights in international human rights law: A proposed draft declaration of linguistic rights. *Virginia Journal of International Law*, 32(2), 515-580.
- Gross, J. M. S. (2018). Document Analysis. In *The SAGE Encyclopedia of Educational Research, Measurement, and Evaluation*. SAGE Publications, Inc. <https://doi.org/10.4135/9781506326139>
- Hakka Affairs Council. (2021). *quanguo kejia renkou ji yuyanjichuziliao diaocha yanjiu* [National Hakka Population and Language Basic Data Survey and Research]. New Taipei City: Hakka Affairs Council Retrieved from https://www.hakka.gov.tw/File/Attach/37585/File_96737.pdf
- Hornberger, N. H. (2002). Multilingual language policies and the continua of biliteracy: An ecological approach. *Language Policy*, 1(1), 27-51. <https://doi.org/10.1023/a:1014548611951>
- Hornberger, N. H. (2016). *Honoring Richard Ruiz and his work on language planning and bilingual education* (1 ed.). Multilingual Matters.
- 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. <https://doi.org/10.1080/01434639708666322>
- Hsu, F. (2021). Taiwan's bilingual policy: Signaling in/dependence and settler coloniality. *American Quarterly*, 73(2), 355-361.

- Huang, C. M. (2001). Fashion or compensation: The developments of multicultural education in Taiwan. *Global constructions of multicultural education: Theories and realities*, 115-133.
- Huang, C. (2007). Language Planning for Naming and its Socio-cultural Connotations: A Case Study in Taiwan. *Current Issues in Language Planning*, 8(3), 305-323.
<https://doi.org/10.2167/cilp127.0>
- Huang, S. F. (2000). Language, Identity and Conflict: A Taiwanese Study. *International Journal of the sociology of language*, 2000(143), 139-149.
- Hubbs, E. (2013). Taiwan language-in-education policy: Social, cultural, and practical implications. *Journal of Second Language Acquisition and Teaching*, 20, 76-95.
- Jørgensen, M., & Phillips, L. (2002). Discourse Analysis as Theory and Method. In SAGE Publications Ltd. <https://doi.org/10.4135/9781849208871>
- Jacobs, B. J. (2005). "Taiwanization" in Taiwan's Politics. Palgrave Macmillan.
https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1057/9781403980618_2
- Jacobs, J. B. (2013). Whither Taiwanization? The Colonization, Democratization and Taiwanization of Taiwan. *Japanese Journal of Political Science*, 14(4), 567-586.
<https://doi.org/10.1017/s1468109913000273>
- Johnson, N. J., & Svara, J. H. (2015). *Justice for all: Promoting social equity in public administration*. Routledge.
- Kaplan, R. B., & Baldauf, R. B. (1997). *Language planning from practice to theory* (Vol. 108). Multilingual Matters.
- Kaveh, Y. M. (2022). Re-orienting to language users: humanizing orientations in language planning as praxis. *Language Policy*, 1-23.
- Kloss, H. (1977). *The American Bilingual Tradition*. Newbury House Publishers.
- Krauss, M. (1992). The world's languages in crisis. *Language*, 68(1), 4-10.
- Lai, M. L. (2011). Cultural identity and language attitudes – into the second decade of postcolonial Hong Kong. *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development*, 32(3), 249-264.
<https://doi.org/10.1080/01434632.2010.539692>
- Leung, S. W., & Lee, W. O. (2006). National identity at a crossroads: the struggle between culture, language and politics in Hong Kong. In *Education for Intercultural Citizenship* (pp. 23-46).
<https://doi.org/10.21832/9781853599200-004>
- Liao, C. C. (2000). Changing dominant language use and ethnic equality in Taiwan since 1987. *2000(143)*, 165-182.
<https://doi.org/doi:10.1515/ijsl.2000.143.165>

- Liddicoat, A., & Baldauf, R. B. (2008). *Language planning and policy: Language planning in local contexts*. Multilingual Matters.
- Linkov, V., & Lu, W. L. (2017). I won't speak our language with you: English privilege, English-speaking foreigner stereotype, and language ostracism in Taiwan. *Human Affairs*, 27(1), 22-29. <https://doi.org/doi:10.1515/humaff-2017-0003>
- Makeham, J., & Hsiau, A. C. (2005). *Cultural, Ethnic, and Political Nationalism in Contemporary Taiwan: Bentuhua*. Palgrave Macmillan.
- May, S. (2015). Language rights and language policy: addressing the gap(s) between principles and practices. *Current Issues in Language Planning*, 16(4), 355-359. <https://doi.org/10.1080/14664208.2014.979649>
- May, S. (2018). Surveying language rights: interdisciplinary perspectives. *Journal of the Royal Society of New Zealand*, 48(2-3), 164-176. <https://doi.org/10.1080/03036758.2017.1421565>
- McCandless, S., Bishu, S. G., Gómez Hernández, M., Paredes Eraso, É., Sabharwal, M., Santis, E. L., & Yates, S. (2022). A long road: Patterns and prospects for social equity, diversity, and inclusion in public administration. *Public Administration*, 100(1), 129-148. <https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1111/padm.12830>
- McGroarty, M. (1996). *Language attitudes, motivation, and standards*. Cambridge University Press.
- Ministry of Culture. (2022). *Guojia yuyan fazhan baogao* [The Report on National Languages Development]. New Taipei City: Ministry of Culture Retrieved from https://www.moc.gov.tw/en/content_373.html
- Ministry of Culture, Council of Indigenous Peoples, Hakka Affairs Council, & Ministry of Education. (2022). *Guojia yuyan zhengti fazhan fangan* [National languages development plan 2022-2027]. Ministry of Culture https://www.moc.gov.tw/information_302_147954.html
- Morales-Gálvez, S. (2022). Is speaking one's own language(s) a right? *Nations and Nationalism*, 28(2), 387-401. <https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1111/nana.12795>
- National Development Council, Ministry of Education, Directorate-General of Personnel Administration, Ministry of Examination, & Civil Service Protection and Training Commission. (2021). *Bilingual 2030*. National Development Council
- Oakes, L., & Peled, Y. (2017). *Normative language policy: Ethics, politics, principles*. Cambridge University Press.
- Pan, C. C. (2020). *Taiwan zuqun yuyan ping deng zhi yanjiu: Yi nantaoyuan yishi keyu shi yong weili* [A Study of Ethnic Language Equity in Taiwan: Examples of Using the Hakka Language in Medical Communication in Southern Taoyuan]

- [Master's thesis, National Central University].
http://ir.lib.ncu.edu.tw:88/thesis/view_etd.asp?URN=104729003
- Peled, Y. (2014). Book Review: Language rights: From free speech to linguistic governance. *Language in Society*, 43(3), 349-354.
<https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1017/S0047404514000232>
- Pupavac, V. (2012). *Language rights: From free speech to linguistic governance* (1 ed.). Palgrave Macmillan London.
<https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1057/9781137284044>
- Rannut, M. (2010). *Linguistic human rights: Overcoming linguistic discrimination* (Vol. 67). Walter de Gruyter.
- Riagáin, D. Ó. (1998). The importance of linguistic rights for speakers of lesser used languages. *International Journal on Minority and Group Rights*, 6(3), 289-298.
- Ruiz, R. (1984). Orientations in language planning. *NABE journal*, 8(2), 15-34.
- Sacks, V. (2000). Can Law Protect Language? Law, Language and Human Rights in the South African Constitution. *International Journal of Discrimination and the Law*, 4(4), 343-368.
- 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.
<https://doi.org/10.1017/s0047404503324030>
- Scott, M., & Tiun, H. K. (2007). Mandarin-Only to Mandarin-Plus: Taiwan. *Language Policy*, 6(1), 53-72. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10993-006-9040-5>
- Skutnabb-Kangas, T. (1998). Human Rights and Language Wrongs-A Future for Diversity? *Language Sciences*, 20(1), 5-27. [https://doi.org/https://doi-org.elib.tcd.ie/10.1016/S0388-0001\(97\)00008-9](https://doi.org/https://doi-org.elib.tcd.ie/10.1016/S0388-0001(97)00008-9)
- Song, M. J. (2020). Shuangyu jiaoyu de yiti: Guoji hua yuyan yu jiazhi jiaoyu de qidian [The issue of bilingual education: Internationalisation, language and its value, the starting point of education]. *Taiwan Educational Review Monthly*, 9(10), 14-18.
- Spring, J. (2000). *The universal right to education: Justification, definition, and guidelines* (1 ed.). Routledge.
<https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.4324/9781410601889>
- Street, B. V. (1993). *Culture is a verb: Anthropological aspects of language and cultural process*. British Association for Applied Linguistics.
- Thornberry, P. (1991). *International law and the rights of minorities*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.

- Tiun, H. K. (2013). An Analysis of the Changes in Taiwan's Language Policy: A Perspective on Language Human Rights. *National Taitung University College of Humanities*, 3(1), 45-82.
- Trueba, H. T., & Zou, Y. (1994). *Power in education: The case of Miao university students and its significance for American culture*. Falmer Press.
- Tsao, F. F. (1999). The Language Planning Situation in Taiwan. *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development*, 20(4-5), 328-375.
<https://doi.org/10.1080/01434639908666383>
- Tse, J. K.-P. (2000). Language and a rising new identity in Taiwan. 2000(143), 151-164. <https://doi.org/doi:10.1515/ijsl.2000.143.151>
- Tse, J. K. P. (1987). *Language planning and English as a foreign language in middle school education in the Republic of China*. Crane Publishing.
- Wang, H. Z. (2011). Immigration trends and policy changes in Taiwan. *Asian and Pacific Migration Journal*, 20(2), 169-194.
- Wang, L. J. (2007). Diaspora, Identity and Cultural Citizenship: The Hakkas in 'Multicultural Taiwan'. *Ethnic and Racial Studies*, 30(5), 875-895.
<https://doi.org/10.1080/01419870701491861>
- Wharton, C. (2006). Document Analysis. In *The SAGE Dictionary of Social Research Methods*. SAGE Publications, Ltd. <https://doi.org/10.4135/9780857020116>
- Wolbring, G., & Nguyen, A. (2023). Equity/Equality, Diversity and Inclusion, and Other EDI Phrases and EDI Policy Frameworks: A Scoping Review. *Trends in Higher Education*, 2(1), 168-237. <https://www.mdpi.com/2813-4346/2/1/11>
- Worthington, R. L., Stanley, C. A., & Lewis Sr, W. T. (2014). National Association of Diversity Officers in Higher Education standards of professional practice for chief diversity officers. *Journal of Diversity in Higher Education*, 7(4), 227-234.
- Wu, C. Y. (2021). *Political Regimes and Minority Language Policies: Evidence from Taiwan and Southeast Asia* [Doctoral dissertation, University of Texas at Austin].
<https://elib.tcd.ie/login?url=https://www.proquest.com/dissertations-theses/political-regimes-minority-language-policies/docview/2709946222/se-2?accountid=14404>
- Wu, L. Y., & Lau, K. (2019). Language education policy in Taiwan. In *The Routledge international handbook of language education policy in Asia* (pp. 151-161). Routledge.
- Wu, M. H. (2009). Language planning and policy in Taiwan: Past, present, and future. *Working Papers in Educational Linguistics (WPEL)*, 24(2), 5.
- Yi Maun, S., & Hsu, M. (2016). Taiwan yuanzhuminzu zhangqi zhaogu zhi kuawenhua zhengce yiti yu xingsi [A Reflection on the Policy of Transcultural Long-Term

- Care for the Indigenous Peoples in Taiwan]. *The Journal of Nursing*, 63(3), 5-11. <https://doi.org/10.6224/JN.63.3.5>
- Yuan, E. (2020). *Renkou ji zhuzhai pucha chubu tongji jieguo tiyao fenxi* [Summary Analysis of Preliminary Statistical Results of Population and Housing Census]. Taipei City: Executive Yuan Retrieved from <https://www.stat.gov.tw/public/Data/1112144316VT5YTOVB.pdf>
- Zemliansky, P., & St. Amant, K. (2008). *Handbook of research on virtual workplaces and the new nature of business practices*. IGI Global.

Appendix 1: Bilingual 2030 policy approaches³

1. Accelerating the development of bilingual higher education.
2. Balancing and optimizing bilingual conditions for schools at the senior high school level and below.
3. Developing digital learning.
4. Expanding provision of affordable English proficiency tests.
5. Raising civil servants' English proficiency.

³ Retrieved from *Bilingual 2030* (2021). National Development Council.

<https://ws.ndc.gov.tw/Download.ashx?u=LzAwMS9hZG1pbmlzdHJhdG9yLzExL3JlbGZpbGUvMC8xNDUzNC9hODg1MTBkMC04YmQxLTQxZGEtYTgzZC1jOTg0NDM5Y2U3ZmMucGRm&n=QmlsaW5ndWFsIDIwMzAucGRm&icon=.pdf>

Appendix 2: National languages development plan 2022-2027 programmes⁴

This programme will employ seven major implementation strategies in two directions: static methods and dynamic methods. Applicable plans in different areas such as family, society and school, especially for the purpose of increasing language use of children and the youth, improving situated learning and digital learning resources, along with integrating mass media to promote national languages. The specific strategies are as follows:

1. Static plans:

(1.) Improve preservation of linguistic materials: Complete the text corpus of national languages and promote the relevant technical application. The key work is to interview the elderly, build up a database, develop corpus digitisation and publication and recreate historical place names.

(2.) Standardise writing systems: Promote writing systems to make them helpful in learning and application. The key work is to encourage the use in popular music lyrics, films and news, and establish local language input methods as well as national language pronunciation search engines.

(3.) Optimise language certification: Integrate language certifications in different national languages to optimise language certification question banks and online test processes.

2. Dynamic plans:

(1.) Expand promotional activities: Enable national languages that can be frequently used in daily life. Hold national language and art competitions, local language camps and events, along with fostering native-speaking families and

⁴ Extracted from *National languages development plan 2022-2027* (2022). Ministry of Culture. <https://mocfile.moc.gov.tw/FileConversion?filename=files/202209/6df86682-c342-43e0-8a39-049683ce7f8f.pdf&nfix=&name=%e5%9c%8b%e5%ae%b6%e8%aa%9e%e8%a8%80%e6%95%b4%e9%ab%94%e7%99%bc%e5%b1%95%e6%96%b9%e6%a1%88>. Translated by Hsin Jung Yeh.

communities.

- (2.) Create an inclusive environment (including media communication): Build a user-friendly environment and develop media resources to increase people's learning interest and opportunity to use. This initiative focuses on producing and broadcasting films and programmes, and making video-audio productions, animation, video games and other forward-looking cultural products in cooperation with private sectors. Financially support local governments and non-governmental organisations to create an inclusive environment for language development and promote international/ domestic linguistic and cultural exchanges.
- (3.) Develop educational resources: Improve teaching materials and teacher training. It aims to cultivate 150 Hakka-speaking teachers, and 300 indigenous-language-speaking instructors. Subsidise 2510 schools to conduct Hoklo teaching, develop immersion programmes in preschools and basic educational institutions, and ameliorate local languages online learning platforms.
- (4.) Improve supplementary resources: Cultivate language professionals via technically assisted systems. It centres on building a language digital resource network and encouraging industrial circles and academia to develop translation software in various languages.

The main work projects

Plan	Strategy	Work projects	Work details
Static plans	Improve preservation of linguistic materials	Establish the text corpus of national languages and integrated database platforms	Establish the text corpus of national languages in phases, and keep upgrading, analysing and amending.
		Interview the elderly and recreate historical place names	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Interview the elderly about their languages and cultures to set up database platforms. 2. Rename and recreate the street names and historical place names in local languages such as Hakka and indigenous languages.
	Standardise writing systems	Build and maintain local languages input methods	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Establish and maintain input methods as we as voice typing in local languages. 2. standardise writing systems in education.
	Optimise language certification	Hold language tests	Increase the quality and frequency of language tests and publish learning materials for the public to prepare the tests.
Active plans	Expand promotional activities	Encourage speaking ethnic mother tongue in the family/community	Encourage and provide incentives to increase the use of mother tongue in family, community and places of religious worship.
		Organise language-related activities to promote local languages	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Organise some activities and art competitions for the public to learn local

			<p>languages and promote ethnic cultures.</p> <p>2. Subsidise schools to host events for students to learn languages and cultures.</p>
	Create inclusive environment (including media communication)	Produce television programmes, broadcasts, films and popular music in local languages	<p>1. Encourage private companies to produce television programmes and subtitle them in local languages.</p> <p>2. Financially support private businesses to produce video games and other technology applications in local languages.</p>
		Create an inclusive environment and increase the quality of public services	<p>1. Establish a user-friendly environment and provide services including multilingual guides.</p> <p>2. Cultivate more sign language and other local language users in health facilities.</p> <p>3. Encourage higher education schools to provide Hakka language courses for students in medicine, nursing, social work, etc.</p>
		Promote linguistic and cultural exchanges	Hold international/nationwide seminars to promote academic and cultural exchanges with more professionals.
		Develop educational resources	Enhance instructors' professionalism

			<p>sign language/local languages.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 2. Subsidise preschools to develop immersion programmes in local languages. 3. Cultivate professors' professionalism in teaching local languages in higher education schools
		Ensure more learning opportunities for students	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Subsidise and launch language immersion programmes in basic education schools. 2. Encourage professors in higher education schools to combine local languages and cultures with courses.
	Improve supplementary resources	Build a digital learning network to enrich learning materials	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Provide digital learning materials and learning platforms in various local languages. 2. Compile dictionary in local languages.