Bridging cultures and policies: A preface to student studies on bilingual education reform

Ching, Gregory S. ✉
National Chengchi University, Taiwan (gching@nccu.edu.tw)

Abstract

This preface introduces a collection of student-led research papers examining bilingual education as a lens for educational reform across diverse global contexts. Emerging from the English as a Medium of Instruction course "Global Comparative Educational Reform" at National Chengchi University, Taipei, Taiwan. The project brings together case studies on Hong Kong, Taiwan, Singapore, Malaysia, South Korea, Thailand, Indonesia, India, Chile, Argentina, and the Philippines. Each paper explores how bilingual or multilingual policies intersect with national identity, globalization, teacher capacity, and educational equity. Thematically, the studies reveal several recurring tensions between global competitiveness and local identity, between centralized policymaking and decentralized realities, and between the aspirational goals of bilingualism and the structural barriers to inclusive implementation. While some countries pursue bilingualism for economic and geopolitical positioning, others frame it as a response to linguistic diversity and Indigenous inclusion. Notably, the invited paper on the Philippines adds a philosophical lens through Charles Taylor's theory of the politics of recognition, arguing that language policy is a moral act with implications for cultural dignity, identity, and justice. Student groups employed a variety of methods, such as policy analysis, stakeholder interviews, comparative frameworks, and philosophical critique, to investigate how language reforms are formulated and lived. Together, their work moves beyond surface-level comparisons to explore how language functions as both a medium of learning and a mechanism of inclusion or exclusion. By bridging cultures and policies, and theory with practice, this project underscores how bilingual education reflects deeper societal questions about who speaks, who is heard, and who belongs in education systems undergoing transformation.

Keywords: bilingual education, language policy, educational reform, cultural identity, comparative education

Bridging cultures and policies: A preface to student studies on bilingual education reform

1. Introduction

Bilingual education stands at the intersection of language, identity, and reform (Hamman & Palmer, 2023). Across societies, decisions about what languages are taught have reveal deeper questions about cultural recognition, national aspirations, and educational priorities (Byram, 2008). Far from being neutral instructional tools, language policies carry social, political, and ethical weight (McGroarty, 2002). They can affirm identities and promote opportunity, or they can marginalize minority voices and reinforce inequality (Tikly, 2016). In this way, bilingual education is not merely a pedagogical practice; it is a reflection of how a society negotiates its past, responds to its present, and imagines its future (Alfaro, 2018).

This collection of student-led studies emerges from the course "Global Comparative Educational Reform" at National Chengchi University, Taipei, Taiwan. Students were tasked with investigating bilingual or multilingual education reforms across diverse national contexts. Their country cases include Hong Kong, Taiwan, Singapore, Malaysia, South Korea, Thailand, Indonesia, India, Chile, Argentina, and an invited case from the Philippines. Each study examines how language policies are constructed, implemented, and experienced by stakeholders, such as: teachers, students, families, and policymakers alike. What makes this collection distinctive is the range of comparative insights that emerge across seemingly different systems. While some countries adopt bilingual education to enhance economic competitiveness (e.g., Singapore, South Korea, Indonesia), others do so to preserve linguistic diversity and affirm Indigenous rights (e.g., Chile, Argentina, India). Taiwan and Thailand represent systems in active transition, facing both institutional and pedagogical challenges in implementing bilingual reforms. Meanwhile, the invited paper on the Philippines introduces a moral-philosophical lens, using Charles Taylor's (1994) theory of the politics of recognition to argue that privileging dominant languages may constitute a form of cultural misrecognition; undermining the dignity and identity of marginalized linguistic communities.

Throughout the project, students employed diverse methodologies, including policy analysis, interviews, classroom observations, and conceptual critique. Collectively, their work affirms a central insight in the field of comparative education: that language is never just a medium of instruction; it is a site of power, access, and belonging (May, 2012). The following sections explore these themes in greater depth, framing bilingual education not as a fixed model, but as an evolving space of negotiation shaped by global forces and local realities.

2. Why Bilingual Education?

Bilingual education has long been situated at the heart of educational reform debates, particularly in contexts marked by linguistic diversity, postcolonial legacies, or aspirations toward global competitiveness (Chimbutane, 2011; García, 2009). At its core, bilingual education refers to the structured use of two (or more) languages as mediums of instruction within a formal schooling context (Skutnabb-Kangas & McCarty, 2008). However, the why of bilingual education varies widely across countries and often reveals far more than pedagogical intent (Wright & Baker, 2016). It reflects how states manage cultural difference, distribute opportunity, and define what counts as national belonging. In some systems, such as Singapore, South Korea, and Indonesia, bilingualism is promoted primarily for its instrumental value (Sun & Rong, 2018; Tan & Ng, 2011).

English proficiency is framed as a gateway to economic advancement, global mobility, and national development (Lasanowski, 2011). This view aligns with what scholars have called the instrumentalist logic of language policy, where language is valued chiefly for its utility in the global marketplace (Park & Wee, 2012).

Yet this logic often overshadows other important dimensions, such as linguistic justice or cultural expression. In contrast, countries like Chile and Argentina promote bilingual or multilingual education as a form of recognition and redress; a means of validating Indigenous and minority languages historically excluded from formal schooling (Lopez, 2009). Here, language is not only a tool for communication, but rather as a symbol of dignity, identity, and historical memory (Joseph, 2016; McDowell, 2008). These models call attention to the ethical stakes of language policy, aligning closely with Charles Taylor's (1994) view that recognition is a fundamental human need.

The case of the Philippines synthesizes both of these tensions. While the Filipino–English bilingual policy has long been justified in terms of national unity and global relevance, it has also marginalized hundreds of regional and Indigenous languages. As the invited paper argues, this exclusion constitutes a form of misrecognition; a failure to affirm the cultural identity of linguistically diverse learners. Ultimately, bilingual education is never just about learning two languages. It is about whose languages are legitimized, whose voices are heard, and whose knowledge is included in the curriculum. It is a site of inclusion or exclusion, a platform for empowerment or erasure. For this reason, bilingual education is not only pedagogical; it is also political, cultural, and profoundly human.

3. Comparative Themes and Country Patterns

Despite their diverse regional, historical, and cultural contexts, the student studies in this volume reveal several shared patterns and tensions in how bilingual education is conceptualized and implemented. These themes illuminate the broader dynamics of educational reform, particularly as language policy becomes increasingly entangled with identity, globalization, and inequality. The following four themes emerged across cases:

Language, Identity, and the Politics of Recognition - In contexts such as Hong Kong, Malaysia, Taiwan, and the Philippines, language is closely tied to political legitimacy and cultural identity. These cases illustrate how language education can serve as either a form of affirmation or exclusion. The Philippine paper, in particular, employs Charles Taylor's (1994) politics of recognition to argue that privileging dominant languages (Filipino and English) has marginalized regional and Indigenous linguistic identities; an ethical concern echoed in Hong Kong's marginalization of Cantonese and Taiwan's concerns over dialect preservation.

Equity and Access in Bilingual Reform - Many papers highlight the risks of bilingual education reinforcing social inequality. In Thailand, South Korea, and Argentina, access to quality bilingual programs is often stratified along socioeconomic lines, with rural and under-resourced communities left behind. The rise of international and English-medium schools in South Korea exemplifies how bilingualism, when privatized, becomes a form of cultural capital (Bourdieu, 1991) accessible only to the elite.

Teacher Capacity and Policy Implementation Gaps - Reforms in Taiwan, India, Chile, and Malaysia reveal significant barriers in classroom implementation. Common challenges include teacher shortages, insufficient training, unclear curriculum guidance, and lack of collaboration with foreign-language teachers, more specifically within the Content and Language Integrated Learning (CLIL) settings (Coyle et al., 2010). These gaps point to a recurring lesson: policy vision without system-level support often fails to reach the learner.

Policy Models, Transfer, and Local Adaptation - The case of Singapore appears frequently as a reference point for successful bilingual policy. However, the comparative paper on Singapore and Taiwan raises critical questions about the transferability of technocratic, centralized models to more pluralistic or democratic systems. Similarly, Thailand draws on neighboring models, but its fragmented policy landscape and urban–rural disparities highlight the difficulty of adapting reforms without strong institutional coherence.

Altogether, these thematic patterns not only provide a lens for comparison, but also reveal how language education serves as a proxy for deeper societal debates about power, identity, and the distribution of opportunity.

Whether implemented in centralized or decentralized systems, bilingual reform requires careful attention to both structural capacity and cultural context (see Table 1 for the summary).

Table 1

Comparative Matrix of Country Patterns

Theme	Countries	Key Issues Highlighted
Identity and recognition	Philippines, Hong Kong, Malaysia, Taiwan	Misrecognition of minority languages; tensions between national unity and pluralism
Equity and access	South Korea, Thailand, Argentina, Indonesia	Urban-rural disparities; elite capture of international education
Teacher capacity and implementation	Taiwan, India, Chile, Malaysia	Lack of training; policy-practice gaps; CLIL resource challenges
Globalization and instrumentalism	Singapore, Indonesia, South Korea	English as economic capital; pressure to perform in globalized settings
Policy borrowing and local fit	Singapore → Taiwan; Thailand → Malaysia	Adaptation difficulties; mismatch of models and governance cultures
Indigenous and intercultural bilingualism	India, Chile, Argentina	Community-based models; teacher training for cultural inclusion

4. Reflections on Student Research and Methodologies

One of the most compelling features of this project is its grounding in student-led inquiry. Rather than approaching bilingual education from a purely theoretical or top-down policy lens, the student groups engaged directly with diverse sources of evidence, interpreted them through interdisciplinary frameworks, and explored real-world implications for learners, educators, and national communities. This methodological openness reflects the core spirit of comparative education: understanding difference not as a barrier, but as a generative space for reflection, critique, and transformation (Bray & Thomas, 1995). Importantly, the students employed a wide range of research strategies, tailored to the unique dynamics of their selected country cases. Several groups used qualitative methods, such as semi-structured interviews and classroom-based observations. For example, the Taiwan study combined student surveys with in-depth interviews with a mathematics teacher, offering a grounded view of how bilingual experimental classes under the Bilingual Nation 2030 policy are experienced on the ground. Other papers, such as those on Thailand, Malaysia, and India, focused on policy document analysis, tracing the evolution, objectives, and outcomes of bilingual education reforms through national education plans and government reports. Notably, the Philippines paper introduces a philosophical lens, drawing on Charles Taylor's (1994) theory of the politics of recognition to frame bilingualism as a moral and cultural issue. This conceptual approach extends the methodological diversity of the project and deepens the discussion on the ethical stakes of language policy.

In terms of comparative logic, some groups examined single-country cases in depth, while others, such as the Singapore–Taiwan paper and the Argentina–Chile–India study; employed cross-national comparisons, highlighting both shared trends and structural divergences. In doing so, students grappled with the challenges of policy transfer, contextualization, and local adaptation, a core concerns in comparative policy research. Across the board, the student work reflects critical engagement with themes of equity, cultural identity, governance, and pedagogy. Their inquiries move beyond surface-level descriptions and reflect a genuine attempt to understand how bilingual education plays out in specific historical, sociopolitical, and institutional contexts. These efforts not only fulfill the objectives of the course, but also demonstrate the value of student scholarship in contributing to broader conversations in education policy, multilingualism, and global reform movements.

5. Conclusion

Bilingual education, as explored through the diverse perspectives in this collection, emerges as a complex, contested, and deeply human site of educational reform. It is shaped not only by pedagogical goals but by

national ideologies, global pressures, sociolinguistic hierarchies, and the everyday realities of teachers and students. Across the cases, spanning Asia and Latin America, wherein bilingualism is shown to function simultaneously as a strategy for economic advancement, a tool for cultural affirmation, and a site of political struggle. The student studies in this volume offer a rich comparative lens into these tensions. Some countries, such as Singapore, have implemented long-term centralized policies to promote bilingualism as both a national identity project and a global competitiveness strategy. Others, such as Malaysia, Thailand, and Taiwan, illustrate how fragmented implementation, regional disparities, and unclear curricular visions can complicate reform, even when policy goals are ambitious. In contrast, countries like India, Chile, and Argentina frame bilingualism as a right; especially for Indigenous communities historically excluded from formal education systems.

Importantly, the Philippines paper reframes the entire conversation through a philosophical lens, challenging the dominant instrumentalist logic that reduces bilingualism to economic utility. By invoking Charles Taylor's (1994) theory of recognition, it positions language policy as a moral and political act; one that can either affirm or deny the cultural dignity of its learners. This ethical dimension runs beneath many of the cases, even when not made explicit. Collectively, the student papers show that bilingual education is not a one-size-fits-all solution. It must be understood within context, critically examined for its effects, and grounded in principles of equity, inclusion, and recognition. As this project demonstrates, meaningful reform begins not with imported models, but with informed, reflective inquiry of the kind these students have undertaken with thoughtfulness and care.

6. References

Alfaro, C. (2018). The sociopolitical struggle and promise of bilingual teacher education: Past, present, and future. *Bilingual Research Journal, 41*(4), 413-427. https://doi.org/10.1080/15235882.2018.1540367

Bourdieu, P. (1991). *Language and symbolic power*. Trans. G. Raymond and M. Adamson. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.

Bray, M., & Thomas, R. M. (1995). Levels of comparison in educational studies: Different insights from different literatures and the value of multilevel analyses. *Harvard Educational Review, 65*(3), 472–490.

Byram, M. (2008). *From foreign language education to education for intercultural citizenship: Essays and reflections*. Multilingual Matters.

Chimbutane, F. (2011). *Rethinking bilingual education in postcolonial contexts*. Multilingual Matters.

Coyle, D., Hood, P., & Marsh, D. (2010). *CLIL: Content and Language Integrated Learning*. Cambridge University Press.

García, O. (2009). *Bilingual education in the 21st century: A global perspective*. Wiley Blackwell.

Hamman, L., & Palmer, D. (2023). Identity and two-way bilingual education: Considering student perspectives - Introduction to the special issue. *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism, 26*(1), 1-6. https://doi.org/10.1080/13670050.2020.1819096

Joseph, J. E. (2016). Historical perspectives on language and identity. In S. Preece (Ed.), *The Routledge handbook of language and identity* (pp. 19-33). Routledge.

Lasanowski, V. (2011). Can speak, will travel: The influence of language on global student mobility. In R. Bhandari & P. Blumenthal (Eds.), *International students and global mobility in higher education* (pp. 193-209). International and Development Education. Palgrave Macmillan. https://doi.org/10.1057/9780230117143_10

Lopez, L. E. (2009). *Reaching the unreached: indigenous intercultural bilingual education in Latin America*. UNESCO.

May, S. (2012). *Language and minority rights: Ethnicity, nationalism and the politics of language* (2nd ed.). Routledge. https://doi.org/10.4324/9780203832547

McDowell, S. (2008). Heritage, memory and identity. In B. Graham & P. Howard (Eds.), *The Routledge research companion to heritage and identity* (pp. 37-54). Routledge.

McGroarty, M. (2002). Evolving influences on educational language policies. In J. W. Tollefson (Ed.), *Language policies in education: Critical issues* (pp. 17-36). Lawrence Erlbaum.

Park, J. S.-Y., & Wee, L. (2012). *Markets of English: Linguistic capital and language policy in a globalizing world*. Routledge. https://doi.org/10.4324/9780203120323

Skutnabb-Kangas, T., & McCarty, T. L. (2008). Key concepts in bilingual education: Ideological, historical, epistemological, and empirical foundations. In N. H. Hornberger (Ed.), *Encyclopedia of language and education* (pp. 1466-1482). Springer. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-0-387-30424-3_112

Sun, W., & Rong, X. L. (2018). Globalization, national identity, and multiculturalism and multilingualism: Language policy and practice in education in Asian countries. In A. Bonnet & P. Siemund (Eds.), *Foreign language education in multilingual classrooms* (pp. 99-123). John Benjamins Publishing Company. https://doi.org/10.1075/hsld.7.05sun

Tan, C., & Ng, P. T. (2011). Functional differentiation: A critique of the bilingual policy in Singapore. *Journal of Asian Public Policy, 4*(3), 331-341. https://doi.org/10.1080/17516234.2011.630227

Taylor, C. (1994). The politics of recognition. In A. Gutmann (Ed.), *Multiculturalism: Examining the politics of recognition* (pp. 25–73). Princeton University Press.

Tikly, L. P. (2016). Language-in-education policy in low-income, postcolonial contexts: Towards a social justice approach. *Comparative Education, 52*(3), 408-425. https://doi.org/10.1080/03050068.2016.1185272

Wright, W. E., & Baker, C. (2016). Key concepts in bilingual education. In O. Garcia, A. Lin, & S. May, S. (Eds.), *Bilingual and multilingual education* (pp. 1-15). Encyclopedia of Language and Education. Springer. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-02324-3_2-1