Routledge
Taylor & Francis Group

Bilingual Research Journal

The Journal of the National Association for Bilingual Education

ISSN: 1523-5882 (Print) 1523-5890 (Online) Journal homepage: http://www.tandfonline.com/loi/ubrj20

Language policy in multilingual contexts: Revisiting Ruiz's "language-as-resource" orientation

Ester J. de Jong, Zhuo Li, Aliya M. Zafar & Chiu-Hui (Vivian) Wu

BILINGUAL RESEARCH JOURNAL
2016, VOL. 39, NOS. 3–4, 200–212
http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/15235882.2016.1224988

RESEARCH ARTICLE

Language policy in multilingual contexts: Revisiting Ruiz's "language-as-resource" orientation

Ester J. de Jong[a], Zhuo Li[b], Aliya M. Zafar[c], and Chiu-Hui (Vivian) Wu[d]

[a]University of Florida; [b]Southern University of Science and Technology; [c]COMSATS Institute of Information Technology; [d]Wenzao Ursuline University of Languages

ABSTRACT

In this article, we apply Ruiz's language-as-resource orientation to three international settings: Taiwan, Pakistan, and mainland China. Our guiding question was how different languages (indigenous languages, Chinese, and English) were positioned differently as resources in these contexts. For our analysis, we used Lo Bianco's (2001) elaboration of the language-as-resource framework as our starting point for an examination of early childhood education (Taiwan), political events (Pakistan), and different types of bilingual education (mainland China). Through this analysis, we confirmed the multidimensionality and multiplicity of the language-as-resource orientation (i.e., different languages can be positioned as different types of resources by different groups in society). We also found that additional dimensions might be considered as part of the language-as-resource orientation, such as native-speaker status, time, and space. Finally, we argue for an emphasis on Ruiz's idea of cooperative language planning as an integral part of the language-as-resource orientation. The "multilingualism-as-a-resource" orientation is a step in this direction.

Introduction

Multilingualism is the norm around the world. Due to continuous migration and technological advances as well as an increased recognition of the value of diversity for healthy ecologies, many languages come in contact with other language varieties in physical and virtual spaces. The coexistence and access to multiple languages in society invites an examination of how multiple language sources are negotiated in policy and practice. In his seminal 1984 article entitled "Language Orientations in Language Planning," Richard Ruiz lays out three approaches to language planning: the language-as-problem, language-as-right, and language-as-resource orientations. *Orientation*, in this regard, refers to the "complex of dispositions toward language and its role, and toward languages and their role in society" (Ruiz, 1984, p. 16). Such language orientations, or ideologies, drive the formulation of language problems, the development of policies, and the interpretation of policies for practice. The introduction

CONTACT Ester J. de Jong edejong@coe.ufl.edu University of Florida, 2423 Norman Hall, Gainesville, FL 32611.

Ester J. de Jong is Professor of ESOL/Bilingual Education and the Director of the School of Teaching and Learning at the University of Florida, Gainesville, Florida. Her research focuses on language policy, two-way bilingual education, and mainstream teacher preparation for bilingual learners.

Zhuo Li is an Assistant Professor in the Center for Language Education at Southern University of Science and Technology, China. She obtained her PhD in ESOL/Bilingual Education at the University of Florida. Her research interests include cross-cultural communication, multiliterate approaches to language learning, and applying educational technology to second language acquisition.

Aliya Zafar, PhD, is Principal Research Officer, Humanities Department at COMSATS Institute of Information Technology, Islamabad, Pakistan. She completed her PhD and MEd in ESOL/Bilingual Education from the University of Florida, USA as a Fulbright Scholar. Her research interests include English language/literature, multicultural education and qualitative research.

Chiu-Hui (Vivian) Wu is an Associate Professor in the Department of English and the Director of the Center for English Language Teaching at Wenzao Ursuline University of Languages, Taiwan. Her research interests include English language education, multicultural education and qualitative research.

of "language as a resource" as a metaphor has allowed for a powerful reframing of the role of linguistic diversity in schools away from deficit-oriented thinking and toward asset-based approaches. While popular in usage, the notion of "resource" is not unproblematic, however; nor has its complexity been fully recognized in the literature as Ruiz himself noted in a later publication (Ruiz, 2010).

The purpose of this article is to examine how the "language-as-resource" metaphor is applied in diverse contexts that involve different minority-majority-international language configurations. Specifically, we consider how the metaphor "language as resource" is applied to advocate for the use and development of different languages in education. After a description of the initial formulation of the "language-as-resource" orientation and its current critiques, the article presents three contexts through the "language as resource" lens. The article concludes with a revisiting of the language as resource metaphor.

Three language planning orientations

Ruiz (1984) proposed the language-as-resource orientation as a third orientation in part as a reaction to what he considered significant limitations of two other orientations: the language-as-problem orientation and the language-as-right orientation. The language-as-resource orientation grounds educational language policies in the assumption that "language is a resource to be managed, developed and conserved," and it considers "language-minority communities as important sources of expertise" (Ruiz, 1984, p. 28). The language-as-resource orientation aims to reframe subordinate languages from being perceived as deficits (or problems) to being viewed as individual and social assets. Ruiz contrasts this orientation with two other language planning orientations. The *language-as-problem* orientation considers the speaking of languages other than the dominant language as a deficit to be overcome if individuals are to be economically, politically successful and socially integrated into mainstream society. In the United States, the language-as-problem orientation supports language-in-education policies that focus on English-only instruction (e.g., English as a second language, English immersion) or remedial, short-term transitional bilingual education models that only use students' native language temporarily as a bridge to English. The language-as-problem orientation has been criticized for perpetuating deficit thinking in the teaching of bilingual children and hence its failure to acknowledge bilingual individuals' and the community's assets, and for failing to examine other explanatory variables than language proficiency to understand minority language students' patterns of underachievement (e.g., Cummins, 2000; S. García & Guerra, 2004; Nieto & Bode, 2008). Despite the criticisms, this monolingually and assimilationist-oriented language orientation continues to dominate policy discourse and practice for linguistically and culturally diverse students (de Jong, 2013; see also McPake & Tinsley, 2007; for a similar framing in the European context).

The second orientation, the *language-as-right* orientation, has a weak and strong version. In its weaker version, language planning conducted through a language-as-right orientation emphasizes the right to not be discriminated against on the basis of language. A stronger version argues for linguistic rights as a basic human right, emphasizing the link between language and culture (e.g., Skutnabb-Kangas, 2002). The stronger version has been most successfully put forward for established regional minorities and indigenous peoples to use and maintain their native languages under self-governance and determination (e.g., the United Nations' Declaration of the Rights of Indigenous People, 2007). While not completely dismissing the language-as-right orientation, Ruiz is skeptical of its effectiveness in the absence of legal recognition of group rights worldwide. He also warns that top-down, law-driven efforts may lead to compliance-driven reform rather than true change. Even if native language use is encouraged through a legal mandate, the quality of implementation may be undermined without local support.

In light of these concerns and limitations, Ruiz proposes the *language-as-resource* orientation as an alternative language planning orientation. The development of additional language resources and the conservation of existing linguistic resources are the focus of this orientation. The language-as-resource orientation has become an effective metaphor for advocates of dual language education and language revitalization efforts. Escamilla, Chávez, and Vigil (2005), for instance, considered how assessment and accountability practices are affected when a language-as-problem (looking at English achievement only) or language-as-resource orientation (examining performance on native language and English tests) is applied by teachers and administrators. In the former approach, the bilingual program was blamed for underachievement of English language learners. In contrast, the resource orientation raised critical questions about how linguistically and culturally diverse students' needs were being met in the mainstream classroom.

Concerns with the language-as-resource orientation

While generally viewed positively, the language-as-resource orientation is not entirely unproblematic. Referencing critiques by Ricento (2005) and Petrovic (2005) in particular, Ruiz (2010) identifies and discusses three concerns. First, the language-as-resource orientation seems to privilege economic and military rationales for maintaining and developing heritage languages. Second, it appears to prioritize instrumental benefits over cultural or ethnic group benefits; and lastly, scholars have critiqued the absence of a language as right discourse as integral to the language-as resource orientation. While acknowledging these dangers, Ruiz (2001) suggests that their critiques can be addressed through purposeful reframing.

To counter the first critique, Ruiz notes that there seems to be an underlying assumption that minority languages cannot be economically viable languages or have any other purpose than sustaining traditional cultural group identity. One strategy, therefore, could be to position less commonly used minority languages as an integral part of modern life and of local and extended economies. In response to the second criticism, Ruiz notes that resource and instrumentalism may go hand in hand and that they are an important dimension of language use and language choice, especially for English as a globally used language. Here he advocates for more advocacy for noneconomic rationales to support the use and development of minority languages across different institutions. Lastly, in response to the language-as-right orientation, Ruiz argues that both orientations can be seen as intrinsically linked but sees language-as-resource as a prerequisite, stating that "unless one sees a language as a good thing in itself, it is impossible to affirm anyone's right to it" (2010, p. 165).

The language-as-resource orientation is therefore complex, but its multidimensionality has not been explored extensively. The purpose of this article is to begin to unpack some of the complexities that accompany the application of the language-as-resource orientation. We do this by examining language policy issues in three multilingual contexts: Taiwan, Pakistan, and mainland China (referred hereafter as China). Taiwan and China are similar as countries where English is mostly a foreign language; whereas English has additional power and status in the postcolonial context of Pakistan. Each context has additional internal linguistic diversity in terms of indigenous/local languages that intersect with official and national languages. For our analysis, we refer to Lo Bianco's (2001) framework that operationalizes the language-as-resource orientation along six dimensions of language (broadly conceptualized) as an individual and social resource. His six dimensions are: (a) language as an intellectual resource (human knowledge development, cognitive benefits of bilingualism); (b) language as a cultural resource (cultural vitality and expression); (c) language as an economic resource (accessing multiple markets); (d) language as a social resource (intergroup relations and interaction); (e) language as a citizenship resource (access and participation), and (f) language as a rights resource to ensure critical analysis of how individuals and groups are positioned in society, e.g., through the labels we use and apply to them. In the following sections, we examine how different languages are positioned in language-in-education policy. As in-depth analysis of each country's complexity is well beyond the scope of this article, we present a detailed vignette for each context to illustrate different dimensions of the language-as-resource orientation. Our overarching question is, *Which language is positioned as what kind of resource and for whom?* In the case of Taiwan, we consider this question from the perspective of an early childhood education policy. The Pakistani context highlights how sociopolitical events (colonialism, independence) shape the framing of different languages. China provides an interesting example of different types of bilingual education with different resource orientations. It is our goal to use these vignettes to further illuminate the language-as-resource orientation.

Vignette #1: Taiwan

Taiwan is situated in an English-as-a-foreign-language environment in which English has traditionally been viewed as an asset. For many parents, an early start of learning English in beginning grades is considered a guarantee for career success (Chen, 2006; Oladejo, 2006; Price, 2014). In 2004, the Taiwan Ministry of Education (MOE) issued an *Early Childhood English Education Policy Statement* (Taiwan MOE, 2011). The document caught much attention by the public in that, in contrast to the trend of globalization that promotes English, the government forbade any English-only curriculum in kindergartens. To illustrate, the word "English-only" was prohibited from any banners or advertisements related to student recruitment for private and public kindergarten programs. This policy statement is the focus of this section. After a brief overview of early childhood education and English education in Taiwan, an analysis of the EC policy and how it positions the native language and English as a resource is presented.

Early childhood education in Taiwan

Kindergarten is not compulsory in Taiwan, although its importance is increasingly acknowledged (Taiwan MOE, 2010). The percentage of 4–7-year-old students who are enrolled in kindergarten in private schools is 60%, as opposed to 40% in public schools (Taiwan MOE, 2010). To compete with public kindergarten programs' inexpensive tuition as well as other private schools, many private kindergarten enterprisers promote full English immersion as a strategy to attract parents and children (Ho, 2006). English as the medium of instruction and instruction by native English-speaking (non-Taiwanese) teachers are integral recruitment strategies. Even though these native English speakers are not formally certified to teach kindergarten in Taiwan, hiring foreign teachers, particularly Caucasians, continues to be common and preferred practice in private kindergartens and language schools in Taiwan (Ruecker & Ives, 2015). The MOE policy therefore presents a challenge to private and public early childhood programs alike as the latter try to meet the requirements of the policy while alleviating parents' anxiety for their children to have access to English (Price, 2014).

Native language as linguistic resource

The MOE early childhood education policy frames the students' native language as a cognitive resource for second language learning. Specifically, it states that

> native language education is the basis to learn a foreign language, a child's native language competence would provide a solid foundation on acquiring 2nd or 3rd language. Thus, language learning is sequential and the order should be first, the native language, followed by Mandarin and English as the last … (Taiwan Ministry of Education, 2011, p. 1).

The successive nature of language learning and, within this sequence, the positioning of English as a third language clearly critiques an English-only immersion approach. The MOE's policy reflects a concern with extensive exposure to English at the cost of learning the native language and Mandarin.

English as a problem and cultural resource

The Taiwan MOE policy explicitly raises concerns about learning a second language at a young age. The document references two rationales: (a) "the critical period hypothesis does not hold," and (b) "a 'full English' 'no Chinese' learning environment creates language barriers" (Taiwan MOE, 2011, p. 2). In contrast to the oft-cited adage in early language immersion ("the earlier the better"), the Taiwanese MOE presents a different perspective. The document notes, "Within the English-as-a-foreign-language environment, children forget as quickly as they learn; learning English at an early age does not guarantee proficiency… . Rather, research indicates that cognitively mature teenagers learn more effectively than preschoolers" (Taiwan MOE, 2011, p. 2).

The second concern relates to the interference of English with the child's overall cognitive and emotional development. Deferring to research findings in early childhood education, the policy rationale states that:

> Preschoolers learn selectively, confining the breadth and depth of learning content, and could result in the greater likelihood of communication barrier, emotional disturbance, value distortion, difficulty in cultural affirmation, and even influence the development of Chinese proficiency (Taiwan MOE, 2011, p. 2)

While not directly questioning the importance of English, the Taiwan MOE policy does seem to present the teaching of English at a young age as a problem. Rather than an asset, or a *resource*, English-only immersion is positioned as a policy that will become a heavy load for a child's cognitive development. This positioning of English essentially reflects a monolingual view toward bilingualism—a child should learn one language at a time or two languages separately and sequentially.

For young children, the policy presents English as a cultural resource that promotes intercultural awareness. The policy states that the goal for English to be introduced to kindergarteners is meant for "cultural learning and international understanding rather than aiming for English proficiency" (Taiwan MOE, 2011, p. 3). As a result, English learning is conditionally accepted as long as instruction integrates games or activities such as chants or storytelling. An English-only immersion program is strongly prohibited.

Being a nonnative speaker as a resource

The import of native speakers, as part of the English Language Teaching industry, has been one of the global-English phenomena (Graddol, 2006; Pennycook, 1994). In Taiwan, English native speakers have enjoyed a privileged status in teaching young children and are sought after as private schools recruit and advertise for teaching positions. This situation results in an ongoing tension between the job rights of native English-speaking and nonnative English-speaking teachers (Ruecker & Ives, 2015). The MOE policy directly indexes this larger debate by stating that "Kindergartens must not employ teachers of foreign nationality to teach English" (p. 3).

Arguably, the move to minimize English learning in the kindergarten curriculum may be viewed as a way to protect or secure nonnative English teachers' job rights. Being a nonnative speaker is positioned as a resource in early childhood by emphasizing that "native speakers of English have no knowledge or training about kindergarteners nor do they follow the Employment Service Act" (p. 3). Being certified within the Taiwanese educational system positions native Taiwanese-speaking early childhood educators as valuable experts in early childhood education.

Vignette #2: Pakistan

Pakistan is situated in Southeast Asia and shares borders with India, China, Afghanistan, and Iran. After independence from Britain in 1947, the new nation consisted of East and West Pakistan. West Pakistan consisted of a Punjabi-speaking majority (67%); while East Pakistan consisted of a Bengali-speaking majority (98%) (Musa, 1996; Rahman, 2004). In 1971, the two areas parted and became modern-day Bangladesh and Pakistan. Today, Pakistan is a linguistically and culturally diverse country with six major and 58 minor languages spoken by approximately 192 million people (Rahman, 2004). The major languages include Punjabi, Pashto, Sindhi, Siraiki, Urdu, and Balochi. Most languages spoken in the country have an Indo-Aryan origin and use the Persio-Arabic script (Seifi, 2015). Most Pakistanis are multilingual and speak Urdu as a lingua franca and English as an official or academic language in addition to their mother tongue. Although Urdu is spoken by only 8% of the people as a mother tongue, it is spoken by 105 million people as a second language (Ammar, Naveen, Fawad, & Qasim, 2015). It is also common for most Pakistanis to learn how to read in Arabic at an early age, as Arabic is used for religious purposes by the Muslim majority. In addition, many Pakistanis speak other regional languages such as, Punjabi, Hindko, Siraiki, and Pashto for business and social purposes. This vignette describes how Urdu and English have been positioned differently as a resource across time.

Shifting orientations: From resource to problem to right

Throughout the brief history of Pakistan, two dominant languages, English and Urdu, have consistently been promoted for different reasons (Rahman, 2004; Shamim, 2011). The contention between the two languages, Urdu and English, dates back to the colonial period that ended the Mughal rule in India. India was colonized by the British in the late 1800s and maintained its status as a colony until its independence in 1947. Prior to colonization, Urdu enjoyed a high status and flourished under the Muslim rulers, who were native speakers of the language. The so-called Mughal era was a period of intense social, intellectual, cultural, and economic development, and the Urdu language served as a marker of sociopolitical and cultural success and was used in literature and poetry among the intellectuals as a means of cultural expression and heritage (Das Gupta, 1971; Musa, 1996).

Although the British maintained Urdu as a language of communication, they took away its function as a resource for intellectual, political, economic, and social mobility. Lord Macaulay, in his famous speech, *Minute on Indian Education*, in 1835 laid the foundation of the first informal language policy in India, and English became a dominant language in administration, education, and society (Macaulay, 1835; Sultana, 2007). Subsequent education policies and accompanying colonial discourses positioned English as the only language through which learning could occur (e.g., Pennycook, 1994; Phillipson, 1992). English became widely accepted as the language of the British rulers and Hindu majority and became the language of instruction, education, administration, and media (Rahman, 1998; Shamin, 2011).

The decision to adopt Urdu as the national language to unify the nation after independence initially met little resistance, given the linguistic diversity of the country and anticolonial sentiments. Despite the fact that, for the majority of the non-Urdu-speaking Muslims, Urdu was not even a preferred second language, Urdu gained further status as a national language. However, it was not long after independence in 1947 that a “language-as-right” orientation emerged for languages other than Urdu and English (Rahman, 2004). When it became difficult for the people of East Pakistan to function with ease in their daily lives due to limited proficiency in English and Urdu (Musa, 1996), they felt they were denied “… the right to personal freedom” (Ruiz, 1984, p. 22). At the height of the language controversy, the Governor General and founder of Pakistan, Mohammad Ali Jinnah, a nonnative Urdu speaker, categorically supported Urdu as the only national language and argued that without one state language a nation cannot stay solidly together and function (Das Gupta, 1971). The language-as-right orientation was part of the movement for East Pakistan to break away in 1971 and become Bangladesh, with Bangladeshi as its official language.

Urdu as intellectual and cultural resource in education

In Pakistan today, the contention between English and Urdu (and other languages) continues. English continues to be positioned as the language for economic success and an internationally oriented identity, as the high status of the language is reinforced by mechanisms such as medium of instruction policies and testing regimes (Shohamy, 2006). That is, students who are proficient in English gain access to education in elite, private, English schools that provide Ordinary level (O level) and Advanced level (A level) education affiliated with educational programs in Britain and, recently, the International Baccalaureate (IB) program. These streams of education subsequently provide access to top universities in the country and promise success in the job market at, e.g., the International Monetary Fund (IMF), United Nations (UN), and World Bank (WB). Competence in English is also desirable for immigration to English-speaking countries (Manan, David, & Dumanig, 2015; Rahman, 2009; Seifi, 2015). Within this discourse, Urdu or local languages are not seen as social and economic resources, which further fuels this paradigm (e.g., Musa, 1996). The continued positioning of English as an elite language has caused language apartheid and cultural shame for speakers of Urdu and local languages (Rahman, 2004; Shamim, 2011).

At the same time, efforts are emerging that reframe the relationship between English and Urdu and local languages. A recent Supreme Court's Order called for the replacement of English with Urdu as an official language (*The Tribune*, 2015). Although in reality the policy has been mainly restricted to official and public functions, it reflects an ongoing attempt to position Urdu as a legitimate language for government communication and a resource for civic life. Moreover, in response to research that shows that many students studying in middle-class schools exhibit limited proficiency in English and Urdu, there is a call for bilingual education (Ammar et al., 2015; Manan et al., 2015; Seifi, 2015). While still far from being reality, Urdu and local languages are beginning to be positively reframed as intellectual and cultural resources and as integral to Pakistani national identity (Gulzar & Qadir, 2010; Seifi, 2015).

Vignette #3: China

China is a multilingual and multinational country with 56 ethnic groups. The Han majority comprises about 92% of the total population in the mainland; whereas the other 55 ethnic minority groups reside in 60% of the country (Lin, 1997; J. Yang, 2005). The official language in China is Putonghua, the so-called Mandarin or standard Chinese, which is based on the Beijing variety. Mandarin functions as a lingua franca within China to satisfy the need for communicating among Chinese people, and its status as China's official language is codified in the Law of the People's Republic of China on the Standard Spoken and Written Chinese Language (2000). Article 6 of the Compulsory Education Law of the People's Republic of China (1986) states: "Schools shall promote the use of Putonghua (common speech based on Beijing pronunciation), which is in common use throughout the nation." In the same vein, Article 12 of theEducation Law of the People's Republic of China (1995) stipulates that the Chinese language "shall be the basic oral and written language for education in schools and other educational institutions."

In addition to Mandarin, China also promotes other languages. China's bilingual education has two dimensions: Chinese-minority language bilingual education and Chinese-English bilingual education (J. Yang, 2005). Feng (2005) labels these parallel conceptions of bilingual education in China as bilingual education "for the minority" and "for the majority." The two different conceptions of bilingualism are also named "traditional bilingualism" versus "modern bilingualism." Ricento's definition of resource as "a tool to be developed for particular national interests" (2005, p. 357) fits the analysis of China's two-dimensional education, in which minority languages are resources for cultural and political interests, and English is a resource for economic interests.

Regional languages as a right and cultural resource

Chinese-minority language bilingual education enjoys legal status so that the ethnic minorities' languages use as cultural resource, citizenship resource, and rights resource can be upheld. It aims at ethnic-minority students in economically underdeveloped minority regions. Its purpose is beyond improving learning for the minorities, as it is also meant to "enhance political stability in ethnic minority regions by showing that minorities are truly 'autonomous' in language and culture" (Lin, 1997, p. 195). Reinforcing minority groups' "bicultural identity (minority cultural identity and political or citizenship allegiance to the state)" (X. Zhang, 2006, p. 33) can help to maintain the whole nation's political stability.

Article 4 of the Constitution of the People's Republic of China (2004) stipulates that "[a]ll nationalities have the freedom to use and develop their own spoken and written languages and to preserve or reform their own folkways and customs." Chinese-minority language bilingual education is thus planned to ensure ethnic minorities' freedom and right to use and develop their own spoken and written languages.

In the Law of the People's Republic of China on Regional National Autonomy (2001), it is worth noting that ethnic minorities' language use is mentioned in seven articles concerning education, government administration, and court proceedings. For instance, article 53 states,

> [t]he cadres and masses of the various nationalities must be educated to trust, learn from and help one another and to respect the spoken and written languages, folkways and customs and religious beliefs of one another in a joint effort to safeguard the unification of the country and the unity of all the nationalities.

Hence this sheds light on the ethnic minorities' languages as "resource" for all in the country in addition to a "right" for ethnic minorities only. Ethnic minorities' languages are a resource to reinforce the aspect of conservation of China's multilingualism and multiculturalism. As such, ethnic minorities' languages are positioned as a critical resource for China's development—specifically, for the whole of China to achieve national harmony and strengthen political stability (Lin, 1997).

English as an economic resource

Chinese-English bilingual education is launched in political and economic centers and big cities in coastal areas. The general public has responded enthusiastically to this type of bilingual education, as is evident in the rapidly growing bilingual programs in different levels of schools (X. Zhang, 2006). Whereas Chinese-minority language bilingual education is protected by laws, Chinese-English bilingual education has been emerging as practice in line with an urgent call for English language teaching reform in China. In 1983, China's late paramount leader, Deng Xiaoping, pointed out that Chinese education needs to correspond to modernization, to the world, and to the future (Mao & Min, 2004). As "modernization" was the need for China's English teaching in the 1980s, "globalization" has become the underlying reason for Chinese-English bilingual education initiated in the 21st century. English language teaching is flourishing in China, and the ratio of English learners to that of other foreign languages is 99:1 in secondary schools (W. Z. Hu, 2001). Chinese-English bilingualism is "widely seen as a useful tool by the Han majority for improving foreign language education, particularly English teaching, and for developing human resources with both specialized knowledge and skills in foreign languages" (Feng, 2005, p. 529).

At China's 2nd National Symposium on Bilingual Education held in Shanghai in April, 2006, Zhang's speech "Construct Bilingual Educational System with Chinese Characteristics" provided a blueprint for Chinese-English bilingual education. According to Zhang, Chinese- English bilingual education aims to improve students' proficiency in English as a foreign language. He emphasized "Content and Language Integrated Learning" (CLIL) and "Content-Based Language Teaching" (CBLT) as ways to reach this goal (Z. Y. Zhang, 2006).

As an economic resource, English proficiency has developed as an important gatekeeper to positions of prestige in the society. English test scores dominate access, from college entrance examination to job hunting and promotion. An English test is required by China's national college entrance examination, commonly known as *gaokao*. The College English Test (CET), a nationally standardized English proficiency test, is required by many colleges for a bachelor's degree, and many employers prefer to hire applicants who pass Band 4 or Band 6 of the CET. English is also widely required in many professional tests, even though English language skills would be of little or no use to do the work. English is thus viewed as an educational resource to prepare bilingual talents for China's development in a global world (X. Zhang, 2006).

Revisiting the language-as-resource orientation

The language-as-resource orientation focuses on the management, development, and conservation of language as a resource. Lo Bianco's framework further describes in what ways language can be an asset and resource for the individual and communities (intellectual, cultural, economic, social, and civic). We applied the metaphor in three different contexts in order to explore what we could learn about the language-as-resource orientation when applied in multilingual, international contexts. In his 1984 article, Ruiz notes that the three policy orientations (language-as-problem, language-as-right, and language-as-resource) should not be seen as mutually exclusive within a particular context. Rather, they are “competing but not incompatible approaches” (Ruiz, 1984, p. 18). Our analysis confirms the importance of acknowledging that the three orientations coexist. China is a good example of the coexistence of the language-as-right (regional autonomy) and the language-as-an economic resource (globalization) orientations. Pakistan’s approach to education has tended to position its local, indigenous languages as a problem and barrier to success, while English is privileged as a political and economic resource. A parallel can be found in the United States, where dominant assimilationist, English-only policies such as California’s Proposition 227 are resisted and challenged by pluralist practices, such as additive bilingual education programs (de Jong, 2011). More recently, the continuous growth of dual language education programs nationwide and efforts to create a Seal of Biliteracy on the one hand (Wilson, 2011) and the monolingually (English) oriented Common Core Standards on the other (e.g., Menken & Solorza, 2014) are another example of this coexistence.

Second, our vignettes affirm the need of a complex view of “resource” that recognizes the multidimensionality of the language-as-resource orientation itself, i.e., different languages can be simultaneously positioned differently as resources within the same context. In Taiwan, the early childhood education policy emphasized English as a cultural resource. The child’s native language is framed as a key intellectual resource and source of national identity. The discrepancy between the government’s and parents’ attitudes toward English in Taiwan illustrates a similar need to consider the question “resource for whom.” English is similarly positioned as an international, economic resource in the Chinese context; whereas Mandarin Chinese is emphasized as the language of national identity and access to national sociopolitical and socioeconomic resources.

Our analysis also suggests two additional dimensions to be considered as part of language policy orientations. First, native-speaker status may be a dimension that needs to be considered as part of the language orientations within second or foreign language teaching contexts. In the case of Taiwan, English proficiency per se is not sufficient; rather, it is native-speaker status that the early childhood programs and parents view as a resource (e.g., Ruecker & Ives, 2015). The native-speaker paradigm has dominated the field of second language teaching for many years, positing an idealized “native speaker” not only as the sole but also most desirable and valued target language user and cultural model that second language learners should aspire to become. This ideological orientation has translated into, among others things, a strong preference for hiring teachers of English who are perceived to reflect this idealized native speaker. Despite evidence to the contrary that show the strengths of bilingual language teachers (e.g., Ghanem, 2015; Llurda, 2004; F. Zhang & Zhan, 2014) and strong critiques of the native speaker paradigm and its assumptions for second language teaching (e.g., Cook, 2003; Kramsch & Whiteside, 2007), those for whom the official or school language may be their second (or third) language continue to face discrimination (Mahboob, 2010).

Our case studies suggest that this ideological dimension of “native-speaker status” is indeed embedded in language education policy—in our case, through teacher qualifications. However, as others have shown, the native-speaker paradigm affects multiple educational decisions, which in turn become language decisions (see Menken, 2008). These include, but are not limited to, decisions about curricula, language testing, and pedagogical approaches that tend to value and privilege specific ways of (monolingual) language production and use (e.g., Lippi-Green, 1997; Shohamy, 2006) and tend to devalue other, dynamic ways of language use, as has been observed among multilingual learners and speakers (O. García, 2008). As a result, the cultural resources, linguistic understandings, and language learning experiences of teachers who are considered “nonnative” speakers are not positioned as a resource (e.g., Ghanem, 2015).

Another dimension might be time and space (geography). Urdu has moved through different phases and roles within Pakistan over time. Although local languages are beginning to be repositioned as an intellectual, civic, and cultural resource at the regional level, there continues to be resistance at the national level, where English is still seen as the sole resource for economic success. In the case of China, English-Chinese bilingual education emerges in urban areas on the east coast of China to meet China's global economic aspirations; whereas Chinese-indigenous language bilingual education functions more directly as an economic resource in rural regions. In the United States, Spanish generally has a low status and is viewed as a problem across the country; however, it is seen as a valuable economic resource in various contexts—for example, in Miami-Dade County, Florida (Fradd & Boswell, 1996). In other words, languages that may not be seen as a resource nationally could hold unique value for different groups at the regional or local level.

A proposal: Toward multilingualism as a resource

Our guiding question for this article was how different languages (indigenous languages, national languages, international languages) were positioned differently as resources in the context of Taiwan, Pakistan, and China. As noted previously, we confirmed that different languages are positioned differently as resources (Lo Bianco, 2001) in policy and public discourse and sometimes even differently by different groups within society (e.g., parents versus the government in Taiwan). As we reflected on common threads, we realized that a missing link across the three settings was the absence of a consideration of multilingualism as integral to the language-as-resource orientation.

The language-as-resource orientation is hugely important in shifting the focus from deficits to assets, whether they be intellectual, cultural, economic, social, or civic (Lo Bianco, 2001). At the same time, the policies we encountered did not frame policy or practices in terms of multilingualism, or they stressed the complementary nature of learning the native language, a national language, and an international language. We argue here that the language-as-resource orientation tends to default to a focus on one language (minority, regional, international language) within a competitive frame (e.g., English versus local languages as in the case of Pakistan), which takes a monolingual view that emphasizes monolingual instruction (e.g., English-only instruction in China through content-based language teaching). Lo Bianco's elaboration similarly discusses language (broadly defined) as a resource, but he only explicitly references bilingualism when discussing the cognitive benefits of learning two languages.

Given the centrality of multilingual realities around the world today, the notion of multilingualism as a resource needs to be at the front and center of language policy (see Stroud & Kerfoot, 2013). In a globalized, interconnected, transnational world, it is multilingualism rather than proficiency in one language that becomes a resource for economic and political access, cultural and civic engagement, and social cohesion (Rodríguez, 2006). In the multilingualism-as-resource orientation, acquisition planning (Cooper, 1989) would not only consider minority language maintenance or proficiency in English as a national or international language but rather advocate for policies that holistically view multiple languages in relationship to one another.

The multilingualism-as-resource orientation would bring Ruiz's notion of cooperative language planning to the fore. Ruiz (1984) specifically identifies language-as-resource planning activities that position minority-language speakers and community-based institutions as experts for others, outside the community, not only for themselves. Multilingualism as a resource would incorporate the dynamic nature of language and language development (Canarajah, 2007) and also encourage civic participation and contribute to social cohesion through democratic linguistic practices that are inclusive of multilingual individuals.

Rodríguez (2006) comments that multilingual societies "thrive because they make linguistic pluralism and popular self-government mutually reinforcing, as opposed to destructive of one another" (p. 695). Cooperative language planning reimagines the relationship between majority- and minority-language speakers as collaborative and bi- or multidirectional rather than as competitive and hierarchical. Ruiz argues that only this approach has the potential to achieve social cohesion and prevent the marginalization of minority-language speakers or their exclusion from societal participation. One of the most promising examples of this kind of cooperative language planning for the purpose of bilingualism for minority- and majority-language speakers are two-way immersion (TWI) programs. The integration of majority- and minority-language speakers within a program that is seen as a "mainstream," regular education program is a unique feature of TWI. The dual target population creates a unique situation where minority-language speakers (students, parents, community members) can be positioned as experts with knowledge and skills needed to learn and excel in the program. While certainly not without its challenges (e.g., Valdés, 1997), TWI programs are uniquely situated to encourage students to develop ways to "negotiate difference" and value practices outside monolingual or monocultural norms or conventions, such as code-switching, interpersonal strategies, and attitudinal resources (Canarajah, 2007, p. 236). Breaking down the hierarchical relationships among speakers of different languages is yet another dimension of the language-as-resource orientation that deserves more attention in the field.

Conclusion

Ruiz's language policy orientations framework is a productive tool to analyze and understand language policies in education. While originally applied primarily to U.S. contexts, our three cases (Taiwan, Pakistan, mainland China) show that a dynamic use of language as a problem, right, and resource can illuminate the complexity and multiplicity of policy discourses within and across diverse contexts. It is important to apply the framework dynamically—for example, by including how language orientations toward the same language may shift across time and space. More research is needed that allows for this more-nuanced and contextualized perspective of the language policy orientations. Finally, we propose that, as multilingualism becomes the norm around the world as a product of globalization, migration, and technology, Ruiz's framework needs to be extended to move away from *a* language to bilingualism or multilingualism as a resource. We argue that the multilingualism-as-a resource orientation can begin to move away from competitive notions of resource to cooperative, inclusive policies and practices in multilingual societies.

References

Ammar, A., Naveen, A. L. I., Fawad, A., & Qasim, K. (2015). Language policy and medium of instruction issue in Pakistan. *Acta Linguistica Asiatica*, *5*, 111–124. doi:10.4312/ala.5.1.111-124

Canarajah, S. (2007). After disinvention: Possibilities for communication, community, and competence. In S. Makoni & A. Pennycook (Eds.), *Disinventing and reconstituting languages* (pp. 233–239). Clevedon, UK: Multilingual Matters.

Chen, S.-C. (2006). Simultaneous promotion of indigenisation and internationalisation: New language-in-education policy in Taiwan. *Language and Education*, *20*(4), 322–337. doi:10.2167/le632.0

Compulsory Education Law of the People's Republic of China. (1986). Retrieved from http://www.china.org.cn/government/laws/2007-04/17/content_1207402.htm

Constitution of the People's Republic of China. (2004). Retrieved from http://www.npc.gov.cn/englishnpc/Constitution/2007-11/15/content_1372963.htm

Cook, V. J. (2003). *Effects of the second language on the first*. Clevedon, UK: Multilingual Matters.

Cooper, R. L. (1989). *Language planning and social change*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.

Cummins, J. (2000). *Language, power, and pedagogy: Bilingual children in the crossfire*. Clevedon, UK: Multilingual Matters.

Das Gupta, J. (1971). Religion, language and political mobilization. In J. Rubin & B. M. Jernudd (Eds.), *Can language be planned?* (pp. 53–64). Honolulu, HI: East West Center.

de Jong, E. J. (2011). *Foundations for multilingualism in education: From principles to practice*. Philadelphia, PA: Caslon Inc.

de Jong, E. J. (2013). Policy discourses and U.S. language in education policies. *Peabody Journal of Education*, *88*(1), 98–111. doi:10.1080/0161956X.2013.752310

Education Law of the People's Republic of China. (1995). Retrieved from http://www.for68.com/new/2006/5/wu6642116161560022l0-0.html

Escamilla, K., Chávez, L., & Vigil, P. (2005). Rethinking the "gap": High-stakes testing and Spanish-speaking students in Colorado. *Journal of Teacher Education*, *56*(2), 132–144. doi:10.1177/0022487104273791

Feng, A. W. (2005). Bilingualism for the minor or the major? An evaluative analysis of parallel conceptions in China. *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualisms*, *8*(6), 529–551. doi:10.1080/13670050508669067

Fradd, S., & Boswell, T. (1996). Spanish as an economic resource in metropolitan Miami. *Bilingual Research Journal*, *20*(2), 283–337. doi:10.1080/15235882.1996.10668631

García, O. (2008). *Bilingual education in the 21st century: A global perspective*. Malden, MA: Wiley-Blackwell.

García, S., & Guerra, P. (2004). Deconstructing deficit thinking: Working with educators to create more equitable learning environments. *Education and Urban Society*, *36*(2), 150–168. doi:10.1177/0013124503261322

Ghanem, C. (2015). Teaching in the foreign language classroom: How being a native or non-native speaker of German influences culture teaching. *Language Teaching Research*, *19*(2), 169–186. doi:10.1177/1362168814541751

Graddol, D. (2006). *English next*. Retrieved from http://englishagenda.britishcouncil.org/sites/ec/files/books-english-next.pdf

Gulzar, M. A., & Qadir, S. A. (2010). Issues of language(s) choice and use: A Pakistani perspective. *Pakistan Journal of Social Sciences (PJSS)*, *30*(2), 413–424.

Ho, M.-S. (2006). The politics of preschool education vouchers in Taiwan. *Comparative Education Review*, *50*(1), 66–89. doi:10.1086/498329

Hu, W. Z. (2001). A matter of balance: Reflections on China's language policy in education. *Asian Englishes*, *4*(1), 66–79. doi:10.1080/13488678.2001.10801064

Kramsch, C., & Whiteside, A. (2007). Three fundamental concepts in second language acquisition and their relevance in multilingual contexts. *The Modern Language Journal*, *91*, 907–922. doi:10.1111/modl.2007.91.issue-s1

Law of the People's Republic of China on Regional National Autonomy. (2001). Retrieved from http://www.npc.gov.cn/englishnpc/Law/2007-12/13/content_1383908.htm

Law of the People's Republic of China on the Standard Spoken and Written Chinese Language. (2000). Retrieved from http://www.npc.gov.cn/englishnpc/Law/2007-12/11/content_1383540.htm

Lin, J. (1997). Policies and practices of bilingual education for the minorities in China. *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development*, *18*(3), 193–205. doi:10.1080/01434639708666314

Lippi-Green, R. (1997). *English with an accent: Language, ideology, and discrimination in the United States*. New York, NY: Routledge.

Llurda, E. (2004). Non-native-speaker teachers and English as an international language. *International Journal of Applied Linguistics*, *14*(3), 314–323. doi:10.1111/ijal.2004.14.issue-3

Lo Bianco, J. (2001). *Language and literacy policy in Scotland—SCILT*. Retrieved from http://www.scilt.org.uk/Portals/24/Library/publications/languageandliteracy/Language%20and%20literacy%20policy%20in%20Scotland_full%20document.pdf

Macaulay, T. B. (1835) *Minute on education*. Retrieved from http://www.mssu.edu/projectsouthasia/history/primarydocs/education/Macaulay001.htm

Mahboob, A. (2010). (Ed). *The NNEST lens: Non-native English speakers in TESOL*. Newcastle upon Tyne, UK: Cambridge Scholars Publishing.

Manan, S. A., David, M. K., & Dumanig, F. P. (2015). English language teaching in Pakistan: Language policies, delusions and solutions. In R. Kirkpatrick (Ed.), *English language education policy in Asia* (pp. 245–264). New York, NY: Springer International Publishing.

Mao, L. M., & Min, Y. (2004). Foreign language education in the PRC. In M. Zhou (Ed.), *Language policy in the People's Republic of China: Theory and practice since 1949*. Boston, MA: Kluwer Academic Publishers.

McPake, J., & Tinsley, T. (2007). *Valuing all languages in Europe: European Centre for Modern Languages*. Brussels, Belgium: Council of Europe.

Menken, K. (2008). *English learners left behind: Standardized testing as language policy*. Clevedon, UK: Multilingual Matters.

Menken, K., & Solorza, C. (2014). No child left bilingual: Accountability and the elimination of bilingual education programs in New York City schools. *Educational Policy*, *28*(1), 96–125. doi:10.1177/0895904812468228

Musa, M. (1996). Politics of language planning in Pakistan and the birth of a new state. *International Journal of the Sociology of Language*, *118*(1), 63–80. doi:10.1515/ijsl.1996.118.63

Nieto, S., & Bode, P. (2008). *Affirming diversity* (5th ed.). Boston, MA: Pearson.

Oladejo, J. (2006). Parents' attitudes towards bilingual education policy in Taiwan. *Bilingual Research Journal*, *30*(1), 147–170. doi:10.1080/15235882.2006.10162870

Pennycook, A. (1994). *ELT from development aid to global commodity*. Reading, MA: Longman.

Petrovic, J. E. (2005). The conservative restoration and neoliberal defenses of bilingual education. *Language Policy*, *4*, 395–416. doi:10.1007/s10993-005-2888-y

Phillipson, R. (1992). *Linguistic imperialism*. Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press.

Price, G. (2014). English for all? Neoliberalism, globalization, and language policy in Taiwan. *Language in Society*, *43*(5), 567–589. doi:10.1017/S0047404514000566

Rahman, T. (1998). *Language-teaching policies in Pakistan*. Islamabad, Pakistan: Sustainable Development Policy Institute.

Rahman, T. (2004). Language policy and localization in Pakistan: Proposal for a paradigmatic shift. In: SCALLA Conference on Computational Linguistics, Vol. 99, p. 100.

Rahman, T. (2009). Language ideology, identity and the commodification of language in the call centers of Pakistan. *Language in Society*, *38*(2), 233–258. doi:10.1017/S0047404509090344
Ricento, T. (2005). Problems with the "language-as-resource" discourse in the promotion of heritage languages in the USA. *Journal of Sociolinguistics*, *9*(3), 348–368. doi:10.1111/josl.2005.9.issue-3
Rodríguez, C. M. (2006). Language and participation. *California Law Review*, *94*, 687–767. doi:10.2307/20439047
Ruecker, T., & Ives, L. (2015). White native English speakers needed: The rhetorical construction of privilege in online teacher recruitment spaces. *TESOL Quarterly*, *49*(4), 733–756. doi:10.1002/tesq.195
Ruiz, R. (1984). Orientations in language planning. *NABE Journal*, *7*(2), 15–34.
Ruiz, R. (2010). Reorienting language-as-resource. In J. E. Petrovic (Ed.), *International perspectives on bilingual education. Policy, practice, and controversy* (pp. 155–172). Charlotte, NC: Information Age Publishing.
Seifi, P. (2015). Language policy in multilingual and multicultural Pakistan. *Advances in Social Sciences Research Journal*, *2*(3), 32–37. doi:10.14738/assrj.24.906
Shamim, F. (2011). English as the language for development in Pakistan: Issues, challenges and possible solutions. In H. Coleman (Ed.), *Dreams and realities: Developing countries and the English language* (pp. 291–310). London, UK: British Council.
Shohamy, E. (2006). *Language policy: Hidden agendas and new approaches*. New York, NY: Routledge.
Skutnabb-Kangas, T. (2002). Marvelous human rights rhetoric and grim realities: Language rights in education. *Journal of Language, Identity, and Education*, *1*(3), 179–205. doi:10.1207/S15327701JLIE0103_2
Stroud, C., & Kerfoot, C. (2013). Towards rethinking multilingualism and language policy for academic literacies. *Linguistics and Education*, *24*, 396–405. doi:10.1016/j.linged.2013.09.003
Sultana, N. (2007). *The role of media in the development and promotion of English in Pakistan* (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). National University of Modern Language, Islamabad, Pakistan.
Taiwan Ministry of Education (MOE). (2010). *Statistics of kindergarten students and its analysis*. Retrieved from https://stats.moe.gov.tw/files/analysis/100children.doc
Taiwan Ministry of Education (MOE). (2011). *Preschool English education policy statement*. Retrieved from http://www.ece.moe.edu.tw/wp-content/uploads/2011/12/earleng1.pdf
The Ministry of Education responds to the rumor that English test will be removed from gaokao: Misinterpretation of the reform. (2015). Retrieved from http://www.sciencetimes.com.cn/baike/2015/1002/3440.html
The Tribune. (2015). *Pakistan to replace English with Urdu as official language*. Retrieved from http://tribune.com.pk/story/928480/pakistan-to-replace-english-with-urdu-as-official-language/
Valdés, G. (1997). Dual-language immersion programs: A cautionary note concerning the education of language-minority students. *Harvard Educational Review*, *67*(3), 391–429. doi:10.17763/haer.67.3.n5q175qp86120948
Wilson, D.M. (2011). Dual language programs on the rise. *Harvard Education Letter*, *27*(2). Retrieved from http://hepg.org/hel-home/issues/27_2/helarticle/dual-language-programs-on-the-rise
Yang, J. (2005). English as a third language among China's ethnic minorities. *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism*, *8*(6), 552–567. doi:10.1080/13670050508669068
Zhang, F., & Zhan, J. (2014). The knowledge base of non-native English-speaking teachers: Perspectives of teachers and administrators. *Language & Education*, *28*(6), 568–582. doi:10.1080/09500782.2014.921193
Zhang, X. (2006). *Bilingual education: From the policy perspective*. Retrieved from http://max.book118.com/html/2015/0922/25938715.shtm
Zhang, Z. Y. (2006). *Construct bilingual educational system with Chinese characteristics*. Retrieved from http://www.tesol.cn/yan_jiu/zhang_zhi_yuan_jianghua.html