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This study addresses one central issue: How do Taiwan’s teacher education programs promote future teachers’ knowledge that fosters bilingualism in children? Three bodies of knowledge were included in this study. The first reviews the theory of second-language acquisition and bilingualism. The second involves the literature of early childhood teacher education in Taiwan. The third illuminates the level of the knowledge base in teacher education in general as a background for a discussion of promoting and fostering bilingualism.

Mixed methods employed in this study to answer the research questions included three distinct components: (a) a document content analysis, (b) a national survey and, (c) five in-depth interviews.

A variety of implications for this issue include the following: First, the overall teacher education program plan and the curriculum should reflect the language diversity of Taiwan and encourage bilingualism in children. Second, early childhood education departments should provide Second-Language Acquisition and Bilingual Education in their schedule of courses. Third, providing more opportunities for preservice teachers to
observe, teach, and interact with children is essential. Fourth, during the 4-year course of study, early childhood education departments should increase preservice teachers’ understanding of the importance of maintaining native culture and mother tongues as well as broaden their world outlook. Fifth, teacher educators should be encouraged to blend children’s language development and issues related to language teaching into the curriculum.
ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

My journey has been a long one that would have been impossible without the personal and practical support of numerous individuals. Thus my sincere gratitude goes to my advisor, committee members, friends, and family for their love, support, and patience over the last few years.

I extend my deepest gratitude first and foremost to Professor Eunsook Hyun, my advisor and gracious mentor, who demonstrates that rigorous scholarship can and must be accessible to everyone. Her constant guidance and support throughout my study were invaluable. Without her consistent and illuminating instruction I would not have been able to attain my degree. Second, I would like to express my heartfelt gratitude to Dr. Martha Lash, my coadvisor, who inspired and encouraged me, offering valuable, thought-provoking advice and providing a source of confidence. I also want to thank Dr. Karla Anhalt, my committee member, for her encouraging words, thoughtful criticism, and time and attention during busy semesters. Moreover, I also would like to take this opportunity to thank all my friends for sharing their enthusiasm for and comments on my work: Dr. Linda Meixner, Yunying Hung, Dr. Mei-Chen Lin, Dr. Angela Lin and Dr. Hsiao-Yin Chen. Finally, the acknowledgments would be incomplete without heartfelt thanks to my beloved family for their affectionate considerations and unwavering confidence in me through all these years. I appreciate my husband Cheng-Hsien, who accompanied me during the long years of my education. I particularly want to thank my parents for reliably
providing all kinds of support during my entire education. I give thanks to my three-year-old daughter Lucy, who has kept me walking on this journey.
# TABLE OF CONTENTS

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS ........................................................................................................ iv

LIST OF FIGURES ............................................................................................................. x

LIST OF TABLES ............................................................................................................. xi

CHAPTER

I  INTRODUCTION .................................................................................................. 1

  Language Issues in Taiwan ................................................................. 2
  Benefits of Bilingualism ............................................................ 11
  Problem Statement ................................................................. 12
  Purpose of the Study ....................................................... 16
  Research Questions ............................................................ 17
  Significance of the Study ....................................................... 17
  Conceptual Framework ....................................................... 18
  Methodology ................................................................. 18
  Definition of Key Terms ....................................................... 20
  Assumptions and Limitations .................................................. 21
  Delimitation ................................................................. 22

II  LITERATURE REVIEW ..................................................................................... 23

  Theory of Second-Language Acquisition and Bilingualism .......... 23
    Second Language Acquisition: Three Major Scientific
      Research Traditions ............................................................ 24
      Behaviorist Tradition ........................................................ 25
      Cognitive-Computational Tradition ..................................... 27
      Dialogic Tradition .............................................................. 30
    Bilingualism ................................................................. 34
      Theories of Bilingual Language Acquisition ...................... 34
      Issues in Children’s Second-Language Acquisition and
        Bilingualism ................................................................. 38
      Critical Period ................................................................. 42
  Early Childhood Teacher Education Programs in Taiwan ............ 45
  Level of Teacher’s Professional Knowledge of Promoting and Fostering
    Bilingualism in Taiwan’s Early Childhood Teacher Education Programs 48
Years of Teaching .................................................................111
Level of Education .............................................................111
Courses Taken .................................................................111
Courses Offered by the Departments .................................111
Data on Survey Participants’ Attitudes ..............................114
Attitudes Toward Integrating Bilingual Issues into
Nonlanguage Courses .......................................................114
Attitudes Toward Bilingualism ..........................................116
Attitudes Toward Second Language Learning ..................118
Attitudes Toward Native Language ..................................119
Attitudes Toward English Learning .................................120
Section 4, Question 19 ......................................................122
Professional Knowledge Needed by the Preservice Teacher ...123
Suggestions and Recommendations for Improving Professional
Knowledge of Preservice Teacher .......................................126
t-Test of Courses Taken vs. Non-Taken ..............................128
One-Way ANOVA ..............................................................128
Suggestions and Recommendations from Survey of the
Open-Ended Questions .....................................................130
Theme 1 .............................................................................130
Theme 2 .............................................................................132
Thems 3 .............................................................................133
Interview Theme Findings ...............................................133
Theme 1: Beliefs of Teacher Educators ...............................134
Subtheme 1-1: Bilingual ....................................................134
Subtheme 1-2: Attitude of mother tongue ..........................135
Subtheme 1-3: Global competition ....................................137
Subtheme 1-4: Integrating ................................................137
Theme 2: Language Chauvinism .......................................139
Theme 3: Difficulties .........................................................140
Subtheme 3-1: Disregard ....................................................140
Subtheme 3-2: Complicate ...............................................141
Theme 4: Language Abilities ..............................................142
Theme 5: English Concentration ......................................143

V SUMMARY OF FINDINGS, DISCUSSION, AND IMPLICATIONS ..........145
Introduction ........................................................................145
Summary of Findings ..........................................................145
Teacher Educator’s Attitudes Toward Second-Language
Acquisition and Bilingualism ..............................................145
LIST OF FIGURES

Figure

3.1 Concurrent triangulation design .................................................................58
4.1 A Graphic Display of Content Analysis ..........................................................96
LIST OF TABLES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>Interview Analysis</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>Content Analysis of the Syllabi</td>
<td>78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>Content Analysis Theme Definitions</td>
<td>79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>Required and Elective Courses of 11 Four Year Study Plans</td>
<td>91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>Data Descriptively (%) of the Language Development Courses in the Entire Professional Required and Elective Courses of 11 Four Years' Program Plans</td>
<td>94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>Four Categories of Language Development, Language Teaching, Bilingual Education, and Multicultural Education in 11 Four Years’ Program Plans</td>
<td>95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>Demographics</td>
<td>108</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>Courses Offered by the Department</td>
<td>112</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>Bilingual Issues into Nonlanguage Courses</td>
<td>115</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.7</td>
<td>Integrated Bilingual Issues into Nonlanguage Courses</td>
<td>116</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>Attitudes Toward Bilingualism</td>
<td>117</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.9</td>
<td>Attitudes Toward Second Language Learning</td>
<td>118</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.10</td>
<td>Attitudes Toward Native Language</td>
<td>120</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.11</td>
<td>Attitudes Toward English Learning</td>
<td>121</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.12</td>
<td>Section 4, Question 19</td>
<td>122</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.13</td>
<td>Integrated Attitudes Toward Bilingualism, Second Language Learning, Native Language, and English</td>
<td>123</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4.14 Professional Knowledge Needed by the Preservice Teacher ..............................125
4.15 Integrated Professional Knowledge Needed by the Preservice Teacher ..........125
4.16 Recommendations and Suggestions about Improving Professional Knowledge ........................................................................................................127
4.17 Integrated Recommendations and Suggestions about Improving Professional Knowledge ......................................................................................................128
4.18 Summary of Findings of t-Test Analysis of Courses Taken..............................129
4.19 Summary of ANOVA Analysis of Professional Status .......................................129
4.20 Post-Hoc Tests of Professional Status .................................................................130
CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

A tool for communication and socialization, language enables people to express their thoughts and ideas; moreover, it allows them to maintain their cultural matters. During the past few decades, language learning has become essential to people’s lives because of increased awareness of linguistic and cultural heritage. In addition, people often believe that those who speak more than one language will have more opportunities for future academic and career success than those who do not (Chang & Wu, 2002; Munks, 1996). The technology of the 21st century has most assuredly turned the world into a global village in which English has become “the world’s second language”, English fever spreading to all parts of the globe and “it is difficult to be active and successfully in international business, politic, scholarship, or science without considerable competence in English” (Krashen, 2003, pp. 100).

The purpose of this study is to contribute to the general understanding of the way Taiwan’s early childhood teacher education programs promote future teachers’ knowledge that fosters bilingualism in children. This research may inform future curriculum and pedagogical design in early childhood teacher education programs and foster preservice teachers’ professional knowledge and skills in the area of bilingualism.
Language Issues in Taiwan

Taiwan, a tiny island located at the Pacific Ocean near mainland China, is hardly a monocultural or monolingual society; in fact at least four ethnic groups of varying sizes constitute the island’s population. According to the database maintained by the Government Information Office (2003), speakers of Hoklo (pronounced “ho-lo”) account for about 70% of Taiwan’s current population of 23 million. These people emigrated from the Min area of southern China in the 17\textsuperscript{th} and 18\textsuperscript{th} centuries. Approximately 15% speak Hakka, a Chinese language spoken in Taiwan since the first settlers arrived between 300 and 400 years ago. Two more ethnic groups include mainlanders and aborigines. Mainlanders, who arrived in the late 1940s, comprise approximately 12% of Taiwan’s population, representing a wide variety of languages and cultural groups; they have spoken Mandarin, their primary language, since settling in Taiwan. The aboriginal community remaining 2% of Taiwan’s population includes those who speak the 10 extant Malayo-Polynesian Austronesian languages of the 17 recorded by the Japanese at the end of World War II (Friedman, 2005, p. 3). On a historical note, many older inhabitants of Taiwan know Japanese because they were required to study it from 1930 to 1945 during the Japanese occupation of Taiwan (1895–1945) (Huang, 2001, p. 115).

All countries need at least one national language to conduct government; yet during its heyday as a colonial power (Brisk, 1998, p. 31). Mandarin was introduced as the national language of Taiwan in 1949, when the Kuomintang (KMT) came to power. Before the lifting of martial law in Taiwan in 1987, Mandarin had been the exclusive language of instruction in the schools. Until the 90s, Taiwan’s languages had been
regarded as “dialects” by the government, but an awareness of identity-based politics growing during the 1980s motivated a shift in the labeling of Taiwan’s language to “mother tongue” or “native language” (Sandel, 2003, p. 530). National governmental officials had assumed that those “dialects” were not national, official, or common languages, hence prohibiting their use in public institutions (Huang, 2001). The stereotypes inherent in this decree influenced the official policy on Hoklo programming on television and radio. The amount of native-language programming had been limited by a 1976 edict stating that Mandarin should account for no less than 55% of radio broadcasts and 70% of television air time (Hsiau, 1997, p. 308) reflecting a point in history when both the government and the public virtually ignored the island’s culture and history. Students learned mainland history, culture, and geography all in Mandarin, to the exclusion of Taiwan’s local values and history (Dreyer, 2003); consequently, many young Taiwanese, able to speak only Mandarin, are losing ethnic identity and their mother tongue. According to Huang’s 1993 study, 87% of Taiwanese people were able to speak Mandarin. Lee’s (2004) study revealed that most aborigines preferred using Mandarin instead of their mother tongue both in public and at home. Tsao (2001) also found fewer and fewer aborigines able to speak their native language fluently and maintain a positive attitude toward it. Young (1989) showed that both Hoklo and Hakka are used less and less. Tsao’s survey revealed that only 40% of student respondents said that Hakka is the most used language at home, indicating a decline in using and speaking Hakka in the community. By contrast, Hoklo has not declined so quickly; however, recent surveys continued to show a decline in mother tongue proficiency (Friedman,
According to estimates nearly 6,000 languages exist in the world, but 90% of them will disappear by the end of the 21st century (Krauss, 1992). This estimate suggests that all Taiwanese native languages will disappear, leaving only Mandarin on the Island. Even the sequence of the loss of native languages has been predicted: aboriginal followed by Hakka and then Hoklo (Tiu, 2004).

Fishman (1972) suggested that an ancestral group language is closely associated with nationalism, which embraces a people’s glorious past, confirms authenticity, and helps construct strong identity. More voices rose up to support native-language use and teaching following the founding of the opposition Democratic Progressive Party (DPP) in 1986 and the lifting of the martial law in 1987. After 1987, the restrictions on the media were gradually removed (Dreyer, 2003), and the “school system eventually eliminated punishment for speaking languages other than Mandarin on all public school campuses” (Huang, 2001, p. 120). The right to use and teach the people’s languages reemerged, causing local Taiwanese to consider seriously the teaching of native language and local culture and history in formal school settings. Native-language education was introduced in Taiwan’s schools through nationwide curricula reform in 1994 for the first time in history. “The new curriculum marked the emergence of a novel and uniquely Taiwanese conception of nationhood, one that departed from the monolithic cultural nationalism of the Japanese and Chinese eras” (Friedman, 2005, p. 4); moreover, in 1999 native-language education finally became a part of the national curriculum with the introduction of the Nine-Year Integrated Curriculum. “The program was phased in slowly, starting with first grade in 2001, second and third grades in 2002, and all of the middle grades at
following year” (Sandel, 2003, p. 530). Course content and which language was to be taught depended on the needs and ethnic composition of the community. Teaching native language in the formal school system, however, was plagued with problems. One hindrance came from parents, who feared that teaching a heritage language could reduce children’s proficiency level in standard (written) Chinese. Others considered learning other foreign languages, such as English or Japanese, more beneficial for social and economic advancement; moreover, problems with class time, teacher qualification, and curriculum issues complicated matters. As a remedy the government provided handbooks, workshop, and teaching materials to support teachers.

Nevertheless, introducing native-language education in the school system required long-term evaluation to understand how the teachers and students viewed the reform and how their attitudes toward the native language changed. At the time of this writing few articles dealing with these issues have been published (e.g., Hsu, 2004; Shih, 2003). A related issue is the need to understand how teachers promote students’ native languages in the classroom and in public. Some concern has also arisen over the division of responsibilities of native-language teachers and regular classroom teachers; native-language teachers rarely spend extra time in the building because most of them are part-time employees, so the classroom teachers have to deal with children’s language problems and issues and accept responsibility for promoting the languages (Chen, 2004). Taiwan’s educational system appears not to have paid close attention to the needs of the in-service teachers. In addition, Taiwanese teacher educators have failed to introduce
these issues to preservice teachers (National Policy Foundation Backgrounder, 2003), leaving them without the professional knowledge and skills they need in their classrooms.

Besides native-language learning, language issues resulting from intercultural marriage have emerged as a significant problem in the educational field in recent years (Che, 2004; Hsia, 2000). Since the 90s, increasing numbers of South Asian women have married Taiwanese men, settling in Taiwan and bringing their cultures with them. Ministry of the Interior records showed that 11.6 % of all couples married in Taiwan in 2003 represented South Asian intercultural and interlingual marriages. Since then the number of new Taiwanese children (children from intercultural and interlingual families) enrolling in Taiwanese schools has increased. In 2000 enrollment of new Taiwanese children in elementary schools stood at 600; in only 2 years, however, the number had increased to 3600. Projections indicated that by 2006 one in eight elementary students would be new Taiwanese children (Hsia, 2000).

Increasing numbers of intercultural and interlingual marriages have raised educational concerns: children’s language issues, family education, and communication problems between mothers and teachers. Che (2004) suggested that new Taiwanese children lacked language proficiency when entering elementary school. Many had difficulty with Mandarin pronunciation and vocabulary, lacking sufficient words and phrases to express their feeling and needs; they were also less able to comprehend sentence structure as compared to those students with two Taiwanese parents. In addition, Hsang’s (2004) study showed the new Taiwanese children’s classmates teased them because of their language and family backgrounds.
Two particularly urgent issues have emerged in the education field in Taiwan: (a) how to help new Taiwanese children cope with Taiwan’s language and culture and (b) how to encourage all children to understand and value their own language and culture as well as that of others.

According to a public survey in Taiwan, young children’s English learning ranks eighth out of fifteen among parents concerned with the early development of their young children (Hsin-Yi Foundation, 1993). The tendency toward globalization has compelled increasing numbers of parents to confront the importance of fostering children’s English abilities, which enhances their school performance and ability to compete with their peers. Parents teach English or other languages to their children at home, and schools provide English language lessons to students as a part of formal education after third grade. The public promotes the ideas of bilingualism and second-language education as well. English has become the most popular second language in Taiwan (“I Can Say My ABC’s!,” 2001), and the whole country has been caught up in the frenzy of learning English.

The question of incorporating English into preschool and kindergarten in Taiwan has been long debated. English, which barely used in daily living, is taught as foreign language (EFL) instead of as a second language (ESL) in Taiwan. The major difference between ESL and EFL is the context. Richards, Platt, and Platt (1992) defined ESL as “English for immigrant and other minority groups in English-speaking countries” (p.124), indicating that English is used both inside and outside the classroom. Richards (1985) also pointed out “when English functions as a second language, that is, where it is used alongside other language but it is commonly the most important language of education,
government, or business, it is often regarded by its users as a local rather than a foreign language” (pp. 2–3). EFL by contrast is defined as “English in countries where it is taught as subject in schools but not used as a medium of instruction in education nor as a language of communication” (Richards et al., pp. 123–124).

On one hand the Taiwanese Ministry of Education has proclaimed that kindergarten is too early to teach English and has forbidden the teaching of English as a subject, whole-English teaching in kindergarten, and bilingual education; furthermore, the Ministry has urged that children learn Mandarin first to strengthen their linguistic ability (Ministry of Education, 2005). Two important reasons support these positions:

1. Kindergarten curriculum should maintain balance among six major areas (health, language, practical wisdom, play, work, and music), without partiality toward English learning. According to research, the critical period for language learning does not exist.

2. Adolescents can learn English better and more effectively than the young children because their cognitive development surpasses that of young children. In its 21st edition (2003) of the Preschool Newsletter, the Ministry of Education announced three claims in support of their position on young children’s English learning. First, the language learning sequence should follow this pattern: mother tongue, Chinese, English because research evidence (Hakuta, 1990; Dufva & Voeten, 1999) strongly supports the positive interrelationship between foreign-language learning and the mother tongue. Such research has also demonstrated that basic foundation knowledge learned in the first language enables people to acquire a
second language more efficiently because the knowledge is transferable between languages; therefore, official English lessons in Taiwan’s elementary schools commence in the third grade (Ministry of Education, 2005). Second, the main objective of young children’s English learning should focus on understanding culture and literacy instead of fluency in English. Teaching English to young children should entail the integration of English with other subjects while talking about culture, weather, nature, and so on. The Ministry of Education has opposed the concept of the critical period hypothesis because some scholars, such as Snow (1987) and Snow and Hoefnagel-Hoehle (1978), have disproven the relationship between age and second-language learning. Third, kindergartens are not permitted to recruit foreign teachers to conduct English lessons. Foreign teachers are not officially licensed and do not have formal early childhood training, causing many serious problems such as classroom management, designing and planning curriculum and breaking the law in early childhood education in Taiwan.

On the other hand no educational legislation with curriculum in Taiwan has designated English as a second language or foreign language (Lu & Chen, 2005); therefore, those in many private educational sectors have defined English as a second language and have promoted the concept of the critical period to encourage the teaching of a second language to children as soon as possible. Most private kindergartens and preschools in Taiwan provide English lessons to the children enrolled. No matter how strongly the Ministry of Education forbids teaching English to young children, leaders of kindergartens and preschools have ignored the government’s edict for several reasons.
First, parents want their children to be fluent in English because they recognize its importance (Lin, 2002). According to the Survey on English Teaching in Primary Schools in Taiwan (2003) conducted by National Teacher Association R.O.C. and Citibank Group in Taiwan, one third of elementary school students learned English when they were in preschool. Parents hope their children can someday speak English and other languages very well, not merely at an elementary level. Most people want their children to be multilingual in order to be prepared to face challenges as well reap financial rewards in the future. Second, offering English lessons represents a good business strategy for kindergartens and preschools, whose administrators would have difficulty recruiting students if they failed to provide English lessons. Third, increasing numbers of elementary schools offer English lessons as part of the formal curricula for first graders. Because parents don’t want their children left behind, kindergartens must offer English to meet parents’ needs and fulfill their expectations. This point also coincides with the objective held by administrators of many kindergartens and preschools: to offer the best and most appropriate curriculum to children to prepare them for further. Many early childhood educators still espouse the theory of the critical period in language learning and are willing to apply it in the curriculum. Recent research showed the following as primary causes for preschools to add English to the curriculum: request of parents (89.3%), current trends (69.96%), and school philosophy (69.5%) (Tsai, 2000). Consequently, it seems inevitable that kindergartens and preschools teach English and other languages.
Benefits of Bilingualism

Learning and speaking more than one language at an early age allows children to explore the world and various cultures. Doing so can open children’s fields of vision, expand their background knowledge, and their ability to think about things from a variety of perspectives; furthermore, learning other languages also enhances children’s mental development, imagination, thinking, and reading abilities (Bialystok & Majumder, 1998; Cook, 1997). Vygostky (1962) asserted that cognitive abilities usually originate from internalizing social exchange (such as language). “Thought development is determined by language, i.e., by the linguistic tools of thought and by the sociocultural experience of the child” (Vygotsky, 1962, p. 94). Vygotsky (1978) claimed positive advantages to bilingual learning resulting from the learners’ view of language as a special system and their deepened understanding of language usage. García (1997) supported Vygotsky’s point of view, stating,

Students who are bilingual and biliterate have been shown to have increased cognitive advantages, such as more divergent and creative thinking, greater metalinguistic awareness and cognitive control of linguistic process, and increased communicative sensitivity. In addition to cognitive advantages, bilingualism and biliteracy can bring about greater understanding among groups and increased knowledge of each other. (p. 409)

Research shows that a bilingual’s knowledge is interchangeable between two languages, enriching her or his cognitive development. “According to Cummins (1984a), instruction that develops first language literacy skills not only develops these skills but
also develops a deeper conceptual and linguistic competence strongly related to the
development of general literacy and academic skills” (Hammers & Blanc, 2000, p. 98).
Linguists (Bee, 1992; Bialystok, 1988; Hakuta & Diaz, 1985) have pointed out that
children immersed in two language systems learn slowly at the outset, using two
languages to express one thing during the learning process; however, bilingual children’s
cognitive ability is stronger than that of monolingual children because of their
metalinguistic understanding. “Metalinguistic awareness differ from ordinary linguistic
competence in the sense that it calls on skills different from ordinary cognitive skills, and
bilingual children differ from monolingual children in literacy and in accomplishing
metalinguistic tasks” (Hammers & Blanc, p. 99).

Problem Statement

Understanding language issues in Taiwan and the benefits of bilingualism are
indeed helpful, but the question remains whether or not to teach English or other foreign
languages to young children. In addition, people may wonder about the necessity of
implementing native language learning for the young and to how to assist new Taiwanese
children learn Mandarin rapidly and efficiently. This researcher will, therefore, attempt to
explore these issues from a variety of perspectives to raise the more serious questions that
those in the educational field will have to face squarely.

Because of the rise of local awareness in recent years in Taiwan, people have
placed greater value on the importance of the native language. The delivery and reception
of language entail very rich and complicated cultural experiences, national consciousness,
and history; furthermore, language is the foundation of people’s thinking, which in turn
controls their understanding and beliefs about the world. When the Ministry of Education in Taiwan promotes the native language so vigorously, the extension of English learning becomes an important lesson worth deeper consideration. To strengthen the learning of the official language and native language, the Ministry of Education has strictly prohibited English teaching to young children in kindergartens and “cram” schools; however, the complete prevention of the teaching of English is impossible because of the broad market. As Ogbu (1981) discussed the cultural ecological perspective, it indicated that most parents raise their children based on their cultural experience and personal believes and those perspectives and believes are hardly influenced by outside force.

In actuality we should look at this controversy from different perspectives instead of merely disputing the appropriate age at which to learn English. The ability to acquire a language is inherent in children, and that fact is undeniable; moreover, considerable research has clearly demonstrated that a child can learn more than one linguistic form (García, 1983; Wong-Fillmore, 1976). Children’s language ability will develop in a naturalistic way when they receive assistance in a proper language-learning environment. Compared with learning and speaking a language, far more time is necessary to understand and to blend into a new culture. Learning a language should not only involve fluency in speaking and writing but also cultural concerns; therefore, the primary objective of teaching second or foreign languages to young children should be to help them explore the other language and learn about the other culture instead of merely pursuing fluency of the language.
According to sociocultural theory, the individual learner’s psychology is sharpened by social interaction. In more practical terms, human knowledge and the mind are constructed through social activity. Vygotsky (1978) viewed society as a foundation for individual cognitive development, believing that individuals develop knowledge and understanding through socialization and that society plays a fundamental role in the development of cognition through interaction. The rate of a child’s second-language acquisition is influenced by the social skills and individual differences (Wong-Fillmore, 1976; Wong-Fillmore & Valadez, 1986). Wong-Fillmore’s research indicated that peoples’ individual social skills affect their second-language learning, which tested and verified sociocultural theory. The importance of interaction between teacher and student can easily be drawn from this research. In a diverse society, young children use and learn several languages before entering school. Every language must be respected and encouraged by teachers and peers in the classroom. The languages used in classroom must be introduced to students at appropriate times; none should be forbidden, and no prejudices should be attached to any of them.

Taiwanese scholars (C. Z. Chang, S. C. Chang, & Yan, 2001; Oladejo, 2006) have recently turned their attention to bilingual learning and teaching in the Taiwanese context, but they tended to focus on parents’ attitudes and perspectives about learning and teaching English in kindergarten. One researcher (Chang, 2006) investigated parents’ attitudes and opinions regarding native-language learning in kindergarten. Most studies have revealed positive attitudes toward both, but some researches have uncovered parents’
misguided notions about bilingual and second-language teaching and learning for their young children.

When parents overemphasize bilingualism, which making it too high a priority for their children, early childhood teachers’ professional knowledge of language acquisition, bilingualism, and bilingual education increase in importance because of the potential effect of bilingualism on children’s language learning and cultural identity. That knowledge can also facilitate communication among parents and teachers to build in parents a proper and positive outlook on bilingualism and bilingual education.

Traditionally, teacher education programs have enhanced the professional knowledge of preservice teachers to help them meet the needs of the current educational milieu and beyond. Equipped with professional knowledge, the preservice teacher can put theory into practice and extend knowledge to self-development and reflection. The trend of protecting and handing down the heritage language has been an important feature of the educational mission in Taiwan since 2000 (Hwang & Chang, 2003). In addition, the extension of English education, the possibility that English will become an official language (Ko, 2002), and the trend toward diversity in the population of Taiwan have made Taiwan a more language-diverse society. Consequently, at the time of this writing, teachers in Taiwan must increase their level of professionalism in language development and bilingualism to a greater degree than ever before in order to understand students’ learning needs, help them overcome barriers, and provide the best strategies to encourage students’ learning. Teachers must have knowledge of bilingualism, second-language acquisition and even bilingual education in order to integrate English or heritage learning
into different course curricula. They also require the professional knowledge needed to promote bilingualism among young children during activity times and daily school life. Teachers must understand how to interact with young children during the language lessons. These requirements necessitate teachers’ professional knowledge and skills, putting them to the test if they had not received relating training and courses earlier. Professional knowledge of curriculum design that fosters bilingualism in young children is now a necessity in early childhood teacher education programs. Universities and colleges in Taiwan must provide courses that meet social expectations and support the field of early childhood education by instituting language acquisition and bilingual-related courses. According to Chang (2006), most of the early childhood education departments in Taiwan offer no courses relative to bilingualism and second language acquisition. She strongly recommended reform in the early childhood educational field to meet the social demand. In order to do so, several questions need to be answered. First, do Taiwan’s early childhood teacher education programs provide professional knowledge to help preservice teachers meet the educational needs of students particularly in bilingualism and second-language acquisition? Second, how do teacher educators view children’s language learning and the relationship between language learning and teacher preparation?

Purpose of the Study

This study addresses one central issue: How do Taiwan’s teacher education programs promote future teachers’ knowledge that fosters bilingualism in children? More specifically, the following research questions will be used to investigate that issue.
Research Questions

1. What courses do early childhood education programs in Taiwan offer to the future teachers in order to extend their professional knowledge of language development, language teaching, and bilingualism?

2. How do teacher educators design and arrange the curricula regarding language development, language teaching, and bilingualism.
   2.1 What values and goals do teacher educators’ apply when designing the curricula regarding language development, language teaching, and bilingualism?
   2.1 Do teacher educators integrate language development, language teaching, and bilingual education issues into nonlanguage-related courses?

3. What are teacher educators’ attitudes toward the second-language learning and bilingualism of young children?

4. From the teacher educator’s point of view, what kind of professional knowledge will be needed by future teachers in order to deal with issues relating to children’s language development and to foster bilingualism in children?

5. What measures do teacher educators suggest to increase future teachers’ knowledge of language development and bilingualism?

Each of these questions has been carefully focused on the research issue.

Significance of the Study

This study is intended neither to provide a comprehensive view of all teacher education programs nor to establish a curriculum to suit the needs of Taiwan’s teacher
education programs. Instead, the main objective is to contribute to the general understanding of the ways early childhood teacher education program curricula and teacher educators promote future teachers’ understanding of curricula that foster bilingualism in children. First, the findings will help teacher education program planners and teacher educators understand what has or has not been taught to future teachers to promote bilingualism in children. This study will also provide information on what kind of professional knowledge will be needed by future teachers in order for them to deal with children’s language development and to foster bilingualism. Finally, the findings should provide important information to lead the way for early childhood education programs to enhance their program plans and course contexts.

**Conceptual Framework**

Three bodies of knowledge will be included in this study. The first reviews the theory of second-language acquisition and bilingualism. The second involves the literature of early childhood teacher education in Taiwan. The third illuminates the level of the knowledge base in teacher education in general as a background for a discussion of promoting and fostering bilingualism.

**Methodology**

The current study was apply primarily mixed methods, including three distinct components: (a) a document content analysis, (b) a national survey and, (c) five in-depth interviews out of 12 colleges and universities which were including nine public universities and two private universities and one private college. Document content
analysis provided brief information on the school curriculum of all 12 early childhood education departments in Taiwan’s colleges and universities. The syllabi used in those departments, relating with language development, second-language acquisition, bilingualism, bilingual education, English and native-language learning and teaching were collected. A national survey send out to all the full time teacher educators at 12 early childhood education departments that collected data on these key elements: (a) language development relating courses, (b) teaching bilingualism and foreign language courses, (c) teacher educators’ expectations and attitudes regarding second-language learning and bilingualism in young children, and (d) teacher educators’ expectations and recommendations toward preservice teachers’ professional knowledge on bilingualism issues. The interview participants were recruited from two different major sources. First, purposeful sampling was conducted to find two early childhood teacher educators from different university to participate in interviews to gather in-depth knowledge about how teacher educators view and arrange the courses that relate with language teaching and learning. One participant was interested in bilingual education, language teaching and learning and used to teach courses in bilingual education and foreign-language teaching. Another participate was graduate from the Department of Home Economic and used to teach child development; pro coming to teach in the university, she taught in kindergarten, primary school and vocational school for more than 10 years. Second, an open-ended question was asked for the purpose of recruiting three interested early childhood teacher educators to volunteer for the interview. A cross-analysis was implemented after all the data have been collected to achieve in-depth insight.
Definition of Key Terms

*Bilingual:* A bilingual is a person who has developed competencies in two or more languages to the extent required by his or her needs and those of the environment (Grosjean, 1989, p.6).

*EFL:* EFL is an acronym for English as a Foreign Language that part about English not being spoken in the larger society where EFL is taught.

*ESL:* ESL is an acronym for English as a Second Language which English being the language of the larger society where ESL is taught. Richards (1985) stated “when English functions as a second language, that is, where it is used alongside other language but it is commonly the most important language of education, government, or business, it is often regarded by its users as a local rather than a foreign language”.

*Heritage language:* Heritage languages in Taiwan include the aboriginal languages, Hakka, and Hoklo. In this study, heritage language also refers as native language and mother tongue.

*Professional knowledge:* Professional knowledge concerns in-depth understanding of pedagogy and skills set forth in professional, national, and institutional standards.

*In-service teacher:* That individual who is an early childhood teacher serve in early childhood educational filed such as kindergarten and preschool.

*Preservice teacher:* That individual who is a teacher candidate in a teacher education program.

*Teacher education program:* The 4-year bachelor’s degree program in early childhood education.
Young children: Those children ranging in age from birth to six years. This research focuses on children aged three to six.

Assumptions and Limitations

The following assumptions guiding this study was based on (a) a literature review of the theory of second-language acquisition and bilingualism, (b) interactions and conversations between the researcher and teacher educators, (c) the 4-year early childhood education program plan of the 12 universities and college and the course syllabi that relate with bilingual education, language teaching and learning, multicultural education and language development and (d) teachers’ professional knowledge and skills in promoting bilingualism. The researcher has assumed that 4-year early childhood education programs have failed (Chang, 2006) to offer proper knowledge about language development and bilingualism to future teachers. A further assumption is that 4-year early childhood education programs should offer courses relating to bilingualism or require a course in bilingualism for future teachers. The researcher has assumed that 4-year early childhood education programs would enhance future teachers’ knowledge of bilingual education and language learning in order to serve diverse society.

The researcher obtained information through the survey instrument. Disadvantages of this technique were determined and acknowledged. Variation may be attributed to the individuals’ perspectives and expectations. For example, certain information was impossible to collect through the self-administered survey. First of all, the researcher cannot be certain who actually fills out the questionnaires. In addition, respondent reactions to the questionnaires will be presented by the participants. The
researcher will acquire no information on the environment in which the survey was completed. Instructions must be clear, and questions must be as unequivocal as possible because the researcher will have no opportunity to clarify the questions (Asher, 1998). Part of the study data will be obtained through interviews. The disadvantages of the interview technique will be acknowledged. The data may be limited by “distorted responses due to personal bias, anger, anxiety, politics, and simple lack of awareness since interviews can be greatly affected by the emotional state of the interviewee at the time of interview” (Patton, 2002, p. 306).

**Delimitation**

This generalizability of this study will be limited to early childhood education programs in Taiwan. A similar study conducted with teacher educators from other educational disciplines may yield different results.
CHAPTER II

LITERATURE REVIEW

The purpose of this chapter is to review relevant literature on the manner in which teacher education programs promote preservice teachers’ knowledge of bilingualism. It is divided into three related sections. The first section explains the theory of second-language acquisition and bilingualism; the second reviews early childhood teacher education in Taiwan; and the third contains an overview of level of teachers’ professional knowledge of promoting and fostering bilingualism in Taiwan’s early childhood teacher education program.

Theory of Second-Language Acquisition and Bilingualism

Second-language acquisition leading to bilingualism is a very complex process comprising, for example, psychological, socio-cultural, linguistic, and behavioral aspects. For young children environmental issues exert considerable influence. They learn two different language systems while parents speak two languages to them or while they operate in a bilingual environment. In order to understand how people acquire a second language and become bilingual, several different theories and research traditions warrant examination.
“Second Language Acquisition is a subset of general human learning, involving cognitive variations and closely related to personality type” (Brown, 2000). Interwoven with second-culture learning, it involves interference, the creation of new linguistic systems, and the learning of discourse and communicative functions of a language” (Brown, p. 271). All of the above categories as well as additional subcategories are part of basic SLA foundational theory. A full inquiry into the various domains can be found in Yorio’s 1967 study.

Three major scientific research traditions have deeply influenced all theories and methods of SLA acquisition. In terms of historical development, the three traditions include “(a) behaviorist, (b) cognitive–computational, and (c) dialogical” (Johnson, 2004, p. 9). Some linguistic scholars have labeled these three schools as follows: “(a) structuralism or descriptive behaviorism, (b) rationalism and cognitive psychology, and (c) constructivism” (Brown, 2000, p. 12).

The field of SLA strongly adheres to the second tradition—the cognitive. In past decades many of the studies on second-language acquisition were most often tied to cognitive development. The third tradition, the dialogic, is an unsubstantiated model regarded as “unscientific” by many SLA scholars because insufficient research has been done to verify its effects on SLA acquisition itself.
The school of behaviorism has dominated second-language acquisition since the end of the 1960s. From the 1940s to the 1950s, many linguistic scholars, including Leonard Bloomfield, Edward Sapir, and others promoted the behaviorist model, based on scientific research into human language. Those who espoused this school of thought also believed that objectively observable behavior was the only acceptable means of data analysis. These attitudes derived from B. F. Skinner’s classic *Verbal Behavior* (1957), an extension of his general theory of operant conditioning. He claimed that language could be analyzed in a series of functional units, each operant serving a different function. The laboratory experiments interpreted participants’ behaviors according to their own ideas, and hypotheses were treated objectively. Any thoughts, feelings, and interpretations of the participants were ignored by researchers.

Furthermore, this tradition emphasized the role of a learner’s external environment in learning and development (nurture), which was believed to stimulate the learning process. Learning in this sense came to be regarded as habits constructed through a stimulus, which was associated with response. Theorists strongly believed that “any stimulus equivalent to a response had to be reinforced, observed, corrected, and practiced” (Johnson, 2004, p. 10).

Contrastive analysis (CA) and the audio-lingual method became the most visible application in understanding how people acquire languages. This analysis was used to understand and analyze the nature of language in addition to the search for positive and negative interlanguage transfer of habits. In other words, the CA hypothesis targeted
differences between first and second language against the background of a common “platform of reference” or “tertium comparationis” (Jaszczolt, 1995, p. 562). Proponents of this hypothesis (Lado, 1957) held that the main source of errors in second language (L2) was the transference of first language (L1) habits. This particular formation is illustrated in Leonard Bloomfield’s 1933 publication Passage From Language. They also theorized the contrastive analysis of L1 and L2, predicting errors as well as the difference between the occurrence of errors in L1 and L2. Analyzing learners’ errors enables teachers to understand a learners’ second-language proficiency level in order to apply the proper teaching strategies; moreover, making errors demonstrates that a learner can test the second language in a natural way (Corder, 1967).

Scholars have published various critiques concerning the CA hypothesis. First, errors that occur may not stem from L1. Krashen (1981) stated, “Many errors are not traceable to the structure of the first language but are common to second language performers of different linguistic backgrounds” (p. 64). This means that learners may be not familiar with the second- language grammatical system and thus can mix and match grammar while practicing the language itself. A second critique of the CA hypothesis states that errors do not occur when they are predicted. We can always assume that the same error will occur with each language student who is taught; however, what has been discovered is that these errors will occur based on the background of the student and the way in which they learn the language from the outset. Third, researchers need to know how to measure both “difference” and “distance.” Defining and measuring them can be very subjective and not easily defined, resulting in misunderstandings and
miscommunication, especially between two different languages and cultures. Merely translating is insufficient; the overall communication strategy should be appropriate based on the social situations.

Linguists have argued other shortcomings of CA theory beside those noted above; however, the foregoing includes the main critiques necessary to understand the research in a historical context. In addition, this structural view of language organization affects the way second-language teaching is performed for the students and can sometimes change over time.

Johnson (2004) discussed the structural model of language organization, proposing that learning a language resembles a construction of blocks beginning with the lowest and moving to the highest, starting with phones, and then increasing to phonemes, morphemes, phrases, clauses, and sentences. This model of second-language learning commences with the teaching of phones and phonemes in order to understand differences within sounds in order to pronounce and speak words properly. It doesn’t concern itself with human cognitive development and the differences between first- and second-language acquisition.

*Cognitive–Computational Tradition*

The term *cognitive* is linguistically based and highly reliant on Noam Chomsky’s theory of first-language acquisition. In the 1960s, Chomsky intended to show that human language couldn’t be scrutinized simply in terms of observable stimuli and responses to the volumes of raw data gathered by field linguists (Brown, 2000). Creating the “language acquisition device (LAD)” theory to demonstrate this viewpoint of language
learning as an inner design of the mind (Chomsky, 1965). He suggested that (a) children are born with a certain language competence, and (b) languages can be acquired naturally.

The LAD functions as the ears and eyes of the mind, working while children are in the womb as well as after they are born, when they can hear human language. This device is a universal rule, and it can fit into any kind of language structure. It contains some basic messages and modes of analysis, which can conclude, generalize, and revise language patterns when children interact with the surroundings of a language-learning environment.

Chomsky and his followers believed that LAD was based on the normal depth structure that augments the surface structure emanating from a language-learning environment. This shows us why everyone’s language competence and language performance differ from those of others.

Chomsky’s other language theory, related with LAD, is known as universal grammar. Because we have a system of rules, such as a grammar structure, we can invent and understand sentences we have never heard before (Chomsky, 1959, p. 56). Kevin Gregg (1989) wrote, “Having fixed our domain as the acquisition of linguistic competence, we now need a linguistic theory to account for that competence.” This linguistic theory was called the “theory of grammar” (p. 24). Gregg believed that this “theory” gave SLA the power to connect with the former theory; moreover, it gave researchers a sense of direction as to where they could pursue additional insights.

Stephen Krashen connected the SLA with the cognitive theories, offering one of the most controversial theoretical perspectives (1977, 1981, 1982, 1985, 1992, 1994,
1997). These were the acquisition-learning hypothesis and the monitor model, which were the most popular in the early years. Other hypotheses also included the input hypothesis, natural order, and affective filtering (Johnson, 2004). Currently, the input hypothesis has become the most familiar term associated with all five of Krashen’s theories and has become part of a larger theoretical framework bringing together deeper influences of SLA.

This input hypothesis refers to acquisition instead of learning. The comprehensive input hypothesis (1985) holds that acquisition takes place while the learner is exposed to an environment rich in comprehensive input sufficiency. Krashen claimed that if enough input automatically provides grammar, it will be acquired subconsciously with the assistance of the internal language processor. This view of the internal language processor resembled Chomsky’s LAD. He too believed that a universal grammar exists in people’s minds and extends beyond first-language development.

Merrill Swain (1985, 1993) proposed a comprehensible output hypothesis. Swain (1985) and many others such as White (1981) also argued that comprehensible input is insufficient for language acquisition to occur. Thus, the comprehensible output hypothesis stated that “language is acquired when we produce it, fail to communicate our meaning, and then try again, eventually succeeding in communication by using a form that is correct” (Krashen, 2004, p. 4). “Sometimes, under some conditions, output facilitates second-language learning in ways that are different from, or enhance, those of input” (Swain & Lapkin, 1995, p. 371). Comprehensible output focuses on learner output, which considers oral and written proficiency besides the spoken proficiency level.
Johnson (2004) pointed out that Swain believed in “the production of comprehensible output forces the learner to notice a gap between what they want to say and what they can say” (pp. 51–52). That means that comprehensible output may help the learner become aware of a gap between his or her knowledge and linguistic competence. This then may motivate a learner to put more energy in improving his or her language competence. This output also attends more closely to syntactic processing in order to gain a higher level of grammatical accuracy.

Among the numerous other SLA hypothesis models are Long’s interaction hypothesis and VanPatten’s input processing (IP) model, which interconnect comprehensible input and output models that have dominated the second-language teaching and learning fields for the past few decades; however, those hypotheses are not regarded seriously because of concerns about environment and culture in language learning. Currently, this idea is changing because language-learning hypotheses and traditions have become out of day. Over time both cultural and environmental elements in language learning will likely appear at the forefront of the SLA field.

**Dialogic Tradition**

Vygotsky’s sociocultural theory supported the relationship between language learning and the environment. In addition, this sociocultural theory also entails the way the environment affects language acquisition and development, essentially (a) how human intelligence originates in our society or culture and (b) how individual cognition is gained through interaction with social environment instead of through internalization. According to Vygotsky (1962) language plays an essential role in cognitive development,
at least from the time the child attains a certain level of language competence (Hamers & Blanc, 2000). He also believed that language learning, development, and its processes came from simple socialization with others, giving people an ability to learn and understand a language more quickly in real-life situations than in a classroom.

Kozulin (1998) expressed Vygotsky’s sociocultural approach to language development by presupposing that different social settings must have different effects on the child’s acquisition of speech (p. 22). To Vygotsky, language was not simply an expression of the knowledge the child had acquired. He saw a fundamental correspondence between thought and speech in terms of one providing resources for the other and viewed language as essential in forming thought and determining personality features (Kozulin, 2002).

In lieu of this Richard Donato (1998) decided to put the Vygotsky’s sociocultural theory into second-language acquisition practice. This was called collective scaffolding in second-language learning, and it was based on the theory of the Zone of Proximal Development (ZPD), which Vygotsky (1978) defined as “the distance between the actual developmental problem solving and the level of potential development as determined through problem solving under adult guidance or in collaboration with more capable peers” (p. 86). Donato’s study demonstrated that scaffolding helps learners acquire language more efficiently when more capable individuals, such as parent, teacher, or an expert native speaker, provided help. He also proved that learners at the same level of second- or foreign-language proficiency showed their abilities by guiding and supporting
one another. Essentially, scaffolding provides learners an opportunity for input exchange as well as the opportunity to expand the learner’s own knowledge.

Viewing cognition and language in a manner different from Vygotsky, Piaget believed that cognitive changes from infant to adult were the result of developing stages (Piaget & Inhelder, 1969). For him, language development is connected with cognition and based on intellectual design. The theory was that a correlation could be made between language and individual cognitive competence; however, cognitive development itself comes earlier than language cognitive development. Piaget (2002) thus divided children’s language function into two parts: egocentric functions and socialized functions. Egocentric speech may be divided into three categories: repetition (echolalia), monologue, and a dual or collective monologue. Socialized speech can be separated into five parts: adapted information, criticism, commands, requirements and threats, questions, and answers (Piaget, 1977). Piaget’s cognitive development theory shows that children’s language learning needs to be specific, real, plentiful, meaningful, interesting, and relating to situational contexts. For adults, teaching children how to use language to solve the problems, deal with social issues, and interact with others becomes an important aspect of children’s language development. Researchers (Ferguson & Slobin, 1973) for their part have demonstrated that a child’s knowledge of language is gathered from environmental interaction; in other words children’s cognitive development in thinking, creativity, and problem solving is a key factor in the language-learning processes.

The major difference between Piaget’s and Vygotsky’s theories of cognitive and language development lies in Piaget’s suggestion that children’s cognition develops
earlier than language; however, Vygotsky claimed that children develop cognition and language skills simultaneously. He also believed that social interaction was the foundation in cognitive development. Piaget was more concerned with individual cognitive development as a solitary act than as a base for language development. He thus ignored the importance of the social environment in the developmental process. Nevertheless, both Vygotsky and Piaget believed that environment plays an important role in a child’s language development.

Mikhail Bakhtin (1895–1975) was one of the great thinkers of the 20th century. His contributions have their basis in the theory of literature, many of his writings relating with the conception of language. He argued that “all language is deeply socioideological and that it comes into being only in the unpredictable heterogeneity of human social interaction, therefore, making it inseparable from the dynamics and particularities of actual sociopolitical conditioning” (cited in Yip, 2004, p. 131). His work is not popular, however, when connecting the fields of linguistics and SLA even though many of his ideas have inspired researchers to make connections between language development and sociocultural issues. In his work language is not regarded as an abstract system of linguistic forms, such as phonology, syntax, and lexical; it is regarded as language itself. Johnson (2004) discussed Bakhtin’s dialogized heteroglossia (literally, multilanguagedness) in her recent publication, trying to connect Bakhtin’s theory and SLA. She indicated that Bakhtin’s thought made Vygotsky’s sociocultural theory more current. Although he pointed out the importance of human language in the cognitive development, he failed to examine the language aspects in the certain social constructs.
Bilingualism

The term bilingualism has many definitions, but researchers have been unable to agree on a single definition. It is a complex acquisition process, which contains several different aspects, such as psychological, sociocultural, linguistic, and behavioral. Webster’s dictionary (1961) defined it as “the constant oral usage of two languages.” Bloomfield (1935) defined it as “the native-like control of two languages” (cited in Hamers & Blanc, 2000, p. 6). Haugen (1969) also asserted that bilingualism begins when the speaker of one language can produce complete meaning utterances in the other language.

A broad definition of bilingual often describes an individual or group of people who obtain knowledge and use more than one language. Again, Webster’s dictionary (1961) defined it as “having or using two languages, especially spoken with fluency characteristic of a native speaker; a person using two languages especially habitually or with control like that of a native speaker.” In other words, a bilingual is a person who has the ability to speak more than one language as fluently as a native speaker “Bilinguals know more than one language to different degrees and use these languages for a variety of purposes” (Brisk, 1998, p. xvi), including jobs in translation and interpretation as well as in the teaching field.

Theories of Bilingual Language Acquisition

Gradual differentiation theory. Merrill Swain (1972) was the first person to proclaim “Bilingualism as a first language,” which was the title of her doctoral thesis.
She suggested that there is no essential difference between children acquiring one or two languages. All children learn one language using one area for storage. Within the native language, monolingual children gain knowledge in separate codes according to the situation. Subsequently, bilingual children separate two different languages into a similar language system based on the speaking situation (Swain, 1971, 1972; Swain & Wesche, 1975).

Volterra and Taeschner (1978) presented a three-stage model for the gradual differentiation theory. First, the child has one lexical system with words from both languages. Secondly, she or he recognizes that two lexical systems are used in the syntactic system. Finally, the child has two linguistic codes, each comprising a separate syntax and lexicon.

The theory has some drawbacks. First, it explains only how young children acquire two languages during a relatively brief period of time. Second, it fails to extend to explaining the acquisition of other languages when the child grows older or becomes an adult. Moreover, based on this theory, many people argue that bilingual children should be considered as monolingual for a period of time before they begin to separate syntax and lexicon.

*The separate development theory.* An alternative view of bilingual acquisition theory, which differs from the gradual differentiation theory, is the separate development theory. This theory holds that (a) bilingual children develop a separate language system from the outset and (b) bilingual children’s language systems, including syntax and lexicon, remain separate even if language borrowing and language mixing happen.
Genesee (1989) argued that a number of general linguistic features may explain the early stages of language mixing, such as lexical borrowing or overextension, features that are not limited to bilingual children. Meisel (1989) also concluded “an individual exposed to two languages from early on should be capable of separating the two grammatical systems without going through a phase of temporary confusion” (p. 35). Lyon (1996), however, raised an argument that questioned whether children differentiated their languages from the beginning, and whether evidence of mixing, or confusion between syntactical systems existed (p. 56).

The threshold theory. Threshold theorists intend to delineate the process of becoming bilingual and focus on older children (i.e., those who attend elementary school, not preschoolers). This theory, initially introduced by Cummins (1976) and Toukomaa and Skutnaab-Kangas (1997) but later expanded by Cummins, suggested that second-language development is highly dependent on a child’s first-language competency level when they are gaining exposure to the second language. Their first language will become advantageous for assisting in second-language learning while the first language is dominant and prestigious. This theory assumes the child’s competence and level of proficiency in the first and second language must rise to a certain level in order to take advantage of bilingualism.

This concept resembles Lambert’s (1974) theory of “additive bilingualism,” in which a second language does not interfere with the learning of a first language and both languages are developed at the same time. Additive perspectives concern children’s
language, culture, and their accompanying values, which play a central role in their future language usage and success. Landry (1987) defined complete additive bilingualism as (a) a high level of proficiency in both communicative and cognitive–academic aspects of L1 and L2; (b) maintenance of a strong ethno-linguistic identity and positive attitudes towards the second language; and (c) the opportunity to use one’s first language without diglossia (p. 110). Landry’s definition covers deeper and broad level of additive bilingualism, which fully explains the theory. However, if the first language is not as important as the second language, it may become dominant when first language is established. Lambert called this situation “subtractive bilingualism.” This occurs when a second language interferes with first-language learning and the second language replaces the first one.

Cummins (1983, 1986) has formulated two hypotheses pertinent to native language literacy, which support threshold theory. First, regarding the interdependency hypothesis, he stated: “To the extent that instruction through a minority language is effective in developing academic proficiency in the minority language, transfer of this proficiency to the majority language will occur given adequate exposure and motivation to learn the majority language” (Cummins, 1986). Verhoeven and Aarts (1998), who studied primary Turkish children in the Netherlands, demonstrated the positive word decoding and reading comprehension skills between languages that support this conceptual framework. Another well-known theory mentioned by Cummins is known as common underlying proficiency, which holds that knowledge is interchangeable across language. Common underlying proficiency has been compared to two icebergs,
representing two languages that overlap and share common underlying proficiencies or operating systems below the waterline. More specifically, Cummins (1989) stated, “Although the surface aspects (e.g., pronunciation, fluency, etc.) of different languages are clearly separate, there is an underlying cognitive academic proficiency which is common across languages.”

Cummins assumed two thresholds: The lower threshold is sufficient to avoid the negative effects of bilingualism, but the higher threshold is necessary to reap the positive benefits of bilingualism (as cited in Lyon, 1996, pp. 57–58). Cummins also claimed that a child’s cognitive development might be strengthened only when she or he achieves a certain threshold level of competence with the second language (1978). A study by Ricciardelli (1992) put the relationship between bilingualism and cognitive development of threshold theory to the test. The result was consistent with the theory in that it demonstrated overall bilingual superiority found in children who had achieved high degrees of bilingualism but not in those who had achieved low degrees of bilingualism. The threshold theory has helped explain bilingual children’s cognitive ability and has provided useful information for educational practice; however, the need still exists to clarify a child’s language proficiency level in order to avoid the negative effects of bilingualism and obtain positive advantages.

issues in children’s second-language acquisition and bilingualism

Most bilingual educators (Cummins, 1984b; E. Garcia, 1997; O. Garcia, 2008) support the notion that children should learn a foreign or second language at an early age, and they believe children’s learning achievement will be better than that of adults. The
major reason to support this belief is that the young bilingual learner would be able to develop both his and her mind and cognition at the same time. Vygotsky (1962) thought that cognitive abilities usually originate through internalized of social exchange (such as language). “Thought development is determined by language, i.e., by the linguistic tools of thought and by the sociocultural experience of the child” (Vygotsky, 1962, p. 94). Vygotsky (1962) claimed positive advantages to bilingual learning resultant from the learners’ view of language as a special system and their deepened understanding of language usage. Garcia (1997) supported Vygotsky’s point of view, stating

Students who are bilingual and biliterate have been shown to have increased cognitive advantages, such as more divergent and creative thinking, greater metalinguistic awareness and cognitive control of linguistic process, and increased communicative sensitivity. In addition to cognitive advantages, bilingualism and biliteracy can bring about greater understanding among groups and increased knowledge of each other. In fact, bilingual and multilingual education is true multicultural education. (p. 409)

Although many researchers have held that early bilingualism has more advantages than disadvantages, many parents, government and researchers still have negative impressions of early bilingualism. Parents and linguists have expressed concerns about the problems and disadvantages of bilingualism, believing that teaching children to read and write in two languages may cause confusion and possibly interfere in the literacy learning process (Arciniega, 1981; Baker, 2000; McLaughlin, 1984). Most investigators who have supported the belief that learning two languages at one time leads to confusion
have focused on children’s writing in one particular language and orthographic system, such as English, Spanish, Hebrew, and Chinese (Fox & Saracho, 1990; Chan & Nunes, 1998; Ferreiro & Teberosky, 1982; Sulzby, 1986; Tolchinsky, 1998).

Cummins argued about the foregoing attitudes toward bilingualism, indicating that “maintaining and developing L1 through using it as a medium of instruction for a major part of the school day has no negative effects on the development of L2 and in many cases has very positive effects, both on the development of L2 and on other academic skills” (Cummins, 1981, p. 16). Cummins (1979) theorized a common operating system, “the distinction between BICS (Basic Interpersonal Communication Skills) and CALP (Cognitive Academic Language Proficiency),” existing across an individual’s two or more language systems. BICS and CALP differentiate between social and academic language acquisition, and Cummins intended to draw attention to the very different time periods typically required by immigrant children to acquire conversational fluency in their second language as compared to grade-appropriate academic proficiency in that language (Cummins, 2006). “According to Cummins (1984b), instruction that develops first-language literacy skills also develops a deeper conceptual and linguistic competence strongly related to the development of general literacy and academic skills” (Hamers & Blanc, 2000, p. 98). Much research evidence shows that conversational skills for social interaction can be achieved within 2 years of exposure to English; the language needed for academic work can take between 4 and 9 years (Collier & Thomas, 1989; Cummins, 1981, cited in Brisk, 1998). In Cummins’ perspective the tasks of CALP are
cognitively demanding and context-reduced, which represents the highest stage of language (1984).

Many linguists (Bee, 1992; Bialystok, 1988; Hakuta & Diaz, 1985) have pointed out that immersion in two language systems can cause children’s learning to slow in the beginning, and they usually use two languages to express one idea during the learning process; however, bilingual children’s cognitive ability is stronger than that of monolingual children because of their metalinguistic understanding. Knowing two languages have been found to have a positive influence on metalinguistic awareness (i.e., the ability to reflect on and manipulate parts of language independent of meaning), a prerequisite for learning to read (Gillanders & Jiménez, 2004). “Metalinguistic awareness is different from ordinary linguistic communication in the sense that it calls on different cognitive skills, and bilingual children differ from monolingual children on literacy and metalinguistic tasks” (Hamers & Blanc, 2000, p. 99). In recent decades increasing numbers of researchers have focused their research interests on biliteracy in order to understand the interrelationship of the emergence of two different scripts. As evidence in Nathenson-Mejia’s (1989) study, children used pronunciation from one language to write in their second language, illustrating their ability to apply first-language writing knowledge to second language as part of process of testing and developing hypotheses about writing in the two languages. Some research has shown positive transfer of literacy skills across language, demonstrating that the use of one language in writing in another language does not cause confusion or interference of children’s literacy development.
We must also understand code switching when we study bilingual education and bilingualism. Code switching plays an important function in the bilingual speaker’s cognitive development and language proficiency. Bilingual speakers often switch from one language to the other without confusion. Language mixing and code switching often happen to bilingual speakers, especially when they remain in the environment where both languages are used. Code switching, or language mixing, occurs when a word or a phrase in one language substitutes for a word or phrase in a second language (Heredia & Altarriba, 2001). Myers-Scotton (1988) described code switching as the use of two or more linguistic varieties in the same conversation, without prominent phonological assimilation of one variety to the other. Language switching often occurs orally instead of in writing. Usually governed by function and grammatical rules, code-switching takes place under many conditions. For example, many bilingual speakers are more fluent in one language than in the other, or they find they can express an idea more easily in one or the other.

**Critical Period**

This is a technical term, and communication across disciplines requires respect for its established meaning (Bialystok, 2001). Brown (2001) defined the “critical period as a biologically determined period of life when language can be acquired more easily and beyond which time language is increasingly difficult to acquire” (p. 53). An argument continues to surround the critical period for language acquisition within the linguistics
field. According to the critical period hypothesis in language, children experience a particular period when language can be acquired in an accurate and effortless way. This critical period runs from birth until puberty; consequently, after puberty people experience more and more difficulty in learning language because of the progressive lateralization of cerebral functions and ongoing myelination. Most of the current critical period studies show the influence of Lenneberg (1967), who noted the “termination of a state of organizational plasticity linked with lateralization of function” (p. 176).

Several experiments conducted with functional magnetic resonance imaging (fMRI) showed a person’s center of first and second language (the Broca’s area) coincide when she or he begins second-language learning in the early age; however, there was a distance between a person’s center of second language and first language in those who learn a second language after the age of puberty (Kim et al., 1996; Kim, Relkin, Lee, & Hirsch, 1997). To be clearer, early bilinguals use very similar overlapping regions of Broca’s and Wernicke’s areas for both languages; however, late bilinguals use only overlapping regions of Wernicke’s areas for both languages, but they use different regions of Broca’s area for each language. The study shows that people use the same part of the brain to control the language function when they acquire two or more languages at an early age. By contrast, the languages function operates within two different brain areas when people acquire the second language after the critical period; in other words people have to manipulate extra brain areas to use nonnative vocabulary, demonstrating that the brain works more strenuously and the learning outcome may not be comparable with first language.
On the other side of the debate about the critical period, some scholars acknowledge no critical period at all; for example, Kinsbourne’s (1981) biological research study of adults’ and young children’s second-language acquisition showed no evidence to support the conclusion that the development of the brain’s pronunciation area directly relates with language learning. In other words, no language learning critical period exists within human life. Johnson and Newport (1989) studied 46 Chinese and Korean learners of English, all of whom had lived in the United States for at least 5 years and their respective age of arrival (AOA) ranged from age 3 to 39 years old. When participants were asked to perform a grammaticality judgment task (GJT), roughly half of them were grammatical and the other half ungrammatical. The results showed that accuracy on the GJT correlated with AOA for subjects who arrived in the U.S. before puberty, but accuracy on the GJT did not correlate with AOA for subjects who arrived after puberty. This outcome suggested that the person who operates within a defined developmental span, not general age, determines the boundary line of second-language acquisition. Johnson and Newport (1989) have straightforwardly interpreted evidence for Pulvermuller and Schumann’s (1994) biologically critical or sensitive period in second-language acquisition. Pulvermuller and Schumann maintained that “there is no clear evidence that after puberty the age of learning onset influences either mean or variance of grammaticality judgment scores” (p. 684).

In a study by Genesee (1987), sixth graders learned French more efficiently than first graders because older children are more mature in terms of cognition and mental development. By contrast, older children have better learning strategies than younger
Werker and Tees (1983) pointed out that in comparison to the inflexible learning strategies of 4-year-olds, 8-year-olds and 12-year-olds adopted better specific cognition strategies; therefore, young children have better simulation capacity, which is advantageous for recognizing sounds. This is why young children can acquire the accent of second language better than adults, yet adults or older children acquire second language in a more efficient way because they engage in effective learning strategies.

Early Childhood Teacher Education Programs in Taiwan

In Taiwan, the two major early childhood education systems are nursery school and kindergarten. The nursery schools are regulated by the local social welfare agency and considered as welfare institutions, which serve children from infancy to six years. Kindergartens are classified as educational institutions administered by local education authorities, which recruit students from four years to six years. Therefore, Taiwan’s higher education system trains early childhood teachers and caregivers in two different programs even though the two programs offer similar courses and emphasize care and education in a similar manner (Hsieh, 2004). Early childhood teachers are prepared only in early childhood teacher education program or teacher education centers administered by the Department of Higher Education of Ministry of Education; and most early childhood caregivers are trained in early childhood care departments managed by the Technological and Vocational Education of Ministry of Education. This study focuses only on early childhood teacher education program, not early childhood care programs.

According to information from the Ministry of Education, 12 colleges and universities currently offer undergraduate early childhood teacher education programs in
Taiwan. Students who study at the departments of early childhood education but do not want employment as early childhood teachers are required to complete between 124 and 128 credit hours of coursework in order to graduate, depending on the requirements at the particular university or college (National Tainan University, 2006; National Taipei Education University, 2006). The regular 124 credit hours for the undergraduate students cover three major areas: general university coursework, required department professional coursework, and professional elective coursework. Students who seek teacher certification must take extra coursework set up by the Ministry of Education. Normally, the extra coursework may include from 10 to 20 credit hours, depending on how the department has organized the professional coursework. Moreover, several teacher education centers offer early childhood teacher education programs as well. Students who intend to become kindergarten teachers must take courses at the teacher education center. All the students attending the teacher education center must complete 26 credit hours coursework designed by the Ministry of Education. Students who finish all required coursework and complete the half-year internship are permitted to take the teacher qualification exam to qualify as kindergarten teachers.

In order to assure teacher quality, the Ministry of Education has set up the standard program plan for the teacher education programs, and each university and college must follow it. The program plan defines the number of credit hours and what kinds of course should be taught. The early childhood program specifies 26 credit hours; of these 20 credit hours represent required courses; and the other 6 hours, electives (Ministry of Education, 2004).
The early childhood teacher education standard program plan was designed under the Early Childhood Education Regulation Program, which also established the objectives of the early childhood education in Taiwan. The five objectives for young children include the following: (a) to maintain healthy bodies and minds, (b) to form good habits, (c) to offer sufficient living experience, (d) to increase ethic concepts, and (e) to nurture habitual, gregarious behavior (Preschool Education Law, 2003). The Regulations of Kindergarten Curriculum Criteria is a subdivision of the Early Childhood Education Regulation Program. The kindergarten curriculum emanates from the criteria and is used as a guideline for curriculum development. Teachers need to adopt these criteria, principles, and values into their classroom curriculum in both private and public schools. The kindergarten curriculum includes six learning fields or areas: (a) health, (b) play, (c) music, (d) work, (e) language, (f) and common knowledge practices (The Ministry of Education, The National Educational Office, 1987). The objectives of the Early Childhood Education Regulation Program became important concerns when the Ministry of Education set up the standard early childhood teacher education program plan. The main purposes of the early childhood teacher education program focus on training teachers with a basic understanding of child development as well as educational pedagogy. Under this program, the 20 credit hours of required coursework are separated into four areas, which comprise fundamental teaching courses, educational fundamental courses, educational methodical courses, and teaching practicum and materials and methods courses.
The 20 credit hours include 10 different courses, of which only one course deals with young children’s language expression and one other with the care and development of the young. The former bears no direct relationship to second-language learning or bilingual education; instead it focuses on children’s first-language development and expression, not second-language acquisition. Although the latter provides insight into child development, including language development and part of second-language acquisition, the course does not promote preservice teachers’ understanding and knowledge of second-language learning and bilingual education. Part of the reason for the failure of the Ministry of Education to consider bilingualism and second-language learning could be what Kach and Mazurek (1992) pointed out; originally, teacher education trained teachers to be the agents of cultural imperialism with the goal of ignoring the heritage of other cultures and assimilating students into the dominant culture. The Ministry of Education’s failure to value preservice teachers’ professional knowledge in promoting and fostering bilingualism may imply that the teacher education program no longer meets the needs of present-day school children.

Level of Teachers’ Professional Knowledge of Promoting and Fostering Bilingualism in Taiwan’s Early Childhood Teacher Education Programs

After carefully reviewing the articles, theses, and dissertations, I have found no research related to Taiwanese teachers’ knowledge base from formal academic sources in bilingual education and bilingualism currently appearing in the literature. The review of the literature in this section, therefore, regards the knowledge base in Teachers of English to Speakers of Other Language (TESOL) teacher education and may be applied by
Teaching English to speakers of other languages occurs in many nations and involves students of all ages, so the TESOL knowledge base has become an international issue. Many researchers have identified the importance of the teacher’s ability to promote academic language development in providing effective instruction (Fradd & Lee, 1998). The teacher’s ability to promote academic language development derives from his or her professional knowledge and skills; therefore, we must identify the TESOL knowledge base.

The notion that skilled teachers exert a significant impact on student learning generally constitutes the common understanding of the relationship between teacher’s professional knowledge of pedagogy and instruction and students’ learning achievement. Rigorous teacher education and training programs is the key to helping preservice teachers and in-service teachers develop the knowledge and skills they need; consequently, we must identify what that knowledge base comprises. Sharon (1991) stated that “the existence of questions about appropriate knowledge implies the need for serious deliberation in the professional community about (a) the types of knowledge required and relationships among the categories identified, (b) conceptual frameworks for organizing and using knowledge, and (c) the modes of inquiry used in creating and validating knowledge claims in the field” (p. 1). Sharon’s explanation focuses on
conceptual frameworks, judgment, and creating and recreating knowledge. Teachers must be able to evaluate and transform outer knowledge into inner knowledge and also to teach that knowledge to others.

Scholars have viewed the definition of the knowledge base from several perspectives. Shulman (1987) enumerated several dimensions of the knowledge base, focusing on “content knowledge” and “pedagogical content knowledge,” which involves “the blending of content and pedagogy into an understanding of how particular topics, problems, or issues are organized, represented, and adapted to the diverse interests and abilities of the learners, and presented for instruction” (p. 8). In other words the pedagogical content knowledge base includes the teacher’s ability to present subject matter that students can understand and from which they can learn. Fradd and Lee (1998) have written extensively on the TESOL knowledge base. For university-level teacher education programs, they separated the knowledge base into two major parts: “knowledge of academic content” and “knowledge of students, schools, and communities” (pp. 765, 768). They subdivided knowledge of academic content into three bodies of knowledge: (a) knowledge of the language-acquisition process, which involves understanding the second-language learning process from linguistic, psychological, and sociological perspectives; (b) knowledge of academic content in subject areas, which entails understanding subject content and the communication discourse and includes the special terminology of the subject content area; and (c) knowledge of culture and the pragmatics of communication, through which the teacher introduces culture and the proper use of the language in various circumstances. We must recognize that the three major components
of the TESOL knowledge base in the American context differ from what is needed in Taiwanese teacher education programs. Knowledge of language acquisition and familiarity with subject area content are indeed needed by the Taiwanese preservice teacher to promote bilingualism in children; however, the knowledge of culture and the pragmatics of communication focusing on the culture of English-speaking countries, primarily America, become problematic. In the Taiwanese context, knowledge of cultural issues must concentrate on how to provide and teach children to value their own culture and that of others without bias toward one or the other.

Hsueh’s (2001) master’s thesis explored the practical assistance to development of English teaching given by class teachers to English teachers. Her study was based on documentation analysis, participant observation, and interview. The results of her study fell into two parts: (a) causes motivating the class teacher to provide assistance in English teaching, (b) limitations of the class teacher’s assistance in English teaching. The second part of her findings connected the issue of teacher professional development, with first, the inadequacy of English proficiency found in the class advisor; and second, the varied awareness and acceptance of English supplementary learning activities between the class advisors and English teachers; third, the absence of interaction between the class advisors and English teachers; and finally, the shortage of administrative support. Her findings indicated class teachers need to have basic English abilities in order to assist in the English classroom. The second- or foreign-language teaching methods and strategies need to be introduced to the class advisors to enhance their professional knowledge of EFL teaching and learning. Instructional handbooks, workshops, and in-service training
can be given to the class teachers to help them have better knowledge on assisting the English lessons rather than just leave them alone. Furthermore, all the teacher education programs are strongly recommended to require (a) English Fundamental Skills Development and (b) Theoretical and Practical Background for English Pedagogy and Methodology.

In an article entitled “What Teachers Need to Know about Language” Wong-Fillmore and Snow (2000) suggested courses teachers need to take. They listed and discussed seven possible courses and components, which cover fundamental issues of language teaching and learning, bilingualism, and diversity. The first course is Language and Linguistics, covering fundamental knowledge of linguistics, such as language structure, language issues in the educational environment, basic linguistic analysis, and so on. Second, Language and Cultural Diversity focuses on the relationship between cultural and language usage and development, especially on teaching and learning. The third course is Sociolinguistics for Education in a Linguistically Diverse Society, which covers language policy and political issue. In addition, language shifts, loss and isolation, and the role and history of dialects and bilingualism in the schools and society may be addressed in the classroom as well. Another course suggested by the authors is Language Development. This course should introduce issues in language development, concentrating on the academic language development of school-aged children and the importance of their literacy development. The fifth course is Second-Language Learning and Teaching, “focusing on theoretical and practical knowledge about how second-language acquisition proceeds and the factors that affect it” (p. 34). This course can
compare the differences and similarities between first- and second-language learning, and students can discuss how the first language assists second-language learning. It also focuses on second-language instruction and the choice and development of materials. The Language of Academic Discourse addresses the language used in teaching and learning school subjects. This course is designed to teach preservice teachers how to teach, explain, and interact with students. The final course is Text Analysis and Language Understanding in the Educational Setting. This course enables preservice teachers understand “how language structures and style in writing affect comprehensibility, which helps them better target instructional needs” (p. 35). The courses discussed by the authors may not precisely fit the needs of early childhood education in Taiwan, but they offer ideas on what kind of courses and knowledge should be and can be offered to preservice teachers.

Summary

A review of the literature revealed the advantages of bilingualism and the necessity of equipping preservice teachers with the knowledge they need to foster bilingualism in young children in Taiwan. At the time of this study teacher education programs in Taiwan did not prepare preservice teachers adequately with the tools they needed to do so in accordance with what research tells us. Therefore, a pressing need exists to (a) understand the extent to which Taiwan’s teacher education programs promote preservice teachers’ knowledge that fosters bilingualism in young children and (b) fill in the gaps that remain.
CHAPTER III

METHODOLOGY

Research Design

Mixed methods, employed in this study to answer the research questions, is a type of research that combines quantitative and qualitative research techniques, methods, approaches, concepts, and language into a single study (Johnson & Onwuegbuzie, 2004). Cresswell, Clark, Gutmann, and Hanson (2003) defined a mixed methods study as one that involves the collection or analysis of quantitative and/or qualitative data in a single study in which the data are collected concurrently or sequentially, are given a priority, and involve the integration of the data at one or more stages in the process of research.

Using this method, the researcher collected both quantitative and qualitative data in order to gain and understand depth and breadth information to explain and evaluate the results. The design of this study included three distinct components: (a) a document content analysis, (b) a national survey within the context of Taiwan, and (c) five in-depth comparative interviews. The document content analysis, surveys, and interviews enabled the researcher to examine the way Taiwan’s early childhood teacher preparation programs prepare preservice teachers who face the issue of multilingualism.
Research Questions

1. What courses do early childhood education programs in Taiwan offer to the future teachers in order to extend their professional knowledge of language development, language teaching, and bilingualism?

2. How do teacher educators design and arrange the curricula regarding language development, language teaching, and bilingualism.
   
   2.1 What values and goals do teacher educators’ apply when designing the curricula regarding language development, language teaching, and bilingualism?

   2.1 Do teacher educators integrate language development, language teaching, and bilingual education issues into nonlanguage-related courses?

3. What are teacher educators’ attitudes toward the second-language learning and bilingualism of young children?

4. From the teacher educator’s point of view, what kind of professional knowledge will be needed by future teachers in order to deal with issues relating to children’s language development and to foster bilingualism in children?

5. What measures do teacher educators suggest to increase future teachers’ knowledge of language development and bilingualism?

Each of these questions has been carefully focused on the research issue.

Focused on whether early childhood teacher education programs offer any courses that enhance preservice teachers’ professional knowledge of bilingualism, Question 1 was designed to determine whether early childhood teacher education programs attend to
contemporary educational needs. Questions 2 focused on major concerns of teacher educators as they design and arrange courses relating with language development, language teaching, and bilingualism; its purpose was to determine whether teacher educators integrate language-related issues into nonlanguage-related courses. This question was designed to probe the nature of professional language development, language teaching, and knowledge of bilingualism and what they really offer to preservice teachers. Questions 3 concentrated on teacher educators’ opinions of bilingualism in order to allow the researcher to understand why the programs do or do not offer such courses as the following: a second-language acquisition course, a bilingual-education course, a second-language teaching and learning course, native-language learning and teaching course, a language and multilingual course, a multicultural education course. Moreover, it enabled the researcher to comprehend the research issue from broader and deeper perspectives. Question 4, which concentrated on the kind of professional knowledge needed by preservice teachers, helped the researcher gain ideas on what kind of courses and contents should be provided to preservice teachers in order to enhance their professional knowledge of children’s language acquisition and bilingualism to meet their educational needs. Question 5 elicited suggestions and recommendations aimed at increasing preservice teachers’ knowledge of children’s bilingualism and language development, allowing the researcher to draw proper final conclusions and make recommendations.
Data Collection

Concurrent triangulation used for data collection, is graphically depicted in Figure 3.1. The idea was to use two different methods in an attempt to confirm, cross-validate, or corroborate findings within a single study (Cresswell, Clark, Gutmann, & Hanson, 2003, p. 229). Quantitative and qualitative data collections were used simultaneously; the data were merged, and the results were used to understand the research problem (Cresswell, 2003). This design offered two data collection methods to offset the weakness of one method and enhance the other. Regarding the practical process, the researcher collected both quantitative and qualitative data, analyzed it, and compared the results to understand whether the results from both types of data supported or contradicted each other. In this research, both quantitative (survey and content analysis) and qualitative (in-depth interviews) data were collected at the same time, and the researcher used results from both types to understand how early childhood teacher education programs promote future teachers’ knowledge of fostering bilingualism in young children. The major design of this study allowed all the data to be integrated during the interpretation stage in order to compare and contrast results to gain deeper insight into the research problem. (See Figure 3.1).

Content Analysis

Krippendorff (2004) stated that “content analysis is a research technique for making replicable and valid inferences from texts (or other meaningful matter) to the contexts of their use” (p. 18). From a content analysis of the literature, he concluded that
Figure 3.1. Concurrent triangulation design
scholars have defined content analysis in three ways: first, that which takes content to be inherent in a text; second, that which takes content to be a property of the source of a text; and third, that which takes content to emerge in the process of a researcher analyzing a text relative to a particular context. According to Berelson (1971) content analysis is the research technique for the objective, systematic, and quantitative description of the manifest content of communication. Objective implies that the coder must code the dataset by the same operational definition, rules, categories, and procedure. Systematic indicates all data are applied consistently to the same developed definitions, categories, rules, and procedure. Quantification measures the extent that analytic categories appear in communication. Basic content analysis includes five techniques: (a) coding, which entails simply determining the unit of analysis and measuring the extent of each unit; (b) categorizing, which involves creating meaningful categories to which units of analysis can be assigned; (c) classifying, in which the researcher organizes units of analysis into appropriate categories; (d) comparing, which involves seeking similarities and differences in the numbers of each category and completing relevant statistical analysis; and (e) concluding, that is, drawing out the results from the context.

For this study, the third definition of content analysis was closest to the researcher’s expectations for analysis of this issue. At the time of this writing, only 12 of the 156 universities and colleges in Taiwan (Ministry of Education, 2006) offered 4-year baccalaureate degrees in early childhood education with certification. The 4-year programs of plan were collected from the websites of those early childhood education departments to determine what courses were relative to language development, second-
language acquisition, bilingualism, bilingual education, and English and heritage-language learning and teaching were available to preservice teachers. The researcher telephoned each department to verify that all the data collected from the website was current. If the information on the web was incomplete, the researcher acquired missing data by phone and formal letter (see Appendix A) sent to the program director. At the end, there were only 11 out of 12 4-year program plans collected due to one university none response to the researcher’s request.

After evaluating the program plans, a formal letter (see Appendix B) was sent to the program directors to secure course syllabi relating with language development, second-language acquisition, bilingualism and bilingual education, and English and heritage-language learning and teaching, and so on. A reminder letter was sent and a follow-up phone call was made to program directors who failed to respond to the request for syllabi. At the end of the data collection period, there were 22 course syllabi from 7 universities and college sent to the researcher.

Design and Development of the Instruments

Orlich (1978) stated that the survey method, a major tool in this study, has been used to collect data and to reach participants in remote or distant areas. “A survey is a systematic method for gathering information from [a sample of] entities for the purpose of constructing quantitative descriptors of the attributes of the large population of which the entities are members” (Groves et al., 2004). “Questionnaires are any written instruments that present respondents with a series of questions or statements to which they are to react either by writing out their answers or selecting from among existing
answers” (Brown, 2001, p. 6). The researcher followed Dillman’s (1978) Total Design Method (TDM) in the design of the survey instrument, but because TDM is used for mail and telephone, not the Internet; Internet-based survey design guidelines provided by Best and Krueger have been used (2004) to ensure that the survey was amenable to completion online. In the case of this research, the survey method enabled the researcher to study and explain the teacher educators’ attitudes toward bilingualism and their perceptions of early-childhood teacher training in children’s language development, language teaching, and bilingualism. Moreover, this method allowed the researcher to gather information about what kinds of courses and knowledge relating with language have been offered to preservice teachers.

The researcher developed a survey questionnaire (see Appendix C) divided into six sections to obtain general data for the study. Section 1, comprising 11 questions, was designed to elicit demographic data on the respondents. In this section participants had the opportunity to identify gender, native language, primary speaking language, university/college, school type, status, number of years of teaching at the university/college, research interests, and teaching foci. The demographic data allowed the researcher to understand whether participants’ personal, teaching, and research background affected their attitudes, opinions, and teaching with regard to bilingual education and bilingualism. Seven questions in Section 2 concerned courses offered by the department; these questions, which could be answered with “Yes” or “No,” were designed to determine whether or not participants’ departments offered courses in child development, children’s language development, bilingual education, teaching of English
as second language, multicultural education, second-language acquisition, and teaching native language. Participants were asked to answer a follow-up question to indicate required courses and electives. Section 3 dealt with the integration of bilingual education and bilingualism issues in nonlanguage courses. A 5-point Likert scale was introduced in this section and applied to successive sections; the Likert-scale questions were accompanied with options including the following: 1=strongly disagree, 2=disagree, 3=neutral, 4=agree, to 5=strongly agree. A Likert scale is a scale with a number of points that provide ordinal scale measurement (Wiersma & Jurs, 2005, p. 170). A 5 point Likert scale clearly defines the options to the respondents which give neutral ground to answer neither positive nor negative. Section 4 included questions designed to elicit respondents’ attitudes toward second-language learning for young children; in this section, participants were asked 15 questions. Section 5 contained questions regarding the early-childhood preservice teachers’ professional knowledge; in this section participants were asked to indicate the importance of the professional knowledge of preservice teachers by answering the 10 questions in this section. The final section involved suggestions and recommendations from teacher educators for improving preservice teachers’ professional knowledge; of the eight questions contained in this section, six of them were closed-ended questions and two were open-ended.

Validity and Reliability

To check for validity, a panel of experts from early childhood education and measurement were invited to study the questionnaire and interview questions to determine content and face validity of the instrument. A content validation form adapted
from Chen (2002) was e-mailed to the experts to ask them to review the questionnaire items and interview questions for face and content validation (see Appendix F). A cover letter (see Appendix E) inviting their participation in this study, explaining the purpose of the study, and containing directions for establishing face and content validation was attached to the e-mail. The questionnaire and interview questions were revised according to their suggestions and recommendations. The translation/back translation (Behling & Law, 2000, p. 20) method was adapted to translate the questionnaire back and forth between English and Mandarin. The questionnaire and interview questions were translated by the researcher from English into Mandarin. A bilingual individual with no knowledge of the wording of the original source-language document translated the Mandarin version into English. The original and back-translated source-language versions were compared by the researcher and the translator. Some significant differences arose in the two versions, so a third bilingual person was invited to look at the both versions and the original document to provide suggestions. At the time of the data collection, the second bilingual translator was a PhD student in the Department of Nursing in America; who completed the bachelor and master degree in the United States and has been a lecturer in the University for more than 8 years. The third translator earned both her bachelor and master degrees in the Department of English in China. She was working on her second master degrees in the Department of Accounting in The City University of New York – Baruch College in the time of data collection. The final versions of the questionnaire and interview questions were agreed by researcher and the two bilingual translators.
Pilot Study

Three teacher educators who were representative but who would not participate in the final sample were randomly chosen for a pilot study to evaluate the survey. Data from the pilot study were examined and analyzed to establish a coefficient of interitem correlations. Cronbach’s alpha value provided by George and Kallery (2003) was used as “≥ .9 – Excellent, ≥ .8 – Good, ≥ .7 – Acceptable, ≥ .6 – Questionable, ≥ .5 – Poor, and < .5 – Unacceptable” (p. 231). The internal consistency reliability coefficient for the third and fourth section was 0.762 and 0.7. Section 5 obtained reliabilities below 0.70; therefore, questions 41 and 43 were deleted to raise Cronbach’s alpha to .714. In section 6, question 53 was removed to secure reliabilities above 0.781. An abbreviated version of the semistructured web-based interview took place to clarify the questions and ensure the understanding of the participants. The results of the pilot study guaranteed the clarity and comprehensibility of the questions (Shin, 2000).

Final Survey Instrument

As presented in the Appendix D, the final survey instrument contained a total of 52 items in six sections. Section 1 contained the participants’ demographic data, which included 11 items. Section 2 contained seven questions intended to elicit understanding of courses relating with language development and bilingualism offered by the department. Section 3 comprised four items dealing with the integration of bilingual education and bilingualism issues in nonlanguage courses. Section 4 was composed of 15 items about teacher educators’ attitudes and opinions toward bilingualism and second-language acquisition. Section 5 included eight questions regarding the early-childhood
preservice teachers’ professional knowledge. In the final section 6, participants answered five closed-ended questions and two open-ended questions involving teacher educators’ suggestions and recommendations for improving preservice teachers’ professional knowledge.

**Survey Collecting Technique**

The population for the survey study consisted of Taiwan’s early childhood education faculties. According to data collected from the web, 137 full-time faculty members were at work in 12 early childhood education departments at the time of this writing. The survey research included the entire population because it is small and easily identified. An Internet-based survey was established by the researcher through the Kent State University website. K. Jansen, Corley, and B. Jansen (2007) cited Green and Stanton, who defined electronic surveys as “those survey instruments that physically reside on a network server (connected to either an organization’s intranet or the Internet) and that can be accessed only through a Web-browser” (p. 2). The survey-collecting period lasted 8 weeks. During the 8-week period, two formal mails and three e-mails were sent out to all participants. Initially, a formal letter (see Appendix G) was mailed to all participants to invite them to fill out the online survey. In addition, all participants’ e-mail addresses were collected through department websites in order to send e-mail invitations to participants as well. A letter explaining the importance and the purpose of the study was attached to the front page of the Web-based survey. A formal letter and survey were sent out to the participants who did not offer a contact e-mail. Completed surveys were submitted anonymously and served a research purpose only. To improve
the response rate, 2 weeks after the first contact, another e-mail went out to the participants who hadn’t opened the original e-mail or who opened the e-mail but did not complete the on-line survey. Between the 5th and 6th weeks another reminder e-mail was sent out to the remaining individuals who hadn’t opened the e-mail or who opened the e-mail but did not fill out the on-line survey to encourage them to contribute to the study. In addition, a formal reminder letter and survey were mailed to increase the response rate.

Fifty-three out of one-hundred thirty seven surveys were returned, but only 45 of them were complete. After calculation, the return rate was 39% and the actual useable rate is 33%. During the collection period, 12 pieces of mail and e-mail were sent to the researcher regarding potential participants’ inability to respond to the surveys. They offered three major reasons. First, the participants were too busy with their work; second, their research foci were not in language or bilingual education, so they chose not to respond to the survey; and third, people were not willing to criticize the system.

Educators used to be the national policy propagandist but it does not mean the educators identify themselves with the policy. For the past few years, Ministry of education in Taiwan advocates the young children should learn mother tongue and Mandarin first rather than learning the English or other foreign languages. However, due to the globalization tendency, Taiwanese parents are enthusiastic about fostering English into the children. Many of the Taiwanese accustomed put English and Mandarin learning together while dealing with the issues of bilingual education and bilingualism. Many of the teacher educators realized the parents’ requirement of English learning and bilingual education; nevertheless, they also understand which against the national policy of
language learning. Under the circumstance, many scholars refuse to discuss the issue of bilingual education and were not willing to comment upon it.

*Interviews*

“An interview is literally an inter view, an interchange of views between two persons conversing about a theme of mutual interest” (Kvale, 1996, p. 2). Five in-depth face-to-face interviews were held by the researcher to gather deeper information and an understanding of the research issue, allowing her better to interpret the data collected through survey and content analysis. In-depth interviews commonly involved one-to-one, face-to-face interaction between an interviewer and an informant and sought to build a kind of intimacy (Johnson, 2002, p. 103). In-depth interviewing involved deeper personal experience, attitudes, and beliefs; thus, the researcher required greater sensitivity to the conversation and had to assume a passive role as a listener. During the interview, the researcher sometimes probed to gain a clear understanding of the subject matter. This fell under the definition of the semistructured interview, which Bryman (2001) said includes “a series of questions that are in the general form of an interview schedule but [the interviewer] is able to vary the sequence of questions—also, the interviewer usually has some latitude to ask further questions in response to what are seen as significant replies” (p. 110).

Five early-childhood teacher educators were recruited for the interviews (see Appendix H for consent letter). The recruitment occurred in two parts. In the first part, two were chosen purposefully according to their educational background and research interests after the researcher evaluated program plans and course syllabi. The sample size
of this study was typical small, purposeful sampling allows researcher to acquire
information-rich units within the sample to fulfill the data (Wiersma & Jurs, 2005). In the
section 6, an open-ended question was asked at the end of the survey, inviting faculty to
participate in an interview. Three interested early-childhood teacher educators to
volunteer for the interview. The researcher audio-recorded all interviews with two
recorders to avoid problems if one recorder malfunctioned. The average length of each
interview took around 60 minutes. Two of the participants took a second around
interview which last around 30 minutes in order to clarify some concepts and to obtain
more information. The researcher also took interview notes during the interview process
to formulate new questions and aid in later analysis (Patton, 2002). All interviews were
translated by research and another doctoral student.

Participants 1 and 2 were recruited purposefully by researcher. Participants 3 to 5
were volunteers for the interview. The pseudonyms were used to protect the participants.
The background of those five participants follows.

Participant 1

Dr. Betty Liao earned a master’s degree and a doctorate in curriculum and
instruction in the University of Texas at Austin, specializing in early childhood education.
She taught undergraduate and graduate courses on children’s literature and literacy
education, children’s language development, and bilingual education. Dr. Liao’s
scholarly interests focused on children’s social and emotional development as well as
multicultural and bilingual education.
Dr. Liao was fully fluent in three languages which are Hoklo, Mandarin and English. Mandarin is the major language which Dr. Liao uses in her daily social life, however, some of the time she did speak Hoklo with her family and friends. Dr. Liao earned a bachelor degree from the Department of English and has been a teaching assistant in the English department for a period of time before went abroad to earn the master degree and PhD. Therefore, English has been a significant language to the Dr. Liao and she was willing to adopt English into her life.

Because of her educational background and the personal experience, Dr. Liao highly believed people have abilities to be fluent in many languages. She thought children will benefit more from the advantages of bilingualism than adults. Therefore, Dr. Liao devoted herself to the research of the monolingual and bilingual development of young children. She encouraged parents to maintain children’s native language proficiency and allow them to explore to other languages as well.

Participant 2

Mrs. Amy Hsu earned her B.A. in the Department of Home Economics in Taiwan and her master’s degree in education from an American university. Currently, she was a doctoral student at the College of Education in Capella University in the U.S. At the time of this writing, she was a lecturer in a college. Prior to that, she taught in a vocational high school for 6 years, kindergarten for 2 years and as a substitute teacher in several primary schools over a period of 3 years.

Mrs. Amy Hsu, who was fully fluent in Hoklo and Mandarin and had achieved intermediate level proficiency in English, stated that Hoklo is the only language she used
in her daily life before attending elementary school; however, after that Mandarin became her primary language. At the time of this writing Mrs. Hsu spoke Mandarin in her daily social and school life; she used Hoklo only in her family life and on certain occasions. Mrs. Hsu indicated English is a second language for her, but she is not fully fluent in it even though she earned her master’s degree in America. While Mrs. Hsu attended high school, she thought the primary reason for learning English was to advance to the next level of school; therefore, she paid attention only to the textbooks instead of speaking the language. Based on her erroneous notion, Mrs. Hsu failed to acquire full knowledge of English, and for that she was regretful.

Participant 3

At the time of this writing Dr. Lisa Ma had served as an assistant professor at the university level for 7 years. Before coming to higher education, she was a vocational high school teacher for more than 10 years. Dr. Ma was born and reared in southern Taiwan, making her fluent in Hoklo and Mandarin; moreover, after graduation from junior college in Taiwan, Dr. Ma went abroad to Japan for her B.A. in early childhood education, making her fluent in Japanese as well. In addition to those three languages, Dr. Ma spoke and wrote American English because she earned her master’s degree and Ph.D. in the U.S..

The research of Dr. Ma focused on the design of teaching materials, preservice teachers’ professional development and learning behavior, and multicultural education. Child Development, Design of Teaching Materials, and Learning Principles of Young Children were three major courses she taught at the university level.
Participant 4

After graduation with a Bachelor of Arts in early childhood education, Dr. Doris Ning worked as a kindergarten teacher in southern Taiwan. Following 3 years of work, she traveled to the U.S. for her master’s degree in curriculum and instruction, concentrating in early childhood education. Prior to beginning her doctoral work, she was employed as the principal of a private kindergarten in Taiwan for 6 years. She completed her Ph.D. in educational leadership in America, and for the 2 years preceding this research, she served on a university faculty.

Dr. Doris Ning is a typical Taiwanese, who was bred up in a bilingual environment which makes her fully fluency in both of the Mandarin and Hoklo. In the Dr. Ning’s social life, she used Mandarin and Hoklo equally; however, at the university she only communicated in Mandarin with the students. Besides Mandarin and Hoklo, Dr. Ning also able to speak and write English but she is hardly use it now.

Dr. Ning’s research interests were focused on administration, collaboration with and mentoring of preservice teachers, and home–school relations. While Dr. Ning worked in the kindergarten as a principal, she paid particular attention to the children’s language learning. Her kindergarten offered Hoklo lessons taught by Dr. Ning herself and English lessons taught by foreign teachers. Dr. Ning stated that she believes children can learn more than one language at the same time and without confusion; therefore, adults should offer opportunities for children to discover multiple languages.
Participant 5

At the time of this writing, Kelly Loh was an assistant professor in the Department of Early Childhood Education at a national university. She earned a B.A. in early childhood education in Taiwan and both of her master degree in early childhood education and a doctorate in education in America. Dr. Loh was a music teacher and a kindergarten teacher before she traveled to America for her master’s degree. Prior to her doctoral work, Dr. Loh was a lecturer at a private college for 2 years.

Dr. Loh was reared in a Mandarin family, making her fluent in Mandarin but with not proficient at other Taiwanese languages. Dr. Loh began her formal English learning when she attended the middle school and she devoted to the study of English. Nowadays, she enjoyed writing the professional papers in English and translated the English textbooks into Mandarin Chinese.

Dr. Loh’s scholarly work in the decade prior to this research concentrated on preservice and in-service teachers’ efficiency, integrated curriculum, mathematics education, and parental education. The major graduate and undergraduate courses Dr. Loh taught included classes on curriculum design for young children, principles of early childhood education, parental education, and music instruction, and design of materials.

Interview Questions

Twelve guiding questions were designed for semistructured interviews in Mandarin to obtain detailed information for the study.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>English Version</th>
<th>Chinese Version</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Please speak briefly about your teaching experience.</td>
<td>1. 能請你簡短的描述你的教學經驗嗎？</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. What are your research interests?</td>
<td>2. 請問你的研究興趣為何？</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. What is your educational background? Degrees?</td>
<td>3. 請問你的教育背景及學位為何？</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. When you were in graduate school working on your degree, did you take any course related to language development, second-language acquisition, bilingual education, teaching and learning foreign language, etc.?</td>
<td>4. 在你就讀研究所或博士班時，是否曾修習有關語言發展、第二外語習得、雙語教育及外語教學等相關性課程？</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Does your department place focus on language development, second-language acquisition, bilingual education, and second- or foreign-language teaching and learning? Do you teach any of those courses? If yes, go to question 6. If no, go to question 7.</td>
<td>5. 請問你任教的學系是否強調有關語言發展、第二外語習得、雙語教育以及第二外語或外語教學等課程？你教過以上相關課程嗎？如果是的話，續問問題 6，如果不是的話，到問題 7。</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. What are your major concerns when designing the course or courses?</td>
<td>6. 當你設計課程時，什麼重點是你最主要的考量？</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Have you ever talked about language development, language teaching, and bilingual education issues in nonlanguage-related courses? Why/how or why not?</td>
<td>7. 你是否曾在非語言的課程裡，談論有關語言發展、語言教學和雙語教育相關議題？如果有的話，談些什麼，如果沒有，為什麼不談論？</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Do you support fostering bilingualism in young children? Why/how or why not?</td>
<td>8. 你支持培養幼兒雙語能力嗎？如果支持的話，為什麼？該如何做？或者為什麼不支持？</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.1 Do you support teaching English or foreign language to young children in the formal school setting?</td>
<td>8.1 你建議在一般的學校裡教授幼兒英語或外語嗎？</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.2 Do you support integrating native, English and foreign-language teaching to young children in the classroom?</td>
<td>8.2 你支持將母語、英語或外語教學融入幼兒的學習課程嗎？</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
9. What do you think are the advantages and disadvantages of bilingualism?
9. 你認爲雙語教育的優、缺點為何？

10. What are your opinions regarding teaching native language to young children in the formal school setting?
10. 在學校裡教授小孩子母語，你的看法為何？

11. From your professional point of view, what basic professional knowledge do preservice teachers need to deal with multilingual, multicultural, and bilingual education issues?
11. 從你的專業角度來看，職前教師要學習什麼樣的基本專業知識，以便應付多種語言、多元文化以及雙語教育等相關議題？

12. Do you have any suggestions or recommendations for increasing preservice teachers’ knowledge of second-language acquisition and bilingualism?
12. 對於增進職前教師的第二外語習得及雙語教育知識，請問你有什麼建議？

---

### Data Analysis

In this study, data were analyzed in two phases. First, qualitative data were analyzed by hand coding. Corbin and Strauss (1990) promoted set of procedures for analysis which are open, axial and selective coding. The interview data were transcribed soon after each interview. Each interview was coded twice by the researcher to assure that all the important information had been coded. A brief description of the content of those passages was attached to each code for future reference (Patton, 2002). Each code was classified into different categories (axial coding), which were sorted by characteristics into themes (selective coding). Second, the course descriptions, goals, objectives and course plans were coded and classified by the same procedure noted above. Please see Table 3.1 for interview analysis and Table 3.2 for the content analysis. Table 3.3 is the theme definition of content analysis.

Second, the quantitative data collected through the survey questionnaires were analyzed statistically. Data were inserted into the Statistical Package for Social Sciences
Table 3.1:

**Interview Analysis**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Emerging Themes / Sub-Themes</th>
<th>Theme Interpretation</th>
<th>Sources</th>
<th>Best exemplary</th>
<th>Frequencies</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Beliefs</strong></td>
<td>The bilingual is a person who can speak Mandarin and English or other foreign language, not one who can speak Mandarin and Hoklo, Hakko, or aboriginal languages.</td>
<td>Dr. Lisa Ma, Mrs. Amy Hsu, Dr. Doris Ning, Dr. Kelly Loh</td>
<td>According to my thought and the circumstance of our society, the bilingual is the person who can speak Mandarin and English or other foreign language. I won’t define Mandarin + Hoklo/ Hakko or aboriginal languages as bilingual. (Dr. Kelly Loh interview, page 3, line 17-18)</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Beliefs</strong></td>
<td>Teacher educators bring positive attitudes in raising bilingual children but do not consider putting mother tongue lessons in formal educational system as necessity.</td>
<td>Dr. Lisa Ma, Mrs. Amy Hsu, Dr. Kelly Loh</td>
<td>I think it is not necessary to teach Hoklo to young children in kindergarten (Dr. Kelly Loh interview, page 6, line 18). Hoklo is an oral language and does not have formal characters, so I do not think we should teach it to our children (Dr. Lisa Ma, interview 2, page 1, line 6).</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Beliefs</strong></td>
<td>Learning English enhances children’s future global competition abilities.</td>
<td>Dr. Lisa Ma, Mrs. Amy Hsu, Dr. Doris Ning, Dr. Betty Liao, Dr. Kelly Loh</td>
<td>English is a global language; I think our government should provide more ways to assist the children to learn it from one’s childhood (Mrs. Amy Hsu interview, page 6, line 24-25). Our children have to learn English in order to compete with others and survive from the global village (Dr. Doris Ning interview, page 5, line 17).</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Beliefs</strong></td>
<td>Integrating English learning and teaching into the kindergarten curriculum is feasible.</td>
<td>Dr. Lisa Ma, Mr. Amy Hsu, Dr. Doris Ning, Dr. Betty Liao</td>
<td>Almost every kindergarten teaches English even though doing so is forbidden by the Ministry of Education (Dr. Lisa Ma interview, page 5, line 19-20).</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Language chauvinism in Taiwan’s educational system</td>
<td>Dr. Kelly Loh, Dr. Betty Liao, Mrs. Amy Hsu,</td>
<td>Not long ago, I made a public speech to a group of women regarding the issues of bilingualism. Prior to the public speech, the local education bureau officer called me to ask me not to talk about the issue of young children learning English. They advised me that if I needed to discuss bilingualism, I should talk about Mandarin with mother tongue, not Mandarin with English (Dr. Betty Liao interview note, page 4, line 3).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bilingual education and bilingualism are ignored by Taiwanese educational system.</td>
<td>Dr. Lisa Ma, Mrs. Amy Hsu, Dr. Doris Ning, Dr. Betty Liao, Dr. Kelly Loh</td>
<td>There are too many things for our preservice teachers to learn. I don’t think we should impose bilingual education lessons on them. (Dr. Kelly Loh interview, page 8, line 5). Our department is re-evaluating the program plan, but I don’t think we will have related courses about bilingual education or the second language acquisition. (Dr. Lisa Ma interview 1, page 12, line 9).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Difficulties</td>
<td>Disregard</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Difficulties</td>
<td>Complicate</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preservice teachers lack of proficiency in English and lack of fluency in mother tongue.</td>
<td>Dr. Lisa Ma, Mrs. Amy Hsu, Dr. Doris Ning, Dr. Betty Liao, Dr. Kelly Loh</td>
<td>The kindergarten at which I used to work usually hired professional English teachers; the classroom teachers are just their assistant because those kindergarten teachers lack of English proficiency (Dr. Doris Ning interview, page 6, line 5). The students in my department used to come with lower English ability; therefore, it is a tough assignment to enhance their English abilities within four years (Dr. Lisa Ma, page 12, line 12).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Language abilities</td>
<td>Dr. Lisa Ma, Mrs. Amy Hsu, Dr. Doris Ning, Dr. Betty Liao, Dr. Kelly Loh</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3.1 (Continued)
Table 3.1 (Continued)

| English Concentration | Some departments plan to put a concentration in English teaching into their 4-year program plan. | Dr. Lisa Ma, Mrs. Amy Hsu, Dr. Kelly Loh | Our department plans to revise the 4-year program plan. We intend to add a concentration in teaching English to young children. We hope we can enrich our students’ future career opportunities (Dr. Kelly Loh, interview, page 8, line 13). |

Note: Number of incidents identified for this emerging theme
Table 3.2:

**Content Analysis of the Syllabi**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Emerging Themes</th>
<th>Number of Syllabi</th>
<th>Name of the Course</th>
<th>Description of Language, Bilingualism, Multilingual, EFL</th>
<th>Goal Language</th>
<th>Course Plans</th>
<th>Field</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Language Development</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Child Development and Care *3</td>
<td>Child development/language development</td>
<td>1st Language</td>
<td>Child development, behavior and care</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Language Expression of Young Children*2</td>
<td>Language development</td>
<td>1st Language</td>
<td>Oral and written development, language theories, and literacy</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Language Development</td>
<td>Language development</td>
<td>1st Language</td>
<td>Language development and theories, enhancing children’s language development</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Language Teaching</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>Language Arts for Young Children/Language Materials and Methods in Early Childhood *4</td>
<td>Language teaching</td>
<td>1st Language</td>
<td>Teaching principle, materials, Whole language, integrated curriculum</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Literature for Young Children *4</td>
<td>Literature and language development</td>
<td>1st Language</td>
<td>Definition, values, teaching principles, activities and curriculum design</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Appreciating English Songs for Early Childhood</td>
<td>English teaching</td>
<td>English</td>
<td>Nursery rhyme, activities, anime and stories</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Listening and Speaking English Stories for Childhood Education</td>
<td>English teaching</td>
<td>English</td>
<td>English teaching</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Selected English Reading in Early Childhood Education</td>
<td>Enhancing Preservice teacher’s English ability</td>
<td>English</td>
<td>English picture books, papers for EC (in English) and listening to the English teaching program</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theme</td>
<td>Definition</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Language Development</td>
<td>The course that comprise the issue of language development.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Language Teaching</td>
<td>The course content covers with the issue of language teaching.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multicultural Education</td>
<td>The issue of multicultural or native culture has been containing into the courses.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bilingual Education</td>
<td>The courses which discuss the topic of bilingualism or bilingual education.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
(SPSS) 14.0 for the following statistical measures: descriptive frequencies, means, percentages, standard deviations, and 95% confidence intervals. One way ANOVA and t-Test were used to explain and predict the relationship among questions. Wiersma and Jurs (2003) wrote that ANOVA (Analysis of Covariance) is an inferential statistics procedure by which a researcher can test the null hypothesis that two or more population means are equal (p. 385). The variables of this study were gender, mother tongue, oral language, public or private university, professional status, year of teaching, higher education and, courses taken. The t-Test is a statistics procedure that allows the researcher to compare the means of two groups to understand whether the means differ from each other. Within the survey questionnaire, there was one open ended question asked the suggestion and recommendation of the research issues. 13 out of 45 participants answered the questions, the answers have been coded and sorted into 3 major themes according to the literature soon after the data collecting period. The three themes were (1) knowledge of second language acquisition, (2) preservice teachers should learn a second language or the native language, and (3) classroom observations and filed experience.

Johnson and Christensen (2000, p. 319) recommend that “the researcher should have the original participants review the interpretations and descriptions of the experience”; therefore, transcripts were sent to the original interviewees so they could read the transcript and verify its accuracy once the raw data had been transcribed by the researcher.

The modified direct translation method (Geisinger, 1994) was used to maintain the accuracy of the transcripts. The entire important interview data collected in Mandarin
was translated into English by the researcher. Two bilingual people fluent in Chinese and English were recruited to participate in a panel to review transcripts in both Mandarin and English. One person was a doctoral student in a Department of Teaching English as a Second Language; the other was an assistant who earned a Ph.D. from an American university. Discussions among the panel members and researcher were held to provide clear direction to modify the transcripts.

A member of an early childhood education faculty in Taiwan, who is a friend of the researcher, served as a peer reviewer. Because of her academic background and work experience, she understood the early-childhood preservice teacher’s need for professional knowledge in language and bilingualism.

Chapter Summary

Mixed methods design was used in this study because this method involves the collections or analysis of both quantitative and/or qualitative data in a single study in which the data are collected concurrently or sequentially, are given a priority, and involve the integration of the data at once or more stages in the process of research (Creswell, Clark, Gutmann, & Hanson, 2003, p. 212). This study included three distinct components: (a) a document content analysis, (b) a survey within in the context of Taiwan, and (c) five in-depth comparative interviews.

Krippendorff (2004) stated that “content analysis is a research technique for making replicable and valid inferences from texts (or other meaningful matter) to the contexts of their use” (p. 18). 11 4-year program plans have been collected and analyses, 22 course syllabi relating with language development, second-language acquisition,
bilingualism and bilingual education, and English and heritage-language learning and teaching, and so on from 7 universities and colleges were collected.

In the quantitative phase, a total of 137 surveys were sent and 53 were returned, but only 45 of them were complete. After calculation, the return rate was 39% and the actual useable rate is 33%. ANOVA and t-Test have been adopted to analysis the data to determine the relationship among the group of samples and variables.

Five early-childhood teacher educators were recruited for the interviews. The recruitment occurred in two parts. In the first part, two were chosen purposefully according to their educational background and research interests. In the second part, an open-ended question was asked at the end of the survey, inviting faculty to participate in an interview. Three interested early-childhood teacher educators to volunteer for the interview.
CHAPTER IV

RESULTS

This chapter contains results declinated in three parts: (a) content analysis, (b) survey results, and (c) interview results. Content analysis focuses on courses offered by early childhood education departments for preservice teachers relating to language development, language teaching, bilingual education, and multicultural education; moreover, the course syllabi, which concern language development, language teaching, bilingual education, and multicultural education from the 11 out of 12 departments, have been evaluated. During the data collection period, the researcher made a personal call to each department to verify that all the data collected from the website was current. Some of the department’s information on the web was incomplete; the researcher acquired missing data by phone and formal letter sent to the program directors. At the end, the researcher unable to obtain the program plan from the National Taipei University of Education, due to the university didn’t post a full-fledged version of program on the website and didn’t response to the researcher’s request. Survey results involve teacher educators’ knowledge of and attitudes toward bilingual education, bilingualism, and preservice teachers’ professional knowledge. Interview results provide a deeper and
wider understanding of teacher educators’ knowledge of and attitudes toward bilingual education and bilingualism as well as the ways their departments deal with those needs.

Content Analysis

Four-year program plans from 10 universities and one college were collected from websites and by mail for evaluation by the researcher. In the evaluation of the program plans, the researcher investigated and analyzed what kinds of courses related to language development, second-language acquisition, bilingualism, bilingual education, foreign- and heritage-language teaching and learning, and multicultural education have been offered to preservice teachers. The Center for Education Information in the U.S. indicates that general courses, academic courses, educational courses and teaching practice are four primary components for program of teacher preparation (Al-Weher & Abu-Jaber, 2007, p. 252). Based on those program plans, the researcher discovered that most departments’ curriculum included three major areas: general university coursework, required department professional coursework, and professional elective coursework. Required professional coursework is similar across the departments, but professional elective coursework varies among them.

To understand how the departments of early childhood education promoted preservice teachers’ understanding and knowledge of bilingualism and bilingual education, the researcher evaluated the syllabi of the required and elective professional coursework of each department. A formal letter (see Appendix B) was sent to the program directors to secure course syllabi relating with language development, second-
language acquisition, bilingualism and bilingual education, and English and heritage-
language learning and teaching, and so on. A reminder letter was sent and a follow-up
phone call was made to program directors who failed to respond to the request for syllabi.
At the end of the data collection period, there were 22 courses syllabi from 7 universities
and college sent to the researcher in order to understand the course objectives, course
plans, assignments, and textbooks.

Four-Year Program Plans

The Department of Early Childhood Education at the Taipei Municipal University
of Education planned the program into two parts which were teacher education program
and non teacher educational program. The students who enrolled in the teacher education
program would require to complete 157 credit hours coursework and a half year
internship. However, the students who enrolled in the non-teacher education program
only needed to study 128 credit hours to graduate. This study only takes teacher
education program curriculum into consideration. Early childhood preservice teachers at
the Taipei Municipal University of Education need to take Development and Care of
Young Children, Language Arts for Children, and Literature for Young Children as
required courses; those courses represents 7.7% of total required department professional
courses. The elective professional courses related to research contexts were Language
Development, Bilingual Education for Young Children and Literacy Development as
elective courses which represent 3.5% in their entire elective professional courses.
The Department of Early Childhood Education at the National Hsinchu University of Education has planned the program for two different group of students which are teacher education and non teacher education which similar to the Department of Early Childhood Education at the Taipei Municipal University of Education. This department offers Development and Care of Young Children, Literature for Young Children and Language Expression of Young Children as the core courses, and also provides Early Literacy Instruction and Cognitive Psychology of Young Children as elective courses. Preservice teachers need to take the three elective courses as required in order to qualify for early childhood teacher certificate. The proportion of those required courses was 10% of their entire required professional courses of ECE teacher education program’s curriculum; the above elective courses represent 3%.

National Taichung University offers many different required courses related with language teaching and learning and multicultural education to students, including Literature for Young Children, Language Expression of Young Children, Development and Care of Young Children, Emergent Literacy for Young Children and Kindergarten Language Arts Teaching Materials and Methods. In addition, the Department also provides Study of Chinese Nursery, Study of Chinese Native Toys, English Teaching for Young Children, and Multicultural Education as optional courses. 21.7% represents above required courses and 6.7% represents these elective courses in their entire professional required and elective courses of ECE teacher education program’s curriculum.
The Department of Early Childhood Education at the National Chiayi University offers various courses to students. Four obligatory courses affiliated with language learning are Children’s Literature, Child Development and Care, Literacy Instructional Materials and Methods in Early Childhood Education, and Multicultural Education. Curriculum on Native and Home Culture for Young Children and Teaching Taiwanese Language Education for Young Children have been offered as optional courses; moreover, this department lists several additional courses connected with English teaching and learning to provide background for students to apply in their future careers. The courses including Applied Linguistics for EFL Teachers of Young Children, Classroom Applications of Picture Books in English, English for Children, and English Children’s Fiction and Its Classroom Applications. The proportion of the above required courses and elective courses was 11.8 % and 7 % represents in their entire required and elective professional courses.

The Department of Early Childhood Education at the National Tainan University required preservice teachers to take at least 134 credit hours in order to graduate; however, the regular students only need to complete 128 credit hours. This department offers three required courses about children’s language learning: Child Development and Care, Language expression of Young Children, and Literature for Young Children. This department also provides Children’s Cognitive Development and Theory and Practice of Bilingual Education as an elective for preservice teachers. The proportion of the above required courses and elective courses were 12.5 % and 3.6 % represents in their entire professional required and elective program’s curriculum.
The Early Childhood Education Department at the National PingTung University of Education provides various elective courses. The elective courses are Cognitive Development of Young Children, Language Development, Literature for Young Children, Taiwanese Culture for young Children, Bilingual Education for Young Children, Multicultural Education, and Writing Children’s Literature. This department only has two required course related to the research issue and they are the Development of Young Children and Language Arts in Kindergarten. This department required preservice teachers need to complete 139 credit hours in order to do the graduate. The proportion of the above required courses was 13.3 % of their entire required professional courses, while the above elective courses represent 10 % in the total elective professional courses.

The Early Childhood Education Department at the National Taitung University provides four courses related with language issues: Children’s Literature, Verbal Expression of Young Children and Child Development and Care1 and 2; those course represent 8.3 % in their entire required professional courses. This department also offers courses titled English Instruction for Young Children, Studies in Children’s Folk Songs, Multicultural Education, and Language Development and Therapy as electives; the above elective courses account for 4 % of total elective professional courses.

Students who enrolled in the Department of Early Childhood Education in National Hualien University of Education were required to take 157 credit hours coursework and completing a half year internship to be a early childhood teachers. However, the students who enrolled in the non-teacher education program only needed to study 128 credit hours to graduate. The Department of Early Childhood Education in
National Hualien University of Education requires courses entitled Children’s Literature and Child Development and Care. These 2 courses represent 16.7% of entire required professional courses of the program curriculum. The department offers Teaching Language Arts to Young Children, Cognitive and Language Development and Guidance, Teaching Native Culture to Young Children, Selected English Readings on Early Childhood Education, English Storybooks for Young Children, Practical English and Songs for Young Children as electives in the 4-year program study plan. The above elective courses make up 4.9% of the entire professional elective courses of the program curriculum.

The Department of Early Childhood Education at the NanHua University requires only two core courses covering the issue of language development: Child Development 1 and 2. This department offers many elective courses to their students, but only four courses relate to language and cultural education. The courses are Teaching Native Culture to Young Children, English Instruction for Young Children, Children’s Literature and Child Language Development and Care. The above courses account for 7.7% of the required professional courses and 8.9% of elective professional courses.

The Early Childhood Education Department at the Asia University lists Development and Care of Young Children, and Literature for Young Children as required courses. Language Development and Therapy, Language Expression of Young Children, Emergent Literacy for Young Children, Study of Chinese Native Toys, and English Instruction for Young Children are elective courses. The proportion of this department’s
The curriculum is similar to the previous one which was 7.7% of required professional courses and 8.3% of elective professional courses.

The Early Childhood Education Department at the Diwan College of Management provides Preschool Child Development and Care and Children’s Literature as two required courses that cover language issues. Five courses offered to the students as elective course that connect to the language and multicultural issues are Teaching Language Materials and Methods in Early Childhood, Multicultural Education, Language Development of Young Children, Appreciating English Songs for Early Childhood, and Listening and Speaking English Stories for Early Childhood Education. The required courses mentioned above make up 7.7% of the required courses and 6.9% of the elective courses. (See Tables 4.1, and 4.2).

Analysis of Course Syllabi

According to the 11 four year’s program plans and the course characteristics, the courses under consideration have been divided into four categories: language development, language teaching, bilingual education, and multicultural education. Please see Table 4.3 and Figure 4.1.

Language Development

Five different courses from 10 universities and one college (each department may name it in different way but share the same contents) fell under the category of language development: (a) Development and Care of Young Children, (b) Language/Verbal Expression of Young Children, (c) Cognitive and Language Development and Guidance,
Table 4.1:

*Required and Elective Courses of 11 Four Year’s Program Plans*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name of University or College</th>
<th>Required Department Professional courses</th>
<th>Elective Professional Courses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **Taipei Municipal University of Education** | 1. Development and Care of Young Children  
2. Language Arts for Young Children  
3. Literature for Young Children | 1. Language Development  
2. Bilingual Education for Young Children  
3. Literacy Development |
| **National Hsinchu University of Education** | 1. Development and Care of Young Children  
2. Literature for Young Children  
3. Language Expression of Young Children | 1. Early Literacy Instruction  
2. Cognitive Psychology of Young Children |
| **National Taichung University** | 1. Literature for Young Children  
2. Language Expression of Young Children  
3. Development and Care of Young Children  
4. Emergent Literacy for Young Children  
5. Kindergarten Language Arts Teaching Materials and Methods | 1. Study of Chinese Native Nursery  
2. Study of Chinese Native Toys  
3. English Teaching for Young Children  
4. Multicultural Education |
| **National Chiayi University** | 1. Children’s Literature  
2. Child Development and Care  
3. Literacy Instructional Materials and Methods in Early Childhood Education  
4. Multicultural Education | 1. Curriculum on Native and Home Culture for Young Children  
2. Teaching Taiwanese Language Education for Young Children  
3. Applied Linguistics for EFL Teachers of Young Children  
4. Classroom Applications of Picture Books in English  
5. English for Children  
6. English Children’s Fiction and Its Classroom Applications |
Table 4.1 (Continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>National Tainan University</th>
<th>1. Child Development and Care Children</th>
<th>2. Language Expression of Young Children</th>
<th>3. Literature for Young Children</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>National PingTung University of Education</td>
<td>1. Development of Young Children</td>
<td>2. Language Arts in Kindergarten</td>
<td>3. Literature for Young Children</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Taitung University</td>
<td>1. Children’s Cognitive Development</td>
<td>2. Theory and Practice of Bilingual Education</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NanHua University</td>
<td>1. Teaching Language Arts to Young Children</td>
<td>2. Cognitive and Language Development and Guidance</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3. Teaching Native Culture to Young Children</td>
<td>4. Selected English Readings on Early Childhood Education</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5. English Story Books for Young Children</td>
<td>6. Practical English and Songs for Young Children</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7. Writing Children’s Literature</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1. Teaching Native Culture to Young Children</td>
<td>2. English Instruction for Young Children</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asia University</td>
<td>1. Development and Care of Young Children</td>
<td>1. Language Development and Therapy</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. Literature for Young Children</td>
<td>2. Language Expression of Young Children</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3. Emergent Literacy for Young Children</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4. Study of Chinese Native Toys</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5. English Instruction for Young Children</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diwan College of Management</td>
<td>1. Preschool Child Development and Care</td>
<td>1. Teaching Language Materials and Methods in Early Childhood</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. Children’s Literature</td>
<td>2. Multicultural Education</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3. Language Development of Early Childhood</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4. Appreciating English Songs for Early Childhood</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5. Listening and Speaking English Stories for Early Childhood Education</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 4.2:

*Data Descriptively (%) of the Language Development Courses in the Entire Professional Required and Elective Courses of 11 Four Year’s Program Plans*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name of University or College</th>
<th>Data Descriptively (%) of Required Department Professional Courses</th>
<th>Data Descriptively (%) of Elective Department Professional Courses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Taipei Municipal University of Education</td>
<td>7.7 %</td>
<td>3.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Hsinchu University of Education</td>
<td>10 %</td>
<td>3 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Taichung University</td>
<td>21.7 %</td>
<td>6.7 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Chiayi University</td>
<td>11.8 %</td>
<td>7 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Tainan University</td>
<td>12.5 %</td>
<td>3.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National PingTung University of Education</td>
<td>13.3 %</td>
<td>10 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Taitung University</td>
<td>8.3 %</td>
<td>4 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Hualien University of Education</td>
<td>16.7 %</td>
<td>4.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NanHua University</td>
<td>7.7 %</td>
<td>8.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asia University</td>
<td>7.7 %</td>
<td>8.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diwan College of Management</td>
<td>7.7 %</td>
<td>6.9%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 4.3:

*Four Categories of Language Development, Language Teaching, Bilingual Education, and Multicultural Education in 11 Four Year’s Programs Plans*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Language Development</th>
<th>Language Teaching</th>
<th>Bilingual Education</th>
<th>Multicultural Education</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Development and Care of Young Children</td>
<td>1. Language Arts/Teaching Language Materials and Methods for Young Children</td>
<td>1. Bilingual Education for Young Children</td>
<td>1. Multicultural Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Language /Verbal Expression of Young Children</td>
<td>2. Literature for Young Children</td>
<td>2. Theory and Practice of Bilingual Education</td>
<td>2. Study of Chinese Native Nursery</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Language Development and Therapy</td>
<td>5. Appreciating English Songs for Early Childhood</td>
<td>5. Education in Taiwanese Culture for Young Children</td>
<td>5. Education in Taiwanese Culture for Young Children</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7. Classroom Applications of Picture Books in English</td>
<td>7. Teaching Taiwanese Language Education for young Children</td>
<td>7. Teaching Taiwanese Language Education for young Children</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Figure 4.1: A Graphic Display of Content Analysis
Three syllabi for courses in child development and care from different universities and colleges were collected and evaluated. The course objectives were designed to strengthen preservice teachers’ understanding of theories of child development as well as the processes and characteristics of child development; nevertheless, some differences exist among those syllabi. One syllabus attended to the issues of guiding, assisting, and nurturing children’s behavior. The other two syllabi were more concerned with making connections between child development and care. The six objectives of one of the syllabi covered the following six areas: (a) child development theories, (b) characteristics and processes of child development, (c) child behavior, (d) growth of a child, (e) child counseling, and (f) investigating the interests of children. Another syllabus had five objectives covering the following areas: (a) child development and care, (b) importance of eugenic health, (c) reasons for problems in the child growth process, (d) child safety, protection, and first aid, and (e) infant care skills. The objectives of this syllabus tended to focus more on child and infant care than the other two. The last syllabus had three objectives that included the importance of development theories, the developmental process from age 0 to 6 years, and strengthening students’ interests in early childhood education. The objectives mentioned above did not specifically cover the issue of children’s language development, but child development often times include development of children’s first language; however, no evidence clearly indicated an introduction to second language and bilingualism by the instructor to students. Several textbooks and
references were listed in the syllabi, but most of them regarded child development and care, such as *Human Development*, *Child Development*, *Developmental Psychology*, and *Touchpoints: Your Child’s Emotional and Behavioral Development*; the only textbook regarding child language development was *How to Help Baby Talk*. None of the syllabi specified assignments.

Four universities and colleges have offered courses in the language expression of young children as a required (2) or an elective course (2), but only two course syllabi were available for evaluation. A typical objective of such a class helps students understand the theories of oral language development, literacy development, and issues that may influence language development; students also compare and contrast the language development theories of different schools. Moreover, this type of course invites students to consider (a) the relationship between language development theories and instruction and (b) issues of language learning. The objectives of another course in this category were slightly different from the previous one; they included an introduction to language acquisition, child language development, understanding and assisting child language instruction, introduction to children’s literacy development and teaching, discussion of bilingual and bicultural development and their influence on young children. In addition, students had opportunities to read and discuss the issues of children’s language expression. Those two course syllabi listed no detailed assignments. Four major textbooks were listed in one of the syllabi: two of them were whole language textbooks; another dealt with the experience of the child’s language, and the last one covered children’s literacy curriculum. The other available syllabus listed four textbooks: two
were whole language, one covered children’s literacy curriculum, another book was about the psychology of language development, and the last one was a children’s storybook. In accordance with the syllabi, the two instructors revealed different concerns while designing the curriculum. One of the instructors taught the course in a broader way, particularly concerned with bilingual and bicultural development and experience as basic knowledge to preservice teachers, but the other instructor concentrated more on whole language. No course assignments were specified on the syllabi.

The category of language development courses contains similar content to the course of Language Expression of Young Children. It concerned the basic principles and concepts of language, theories of language development, stages of language development, and issues and problems that may influence children’s language development and how to solve problems associated with it. In addition, this course covered tactics to enhance children’s language development. This course required students to do field observation to explore children’s language and share the results of the observation with classmates; this activity helped students make connections between the theories and real situations. In addition, it may allow them to gain real insights into children’s language development. More than 10 textbooks and articles were listed in the syllabus; these included Owens’ *Language Development: An Introduction*, Hudson’s *Child Language*, Hamaguchi’s *Childhood Speech, Language, and Listening Problems: What Every Parent Show Know*, and books about the psychology of language development. Based on the course objectives and the list of textbooks, the general concepts and goals of these courses seem
focused more on children’s first language development instead of second-language acquisition and bilingualism.

Language Teaching

This category included 10 different courses shown in the Table 4.2; nevertheless, this researcher was only able to acquire 11 syllabi in four different courses. The course generally known as Language Arts for Young Children (some departments called it Language Materials and Methods in Early Childhood) in four different departments focused on children’s literacy development, theory of whole language, and how to integrate children’s literacy into classroom teaching and activities. The major concerns of this course were to understand the principles of children’s literacy instruction and familiarize preservice teachers with various activities to teach literacy, the design of integrated literacy curriculum, literacy teaching materials, and the arrangement of literacy environment. For textbooks, the four syllabi listed various books, most of which dealt with whole language teaching and learning. One of the instructors listed more reference books, which included scaffolding, Vygotsky’s theory of literacy teaching, and how to build a proper reading environment. The assignments in this course focused on devising and making teaching materials, teaching demos, and teaching evaluations. From those four syllabi, the researcher discovered that the major concepts of this course concentrated on whole language teaching and learning and dealt more with teaching and learning children’s first language than others. Only one of the four departments provided for student discussion of the issues and problems of native language teaching and bilingualism.
Literature for Young Children appears to be considered an important course for early childhood preservice teachers as most of the departments (10 out of 11) provide it as a required core course. Four syllabi for Children’s Literature were evaluated. Two of the four universities represented required students to take Language Arts for Young Children as a prerequisite to Literature for Young Children, an advanced elective course taken during the 3rd or 4th year. Nevertheless, another two universities designated this course as a core course and required students to take it during the 1st or 2nd years of study. Three syllabi had similar objectives, which included the values of children’s literature, incorporating storybooks into the curriculum, understanding and promoting children’s understanding of literature, and practice and design of a literature curriculum and teaching activities. The objectives of the fourth syllabus focused heavily on incorporating children’s literature into the curriculum, emphasizing how to use literature as base to teach reading and writing. The instructor stated that the key points of this course were to assist children to be able to read, write, and discuss through literature, and then to form a habit of self-learning and reading as well as to raise problem-solving skills. This course required students to read several different textbooks, including *Growing up With Literature* by Sawyer and Comer, several Chinese textbooks dealing with children’s literature, and books regarding children’s storybook and picture books. As a weekly assignment, one instructor required every student to share a children’s story with a classmate, keep a notebook for recording the ideas and pictures of stories, and create their own storybooks and children’s literature folder. The final assignment of another syllabus asked students to introduce a children’s author, share the basic concepts of the author’s
storybooks with the class, and participate in group drama teaching and acting. The remaining two syllabi required students to design a curriculum for the teaching of children’s stories and activities and integrate children’s literature into curriculum. This course provided preservice teachers a clearer balance between assisting children’s language development and curriculum design.

Approximately 3 syllabus directly related to English teaching have been collected, which covered appreciating English songs for early childhood and listening, speaking English stories for early childhood education, and selected English reading in early childhood education. Appreciating English songs for early childhood focused on how to integrate music, stories, activities, and English learning into the classroom in addition to introducing different cultural and customs. *Wee Sing: Children’s Songs and Finger Plays* was the textbook for this course. The syllabus specified no assignments.

Listening and Speaking English Stories in Early Childhood Education (or similar name) was a course to raise preservice teachers’ interest and abilities in English, to help them able to read and use children’s books in their future jobs, and to empower preservice teachers with knowledge of the children’s world through children’s books. The instructor did not list a required textbook but cited several reference books relating to storybook appreciation and application as well as Moen’s *Teaching With Caldecott Books*. The syllabus listed no assignments.

Selected English Readings in Early Childhood Education is a course designed to promote students’ ability to select English songs and picture books readings, develop behaviors necessary to listen to English teaching programs, collect and read English-
related information on early childhood education, and to learn to love English. This course required students to make group presentations on sharing children’s songs and picture books, listen to English teaching programs and share the major points with classmate, make group presentations on selected early childhood English articles, take a final semester exam, and complete a reflection report. The instructor listed three major readings in the syllabus, which included a dissertation relating to teachers’ understanding and practices regarding children’s play, an article concerned with intergenerational learning through play, and another on the innovative use of local resources for children’s play. The above description clearly shows that the main goal is to nurture preservice teachers’ interest in learning English in order to increase their English ability.

**Bilingual Education**

According to the data, three universities offered Bilingual Education for Young Children (or similar name) as an elective course in their 4-year study plan; however, the researcher was able to acquire only one syllabus for an undergraduate-level course and one syllabus for a graduate-level course for evaluation. According to the 4-year study plan of the Department of Early Childhood Education at National Tainan University, the course on theory and practice of bilingual education was first listed as an elective course during fall semester 2007 but has not been actually taught yet. Therefore, the syllabus from National Tainan University for the graduate-level will be discussed. The syllabus stated the course objective as follows:

The curriculum will cover bilingual learning of children and bilingualism as well as related issues in school. The content will include different viewpoints
from society, culture, politics, psychology, child development, and language learning. The curriculum will also introduce some research methods about children’s bilingual learning.

Another course syllabus for undergraduate-level from another university stated the course objectives from similar angle; however, the instructor expressed the objective in a clearer form:

This course looks both beyond and within the individual to factors that might affect bilingual and second-language development. . . . In sum, the course will help to increase candidates’ understanding of the sociolinguistic and psycholinguistic aspects of bilingual education, enabling them to make informed decisions about curriculum and instruction.

Based on the course objectives of these two courses, the two instructors designed the bilingual education courses in a similar form. Both of them opened the course with the issues and problems of bilingualism and bilingual education in Taiwan’s early childhood educational field. In addition, they introduced issues and problems from various views, such as parents’ and early childhood teachers’ points of view instead of educational perspectives. Theories of second-language acquisition and second-language learning and teaching were germane to the courses. Allowing students to practice and design the curriculum of bilingual education during the course could enhance students’ understanding and knowledge of bilingual issues. This course provided preservice teachers with knowledge on bilingualism and bilingual education unlike the other courses.
Multicultural Education

Because of noticeable demographic changes in Taiwan and globalization, multicultural education has become a popular course in early childhood education departments; therefore, the researcher has carefully reviewed several course syllabi. Five different courses fell under the category of multicultural education: (a) Multicultural Education, (b) Study of Chinese Native Nursery, (c) Study of Chinese Native Toys, (d) Teaching Native Culture to Young Children (some department may call it course as Curriculum for Native Home Culture for Young Children), and (e) Education of Taiwanese Culture for Young Children. Course objectives in multicultural education aimed to help students reflect the values and biases of their own culture and other cultures, moreover, to assist students in understanding the relationship between multicultural and education, how children develop their own sense of multiculturalism, and the concepts and goals of multicultural education for young children. Based on the course objectives, most of the course content of multicultural education dealt with the cross-relationships among regions, languages, and education, which gave students insights into the language issues and problems of education. One major textbook was assigned to the students: *Teaching and Learning in a Diverse World: Multicultural Education for Young Children* by P. G. Ramsey (1998) (Chinese version). None of the assignments were specifically described in the syllabus.

A course similar to Multicultural Education is Education in Taiwanese Culture for Young Children, which was offered as an elective course to students and has been studied by researcher. This course allowed students to discover their own culture, comprehend
the theories of local culture education, acknowledge the importance of local culture education, and make the connection between local culture, community, and curriculum. *Native Education* by C.-J. Huang and L.-S. Lee (1995) has been assigned as required textbooks to students, and the syllabus included no specific assignments. The course syllabus for Teaching Native Culture to Young Children has been studied as well. The three objectives were to (a) understand the meaning and components of native culture, (b) nurture the basic abilities of teaching native culture to young children, and (c) to meet the demand for native culture teachers. The textbook for this course focused on Taiwanese folk culture and old customs. Multicultural Education and Local Culture Education did not provide a direct connection between language teaching and learning of young children; nevertheless, those two courses emphasized preservice teachers’ knowledge of maintaining and respecting a child’s culture and language. This course conveyed a positive impact on children’s language learning and teaching.

**Survey Results**

Data were analyzed by using Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (SPSS) 14.0. Descriptive data gave basic information of the participants, one sample *t*-Test offered the essential results of each questions. The *t*-Test and one-way ANOVA were then used to present and explain the relationship between independent and dependent variables. Gender, mother tongue, oral language, public or private university, professional status, year of teaching, higher education and, courses taken have been used as independent variables in the study. Negative statements were coded in reverse after the
data were entered into the computer for analysis; these were section 4, questions 7, 12, and 13; and section 5, question 24.

Questions from section 3, number 1 through section 6, number 33 were grouped into 7 categories. The first category is bilingual issues integrated into nonlanguage courses, which included section 3, questions 1, 2, 3, and 4. Section 4, questions 5, 6, 7, 8, and 9 have been grouped into the second category: attitude toward bilingualism. The third category, attitude toward second-language learning, included section 4, questions 10 and 11. The fourth category was attitude toward native-language learning, which derived from section 4, questions 12, 16, and 18. Attitude toward English learning included section 4, questions 13, 14, 15, 17, and 18. Number 18 has been grouped twice both in the category of native-language learning and the category of attitude of English learning; however, question 19 did not belong in any group and will be discussed individually. The next category was professional knowledge needed by preservice teachers and included section 5, questions 20 to 27. The final category was recommendations and suggestions and involved section 6, questions 28 to 33.

**Descriptive Data**

**Gender**

Table 4.4 shows that 71% of the survey respondents were female and 28.9% were male.
Table 4.4:

**Demographics**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Gender</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>28.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>71.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Mother Tongue</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mandarin</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>53.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hoklo</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>37.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hakka</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>97.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Oral Language</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mandarin</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>88.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hoklo</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>97.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Public/Private</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Professional Status</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professor</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>24.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Associate Professor</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>31.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assistant Professor</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>44.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 4.4 (Continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year of Teaching</th>
<th>0–5</th>
<th>6–10</th>
<th>11–15</th>
<th>More than 15</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>18</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>40</td>
<td>17.8</td>
<td>26.7</td>
<td>15.6</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Higher Ed.</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>M.Ed.</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M.A.</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>6.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ed.D.</td>
<td>17</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>37.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ph.D.</td>
<td>23</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>51.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>45</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Courses Taken</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>17</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>37.8</td>
<td>62.2</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
*Mother Tongue*

Participants specified three mother tongues. Mandarin was the mother tongue of 53.3%; Hoklo, of 37.8%; and Hakka, of 6.7%. One participant did not answer the question; none response 2.2%. (See Table 4.4).

*Oral language*

Forty of the 45 participants indicated that Mandarin was the major oral language they used in their daily lives. Only 4 (8.9%) participants said that Hoklo was their primary oral language, and none specified Hakka as their oral language. One person didn’t specify his or her oral language.

*Public/Private*

Of those who answered the demographic section, 60% of the teacher educators taught in public schools and 40% in private schools.

*Status*

The positions identified on the survey were professor, associate professor, assistant professor, or lecturer. Of the 45 participants who responded to the survey, 11 held the rank of professor; 14, associate professor; 16, assistant professor; and 2, lecturer. The lecturers were integrated with assistant professors because of the ineffectiveness of a small group. After the integration, 24.4% of the participants were professors; 31.1%, associate professors; and 44.4%, assistant professors.
Years of Teaching

The number of years of participants’ teaching experience has been grouped into four categories: 1-5 years of teaching experience; 6–10 years; 11–15 years; and more than 16 years. Forty percent of the participants had taught at a university or college for fewer than 6 years, and 15.6% of them worked in the field for over 15 years. The average number of years of teaching experience of participants was 10.81 years.

Level of Education

The level of education attained by participants is presented in Table 4.3. More than 88.9% of participants had doctorates.

Courses Taken

Table 4.4 shows that 62.2% of the participants had taken no courses related to language development, bilingual education, second language acquisition, second language teaching and learning while they were earning their degrees; the remaining 37.8% took such courses.

Courses Offered by the Departments

As shown in Table 4.5, of the 45 participants who responded to the questionnaires, 39 (86.7%) participants pointed out a child development course (section 2, number1) as required in their department; 5 (11.1%) indicated their department did not offer this course.
Table 4.5  

*Courses Offered by the Department*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Courses</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Child Development</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>11.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Required</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>86.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elective</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Child Language Development</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>24.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Required</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>26.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elective</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>48.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Bilingual Education</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>57.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Required</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elective</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Teaching of English as a SL</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Required</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elective</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>33.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Multicultural Education</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Required</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elective</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>75.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Second-Language Acquisition</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>53.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Required</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elective</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>42.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Native-Language Teaching</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>64.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Required</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>17.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elective</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>17.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Only 26.7% of the participants said their departments required students to take a child language development course (section 2, number 2); nearly 48.9% of the participants’ departments offered it as elective.

Over 57% of the participants indicated their departments did not provide bilingual education courses (section 2, number 3), but 40% indicated bilingual education as an elective. One (2.2%) participant’s department required bilingual education.

To section 2, number 4, three (6.7%) participants responded that teaching of English as a second language is required in their department; the departments of 60% of them provided no such course either as elective or required.

Multicultural education (section 2, number 5) was offered as an elective course in the departments of 75% of the participants; only 4.4% indicated multicultural education as a required course to their students.

More than 53% of the participants pointed out their departments did not provide courses in second-language acquisition (section 2, number 6); the departments of 42% offered this course as an elective.

The departments of 29 of the 45 (64.4%) participants provided no courses in native language teaching (section 2, number 7); the departments of the remaining 35.6% required this course.
Data on Survey Participants’ Attitudes

Attitudes Toward Integrating Bilingual Issues into Nonlanguage Courses

The 5 point Likert-scale scores were used to evaluate the average mean and the standard deviation of the following individual signal questions. In the section 3 of question 1, fifty-seven percent of the teacher educators surveyed indicated that they talked about children’s language development in their classrooms; they agreed or strongly agreed with the item on the survey covering this issue. The average mean of their responses was 3.33, and the standard deviation was 1.225. (Table 4.6).

Only 22.2 % of the teacher educators surveyed indicated that they made clear efforts to integrate teaching and learning second and foreign language into curriculum design (section 3, question 2); 55.5% of them stated they made no effort to do so. Remaining neutral were 22.3 % of the teacher educators. The average mean of this question was 2.51, and standard deviation was 1.079. The above information clearly shows that integrating teaching and learning second and foreign language into curriculum design is not major issue in the minds of most of the teacher educators while planning the curriculum.

In the section 3 of question 3, only 26.6% of the teacher educators agreed or strongly agreed that multilingualism is an important issue in their classrooms. Thirty-one percent of them remained neutral on this issue, and 42.2 % of them disagreed or strongly disagreed with this item on the survey. The average mean on this question was 2.689, and the standard deviation was 1.164.
Table 4.6

*Bilingual Issues into Nonlanguage Courses*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>S3Q1</th>
<th>S3Q2</th>
<th>S3Q3</th>
<th>S3Q4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>3.33</td>
<td>2.51</td>
<td>2.69</td>
<td>2.51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Median</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>3.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Std. Mean</td>
<td>1.225</td>
<td>1.079</td>
<td>1.164</td>
<td>1.121</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Twenty-two of the 45 teacher educators (or 48.9%) indicated that bilingual education and bilingualism were not popular topics in their classrooms, and 33.3% of them remained neutral on this issue. Only 17.7% (8 of the 45) agreed or strongly agreed that this issue was popular in their classrooms. The average for responses to this issue was 2.511; standard deviation was 1.121 (section 3 of question 4).

There were 4 questions in this section, which made the minimum score of this section 4 and the maximum score 20. The average mean for the sector of Integrated Bilingual Issues into Nonlanguage Courses was 11.0444, median was 11 and standard deviation was 3.80165 (Shown in Table 4.7). This result showed that the teacher educators put little effort into integrating bilingual issues into their classrooms, but they attempted to discuss the issue of child language development with their students.
Table 4. 7

*Integrated Bilingual Issues into Nonlanguage Courses*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Integrated Bilingual</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Median</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Std. Deviation</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Attitudes Toward Bilingualism*

In the section 4, question 5, all teacher educators surveyed agreed (51.1 %) and strongly agreed (48.9%) that children are capable of learning more than one language. The average mean of this survey question was 4.51, and the standard deviation is 0.506.

Nearly 36% of the teacher educators surveyed strongly agreed, and 64.4% of them agreed that the right environment can awaken children’s capabilities to learn other languages. The mean of section 4, question 6 was 4.64, and the standard deviation was 0.484.

The average mean of the responses on the issue of fluency in a second or foreign language beyond the critical period was 3.51 with the width range of standard deviation 1.2 (section 4 of question 7). More than 57% of the teacher educators surveyed indicated a belief that people are still able to achieve fluency in second or foreign language once past the critical period, but 33.3% of them did not.
The question 8 of section 4 showed that more than 60% of the teacher educators agreed and strongly agreed that bilingualism enhances children’s metalinguistic awareness with only 6.7% disagreeing. The mean for this item was 3.53, and the standard deviation was 1.218.

Forty-two percent of the teacher educators surveyed expressed some degree of agreement, and 31.1% remained neutral in response to the issue of higher levels of bilingualism resulting in superior cognitive development. The average mean was 3.16, and the standard deviation was 1.043 (section 4, question 9). (See Table 4.8).

Table 4.8

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Attitudes Toward Bilingualism</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>S4Q5</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Median</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Std. Deviation</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

There were 5 questions at this section that made the minimum section score became 5 and maximum was 25. The average mean of attitudes toward bilingualism was 19.36; the median was 19, and the standard deviation was 1.99. (See Table 4.13). Based on the above result, the early childhood teacher educators indicated at least some degree of agreement on the advantages of bilingualism and positive attitudes toward children’s language development.
**Attitudes Toward Second-Language Learning**

Sixty-six percent of the teacher educators surveyed agreed and strongly agreed that developing literacy in the primary languages is necessary in order to facilitate the acquisition of second and foreign languages (section 4, question 10). The mean was 3.80, and the standard deviation was 1.057.

In a related follow-up question, 75.6 % of the teacher educators agreed or strongly agreed that learning subject matter through the primary language first makes subject matter taught in a second or foreign language more understandable. Only 4 of the 45 participants disagreed with the statement. The average mean of responses to this question was 3.84, and the standard deviation was 0.824 (section 4, question 11). (See Table 4.9).

Table 4. 9

**Attitudes Toward Second Language Learning**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>S4Q10</th>
<th>S4Q11</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>3.80</td>
<td>1.057</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Median</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>4.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Std. Deviation</td>
<td>3.84</td>
<td>.824</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

There were 2 questions at this section, the minimum of this section was 2 and maximum was 10. The mean of this issue was 7.64, the standard deviation was 1.57, and the median was 8 (See Table 4.13). All the participants noticed the importance of the relationship between mother tongue and second-language learning.
**Attitudes Toward Native Language**

In the section 4 of question 12, most of teacher educators responded that promoting children’s native language and culture in the school setting is necessary, but 8.9% of them disagreed. The average mean was 4.24, and the standard deviation was 1.111.

The question of implementing bilingual (Mandarin and native language) education in kindergarten and preschool brought a variety of responses from the teacher educators surveyed. Twenty-one of the 45 (46.6%) disagreed and strongly disagreed, but 16 of the 45 (35.6%) agreed or strongly agreed. The average mean for the question was 2.82, and the standard deviation was 1.451 (section 4, question 16).

Introducing a language also means introducing another culture. Eighty-six percent of the teacher educators surveyed agreed with this statement. Only 8.9% of them remained neutral, and 4.4% of them disagrees or strongly disagreed. The average mean was 4.04, and the standard deviation was 0.796 (section 4, question 18). (See Table 4.10).

The mean of this issue is 11.11; the median was 11; and the standard deviation was 2.298. (See Table 4.13). The teacher educators agreed on the importance of native language and culture to young children in school settings because they believe that bringing in a language allows children to get in touch with another culture; nevertheless,
Table 4.10

*Attitudes Toward Native Language*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>S4Q12</th>
<th>S4Q16</th>
<th>S4Q18</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>4.24</td>
<td>2.82</td>
<td>4.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Median</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>4.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Std. Deviation</td>
<td>1.11</td>
<td>1.451</td>
<td>.796</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

They thought it is unnecessary to implement bilingual (Mandarin and native language) education.

*Attitudes Toward English Learning*

Sixty percent of the teacher educators surveyed agreed that introducing foreign language to young children is a necessity, but 26.7% of them remained neutral (section 4, question 13). The average mean was 3.60, and the standard deviation was 0.963.

To a follow-up question, question 14 about the necessity of teaching English to young children in school settings, more than 55% of the teacher educators surveyed disagreed or strongly disagreed with this issue, and only 26.6% agreed or strongly agreed with it. The mean was 2.42, and the standard deviation was 1.288.

In the section 4 of question 15, fifty-five percent of the teacher educators surveyed indicated that enrolling in classes in Mandarin and English at the same time would not confuse children, and 20% of them remained neutral. The mean was 3.31, and the standard deviation was 1.062.
A question on the related issue of the urgency of legalizing Mandarin and English bilingual education in kindergarten and at the preschool level garnered slightly different results compared with the above (section 4 of question 16). None of the teacher educators strongly agreed, and 33% of them strongly disagreed; but 20% of the teacher educators agreed that legalizing Mandarin and English bilingual education is urgently needed. The average mean was 2.24, and the standard deviation was 1.131.

In the section 4, question 18 asked introducing a language also means introducing another culture. Eighty-six percent of the teacher educators surveyed agreed with this statement. Only 8.9% of them remained neutral, and 4.4% of them disagrees or strongly disagreed. The average mean was 4.04, and the standard deviation was 0.796. This question has been grouped in category of native-language learning and category of attitude of English learning. (See Table 4.11).

Table 4.11

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>S4Q13</th>
<th>S4Q14</th>
<th>S4Q15</th>
<th>S4Q17</th>
<th>S4Q18</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>3.60</td>
<td>2.42</td>
<td>3.31</td>
<td>2.24</td>
<td>4.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Median</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>4.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Std. Deviation</td>
<td>.963</td>
<td>1.288</td>
<td>1.062</td>
<td>1.131</td>
<td>.796</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The average mean of this issue was 15.62, and the standard deviation was 3.40. (See Table 4.13). Most of the teacher educators realized that having classes in Mandarin and English at the same time would not confuse children, so many of them agreed that
young children should be introduced to foreign languages; nevertheless, they were unconcerned about the necessity of teaching English to young children as a course, disagreeing about legalizing Mandarin and English bilingual education in kindergarten.

Section 4, Question 19

The final question of section four was designed to understand whether teacher educators are concerned about reforming the field of early childhood education to increase preservice teachers’ professional knowledge about second-language acquisition and bilingualism. For this question, only 11.1 % disagreed, indicating that teacher educators were attentive to the issue. The average mean of this question was 3.71 and the standard deviation was 0.895. (See Table 4.12).

Table 4.12

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section 4, Question 19</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>S4Q19</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Median</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Std. Deviation</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Ninety-five percent of the teacher educators surveyed indicated that language development is a vital necessity for the preservice teacher; the average mean of this question was 4.44, and 0.586 was standard deviation. In addition 73% of them agreed and strongly agreed that second-language acquisition is also a necessary part of the preservice teacher’s knowledge base. The mean of the question was 3.87, and standard deviation was 0.757. Nevertheless, around 49% of the teacher educators thought the preservice teacher must have the ability to integrate the teaching of English or other languages into classroom activities, and 31.1% of the teacher educators remained neutral. The average mean of this issue was 3.27, and standard deviation was 0.986.

The next related question dealt with whether the preservice teacher must know how to create lessons to facilitate young children’s learning of English or a foreign language, to which 48.8 % of the participants strongly agreed and agreed, matching responses to the previous question; however, more than 35 % of the participants
disagreed and strongly disagreed to this statement. The mean was 3.13, and the standard deviation was 1.057.

By contrast more than 74% of the teacher educators agreed and strongly agreed with the statement that preservice teachers need knowledge of adopting and practicing bilingual education. Only 15.5% of the participants indicated a level of disagreement to this statement. The mean was 3.62, and the standard deviation was 0.984.

Questions 25 and 26 stated that the preservice teacher must feel comfortable communicating in and speaking English with young children or native English teachers. None of the teacher educator strongly agreed with these statements, but 44.5% and 42.4% of the participants agreed or remained neutral. For those two questions, 55% of the teacher educators surveyed held at least some level of disagreement. The average mean for question 25 was 2.36, and the standard deviation was 1.026. Question 26 had the same mean as question 25, which was 2.36, but a narrower standard deviation of 0.957.

Most of the teacher educators agreed with the final statement that the preservice teacher must be able to answer parents’ questions regarding second-language acquisition and bilingualism. The mean was 3.93, and the standard deviation was 0.837. Only 8.9% of the participants disagreed with this issue. (See Table 4.14).

The average mean for this section was 26.98 with 27.00 the median and 4.35 the standard deviation (Shown in Table 4.15). The above information has led the researcher to conclude that the teacher educators surveyed considered knowledge of language development, second-language acquisition, and bilingual education important to preservice teachers; they also agreed that preservice teachers should know how to design
Table 4.14

*Professional Knowledge Needed by the Preservice Teacher*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>S5Q20</th>
<th>S5Q21</th>
<th>S5Q22</th>
<th>S5Q23</th>
<th>S5Q24</th>
<th>S5Q25</th>
<th>S5Q26</th>
<th>S5Q27</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>4.44</td>
<td>3.87</td>
<td>3.27</td>
<td>3.13</td>
<td>3.62</td>
<td>2.36</td>
<td>2.36</td>
<td>3.93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Median</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>4.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Std. Deviation</td>
<td>.586</td>
<td>.757</td>
<td>.986</td>
<td>1.057</td>
<td>.984</td>
<td>1.026</td>
<td>.957</td>
<td>.837</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.15

*Integrated Professional Knowledge Needed by the Preservice Teacher*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Professional Knowledge</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>26.98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Median</td>
<td>27.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Std. Deviation</td>
<td>4.35</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

curricula to promote children’s learning of English or other foreign languages and how to integrate English or other languages into classroom activities. Nevertheless, teacher educators did not perceive communicating with native English speakers and young children in English as necessary to the preservice teacher.
Suggestions and Recommendations for Improving Professional Knowledge of the Preservice Teacher

Only two (4.4%) teacher educators surveyed did not believe that preservice teachers must take Language Development as a required course. The average mean of this question was 4.04, and the standard deviation was 0.928 (section 6 of question 28).

In the section 6 of question 29, only 6 of the 45 teacher educators did not support a Second-Language Acquisition course as essential for preservice teachers, but 57% of them agreed and highly agreed with this issue, making the average mean of the question 3.49 and standard deviation 0.944. (Table 4.16).

Moreover, only 4 teacher educators disagreed and strongly disagreed that bilingual education must be introduced to the preservice teacher. Sixty-four percent of them agreed and strongly agreed with this item, and 26.7% of the participants remain neutral. The mean of this question was 3.60, and standard deviation 0.809 (section 6, question 30).

Multilingual education for the preservice teacher was a major concern for the teacher educators with 44 of the 45 participants agreeing and strongly agreeing with the issue; only one remained neutral. The average mean of the section 6 of question 31 was 4.44, and standard deviation was 0.546.

The next statement dealt with departments of early childhood education adding a course in the teaching English to young children to the program plan; the average mean of this question was 3.11, and the standard deviation was 1.049. Nineteen teacher educators agreed with the statement, but 14 remained neutral, and 12 disagreed with this statement (section 6, question 32).
Most of the teacher educators disagreed that preservice teacher should pass the TOEFL with a particular score before graduation. None of them strongly agreed with the statement, but 4 (8.9%) teacher educators agreed with the statement. The average mean was 2.22, and the standard deviation was 0.951 (section 6 of question 33).

Table 4.16

*Recommendations and Suggestions about Improving Professional Knowledge*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>S6Q28</th>
<th>S6Q29</th>
<th>S6Q30</th>
<th>S6Q31</th>
<th>S6Q32</th>
<th>S6Q33</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>4.04</td>
<td>3.49</td>
<td>3.60</td>
<td>4.44</td>
<td>3.11</td>
<td>2.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Median</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>2.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Std. Deviation</td>
<td>.928</td>
<td>.944</td>
<td>.809</td>
<td>.546</td>
<td>1.049</td>
<td>.951</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The average mean of the Suggestions and Recommendation section was 20.911, the median was 22.00, and the standard deviation was 3.48 (shown in Table 4.17). Most of the teacher educators considered introducing multicultural education to the preservice teacher important; moreover, they also considered a required language development course necessary for the preservice teacher. They also valued courses in second-language acquisition and bilingual education for the preservice teacher, but most of them did not support the need for preservice teachers to pass the TOFEL at a particular level before graduating.
Table 4. 17

*Integrated Recommendations and Suggestions about Improving Professional Knowledge*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Recommendations and Suggestions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Median</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Std. Deviation</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*t-Test of Courses Taken vs Non-Taken*

Whether the teacher educators took courses related to language development, bilingual education, second-language acquisition, and second-language teaching and learning while they were earning their degrees resulted in significant difference in attitude toward native language learning (p = .012). The teacher educators who took such courses had more positive attitudes toward native language learning than the ones who had never taken such courses before (Yes M = 11.88, No M= 10.64). (See Table 4.18).

*One-Way ANOVA*

An ANOVA analysis revealed a significant difference in the relationship between professional status and the issue of integrating bilingualism into nonlanguage courses (p = .030). Compared to professors (M = 10.55) and associate professors (M= 9.21), assistant professors (M = 12.60) put more effort into integrating bilingual issues into classrooms. (See Table 4.19). A post-hoc comparison showed a significant mean
difference (p = .025) in the way the assistant professor and the associate professor dealt with the issue. (Table 4.20)

Table 4.18

Summary of Findings of t-Test Analysis of Courses Taken (The Significant Findings)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Courses Taken</th>
<th>Att. Native Language 45</th>
<th>Mean SD</th>
<th>P value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes (1)</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>11.88 (2.79)</td>
<td>p = .012*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No (2)</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>10.65 (1.85)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. * < 0.05

Table 4.19

Summary of Findings of ANOVA Analysis of Professional Status (The Significant Findings)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Prof Status</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>P</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Integrating Bilingualism</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professor #11</td>
<td>10.55</td>
<td>3.90</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.827</td>
<td>.030*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assoc. Prof #14</td>
<td>9.21</td>
<td>3.26</td>
<td>42</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assist. Prof. #20</td>
<td>12.60</td>
<td>3.60</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. * < 0.05
Table 4.20

*Post-Hoc Tests of Professional Status*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>(I) Prof. Status</th>
<th>(J) Prof. Status</th>
<th>Mean Difference (I-J)</th>
<th>Sig</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Prof.</td>
<td>Associate Prof.</td>
<td>1.33117</td>
<td>.629</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Assistant Prof.</td>
<td>-2.05455</td>
<td>.288</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Associate Prof.</td>
<td>Professor</td>
<td>-1.33117</td>
<td>.629</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Assistant Prof.</td>
<td>-3.38571*</td>
<td>.025</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assistant Prof.</td>
<td>Professor Prof.</td>
<td>2.05455</td>
<td>.288</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Associate Prof.</td>
<td>3.38571*</td>
<td>.025</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*The mean difference is significant at the .05 level.

*Suggestions and Recommendations from Survey of the Open-Ended Questions*

**Theme 1: Knowledge of Second Language Acquisitions**

Thirteen out of 45 participants answered the survey open-ended questions. Within the 13 participants, there were 5 participants (38.5%) indicated preservice teachers should have more firm and solid knowledge of second language development due to the multi-lingual environment of Taiwan. As Wong-Fillmore and Snow (2000) suggested in the article of “What Teachers Need to Know About Language”, seven possible courses and components have been suggested. The first language is Language and Linguistics, second is Language and Cultural Diversity, third is Sociolinguistics for Education in a Linguistically Diverse Society, fourth is Language Development, and the fifth is Second-
Language learning and Teaching. The Language Academic Discourse and Text Analysis and Language Understanding in the Educational Setting are the sixty and seventy courses.

Within the past few years, the Ministry of Education made every effort to promote native culture education and mother-tongue learning and teaching at all school levels. The government is merely realizing the native languages and culture has facing a major juncture of fail to hand down for the next generation. Most people are completely still unaware of the consequences of eliminating native languages and culture from the community and how doing so will influence people’s self-identity and consciousness. A teacher educator stated:

Many young children enter school with insufficient native-language speaking skills, and many of them are unable to speak their own mother tongues, making the learning of mother tongues in effect the learning of a second language instead of a first language. Consequently, preservice teachers must have knowledge of second-language acquisition in order to deal with needs of these young children.

In addition, teacher educators cited the necessity of providing more courses for preservice teachers relating with language learning and teaching because they must have adequate knowledge of children’s language development and language instructional skills. Because Taiwan is a multilingual society, people should take every advantage to enhance their language abilities instead of isolating themselves. Young children will benefit from preservice teachers’ positive attitudes toward different languages and cultures and their professional knowledge of language teaching and learning.
Theme 2: Preservice Teachers Should Learn A Second Language or the Native Language

Hsueh’s (2001) master thesis explored the practical assistance to development of English teaching given by class teachers to English teachers, Hsueh’s study observed inadequacy of English proficiency of class teachers and the different awareness and acceptance of English supplementary learning activities between class teachers and English teachers. The study finding indicated class teachers need to have basic English abilities to assist in the English classroom and the second- or-foreign-language teaching methods and strategies need to be introduce as well.

Six out of 13 participants (46 %) suggested that early childhood teacher education programs should encourage preservice teachers to learn a second language in their 4-year program. Because of the needs of the Taiwanese society, English was the language suggested by most of the teacher educators; however, some teacher educators indicated preservice teachers might also learn a language other than English, such as Vietnamese or Indonesian. More languages have come into use in Taiwan within the because of the increasing number of foreign brides and globalization. A tighter network can be built between teacher, parents, and community if teachers are able to communicate with the foreign mothers and understand their culture. A teacher educator wrote the following:

Preservice teachers can choose to learn a language other than their mother tongue. The language can be a one that will be most useful in the region in which they will serve in the future. Understanding languages will help teachers make better connections between school and family, and the reward of learning this language may be greater than learning English.
Theme 3: Classroom Observations and Field Experience

Observation and field experience allow preservice teachers to gain the more clear ideas, concepts, and pictures of children and their learning patterns. There were 4 (30 %) participants specified early childhood education program should offer preservice teachers more opportunities to observe children’s learning and to participant in the classroom activities. In *Studies of Excellence in Teacher Education*, Darling-Hammond (1996) asserted high quality in teacher education program was feasible when it included extensive clinical practice and made a focus on context of practice and etc. According to the teacher education preparation regulation, students have to complete the half year internship after finish all required course in order to take the teacher qualification exam (Ministry of Education, 2004). Besides the half year internship, none of researcher data showing the early childhood teacher education programs in Taiwan required extensive clinical practice within the four years study period. Opportunities for preservice teachers to observe and interact with children during their 4 years of study are limited. Teacher educators suggested departments and teachers should consider providing more opportunities for classroom visits, field observations, and real case studies to explore how young children develop and learn languages. A participant wrote that preservice teachers need opportunities to allow them to observe carefully children’s language development and their bilingualism.

Interview Theme Findings

After analyzing the interview transcripts, several points have been grouped together into several categories. Those categories were sorted by characteristics into 5
themes. The theme 1 was beliefs of teacher educators. Under the theme 1, there were 4 sub-theme include bilingual, attitudes of mother tongue, global competition, and integrating. Theme 2 was language chauvinism. Theme 3 was difficulties which contained with two sub-themes which were disregard and complicate. The theme 4 and 5 were language abilities and English concentration.

*Theme 1: Beliefs of Teacher Educators*

Interviewees shared their beliefs about bilinguals and bilingual education. Most of the participants asserted that bilingual people and bilingual education are in great demand in contemporary society, and they supported the concepts of bilingualism and bilingual education.

*Subtheme 1-1: Bilingual*

The meaning of bilingual focus on “the constant oral usage of two languages (Webster’s dictionary 1961)” or “the native-like control of two languages (Bloomfield 1935, cited in Hamers & Blance, 2000, p.6).” When the researcher asked participants about bilingualism and how they defined it, everyone answered that a bilingual is one who can speak at least two languages; however, 3 of the 5 clarified their definition (for the context of this research), stating that a bilingual speaks Mandarin and a foreign language, not Mandarin and a mother tongue. For example:

According to my thought and the circumstance of our society, the bilingual is the person who can speak Mandarin and English or other foreign language. I won’t define Mandarin plus Hoklo/Hakka or aboriginal languages as bilingual (Dr. Loh).
Before lifting martial in Taiwan in 1987, Hoklo, Hakka, and aboriginal languages were acknowledged as “dialects” but at the time of this writing as “mother tongues” or “native language” (Sandel, 2003, p. 530); Mandarin is the only official language. Before 90s, national government officials had assumed those “dialects” were not national, official, or common languages, hence prohibiting their use in public institutions (Huang, 2001). The stereotypes influence people used to think Hoklo, Hakka, and aboriginal languages were part of the language family of Mandarin, not single languages. This is the reason that most of the participants did not define a person who can speak Mandarin and Hoklo, Hakka, or aboriginal languages as a bilingual.

Subtheme 1-2: Attitude of mother tongue

The literature reviews clearly showed that Hoklo, Hakka, and aborigine languages are used less and less in Taiwan Island, nowadays, and those languages many disappear at the end of 21st century (Tsao, 2001, Young, 1989, Friedman, 2005 & Tiu, 2004). Lee (2004) indicated that most aborigines favorite to speak Mandarin instead of their mother tongue both in public and at home. Under the circumstance, save and maintain the Taiwan’s native languages must been the essential issues to the Taiwan’s society and the education field. Nevertheless, teacher educators bring positive attitudes to educating bilingual children but do not consider the necessity of inserting mother tongue lessons into the formal educational system.

Because of the multilingual environment of Taiwan, every one of the participants spoke more than one language and experienced the benefits of multilingualism. During the interview, Dr. Lisa Ma shared the difficulties she experienced while learning and
using English. Mandarin and Hoklo are her primary languages; Japanese is her second language. Dr. Ma studied Japanese since she was young and gained fluency; but she said that she was enthusiastic about learning English when she over 40 years old. Learning English took longer, and she found it more difficult because the syntax of Japanese and English are completely different. The two languages interfered with each other, and interference situations sometime occurred. In accordance with the experience of Dr. Ma and the comments of others, every participant agreed that learning languages at young ages is effortless; moreover, because of the language-learning experience of the participants, they firmly believed that children have the ability to acquire more than one language and become balanced bilinguals. According to Dr. Loh children can learn many kinds of languages in a proper learning environment. Participants had some very specific notions about training bilingual children.

Nevertheless, with regard to training bilingual children, most of the participants did not support teaching Hoklo or other mother tongues to young children in kindergarten. Dr. Loh said that to do so is unnecessary. Reasons may focus on the notion that Hoklo or other mother tongues are oral languages without formal characters. Originally, teacher education accustomed trained teachers to be the agents of cultural imperialism with the goal of ignoring the heritage of other culture and assimilating students into dominant culture (Kach and Mazeek, 1992). Dr. Lisa Ma stated, “Hoklo is an oral language and does not have formal characters, so I do not think we should teach it to our children.” Furthermore, participants cited English as a global language and consequently more useful than Hoklo, Hakka, and aboriginal languages.
**Subtheme 1-3: Global competition**

Nowadays, language has been highly associated with power. Both of Munks (1996) and Chang & Wu (2002) clearly point out, people accustomed believe who can speak more than one language will have more opportunities for future academic and career success than who do not. It is difficult to be active and successfully in international business, politic, scholarship, or science wither considerable competence in English (Krashen, 2003, pp. 100). Mrs. Amy Hsu stated:

> English is a global language. Our children will have significant advantages and higher self-confidence if they speak fluent English. The drawback is that we lack the proper environment in which to use English, and once the children leave school, they quickly lose their English skills because they have no opportunity to practice them. I think our government should provide more ways to help children learn English from childhood.

Learning English has become a major issue in the educational field at all levels. A majority of the participants highly value learning English because they do believe in learning English enhances children’s ability to compete globally in the future. Dr. Ning mentioned that our children have to learn English in order to compete with others and survive in the global village. She also pointed out learning English allows children to explore many cultures, and doing so enriches their lives and learning.

**Subtheme 1-4: Integrating**

English is a foreign language in Taiwan, and people don’t often have opportunities to use it in their daily lives. Dr. Liao stated that some early childhood
teacher educators advocated the theory of whole language in Taiwan. Kenneth Goodman (1986), who originated whole language, believed that children should have the opportunity to use language to express what they have learned. The teacher should be a listener and require children to ask questions; they should also respond to children’s question or ask further questions. Whole language supporters in Taiwan have opposed the teaching of English to young children because English is not a commonly used language in the environment, and it unrealistic to learn it at such a young age.

In the interviews, however, every participant supported learning English or any other second language at an early age because children are naturally inclined to acquiring more than one linguistic form. Chomsky’s theory of language acquisition device (LAD) viewed language learning as inner design of the mind (1965). He suggested that (a) children are born with a certain language competence, and (b) language can be acquired naturally.

Most of the participants stated that learning English should be pressure free and occur in harmony with children’s lives. All the participants agreed that English teaching does not need to occur in isolated lessons; it should instead be integrated into the normal kindergarten curriculum. According to Mikhail Bakhtin all language is inherently socioideological in that it develops as a result of human interaction; consequently, it is also inextricably linked to the substantial world and sociopolitical circumstance (cited in Yip, 2004). Dr. Lisa Ma said that almost every kindergarten teaches English even though doing it is forbidden by the Ministry of Education. She supported integration of English into normal classroom lessons instead of teaching it in a single course. The interview data
strongly showed integrating English learning and teaching into the kindergarten curriculum is feasible that supported by the early childhood educators.

**Theme 2: Language Chauvinism**

“All countries need at least on national language to conduct government, yet during its heyday as colonial power. Political, social, religious, and economic factors cause division far more than differences in language (Brisk, 1998, p.31, 48).” At the time of this writing, decreasing numbers of young people were able to speak Hoklo or other mother tongues fluently. Since 2000, the turned of protecting and handing down the mother tongue has been an important issues of education mission in Taiwan (Hwang & Chang, 2003).

In order to prevent the total loss of the mother tongues, the Ministry of Education established a sequence for children’s language learning: first the mother tongue, then Mandarin, and finally English. The Ministry of Education has encouraged kindergarten administrators to promote regional mother tongues to young children and forbidden English teaching and bilingual education. Dr. Liao described her experience with the education bureau concerning bilingual education. She said:

Not long ago, I made a public speech to a group of women regarding the issue of bilingualism. Prior to the public speech, the local education bureau officer called me to ask me not to talk about the issue of young children learning English. They advised me that if I needed to discuss bilingualism, I should talk about Mandarin with mother tongue, not Mandarin with English.
Because of this experience, Dr. Liao perceived Taiwan’s educational system as linguistically chauvinistic. In an effort to retain the mother tongue, Taiwan’s education system accords unequal status to various languages, which may influence people’s attitudes toward them. Dr. Loh also indicated that politics has forced our government to place particular emphasis on promoting Hoklo and other mother tongues, which misplace the value of the education.

Theme 3: Difficulties

Theme 3 addresses the difficulties inherent in enhancing preservice teachers’ professional knowledge of bilingualism and bilingual education. The purpose of this theme is to examine teacher education program plans and the notions of teacher educators.

Subtheme 3-1: Disregard

During the decade previous to the writing of this paper, bilingual education had been intensely discussed in the society and has become a serious subject of debate in the early childhood field. Many parents are concerning about either sending their children to the Mandarin and English bilingual kindergarten or the kindergarten offering English as the exclusive language. In addition, more and more parents have enrolled their children in English cram schools. The government has ignored trends in learning English and training bilingual children, so teacher education programs generally neglect these issues as well. Kach and Mazurek (1992) pointed out that teacher education trained teachers to be the agents of cultural imperialism with the object of assimilating students into dominant culture and ignoring the heritage of other cultures. For example, Dr. Loh noted
the excessive number of topics our preservice teachers must learn and stated that bilingual education lessons should not be imposed upon them. Dr. Lisa Ma also indicated that the current plan for program reform in her department does not include bilingual education or second-language acquisition. She said, “Our department is reevaluating the program plan, but I don’t think we will have courses related to bilingual education or second-language acquisition.”

Subtheme 3-2: Complicate

Recently, bilingualism and bilingual education are new issues in the field of early childhood education in Taiwan; at the time of this writing few Taiwanese scholars (C.Z. Chang, S. C.Chang & Yan, 2001: Oladejo, 2006) turned their research interests to bilingual learning and teaching in the Taiwanese context, but they tended to focus on parents’ attitudes and perspectives about learning and teaching English in kindergarten. Two of the five participants of this research interviews never took any courses relating to bilingual education, language development, and second-language acquisition. In addition, only one participant had taught a course in bilingual education.

Most of the participants professed that they rarely spoke of second-language acquisition and bilingual education with their students because these were not their areas of specialization. Teacher educators experience difficulties in addressing bilingual issues in nonlanguage courses. They also claimed they would not incorporate these issues into their courses because they did not have sufficient time to cover their own subject matter. Dr. Doris Ning said, “For example, in my lessons, it is hard to talk about language issues because we have too many things to teach.”
Theme 4: Language Abilities

The interview participants pointed out that, nowadays, preservice teachers’ lack of proficiency in English and not fluency in the mother tongue that cause problem of adopting integrated English or mother tongue into classroom.

Dr. Ning said:

The kindergarten at which I used to work usually hired professional English teachers; the classroom teachers were just their assistants because those kindergarten teachers lacked English proficiency. . . . I wish my teachers could raise their English abilities while they assist in the classroom and perhaps teach English one day.

A number of the interview participants acknowledged that many students come to their programs with lower English proficiency and hold negative impressions of learning English. A master thesis wrote by Hsueh’s (2001) indicated the inadequacy of English proficiency found in the class advisor; and second, the varied awareness and acceptance of English supplementary learning activities between the class advisors and English teachers; third, the absence of interaction between the class advisors and English teachers. Hsueh’s finding demonstrated the early childhood in-service teachers lack of English proficiency and having difficulties to interact with others in English. Before coming to the university, every student had studied English for at least 6 and up to 10 years, which should mean those students have a certain level of English proficiency; however, this is apparently not the case. In Taiwan, students learn English as foreign language while they attend school. For the majority, learning English enhances their opportunities to advance
to a higher level of school, but many of them define English as learning a subject rather than a language, causing students to experience pressure and difficulties. Under these circumstances many people are still unable to speak and read English even if they have studied it for a long time. Dr. Lisa Ma stated, “Students in my department used to come with lower English ability; therefore, it is a tough assignment to enhance their English abilities within 4 years.”

Some individuals also mentioned that increasing numbers of young people live in the northern part of Taiwan and speak only Mandarin and English. More and more youngsters are unable to speak their mother tongues; some may be able to speak some Hoklo or Hakka but not fluently. Friedman’s recent study (2005) showed a decline in mother tongue proficiency of young Taiwanese (Friedman, 2005). Dr. Liao indicated that some educators thought the mother tongue of the most children is Mandarin instead of Hoklo because in northern Taiwan most mothers use Mandarin to communicate with children instead of another language (even if they speak Hoklo).

**Theme 5: English Concentration**

Chang’s study pointed out (2006) most of the early childhood education departments in Taiwan offer no courses relative to bilingualism and second language acquisition. She highly recommended reform in the early childhood educational field, which offers courses in bilingualism and second-language acquisition to enhancing professional knowledge in pre-service teachers to meet the social demand. More and more administrators of teacher education programs have noticed the importance of English abilities and professional knowledge of teaching English for preservice teachers;
therefore, departments plan to add teaching English as a concentration to their 4-year program plans. Dr. Loh pointed out the following:

My department plans to revise the 4-year program plan. We intend to add a concentration in teaching English to young children. We hope we can enrich our students’ future career opportunities, and I believe no other teacher education program has the same plan as my department.

Dr. Lisa Ma stated that her department is in the process of revising the 4-year program plan at the time of this writing, and enhancing students’ English proficiency is of major concern to her department; this issue may become a new concentration area for their students. In the survey’s open-ended question, there was one participants also pointed out here department considered to add the English teaching as a concentration as well.
CHAPTER V

SUMMARY OF FINDINGS, DISCUSSION, AND IMPLICATIONS

Introduction

In this chapter I have summarized major findings and discussed them in depth. In addition, I have outlined significant implications for those in the field of early childhood education as they plan teacher education programs and curriculum design in the future. Furthermore, suggestions for additional research have been included at the end of this chapter for those interested in related areas.

Summary of Findings

Teacher Educators’ Attitudes Toward Second-Language Acquisition and Bilingualism

In answer to questions asked about second-language acquisition and bilingualism, most of the teacher educators report positive views and attitudes, and they all believe in the need for reform in the field of early childhood education to increase preservice teachers’ professional knowledge of second-language acquisition and bilingualism. The greater number of teacher educators understand that creating a proper language-learning environment will allow children to acquire language accurately and efficiently. In
addition, they also realize that children can acquire more than one linguistic form simultaneously and their metalinguistic awareness is enhanced when they become bilingual. Research results show that most of the teacher educators value bilingualism for young children.

Participants indicate a dilemma regarding the teaching of mother tongues to young children in formal school settings. In recent decades the increase in government attention to maintaining the native culture and languages of the island (Hwang & Chang, 2003) is revolutionary compared to the situation of Taiwan before 1990. The data show that most early childhood departments operate in coordination with government policies, offering Multilingual Education and Teaching Native Culture to Young Children as elective courses; some departments even provide courses like Teaching the Taiwanese Language to Young Children. Teacher education accustomed trained teachers to be the agents of cultural imperialism with the goal of ignoring the heritage of other culture and assimilating students into dominant culture (Kach & Mazurek, 1992). Most of the teacher educators in this study think it is important to promote children’s native language and culture in the school setting; nevertheless, few advocate teaching children’s native languages in school settings or providing Mandarin–native language bilingual education perhaps because they perceive native languages as merely oral dialects lacking formal characters.

A t-test, however, shows a significant difference in attitude toward native language learning if the teacher educators did or did not take courses related to language development, bilingual education, second-language acquisition, and second-language
teaching and learning while they earned their degrees. The teacher educators who took such courses are more open-mined and positive about native-language learning than the ones who had not taken such courses. During the interview, 3 of 5 participants clearly perceived a bilingual as one who speaks Mandarin and a foreign language, not Mandarin and a mother tongue. Those participants understood bilingualism as directly influenced by the previous national policy that acknowledged Hoklo, Hakka, and aboriginal languages as “dialects” (Sandel, 2003, p. 530). In addition, the demographics and the interview data showed that the 3 of 5 participants who defined a bilingual as one who speaks Mandarin and a foreign language had a potential bias toward native language because they never had a course in bilingual education, second-language acquisition, or second-language teaching.

While the English become a global language (Krashen, 2003) and Taiwanese parents urgent of raising Mandarin and English bilingual children (“I Can Say My ABC’s,” 2001), teacher educators view introducing a foreign language to young children as a necessity, but they do not think teaching English to young children in school settings is needed. Most teacher educators understand that first language will facilitate the acquisition of second and foreign languages and also recognize that the relationship between the subject matter taught in the first language will transfer to the second language. Because of global competition, however, the interview participants suggest that children who learn English at an early age will be equipped to compete with others and survive in the global village. They all agree that integrating English into kindergarten is beneficial but insist that learning English must be pressure free to all children. The
sociocultural theory by Vygotsky (1962) supported the relationship between language learning and the environment. Goodman (1986) believed that children should have the opportunity to use language to express what they have learned. English is not a commonly used language in the Taiwan and the best way to learn it is to integrate it into the regular classroom. A concern they raise about integrating English into the curriculum is that preservice teachers are insufficiently prepared to do so.

*Professional Knowledge Needed by Preservice Teachers*

What kinds of professional knowledge do preservice teachers need to promote bilingualism in young children? Teacher educators recommend the following: First, child development is basic knowledge that all students require. Second, the knowledge of second-language acquisition is essential. One of the teacher educators wrote in answer to an open-ended survey question that learning a mother tongue resembles learning a second language for many young children, “Our students must have knowledge of second-language acquisition even for teaching the mother tongue.” During the interview Dr. Liao stated that many children who live in Taipei do not speak Hoklo or mother tongues, causing scholars to regard Hoklo and mother tongues as second languages to those children. What’s more, a teacher educator wrote, “I agree that preservice teachers need that knowledge, but it does not mean the young children have to learn English or any other second language.” Third, having the knowledge of adopting and practicing bilingual education with young children is important. Many teacher educators point out their support of integrating English or other foreign language into curriculum; thus, they agree that preservice teachers need a certain level of knowledge about bilingual education.
Fourth, providing knowledge of and supporting second-language acquisition and bilingualism to the parents is vital. Parents face the dilemma of whether or not to send the children to bilingual kindergarten and English cram school. Early childhood teachers must be equipped with proper suggestions and answers to their questions. Finally, most of the teacher educators think it is unnecessary for preservice teachers be able to communicate easily and smoothly with native English-speaking teachers and young children in English.

Courses to Enhance Preservice Teachers’ Professional Knowledge of Promoting Bilingualism in Young Children

Bilingual education courses will help preservice teachers understand not only how children become bilingual but also how to deal with and instruct them appropriately. According to the data, only three departments list Bilingual Education as an elective course for preservice teachers. A related course that promotes preservice teachers’ knowledge of bilingual education and bilingualism is Applied Linguistics for EFL Teachers of Young Children, a course newly added to the 4-year program plan of one department because the faculty intended to add a concentration in English to the program plan. In some departments Language/Verbal Expression of Young Children and Theory of Child Language Development and Teaching have been offered as elective courses for preservice teachers. Based on course titles, this researcher conjectures that instructors may cover the theory of second-language acquisition, but further discussion on bilingualism and bilingual education may be limited or missing. Beside language courses, some other types of courses may enhance preservice teachers’ conception of promoting
bilingualism in young children, including Multicultural Education and courses concerning native culture and language as well as English and foreign-language teaching. According to the data, approximately half the departments offer Multicultural Education as an elective course, and the other departments list Native Language Teaching and Learning as an elective. A course on the teaching of English has been offered to preservice teachers by more than half the departments; however, according to the syllabi, this researcher detects no multicultural education courses, native language teaching and learning courses, or English-related courses offering complete knowledge of bilingualism and bilingual education.

A significant finding emerging from the survey shows assistant professors discussing the bilingual issue more than associate and full professors; therefore, the researcher has concluded that preservice teachers gain more knowledge about bilingualism and children’s language development and learning from courses taught by assistant professors, not associate and full professors.

_Suggestions and Recommendations for Improving Preservice Teachers’ Professional Knowledge of Fostering Bilingualism in Young Children_

Teacher educators contributed several different kinds of suggestions and recommendations for improving preservice teachers’ knowledge of fostering bilingualism in young children. Based on the survey results, teacher educators indicated that no particular level of achievement on the TOFEL exam should be required for preservice teachers nor should Teaching of English to Young Children be included in the program plan. Nevertheless, to enrich preservice teachers’ knowledge of bilingualism, more than
half the teacher educators recommend adding Second-Language Acquisition to the program plan. They also support the introduction of Bilingual Education to preservice teachers. Teacher educators strongly recommend for preservice teachers more field observation and classroom visitation, which will allow them to gain a more complete understanding of the relationship between theory and the reality of children and their learning patterns. The above suggestions from teacher educators coincide with those of Fillmore and Snow (2000) in “What Teachers Need to Know about Language.” Beside classroom courses and field experience, teacher educators suggested that preservice teachers learn a second language, not necessarily English; it can be another foreign language, such as Vietnamese or Indonesian. Che’s study (2004) showed that many new Taiwanese children lack language proficiency when entering elementary school and consequently endure teasing by classmates (Hsang, 2004). Learning a second language other than English can benefit (a) teachers who may need to interact with new Taiwanese children and (b) the long-term growth of those teachers. Preservice teachers should strengthen their native-language abilities as well.

Discussion

This study has focused on the way teacher education programs promote future teachers’ knowledge of bilingualism in young children. It aimed at understanding the kinds of knowledge provided to early childhood preservice teachers in order for them to assist children’s first- and second-language development and promote bilingualism in young children. It was not the aim of this study to urge the inclusion of bilingual
education in kindergarten and preschool or to promote learning English or other foreign language at an early age.

**Attitudes Toward Promoting Bilingualism in Young Children**

The educational policy of promoting mother-tongue learning in past decades shows that the Taiwan government has experienced a profound awakening to the challenge of maintaining native culture and languages. As Taiwan becomes part of the global village, people fear losing the competitive edge and the inability to survive; therefore, more and more parents are willing to encourage their children’s learning English and other foreign languages from early childhood and demand bilingual education. Din (2004) discovered that the parents of preschool and elementary school students are adamant about bilingual education, supporting Chinese and English bilingual education; furthermore, they expect emphasis on the child in bilingual education. They believe that bilingualism should begin in kindergarten and extend to the college years.

However, parents do not prefer only Mandarin and English bilingual education, nor do they want to preserve the native culture and language of Taiwan. Chang (2006) asserted that parents have positive attitudes toward both English and native-language learning for their children.

The Ministry of Education and some scholars still argue about the sequence of language learning while the central government and society call for maintaining native languages and culture and the need to learn English and other languages. In addition the Ministry of Education and some scholars seem concerned that children will live in subtractive bilingual environments instead of additive bilingual environments if the
children learn English or other languages in their early years. Children who are expected to learn a dominant language may lose their native language through subtractive bilingualism; however, those who have solid support for maintaining their native language will benefit from additive bilingualism. Engagement in additive bilingualism or subtractive bilingualism all depends on parents’ attitudes and the support available in the environment. Baker (2000) asserted that children should develop bilingual abilities at a young age if the family environment permits because the children will benefit from the advantages of cognition and socialization immediately and gain long-term benefits in language, economics, personal relationships, and culture.

Taiwan is a multilingual society; every child has the opportunity to acquire at least two languages or even three. Mandarin and Hoklo are the major languages in Taiwan, and the children often learn English or other foreign languages at an early age in school settings or cram schools. At the time of this writing, those in the field of early childhood education encourage the notion of whole language. Its practitioners regard children as active learners. The child spontaneously learns language syntax, articulation, and meaning so that she or he becomes fluent and unafraid of using language to master reading, writing, speaking, and listening. Because of whole language, some teacher educators reject forcing young children to learn English because Taiwan lacks the environment necessary to help children acquire English in a natural way recommended under whole language theory. Vygotsky (1978) asserted that “language and consciousness are both lodged within a matrix of social activity, and that this activity system, rather than the isolated individual, should be the primary focus of study” (p. 21).
The language-learning process involves self and others in the social context during idea exchange and deeper discussion, providing a rich and positive language context, allowing children to develop fluency in mother tongue, second, and even foreign language. In a multilingual society, we should encourage children to respect every language and develop proper language awareness and multilingual abilities instead of prohibiting languages other than Mandarin. The Ministry of Education and teacher educators should be more open-minded in their view of the language learning of young children and take further steps to consider the effect of the teacher education program.

The data in this study show that most teacher educators have positive attitudes toward raising bilingual children and understand that children have abilities to acquire more than one linguistic form without confusion. In addition, most of the teacher educators preferred to integrate English or other language into the kindergarten and preschool curriculum instead of teaching English as an isolated course. In this study, more than 44% of the participants were assistant professors, and 40% of the participants had fewer than 6 years of teaching experience in college and university. The data clearly show the participants who have fewer than 6 years of teaching experience in college and university pay more attention to integrating English or other languages into their curriculum and also show more agreement on the critical period than the others perhaps because bilingual education and bilingualism are contemporary issues in early childhood educational, prompting young researchers and faculty members to develop their interests in these areas. In addition, new faculty members may experience the impact of languages
to a greater extent because of their exposure to globalization, causing them to attach importance to bilingualism and the acquisition of foreign languages.

Having a positive attitude toward bilingualism and English or other languages integrated into the classroom does not mean that teacher educators think kindergartners are ready for them and have to learn them immediately. The teacher educators are concerned that preservice teachers are not sufficiently fluent in English and have difficulties putting English into practice. Teacher educators generally think that integrating English into the curriculum means teaching English, so they worry about preservice teachers’ English proficiency. Tedick and Walker (1994) stated that second-language teachers consider language as a content area, which leads them to believe one has to know the language in order to teach. This misunderstanding has caused people to think that second-language teaching is about teaching the language instead of teaching with language. Findings from this study show that more efforts are needed to strengthen preservice teachers’ knowledge of promoting bilingualism in young children instead of worrying about their English proficiency.

More Courses Delivering Knowledge of Bilingualism and Bilingual Education for Early Childhood Preservice Teachers

The people of Taiwan should strongly support maintaining the learning of both native language and a foreign language. Many researchers have found that courses in second-language acquisition and bilingual education are needed because in-service teachers experience difficulties in assisting in English lessons and the carrying out the social demands of bilingual education. Wang (2007) proposed that ECE teacher educators
must value early childhood bilingualism and linguistic issues in early childhood settings (p. 237). She cited three implications,

First, prospective teachers must be prepared to work with children from different cultural backgrounds or those who have learned an additional language. Second, prospective teachers require knowledge about language. How does second-language acquisition process? How do young children acquire and use a second language? Finally, facing the new phenomenon of EFL learning starts in preschool or at kindergarten age; prospective teachers have to know how young children learn EFL as well as the best and most appropriate EFL pedagogy for EFL learners (pp. 237–238).

The research data clearly show most early childhood preservice teachers have no opportunities to learn how young children develop their first and second languages, nor do they acquire the idea of promoting bilingualism in young children during their 4 years of study because early childhood departments do not offer enough appropriate courses relating to first- and second-language acquisition, bilingual education, and second-language teaching and learning to preservice teachers. More than 60% of the teacher educators in this study indicate that they have never taken courses related to language development, bilingual education, second-language acquisition, or second-language teaching and learning while earning their degrees. Consequently, the researcher conjectures that because of teacher educators’ lack of professional knowledge and interest in first- and second-language acquisition and bilingual education, many early childhood departments provide few if any courses on these subjects for preservice
teachers. According to the survey data, an average of more than 58.9% of teacher educators indicate that their departments do not offer courses in bilingual education, teaching of English as a Second Language, and native-language teaching in their 4-year programs. In addition, because of teacher educators’ lack of professional interest and knowledge in first- and second-language acquisition and bilingual education, the issues of bilingualism and second-language learning and teaching are not popular topics among preservice teachers.

In order to accommodate trends in the multicultural society, especially the need to learn English and maintain native languages, early childhood education departments should offer more courses that deliver knowledge of bilingualism and bilingual education to early childhood preservice teachers. Moreover, early childhood teacher educators should gain more knowledge of bilingual education and how children acquire first and second languages and bring these related issues to their classroom discussions and syllabi.

Field Experience

Darling-Hammond (2000) pointed out a positive connection between teacher preparation in subject matter and teacher performance in the classroom. The early childhood environment rapidly changes during the course of a teacher’s career. Without exposure to new ideas, the professional knowledge and skills of the early childhood teacher cannot grow and old traditional theories take hold in the classroom. Preservice teachers must have opportunities to observe and work with children in the field. Doing so will allow them to learn about children and put theories into action.
Research and human experience demonstrate that young children are born to be bilingual or even multilingual, but parents and the environment often inhibit young children’s language development, and remain monolingual. Few people in Taiwan are fluent in Hoklo, Hakka, and aboriginal languages; many cannot speak these languages at all. During the interview participants observed that members of the younger generation in Taiwan cannot speak their mother tongue fluently; Mandarin has become the primary language of the younger generation. More than 88% of the teacher educators in this study cited Mandarin as their primary oral language, no matter what their mother tongue. Clearly, mother tongues have nearly been lost in a language shift in Taiwan.

Without field experience and classroom observation, the preservice teacher has no opportunity to see firsthand the seriousness of the loss of language and language shift in their country. In addition, they will be unable to engage in real experience and discover the difference between acquiring a language and learning a language. Only field experience will allow preservice teachers to discover how children develop language attitudes and language awareness. As participants mentioned, increased opportunities for field experience and classroom observation will allow preservice teachers to enhance their professional knowledge and skills. Different types of field experience and classroom observation should be incorporated into 4-year program plans and curricula; these experiences should not constitute stand-alone subjects or classes.

Implications

The information found in this study has served as the foundation for the following recommendations for implementation in early childhood teacher education.
First, the overall teacher education program plan and the curriculum should reflect the language diversity of Taiwan and encourage bilingualism in children. In addition, all preservice teachers should be required to show they (a) know how to effectively enhance children’s language abilities and (b) maintain positive attitudes toward bilingualism.

Second, to strengthen preservice teachers’ understanding of children’s language development and bilingualism, early childhood education departments should provide Second-Language Acquisition and Bilingual Education in their schedule of courses. The collected data show that many of the departments provide preservice teachers with courses relating to English teaching; and some departments have plans to insert a concentration in English teaching into the 4-year plan. Enhancing the preservice teacher’s professional knowledge of the teaching of English has become a major concern in the early childhood educational field, so Second Language Acquisition or Bilingual Education should be a required course for every early childhood preservice teacher.

Third, providing more opportunities for preservice teachers to observe, teach, and interact with children is essential. When preservice teachers have complete field experience, they can more fully comprehend language development and language acquisition in children and blend theory with practice.

Fourth, during the 4-year course of study, early childhood education departments should increase preservice teachers’ understanding of the importance of maintaining native cultural and mother tongues as well as broaden their world outlook. Courses in multiculturalism, native culture, mother tongue, and foreign-language learning should be
available to preservice teachers to encourage them to increase their abilities in mother
tongues and foreign language.

Fifth, teacher educators should be encouraged to blend children’s language
development and issues related to language teaching into the curriculum. Language issues
should not be taught in isolated courses because every course is some extent a language
course. All lessons are taught via language, and teachers and students communicate and
discuss via language; therefore, student teachers should gain professional knowledge
about language and the relationship between context and language during their 4-year
programs of study. Teacher educators must consider the language diversity of the society
and the language development of young children and integrate those issues into the
curriculum.

Limitations

The study is applicable only to early childhood teacher education programs in
Taiwan. In addition, the results of this study are limited to the early childhood
educational field because other type of teacher education programs require different kinds
of program plans, and teacher educators in those fields may have different ideas about
bilingual issues; however, teacher educators in countries struggling with similar issues
(teaching of English, the extinction of the mother tongue) may consider these findings
helpful.
Conclusions

Language is for communication; it also functions as the basis of relationships among peoples and even plays a role in maintaining self-confidence. The ability to speak more than one language is a given; however, parents often reject opportunities to allow their children to become bilingual or multilingual. As a multilingual society and member of the global village, Taiwan should not restrict the development of bilingualism in children. People and society should maintain positive attitudes toward all languages because no language is more privileged than another. School administrators should build on the experience and knowledge that children bring to the classroom, and instruction should also promote children’s abilities and talents (Cummins, 2008). Diversification and multifaceted language teaching and learning environments should be available to children. Early childhood teachers must have a professional knowledge of children’s second-language development, second-language teaching, and bilingualism. At the time of this study, many early childhood education departments and early childhood teacher educators still fail to put the issue into consideration. The urgent need to enhance preservice teachers’ professional knowledge and skills in children’s second-language acquisition, second-language teaching and bilingualism must be fulfilled immediately; moreover, preservice teachers’ ability to integrate English or the mother tongue into the classroom needs to be considered as well.

Maintaining the mother tongue while simultaneously learning a foreign language has become an inevitable trend worldwide; nevertheless, creating and developing a proper language environment to create a win–win situation in which children are
bilingual has become a priority issue in early childhood education and the government. Now, it is incumbent upon government officials in Taiwan to reflect upon the national language policy regarding the designation of English as a foreign or second language. The government of Taiwan should respect and treat every language fairly and must resist putting ideology, uniformity, and similarity before language and furthermore promote and preserve the native languages of the Taiwan island. Moreover, early childhood education teacher education programs should enhance early teachers’ knowledge of bilingual and bilingual education to assist in the nurturing of bilingual children and deliver a linguistically sound attitude toward languages and culture. The government and experts in the fields of bilingualism and early childhood education should take steps to integrate Mandarin, mother tongues, and other languages such as English in the curriculum.

Need for Further Research

Future researchers may choose to investigate the following: First, the literature review shows that because of in-service teachers’ language abilities, they often experience difficulties while assisting in English classes or classes in which the mother tongue is taught. Therefore, future researchers may develop methods to help in-service teachers overcome the language barrier and define their roles in promoting bilingualism or even trilingualism in children. Second, an investigation can be done to discover preservice teachers’ knowledge of and ability to promote bilingualism. Third, some departments may initiate offerings for preservice teachers in bilingual education, English/mother tongue teaching, or second-language acquisition; and a future researcher
should examine whether taking related courses on second-language acquisition and second language/mother tongue teaching or bilingual education courses really helps early childhood teachers perform better in the field. Fourth, the data indicate that most teacher educators endorse an integrated curriculum for promoting English and mother-tongue learning; however, blending the mother tongue and English in the regular lessons presents a major challenge to early childhood teachers. Case studies on promoting bilingualism in an integrated curriculum to help early childhood teachers gain clearer ideas of the issues will improve practice. Case studies on integrating curriculum for promoting bilingualism are highly recommended for the future study.
APPENDIX A

SAMPLE LETTER TO REQUEST THE PROGRAM PLAN
Dear Director,

I am a Ph.D. candidate at the Kent State University, U.S.. Currently, I am working on collecting data for my dissertation, which is entitled “How Taiwan’s Teacher Education Programs Promote Future Teachers’ Knowledge Necessary of Fostering Bilingualism in Children”? Part of my study covers the 4-year program plans in place in Taiwan’s early childhood departments. I have retrieved useful information from each early childhood department’s website; however, I am experiencing difficulty finding the verifying information I need from your website. I am writing to request your assistance in providing the latest 4-year program plan used by your department.

Enclosed please find a self-addressed stamped envelope for your convenience, or you can e-mail the program plan to me at lchou@kent.edu or ln1021@hotmail.com. If you have any questions about this study, please contact me at lchou@kent.edu. Thank you in advance for your valuable assistance.

Sincerely,

Lan-Ying Chou
Ph.D. Candidate
Department of Teaching, Leadership, and Curriculum Studies
Kent State University
親愛的系主任 您好:

我是美國肯特州立大學的博士候選人，主修課程與教學。目前我正進行我的博士論文的資料收集。我的論文主要在探討台灣的師資培育單位如何強化職前教師的專業知識，讓他們得以促進孩子習用兩種以上的語言。我的論文研究裡的一部分是分析台灣所有的幼兒教育學系的課程規劃。一般而言，我從各系的網頁上節取我所需的資料。但當我察看貴系網頁時我無法找到我所需的資料。請你不吝惜的提供我貴系最新的大學部四年制的課程規劃。

僅附回郵信封，煩請將相關資料寄回。或您也可直接將課程規劃寄到我的電子信箱 lchou@kent.edu 或 ln1021@hotmail.com。如您對此研究有任何的疑問，請不吝與我連絡 (E-mail: lchou@kent.edu 或 ln1021@hotmail.com）。在此先行感謝您的參與。

Sincerely,

Lan-Ying Chou
Ph.D. Candidate
Department of Teaching, Leadership, and Curriculum Studies
Kent State University
APPENDIX B

SAMPLE LETTER TO REQUEST THE COURSE SYLLABI
Dear Director,

I am writing to request your assistance in providing several course syllabi, which I have listed below. The study of such course syllabi is part of my dissertation research supported by Kent State University. The purpose of the study is to explore the manner in which Taiwan’s early childhood teacher education programs equip future teachers with the knowledge necessary to foster bilingualism in children. The researcher intends to investigate relevant needs for future curriculum and pedagogical design in early childhood teacher education programs and to foster in preservice teachers professional knowledge and skills in the area of bilingualism, so your providing these syllabi is very important.

I would like the following syllabi from your department:

(1)
(2)
(3)

If you department offers any other courses which I didn’t indicate there. Please kindly offering the course syllabi to me.

Enclosed is a self-addressed return envelope for your convenience or you can e-mail the syllabi to me at lchou@kent.edu or ln1021@hotmail.com. If you have any questions about this study, please contact me at lchou@kent.edu. Thank you in advance for your valuable assistance.

Sincerely,

Lan-Ying Chou
Ph.D. Candidate
Department of Teaching, Leadership, and Curriculum Studies
Kent State University
親愛的系主任 您好:

這封信是你煩請主任您提供以下所列課程的教學大綱。研讀暨瞭解這些課程
的教學大綱是我論文研究的一部份。而這研究是受 Kent State University 所批准和
支持的。問卷的主要目的是探討台灣的師資培育單位如何強化職前教師的專業知識，
讓他們得以促進孩子習用兩種以上的語言。本研究想要調查職前教師的雙語專業知
識的需求，以及提供幼兒師資培育單位未來課程與教學的規劃方向。

我需要以下所列課程的教學大綱:

(1)
(2)
(3) 如果您的系上提供其它相關課程是我沒有列到的，請您不吝惜提供這些
課程的教學大綱。

僅附回郵信封，煩請將相關資料寄回，或您也可直接將教學大綱寄到我的電
子信箱 lchou@kent.edu 或 ln1021@hotmail.com。如果您有任何的疑問，請
不吝與我連絡 (E-mail: lchou@kent.edu 或 ln1021@hotmail.com)。在此先行感謝
您的參與。

Sincerely,

Lan-Ying Chou
Ph.D. Candidate
Department of Teaching, Leadership, and Curriculum Studies
Kent State University
APPENDIX C

FINAL SURVEY
### Survey Questionnaire

#### English Version

**Section I: Demographic**

1. Please identify your gender – Male, Female
2. What is your native language?
3. What is your primary speaking language?
4. Name of your University/College: (Optional)
5. School type: Public or Private
6. Status: Please identify faculty rank Professor, Associate professor, Assistance professor, Instructor
7. How many years have you taught at the college level?
   - 1-5, 6-10, 11-15, 16-20, 21+
8. What are your research interests?
9. What are your primary teaching focuses?
10. What is your current degree?
    - MEd
    - MEs
    - EdD
    - PhD
11. During your degree earning did you take courses related to language development, bilingual education, second language acquisition, second language teaching and learning?
    - Yes ______ or No ______
    - Listing the name of the courses you took.

**Section II: Courses offered by the department**

YES or NO

12. My department offers a course in child development.
    - Yes or No Required or Elective
13. My department offers a course in child language development.
    - Yes or No Required or Elective
14. My department offers a course in bilingual education.
    - Yes or No Required or Elective
15. My department offers a course in the teaching of English as a second language.
    - Yes or No Required or Elective
16. My department offers a course in multicultural education.
    - Yes or No Required or Elective
17. My department offers a second-language

#### Chinese Version

**第一部份: 基本資料**

1. 性別 – 男，女
2. 請問你的母語是 __________
3. 您主要之口說語言為 __________
4. 您任教大學 / 專科名稱: (選填)
5. 學校類別: 公立或私立 __________
6. 職稱: 請說明您之職級
   - 教授 ___
   - 副教授 ___
   - 助理教授 ___
   - 講師 ___
7. 大學 / 專科教學年資? 1-5, 6-10, 11-15, 16-20, 20+ __________
8. 您的研究領域為何? __________
9. 您（主）要的授課類別（科目）為何? __________
10. 您目前之最高學歷為何?
    - 教育碩士 ___
    - 碩士 ___
    - 教育博士 ___
    - 哲學博士 ___
11. 在取得學位期間，您是否修習過語言發展、雙語教學（育）、第二語言習得、第二語言教學?
    - 是 _______ 或 不 _______
    - 請列出您修習過之課程名稱

**第二部份: 系提供的課程 是或非**

12. 我任教的科系提供兒童發展課程。
    - 是 _____ 或 非 _____
    - 必修 _____ 選修 _____
13. 我任教的科系提供兒童語言發展課程。
    - 是 _____ 或 非 _____
    - 必修 _____ 選修 _____
14. 我任教的科系提供雙語教學課程。
    - 是 _____ 或 非 _____
    - 必修 _____ 選修 _____
15. 我任教的科系提供以英語為第二語言之教學課程。
    - 是 _____ 或 非 _____
    - 必修 _____ 選修 _____
16. 我任教的科系提供多元文化教育課程。
    - 是 _____ 或 非 _____
acquisition course.  
Yes or No Required or Elective  
17. My department offers a native language teaching course.  
Yes or No Required or Elective  
18. My department offers a native language teaching course.  

Section III: Integrated bilingual education and bilingualism issues in non-language course  
5-point Likert scale  
5 = Strongly Agree  4 = Agree  3 = Neutral 
2 = Disagree  1 = Strongly Disagree  
19. I often talked about the issue of children’s language development in my classroom.  
20. When I designed my curriculum, I made effort to integrate of teaching and learning second and foreign language.  
21. Multilingualism is an important issue in my classroom.  
22. Bilingual education and bilingualism are popular topics in my classroom.  

Section IV: Attitudes toward second-language learning for young children  
5-point Likert scale  
5 = Strongly Agree  4 = Agree  3 = Neutral 
2 = Disagree  1 = Strongly Disagree  
23. A child is capable of learning more than one linguistic form.  
24. The right environment can awaken children’s capabilities to learn other languages.  
25. Once past the critical period, people are unable to develop fluency in a second or foreign language.  
27. High levels of bilingualism can result in superior cognitive development.  
28. Developing literacy in the primary language is necessary in order to facilitate the acquisition of a second /foreign language.  
29. Learning subject matter through the primary language first will make subject matter taught in second /foreign language more understandable.  
30. Promoting children’s native language and culture in the school setting is a necessity.
31. Introducing foreign language to young children is unnecessary.
32. Teaching English as a course to young children in the school setting is a necessity.
33. Having classes in Mandarin and English at the same time would be confusing for children.
34. Implementing bilingual (Mandarin and native language) education in kindergarten and preschool is a vital necessity.
35. Legalizing bilingual (Mandarin and English) education in kindergarten and preschool level is urgently needed.
36. Introducing a language also means introducing (touching) another culture.
37. I am very concerned about reforming the field of early childhood education to increase preservice teachers’ professional knowledge about second-language acquisition and bilingualism.

Section V: Professional Knowledge Needed by Preservice the Teacher

5-point Likert scale
5 = Strongly Agree  4 = Agree
3 = Neutral  2 = Disagree
1 = Strongly Disagree

38. Language development is a vital necessity for the preservice teacher.
39. Knowledge of second-language acquisition is part of the basic knowledge needed by a preservice teacher.
40. The preservice teacher must be able to integrate the teaching of English or other languages into classroom activities.
41. The preservice teacher must know how to promote bilingualism in the classroom.
42. The preservice teacher must know how to create lessons to facilitate young children’s learning of English or a foreign language.
43. The preservice teacher needs professional knowledge on designing curriculum that promotes bilingualism in children.
44. The preservice teacher needs no knowledge of adopting and practicing bilingual education.
45. The preservice teacher must feel comfortable speaking English with young children.
46. The preservice teacher must feel comfortable communicating in English with English teachers (i.e., native speakers of English) at the kindergarten or preschool.

33. 同時以國語和英語授課將造成孩童學習困擾。
34. 在幼稚園裡實施雙語（國語和母語）教學（育）是極其必要的。
35. 將幼稚園雙語（國語和英語）教學合法化是當務之急。
36. 介紹一種語言同時也意味者融入（接觸）另一種文化。
37. 我相當關切幼兒教育領域的職前教師需增加第二語言修習和雙語教學之專業知識的革新。
47. The preservice teacher must be able to answer parents’ questions regarding second-language acquisition and bilingualism.

Section VI: Suggestions and recommendations

5-point Likert scale
5 = Strongly Agree  4 = Agree
3 = Neutral  2 = Disagree
1 = Strongly Disagree

48. All preservice teachers must take language development as a required course.
49. Second-language acquisition course is a must for the preservice teacher.
50. Preservice teachers should be introduced to bilingual education.
51. Introducing multicultural education to the preservice teacher is important.
52. Teaching English to young children should be added to early childhood education programs.
53. All preservice teachers should be required to meet at the 550 (paper test) or 213 (computer test) on the test of English as a foreign language before graduate.
54. Please note any suggestions and recommendations for increasing future teachers’ knowledge of language development and bilingualism.

55. I am looking for three teacher educators to participate in interviews so I can acquire an in-depth understanding of the issues covered in this questionnaire. Please provide your name, e-mail, mailing address, work phone and contact information at the below if you are willing to talk more about these issues. I will get in touch with you as soon as possible.

58. 所有的準教師都必需修習語言發展課。
49. 第二語言修習課程對職前教師而言是必要的。
50. 雙語教學必須被介紹給職前教師。
51. 介紹多元文化教育給職前教師是重要的。
52. 幼兒教育學系應該增加孩童英語教學課程。
53. 所有實習教師在畢業前必須參加托福考試並獲得 550 分 (筆試) 或 213 分 (電腦測試) 之成績。
54. 請提出任何可以增進準教師語言發展與雙語知識之意見與建議。

55. 我想會晤三位大學 (學院) 教授 (講師)，以便深入了解本問卷所涉及之議題，若您願意更進一步探討此議題，請於右側之欄位提供您的姓名、電子信箱、工作電話等的連絡資料，我將盡快與您聯絡。
APPENDIX D

SURVEY
第一部分－個人資料

填答方式：請選擇或寫下最符合你個人的背景資料與教學經驗。

1. 性別：
   男__________  女__________

   請問你的母語是：________________________

2. 您主要之口說語言為：________________________

3. 您任教大學/專科名稱：
   (選填) __________________________

4. 學校類別：
   公立__________  私立__________

5. 職稱：（請說明您的職級）
   教授__________  副教授______
   助理教授______  講師______

6. 大學/專科教學年資：
   __________________________

7. 您的研究領域為何？
   __________________________

8. 您首（主）要的授課類別（科目）為何？
   __________________________

9. 您目前之最高學歷為何？
   教育碩士______  碩士______
   教育博士______  哲學博士____

10. 在取得學位期間，您是否修習過語言發展、雙語教育、第二語言習得、第二語言教學？
   是__________  否__________

   根據上述問題，如你的回答為是。請列出您修習過之課程名稱。

______________________________________________________________________________________
______________________________________________________________________________________
第二部份: 系提供的課程

填答方式: 是非題 和 必修或選修。

1. 我任教的科系提供兒童發展課程。
   非 _______ 必修 _______ 選修 _______

2. 我任教的科系提供兒童語言發展課程。
   非 _______ 必修 _______ 選修 _______

3. 我任教的科系提供雙語教學課程。
   非 _______ 必修 _______ 選修 _______

4. 我任教的科系提供以英語為第二語言之教學課程。
   非 _______ 必修 _______ 選修 _______

5. 我任教的科系提供多元文化教育課程。
   非 _______ 必修 _______ 選修 _______

6. 我任教的科系提供第二語言習得課程。
   非 _______ 必修 _______ 選修 _______

7. 我任教的科系提供母語教學課程。
   非 _______ 必修 _______ 選修 _______

第三部份: 雙語融入於非語言課程

填答方式: 請在讀取問題後圈選最符合你想法的號碼。

五分量表選項
1 分=非常不同意; 2 分=不同意; 3 分=沒有意見;4 分=同意; 5 分=非常同意

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>非常不同意</th>
<th>不同意</th>
<th>沒有意見</th>
<th>同意</th>
<th>非常同意</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
第四部份：對幼兒雙語與第二語言學習的看法與意見

填答方式：請在讀取問題後圈選最符合你想法的號碼

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>項目</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>兒童具有學習一種以上語言的能力。</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>適當的環境可以激發<code>（喚起）</code>兒童學習其它語言的能力。</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>一旦過了關鍵時期，人們的第二或外國語言流暢度將無法發展的很好。</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>雙語可促進兒童之後設語言認知。</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.</td>
<td>高程度的雙語能力會導致發展出較高等的認知能力。</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.</td>
<td>爲促進第二/外國語言之學習，發展主要語言之讀寫能力是必要的。</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.</td>
<td>先透過主要語言學習科目內容，再以第二/外國語文在課堂上教授該科目，將更易理解。</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.</td>
<td>在校園裡推廣兒童之母語和文化是沒有必要的。</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.</td>
<td>介紹外國語言給幼童是沒必要的。</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14.</td>
<td>在校園環境內將英文制定為一門課程來教授幼童是必要的。</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15.</td>
<td>同時以國語和英語授課將造成孩童學習困擾。</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16.</td>
<td>在幼稚園裡實施雙語（國語和母語）教學（育）是極其必要的。</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17.</td>
<td>將幼稚園雙語（國語和英語）教學合法化是當務之急。</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18.</td>
<td>介紹一種語言同時也意謂著融入（接觸）另一種文化。</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19.</td>
<td>我相當關切幼兒教育領域的職前教師需增加第二語言修習和雙語教學之專業知識的革新。</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### 第五部份：未來幼教師所需的專業能力

**填答方式：** 請在讀取問題後圈選最符合你想法的號碼。

<p>| | | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>20.</td>
<td>語言發展對職前教師而言是不可或缺的知識。</td>
<td>非常不同意</td>
<td>不同意</td>
<td>沒有意見</td>
<td>同意</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21.</td>
<td>第二語言習得是職前教師必備的基本知識之一。</td>
<td>非常不同意</td>
<td>不同意</td>
<td>沒有意見</td>
<td>同意</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22.</td>
<td>職前教師必須能夠將英語或其他語言教學融入課堂活動。</td>
<td>非常不同意</td>
<td>不同意</td>
<td>沒有意見</td>
<td>同意</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23.</td>
<td>職前教師必須知道如何設計課程，以便輔助（促進）孩童英語或外國語言的學習。</td>
<td>非常不同意</td>
<td>不同意</td>
<td>沒有意見</td>
<td>同意</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24.</td>
<td>職前教師必須能夠將英語或其他語言教學融入課堂活動。</td>
<td>非常不同意</td>
<td>不同意</td>
<td>沒有意見</td>
<td>同意</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25.</td>
<td>職前教師必須能夠回答家長對於第二語言修習和雙語教學的問題。</td>
<td>非常不同意</td>
<td>不同意</td>
<td>沒有意見</td>
<td>同意</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 第六部份：提議與建議

**填答方式：** 請在讀取問題後圈選最符合你想法的號碼。

<p>| | | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>28.</td>
<td>所有職前教師均需修習語言發展課程。</td>
<td>非常不同意</td>
<td>不同意</td>
<td>沒有意見</td>
<td>同意</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29.</td>
<td>第二語言修習課程對職前教師而言是必要的。</td>
<td>非常不同意</td>
<td>不同意</td>
<td>沒有意見</td>
<td>同意</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30.</td>
<td>雙語教學必須被介紹給職前教師。</td>
<td>非常不同意</td>
<td>不同意</td>
<td>沒有意見</td>
<td>同意</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31.</td>
<td>介紹多元文化教育給職前教師是重要的。</td>
<td>非常不同意</td>
<td>不同意</td>
<td>沒有意見</td>
<td>同意</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32.</td>
<td>幼兒教育學系應該增加孩童英語教學課程。</td>
<td>非常不同意</td>
<td>不同意</td>
<td>沒有意見</td>
<td>同意</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33.</td>
<td>所有實習教師在畢業前必須參加托福考試並獲得 550 分（筆試）或 213 分（電腦測驗）之成績。</td>
<td>非常不同意</td>
<td>不同意</td>
<td>沒有意見</td>
<td>同意</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
34. 請提出任何可以增進準教師語言發展與雙語知識之意見與建議。

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

35. 我想會晤三位大學(學院)教授(講師)，以便更深入了解本問卷所涉及之議題，
若您願意更進一步探討此議題，請於右側之欄位提供您的姓名、電子信箱、工
作電話等的連絡資料，我將盡快與您聯絡。

姓名： __________________________ 電子信箱： __________________________

工作電話： __________________________

通信住址： __________________________
Dear:

I am writing to ask for your assistance in the development of an important survey and interview instrument regarding my doctoral dissertation. My dissertation topic is “How Taiwan’s Teacher Education Programs Promote Future Teachers’ Knowledge of Curricula that Foster Bilingualism in Children.” You have been chosen as a member of my panel of experts because of your commitment to and knowledge of the field of private rehabilitation.

This survey and interview instrument proposes to measure how Taiwan’s teacher education programs help preservice teachers gain knowledge in order to promote bilingualism in young children. The survey questionnaire will be administrated to the early childhood education faculty in Taiwan and 6 faculty participants will be chosen for in-depth interview.

This review by the panel of experts will help establish the validity of the survey and interview instruments. I am requesting that you review the survey and interview questions to determine the appropriateness and clarity of the questions and their applicability to the dissertation topic.

A special form has been developed for your use in commenting on the item I have developed for the instrument. Please feel free to comment based upon the following criteria:

**Face Validity:** Does the instrument “look like” it is measuring what it is supposed to measure?
**Content Validity**: Are the items representative of concepts related to the dissertation topic.

**Clarity**: Is each item in the instruments clear? Is the language/wording appropriate?

**Format**: Logical flow? Suggestions

**Other**: Please make any additional suggestions as warranted?

The five point Likert-type Scale method is being used for the survey questionnaire. Subjects will be asked to indicate the level of their certainty of the agreement and disagreement by placing their response to the item on a five-point scale. In addition, please feel free to delete those items you feel inappropriate.

If possible, please return the enclosed expert form with your comments to me by January 15, 2007. If you have any questions, please contact me at lchou@kent.edu.

Thank you in advance for your great help.

Sincerely,

Lan-Ying Chou

Ph.D. Candidate

Department of Teaching, Leadership and Curriculum Studies

Kent State University
APPENDIX F

SAMPLE OF CONTENT VALIDATION FORM
How Taiwan’s Teacher Education Programs Promote Future Teachers’ Knowledge of Curricula that Foster Bilingualism in Children?

Survey Questionnaires Item Content Validation Form

Directions: There are 60 items listed on the following pages designed to investigate how early childhood teacher education programs promote future teachers’ knowledge of curriculum that fosters bilingualism in young children in Taiwan. Please rate each item based on two criteria: 1) the appropriateness of the item in representing the topic, and 2) the clarity of the meaning of the item. Please circle your response.

1) Is the item appropriate?
   YES = Appropriate
   NO = Inappropriate

2) Is the item clear?
   YES = Meaning Clear
   NO = Meaning Unclear

If the item is appropriate but unclear, please reword the item on the blank lines below the item. If the item is inappropriate and not clear, please indicate the item should be deleted from the questionnaire by writing the word “Delete” on the blank lines.
**Section I – Demographic Question**

1. Name of your University/College: (Optional)  | APPROPRIATE | CLEAR
---|---|---
YES | NO | YES | NO

2. School type: Public or Private  | APPROPRIATE | CLEAR
---|---|---
YES | NO | YES | NO

3. Status: Professor or Instructor  | APPROPRIATE | CLEAR
---|---|---
YES | NO | YES | NO

4. How many years have you taught at the college level? 1-5, 6-10, 11-15, 16-20, 20+  | APPROPRIATE | CLEAR
---|---|---
YES | NO | YES | NO

5. What are your research interests?  | APPROPRIATE | CLEAR
---|---|---
YES | NO | YES | NO

**Section II – Courses Offered by the Department**

6. The department offers a required course in child development.  | APPROPRIATE | CLEAR
---|---|---
YES | NO | YES | NO
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>My department offers a course in child language development.</th>
<th>APPROPRIATE</th>
<th>CLEAR</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>YES NO</td>
<td>YES NO</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>My department offers a course in bilingual education every academic year.</td>
<td>YES NO</td>
<td>YES NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.</td>
<td>My department offers a course in the teaching of English as a second language for the preservice teacher.</td>
<td>YES NO</td>
<td>YES NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.</td>
<td>My department considers multicultural education important for the preservice teacher.</td>
<td>YES NO</td>
<td>YES NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.</td>
<td>My department considers second-language acquisition a necessary course for the preservice teacher.</td>
<td>YES NO</td>
<td>YES NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.</td>
<td>My department considers teaching native language as an important course.</td>
<td>YES NO</td>
<td>YES NO</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
13. Many other courses relating with foreign and second-language teaching and learning are part of my department’s program plan.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>APPROPRIATE</th>
<th>CLEAR</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>YES</td>
<td>NO</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>APPROPRIATE</th>
<th>CLEAR</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>YES</td>
<td>NO</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

15. When I design my curriculum, I am concerned with the integration of teaching and learning second and foreign languages.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>APPROPRIATE</th>
<th>CLEAR</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>YES</td>
<td>NO</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

16. Multilingualism is an important issue in the classroom.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>APPROPRIATE</th>
<th>CLEAR</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>YES</td>
<td>NO</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

17. Bilingual education and bilingualism are the popular topics in the classroom.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>APPROPRIATE</th>
<th>CLEAR</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>YES</td>
<td>NO</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Section III – Opinions and Attitudes about Bilingualism and Second-Language**
18. A child is capable of learning more than one linguistic form.  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>APPROPRIATE</th>
<th>CLEAR</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>YES</td>
<td>NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YES</td>
<td>NO</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

19. The right environment can awaken children’s capabilities to learn other languages.  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>APPROPRIATE</th>
<th>CLEAR</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>YES</td>
<td>NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YES</td>
<td>NO</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

20. Once past the critical period, people are unable to develop fluency in a second or foreign language.  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>APPROPRIATE</th>
<th>CLEAR</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>YES</td>
<td>NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YES</td>
<td>NO</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

21. People won’t be able to speak fluently in their primary language if a second or foreign language has been introduced to them at an early age.  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>APPROPRIATE</th>
<th>CLEAR</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>YES</td>
<td>NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YES</td>
<td>NO</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

22. Learning and using any kind of language is a human right.  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>APPROPRIATE</th>
<th>CLEAR</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>YES</td>
<td>NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YES</td>
<td>NO</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

23. Languages cannot be classified as good or bad.  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>APPROPRIATE</th>
<th>CLEAR</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>YES</td>
<td>NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YES</td>
<td>NO</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

25. High levels of bilingualism can result in superior cognitive development.

26. Knowledge is not interchangeable between languages.

27. Promoting children’s native language and culture in the school setting is a necessity.

28. Developing literacy in the primary language is necessary in order to facilitate the acquisition of a second language.

29. Learning subject matter through the primary language first will make subject matter taught in English more understandable.
<p>| | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>30. Introducing English or other languages to young children is unnecessary.</strong></td>
<td><strong>APPROPRIATE</strong></td>
<td><strong>CLEAR</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>31. Teaching English as a course to young children in the school setting is a necessity.</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>32. Having classes in Chinese and English at the same time would be confusing for students.</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>33. Implementing bilingual (Mandarin and native language) education in kindergarten and preschool is a vital necessity.</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>34. Legalizing bilingual (Mandarin and English) education in kindergarten and preschool level is urgently needed.</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>35. Teachers should encourage children to speak only Mandarin in school.</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
36. Introducing a language also means introducing another culture.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>APPROPRIATE</th>
<th>CLEAR</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>YES</td>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NO</td>
<td>NO</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Section V – Professional Knowledge Needed by Preservice the Teacher**

37. Language development is part of the basic knowledge needed by a preservice teacher.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>APPROPRIATE</th>
<th>CLEAR</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>YES</td>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NO</td>
<td>NO</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

38. Knowledge of second-language acquisition is a vital necessity for the preservice teacher.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>APPROPRIATE</th>
<th>CLEAR</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>YES</td>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NO</td>
<td>NO</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

39. Preservice teachers must be able to integrate the teaching of English or other languages into classroom activities.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>APPROPRIATE</th>
<th>CLEAR</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>YES</td>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NO</td>
<td>NO</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

40. Preservice teachers must know how to promote bilingualism in the classroom.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>APPROPRIATE</th>
<th>CLEAR</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>YES</td>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NO</td>
<td>NO</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

41. The preservice teacher must know how to create lessons to facilitate young children’s learning of English or a foreign language.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>APPROPRIATE</th>
<th>CLEAR</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>YES</td>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NO</td>
<td>NO</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
42. The preservice teacher needs professional knowledge on designing curriculum that promotes bilingualism in children. | APPROPRIATE | CLEAR |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>YES</td>
<td>NO</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

43. The preservice teacher needs no knowledge of adopting and practicing bilingual education. | YES | NO |

44. The preservice teacher must be able to speak the primary native language of the district. | YES | NO |

45. The preservice teacher must be comfortable reading English storybooks to children. | YES | NO |

46. The preservice teacher must feel comfortable speaking English with young children. | YES | NO |

47. The preservice teacher must feel comfortable communicating in English with English teachers (i.e., native speakers of English) at the kindergarten or preschool. | YES | NO |
48. The preservice teacher must be able to answer parents’ questions regarding second-language acquisition and bilingualism.

49. The preservice teacher must understand the rich diversity of development among children.

50. The preservice teacher must have the ability to practice reflection.

51. The preservice teacher must be able to look at issues from various perspectives.

Section VI- Suggestions and Recommendations

52. All preservice teachers must take language development as a required course.

53. Second-language acquisition course is a must for the preservice teacher.
54. Preservice teachers must be introduced to bilingual education.  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>APPROPRIATE</th>
<th>CLEAR</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>YES</td>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NO</td>
<td>NO</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

55. Introducing multicultural education to the preservice teacher is important.  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>APPROPRIATE</th>
<th>CLEAR</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>YES</td>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NO</td>
<td>NO</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

56. Teaching English to young children must be added to early childhood education programs.  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>APPROPRIATE</th>
<th>CLEAR</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>YES</td>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NO</td>
<td>NO</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

57. All preservice teachers are required to meet at the 550 (paper test) or 75 (iBT) on the TOEFL before graduation.  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>APPROPRIATE</th>
<th>CLEAR</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>YES</td>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NO</td>
<td>NO</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

58. I am very concerned about reforming the field of early childhood education to increase preservice teachers’ professional knowledge about second-language acquisition and bilingualism.  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>APPROPRIATE</th>
<th>CLEAR</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>YES</td>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NO</td>
<td>NO</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
59. Please note any suggestions and recommendations for increasing future teachers’ knowledge of language development and bilingualism. Use the back of this form or additional paper if necessary.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>APPROPRIATE</th>
<th>CLEAR</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>YES</td>
<td>NO</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

60. I am looking for three teacher educators to participate in interviews so I can acquire an in-depth understanding of the issues covered in this questionnaire. Please provide your name and contact information in the box at the right if you are willing to talk more about these issues. I will get in touch with you as soon as possible.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>YES</th>
<th>NO</th>
<th>YES</th>
<th>NO</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
APPENDIX G

SURVEY CONSENT FORM
Dear Teacher Educator,

I am writing to request your assistance in answering an on-line survey questionnaire that is part of my dissertation study supported by Kent State University. The purpose of the study is to explore the manner in which Taiwan’s early childhood teacher education programs equips future teachers with the kind of knowledge necessary to foster bilingualism in children. The researcher intends to investigate relevant needs for future curriculum and pedagogical design in early childhood teacher education programs and to foster in preservice teachers professional knowledge and skills in the area of bilingualism, so your contribution is very important.

If you decide to participate in this study, you will be asked to complete the 53-item survey. It will take approximately 10-15 minutes to complete; however, you may take all the time you need to complete it.

The questionnaire consists of six sections. Section one contains demographic data. Section two concerns courses offered by your department. Section three covers integrated bilingual education and bilingualism issues in nonlanguage courses. Section four contains statements about your attitudes toward second-language learning for young children. Section five includes questions regarding early childhood preservice teachers’ professional knowledge. The final section involves suggestions and recommendations from you for improving preservice teachers’ professional knowledge.
All information you provide is anonymous and will be kept confidential through the use of control numbers on surveys (instead of names). Completed questionnaire data will be kept safely in a locked file cabinet for 5 years (after I received the questionnaire) and then destroyed.

An e-mail will be sent to you within a week’s time regarding the link for the questionnaire. Please respond to the e-mail as soon as you can. If you have any concern about this study, please e-mail me at lchou@kent.edu or ln1021@hotmail.com or contact me at (06) 2206569. This project has been approved by Kent State University. If you have any questions regarding Kent State University’s rules for research, please call Katherine Light, Human Subject Review Contact, Division of Research and Graduate Studies (Tel. 330.672.2704). Thank you in advance for your valuable assistance.

Sincerely,

Lan-Ying Chou, Ph.D. Candidate
Department of Teaching, Leadership, and Curriculum Studies
Kent State University

B. CONSENT STATEMENT(S)

I agree to take part in this project. I know what I will have to do and that I can stop at any time.
親愛的教授，您好：

這封信主要是邀請您參與我博士論文的網路學術問卷作答。此問卷是我博士論文的一部分，而這研究是受 Kent State University 所批准和支持的。問卷的主要目的是探討台灣的師資培育單位如何強化職前教師的專業知識，讓他們得以促進孩子習用兩種以上的語言。本研究想要調查職前教師的雙語專業知識的需求，以及提供幼兒師資培育單位未來課程與教學的規劃方向。

如您決定回答此問卷，您會將被要求完成 53 個問題。這份問卷約需佔用你 10-15 分鐘的時間，當然你可以依你所需的時間來完成問卷。

這份問卷包含六個部分：第一部分為個人資料，第二部分在了解師資培育提供了哪些有關語言發展及教學的課程，第三部分旨在了解語言暨雙語議題融入於一般及非語言的課程，第四部份包含的議題是想了解老師您對幼兒雙語學習的態度，第五部分強調幼教職前教師的專業知識，最後一部分為意見和建議，希望老師您對如何強化職前教師的專業知識給予個人一些指導與建議。

以上的資料將以代碼替代名字，所有完成後的問卷數據會保存於安全的地方，且在五年後統一銷燬。

在您收到此信後的一個星期內，您將透過個人的電子信箱，收到我所發出的電子信件，此信件將會有此問卷的網路連結，懇請您收到連結後，點擊連結做答。如您對此研究有任何的疑問，請不吝於與我連絡（E-mail: lchou@kent.edu 或 ln1021@hotmail.com）。如您對 Kent State University 的研究條款有任何的疑慮，請您致電 Katherine Light, Human Subject Review Contact, Division of Research and Graduate Studies (Tel: 330-672-2704)。在此先行感謝您的參與。
Sincerely,

Lan-Ying Chou  
Ph.D. Candidate  
Department of Teaching, Leadership, and Curriculum Studies  
Kent State University

B. 同意聲明
我同意參與此研究，我知道我將做的，且可以在任何時候停止不問答。
_________________________________________________________________________
APPENDIX H

INTERVIEW CONSENT FORM
How Taiwan’s Teacher Education Programs Promote Future Teachers’ Knowledge of
Fostering Bilingualism in Children

Dear Teacher Educator,

My name is Lan-Ying Chou, and I am a doctoral candidate majoring in curriculum and instruction at Kent State University in Kent, Ohio, U.S. I want to do study on how Taiwan teacher education program equip future teachers with the knowledge necessary to foster bilingualism in children. I want to do this because I intend to investigate relevant needs for future curriculum and pedagogical design in early childhood teacher education programs and to foster in preservice teachers professional knowledge and skills in the area of bilingualism. I would like you to take part in this project.

If you decide to do this, you will be asked to participate in the interview. The conversational in-depth interview will last approximately 90 minutes. The interview will help me to understand how do teacher educators view and prepare future teacher’s knowledge of fostering in children. Confidentiality will be maintained to the limits of the law. If you take part in this research, you will receive a small gift as compensation for your time and contributions to the research. Taking part in this project is entirely up to you, and no one will hold it against you if you decide not to do it. If you do take part, you may stop at any time.
The interview data will remain confidential, and you can read your own transcript of the interview any time by connecting with me at lchou@kent.edu or ln1021@hotmail.com. If you want to know more about this project please call me at (06)2206569 or e-mail me at lchou@kent.edu. You can also connect with my advisor, Professor. Hyun at ehyun@kent.edu.

This project has been approved by Kent State University. If you have any questions regarding Kent State University’s rules for research, please call Katherine Light, Human Subject Review Contact, Division of Research and Graduate Studies (Tel. 330.672.2704). Thank you in advance for your valuable assistance.

Sincerely,

Lan-Ying Chou
Ph.D. Candidate
Department of Teaching, Leadership, and Curriculum Studies
Kent State University

B. CONSENT STATEMENT(S)

I agree to take part in this project. I know what I will have to do and that I can stop at any time.
親愛的教授，您好：

我是美國肯特州立大學的博士候選人，主修課程與教學。目前我正進行我的博士論文的資料收集。我的論文主要在探討台灣的師資培育單位如何強化職前教師的專業知識，讓他們得以促進孩子習用兩種以上的語言。本研究想要調查職前教師的雙語專業知識的需求，以及提供幼兒師資培育單位未來課程與教學的規劃方向。我希望能邀請你參與我的研究。

如果你決定參加我的研究，你將被邀請參與訪談。這訪談大約會佔用你 90 分鐘的時間。它將有助於我瞭解師資培育者如何看待及準備職前教師的雙語專業能力。如果你參與這研究，在訪談結束後你將獲得一份小禮物以茲感謝您的參與暨貢獻。

您在訪談中所有的回答將會列為機密並被妥善保管。如您在事後想察看訪談記錄，請你與我連絡（E-mail: lchou@kent.edu 或 ln1021@hotmail.com）。如您想對這研究有更深入的瞭解請你來電 (06) 2206569 或寫信至 lchou@kent.edu。您也可以聯絡我的指導教授 Professor Hyun (E-mail: ehyun@kent.edu)。

這研究是受 Kent State University 所批准和支持的。如您對 Kent State University 的研究條款有任何的疑慮，請您致電 Katherine Light, Human Subject Review Contact, Division of Research and Graduate Studies (Tel: 330-672-2704)。
Sincerely,

Lan-Ying Chou
Ph.D. Candidate
Department of Teaching, Leadership, and Curriculum Studies
Kent State University

B. 同意聲明

我同意參與此研究，我知道我將做的，且我可以在任何時刻停止不做答。

_______________________________________________________________________________________
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