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Introduction
In the half century after World War II, the subjects in the compulsory elementary education worldwide had remained stable (Meyer, 2007), with (national) language, math, and (social) science constituting the core subjects. Compulsory education at the elementary level had become a universal value. While the content, goal, and ideal of compulsory education may have adjusted according to social changes, its main purpose as equipping students with basic competence, literacy, and morality have remained unchanged until now (McEneaney & Meyer, 2000). The latest change involves the rise of English as an international language as countries around the world have gradually started to include English as a compulsory subject in their elementary school curriculum. The inclusion of English in the compulsory education, on the other hand, further reconfirms the role of English as a global lingua franca, forming a reinforcing cycle that increases the value of English in the world.

A recent survey (Cha, 2007) showed that in the first decade of the twenty-first century, the majority of the countries in the world had much or less incorporated English into their elementary school curriculum. In the past, most countries in the expanding circle in Kachru’s (1985) three concentric model (inner circle refers to English-speaking countries like USA, UK, and Australia, outer circle refers to former colonies by inner circle countries, and the rest are expanding circle) started to offer English from secondary education (middle school or junior high school or even later). As globalization intensified after the 1990s, knowledge economy has created the need of a lingua franca and English so far has served the instrumental needs. With service economy overtaking manufacture as the main sector, most governments have realized the importance of English, which consequently has been institutionalized as a school subject starting from the elementary school.

As English continues to establish its role as the global language, this topic, namely English education in the elementary level in expanding circles, is supposed to draw more research and policy attention. Most studies so far seem to have taken this phenomenon for granted; that is, teaching and learning English at the elementary level in these countries is totally natural and normal. Under this presumption, researchers focused on what to teach, how to teach it better, how to implement better the policy and the obstacles related to the
policy. In the field of English as a foreign language (EFL), the majority of researchers looked at teacher education (Mikio, 2008), English teachers (Butler, 2004; Su, 2006), teaching content (Sifakis, 2004), and motivation (Gao, Zhao, Cheng & Zhou, 2007), just to name a few. Studies that approach this topic from the perspective of elementary education remain rare, as English in EFL contexts is regarded as one of the school subjects. In elementary education, curriculum integration has been an important trend (Fon, 1999; Pepper, 2008; Yu, 2000) and homeroom teachers play a critical role in students’ learning. Homeroom teachers perceive the topic differently from subject teachers (Chu, 2005). Unfortunately there has been insufficient attention to homeroom teachers’ perspectives on English education at the elementary level. It is within this context that this study was conducted, aiming to fulfill the gap in the research literature by providing the views from homeroom teachers on the impact of English in the elementary schools. The research findings may also illuminate future policies concerning English education in expanding circles.

**English in elementary education in expanding circles**

Since the last decade of the twentieth century, many countries in expanding circles had started to incorporate English in the elementary education in various ways. Most started with small-scale trials in a few schools before enforcing the policy. David Nunan (2003) investigated the impact of English on the educational policies in seven East Asian countries (China, Taiwan, Hong Kong, Japan, Korea, Malaysia, and Vietnam). Policy makers, administrators, teachers, and relevant stakeholders were interviewed to probe their view on the topic. Nunan found out that in all seven countries, most interviewees believed that the earlier English education starts, the better it is for the students. However, many problems still existed in most countries: for instance, insufficient qualified English teachers, messy curricular adjustments, and confusion over the goals of English education at the elementary level. Nunan revealed his curiosity about the result that most interviewees were not worried about the impact of English on local languages (p.607), and seemed to have positive attitudes towards the addition of English into the elementary school curriculum.

After going over the English education policies in East Asia, Kam (2002) found that the policy in all East Asian countries “has advocated the teaching of English from the early grades in primary school” (p.13). However, the policy was seldom fully implemented due to lack of qualified teachers. The addition of English into the elementary education seemed to have depleted the qualified teachers and have caused great instabilities in educational policy. Despite the adversities, the prospect suggests a brighter future, echoing Graddol’s (2006) world English project, in which a large number of bilingual cohorts would further bolster English’s status as the global communication medium.

Since qualified teachers remain a key requirement in expanding circles, Butler (2004) asked English teachers in elementary schools in Japan, South Korea, and Taiwan to self-evaluate their proficiency level and the expected qualifying level. Most teachers expected a higher level for qualifying English teachers, revealing their diffidence in English. The study also exposed the urgent need in English teacher education to deal with language ideology in order to build teachers’ confidence.

In sum, English should continue to play a very important role in the elementary education in non-English-speaking countries in the foreseeable future. The addition of English into the elementary curriculum marks a dramatic curricular change since the main curricular structure in the elementary education has remained stable for decades. There is
great need to study more about the impacts and consequences caused by the addition of English into the elementary curriculum.

**Purpose of the study**
The research investigated the impacts from the addition of English into the curriculum that homeroom teachers in the elementary school in Taiwan perceive. Taiwan first brought English into elementary education as a part of a dramatic curricular reform in 2001, starting from fifth grade. In 2013, most urban schools offer English from the first grade. In the foreseeable future, English is expected to become even more important in Taiwan’s elementary education. The impact of a new school subject, particularly in the case of English, tends to be complicated and multifold, often dependent on contextual conditions. At the elementary level, almost all policies go through homeroom teachers, who to a great extent determine students’ learning and school life. Homeroom teachers’ perceptions and opinions are crucial as far as English education is concerned at the elementary level.

Moreover, in Taiwan, low-birth rate in recent two decades has greatly changed the ecology of elementary schools: in the past ten years, few new teachers were recruited. Consequently, to bring in a new subject by hiring new teachers would not work in the context of Taiwan. Many existent elementary school teachers were asked to transform themselves into English teachers to fill in the need for English teachers. They acquire the certificate or qualification to teach English by taking additional courses and workshops. Thus in the elementary schools, there may be two kinds of English teachers: one that graduates from the English education department in a normal university and the other that was originally a homeroom teacher, not English major. In this study, both kinds of homeroom teachers were interviewed to compare their different views. In what follows, a brief review of relevant studies precedes the sections of methodology, results, and discussions.

**Relevant studies in Taiwan**
While previous studies have investigated policy implementation (Yu, 2003), the perceptions from principals, administrators, and English teachers (Su, 2006; Lin, 2010), few have considered homeroom teachers’ perspectives. There were plenty of studies on English in the elementary education, but most seemed to assume that homeroom teachers were not relevant.

On the other hand, the perceptions of English teachers were widely examined, usually through questionnaires that elicit English teachers’ responses (e.g. Lin, 2003; Lin, 2010). The results of these studies are also similar, highlighting the need for qualified teachers, decreasing the number of students in a class, and other resources-related issues. English teachers also expressed concerns about access to English, teaching loads (required to teach many different classes) and mixed levels in a class.

Studies at the policy level provide a macro perspective to the topic. Yu (2003) utilized policy analysis to speculate the potential impacts of English in the elementary school, and enunciated his concern over the issue of language imperialism. If English cultures penetrate and permeate our basic education through the teaching of English, then this would be detrimental for our future generations. The relationship between English and self-identities need to be clarified, and this clarification forms the basis of English education in the elementary schools.
Su (2006) interviewed ten English teachers in the elementary school to elicit their views on the policy of including English in the elementary school. All participants agreed to the policy and voiced their perceptions of the benefits and problems of the policy. In addition to various resource constraints, one major obstacle was parents’ expectation, which relates to the unique role of English in Taiwan. Overemphasis on English learning with the focus on proficiency tests as the indicators of learning outcome led to many bizarre and unusual phenomena related to English teaching and learning.

An interesting study (Chu, 2005) compared the differences between the beliefs and practices of a homeroom teacher and a subject English teacher. This case study found out that students performed better when homeroom teacher taught English. The homeroom teacher paid more attention to learning problems and discipline, and monitor learning more closely, though less confident in English. Homeroom teachers, with their focus on character development, are able to help students’ learning more.

### Tensions associated with the addition of English in the elementary education

The above discussions approach the issue from the perspective of EFL education without considering the uniqueness of elementary education. While English has been taught in the junior high school for many decades, teaching English at the elementary level creates tensions mostly due to two conflicting ideas: (a) character education vs. cognitive development as the main goal of elementary education (b) English as a living language vs. a school subject. At the core of these tensions are the roles of English in Taiwan: in the past English was seen as a foreign language, but with the rise of globalization, English has gradually taken the role of an international or global language in Taiwan (Ke, 2012). Table 1 below derives from my earlier theoretical discussions on the curriculum in the elementary education (Ke, 2008) to illustrate the conflicting forces about English in the elementary education.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Knowledge-oriented/ Instrumentalist</th>
<th>Value-oriented/ Humanist</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>English as a school subject</td>
<td>English as a living language</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emphasis on usefulness of English</td>
<td>Emphasis on intrinsic value of English</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extrinsic motivation</td>
<td>Intrinsic motivation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cognitive development: Linguistic knowledge</td>
<td>Affective development: Positive attitude</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Realistic: Focus on skills</td>
<td>Idealistic: Focus on feelings and awareness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summative assessment (tests)</td>
<td>Formative assessment (portfolio)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Specialization: English separated from other subjects, taught by professional English teachers</td>
<td>Integration: English across curriculum, taught by homeroom teachers</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Instrumentalist views see education as a tool. In the curriculum, English is positioned as a school subject that offers students a useful tool for students’ future. Students’ extrinsic motivation plays a key role in learning English. The English curriculum should stress cognitive development and linguistic knowledge. Students are expected to master the four skills of reading, listening, speaking, and writing in using the English tool. Summative assessments, particularly standardized tests, are the best evaluations for helping
students acquire the linguistic tool. Professional English teacher with specialized expertise in English language knowledge are the ideal teachers of English.

On the other hand, humanist views education as an end in itself. The value of education lies in helping students appreciate the value and beauty of knowledge. English is not a tool for future use but a living language that could be a part of students’ life. Children’s curiosity in new knowledge forms the intrinsic motivation to learn English. Students are expected to develop positive attitudes towards English at the elementary level. Students’ feelings toward and awareness of English is more important than whether they master the four skills. Consequently, formative assessments like portfolios that document learners’ progress serve best in English education at the elementary level. Homeroom teachers teaching English may embody the idea of English as a living language. Integrated curriculum that keeps knowledge intact and close to students’ life reflects the humanist viewpoint.

At the policy level, the reasons that English were added into the elementary curriculum were mostly instrumental in nature (Chen, 2003). The rhetoric about teaching English at the elementary level adopted many humanistic ideas such as ‘fostering positive attitudes and interests with earlier contact’ and ‘happy learning without stresses’ in addition to its instrumental value. However, the lack of research on homeroom teachers’ perspectives manifests the dominance of instrumentalist views since most studies so far have focused on the issues that instrumentalists care more about. Unlike secondary education in which each subject is taught by a different teacher, in the elementary education, homeroom teachers teach the major subjects of national language and math. Homeroom teachers spend much time with students and are the soul of elementary education because the main mission of elementary education is character development, of which homeroom teachers are responsible. It is thus necessary to explore homeroom teachers’ view within the context of this tension between instrumentalist and humanist views.

Methodology
Qualitative in-depth interviews were conducted to answer the research question. To explore homeroom teachers’ perspectives and perceptions on the impact of English on the elementary education, qualitative methodology is more suitable than quantitative questionnaires. The particular qualitative interview methodology used in this study, namely ‘portraiture’ (see Lawrence-Lightfoot & Davis, 1997), aims to provide a systematic and holistic research instrument to examine human beings’ subjective worlds. Portraiture can be quite effective in accessing data related to unobservable and immeasurable mental activities, such as cultural norms, belief, and ideological assumptions (Dixson, Chapman, and Hill, 2005). The fundamental assumption is that contextualized and gestalt-like understanding of the participants forms the foundation for any further interpretations on any given research topic. Without the foundation, the interpretations would be partial and fragmented. Applied in the qualitative interview, portraiture serves as the basis on which a given research topic is explored. In the context of elementary school, this kind of holistic understanding is necessary because most issues are interconnected and the results would be superficial if they are not developed from contextualized knowledge and holistic understanding of the participants’ subjective reality.

After constructing the portrait of each participant/interviewee, the researcher utilized ‘grounded theory’ (Corbin & Strauss, 1990) to identify common patterns and
conceptual codes when comparing answers within the same participant and by different participants. Key passages that reveal the participants’ views concerning the impact of English on the elementary school were identified; important concepts were coded, and in the process of analyzing the data, old codes may be replaced or modified by new codes that better reflect the central concepts in the data. Through this recursive process, the researcher immersed himself in the data and after saturation, salient patterns naturally emerged.

In-depth interview may help the interviewees, i.e. homeroom teachers in the elementary school, to engage in dialogues with their experience and ideas. Most of us only pay attention to the moment of being, so the deeper feelings and thoughts tend to be buried in the corner of our mind. In the case of teachers, since they have many tasks in teaching, preparing classes and guiding students, they seldom reflect upon their feelings about their daily life experience. In-depth interview facilitates the teachers to reflect and become aware of their feelings and thoughts hidden inside. Personal experience constitutes the foundation of subject realities, which further construct inter-subjective social world. Qualitative research data collected this way would then be able to reflect the contextual subtlety embedded in the complex educational issues.

Participants
Targeted participants were homeroom teachers in public elementary schools with at least six years of homeroom teaching experience. Six-year homeroom teaching experience was required because novice teachers would still be learning how to teach and probably not paying attention to new policies. Novice teachers might also have less valuable insight related to the research topic compared to more experienced teachers since they would not have experienced the policy change process.

The variety principle guided the recruiting process: the ideal pool of the participants should reflect the gender proportion and different years of teaching experience in the population. Eleven homeroom teachers in five different schools were interviewed, with eight females and three males. The gender proportion reflects the overall population: according to the Ministry of Education, in 2012, overall 69% of elementary school teachers were female. The five chosen schools had different sizes (from the smallest, 6 classes, to the largest, 102 classes) and years of history (the newest school was founded in 2000, while the oldest one in 1917). The participants’ background and teaching experience are shown below in Table 1 and Table 2.
Table 1 Background information of the participants and their school

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School area</th>
<th>Number of classes</th>
<th>Founding Year</th>
<th>Participant (pseudo name)</th>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Years of teaching</th>
<th>English teaching (years)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Suburban</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>2000</td>
<td>Yanni</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Remote</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1917</td>
<td>Ray</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Remote</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1917</td>
<td>Yang</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suburban</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>1925</td>
<td>Don</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suburban</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>1925</td>
<td>Super</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suburban</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>1925</td>
<td>Snow</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urban</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>1960</td>
<td>Wu</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urban</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>1960</td>
<td>Han</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urban</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>1960</td>
<td>Rich</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urban</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>1954</td>
<td>Pin</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urban</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>1954</td>
<td>Nana</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2 Participants’ teaching experience

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Participant</th>
<th>Homeroom teaching years/grades</th>
<th>Teacher education</th>
<th>Homeroom English</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yanni</td>
<td>11, all grades</td>
<td>Post-bachelor program</td>
<td>No,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ray</td>
<td>16, all grades</td>
<td>Post-bachelor program</td>
<td>Yes, 6 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yang</td>
<td>10, middle 2 years, high 8 years</td>
<td>Post-bachelor program</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don</td>
<td>6, middle 2 years, low 4 years</td>
<td>Normal university</td>
<td>Yes, 1 semester</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Super</td>
<td>6, middle 5 years, high 1 year</td>
<td>Normal university</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Snow</td>
<td>24, all grades, mostly Low</td>
<td>Post-bachelor program</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wu</td>
<td>8, all grades</td>
<td>Normal university</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Han</td>
<td>8, high 6 years, middle 2 years</td>
<td>Normal, English major</td>
<td>Yes, 5 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rich</td>
<td>17, middle 4 years, low 13 years</td>
<td>Post-bachelor program</td>
<td>Yes 1 year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pin</td>
<td>24, all grades, mostly middle</td>
<td>Normal college</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nana</td>
<td>14, middle 8 years, low 6 years</td>
<td>Normal university</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Surprisingly nearly half of the participants had their teacher education in a post-bachelor program, not normal university or college. This relates to the surging need for teachers in the 1990s. A large number of university graduates became elementary school teachers at that time.

Interview structure

All participants were interviewed twice, each time ranging from 40 to 80 minutes. The first interview was transcribed and analyzed before the second interview because the questions for the second interviews were derived from the first interview. The structure of the interview consists of three main dimensions:

a. Personal background: the reason why they became a teacher, general teaching experience, teaching philosophy, and English learning experience.

b. Experience related to English education in the elementary school: knowledge, perceptions and involvement of the implementation, feedback or comments from parents, fellow teachers and students, and major events that lead to implications.
c. The impact of English as a new subject: The main issue was investigated from the participants’ real experience and natural reactions to the issue. The researcher selected relevant aspects which the participants actively brought up in the first two dimensions. The topics include: resource allocation, educational policy, curriculum policy, school ecology, changes in teaching and curriculum, administrative adjustment, responses from staff, teachers, parents, students, and potential stakeholders.

In most cases, the first two dimensions were the foci in the first interview, while the third dimension was probed in details in the second interview. The researcher would tell the participants before the first interview the purpose of this study, so that the participants could contemplate about this issue.

Brief portraits of the participants
In this section a short portrait of all eleven participants serves as the basis of contextual understandings of the following results session in which issues related to the impacts of English in the elementary school in Taiwan are discussed.

Yanni
The school that Yanni was teaching at the time of interview was located in an industrial area, with most parents in small businesses or factories. It had reached stability for nearly a decade, not expanding anymore. With a size of 42 classes in 2012, it was a medium-sized school. She majored in business in undergraduate. Due to part-time job as tutors, she became interested in teaching and decided to make herself a teacher in a public school. At the time of the interview, she was an English subject teacher in school, teaching first to fourth graders. This was the third year that she taught English. Before that, she was a homeroom teacher, having taught in all grades in the elementary school.

The reason why she decided to become an English teacher was due to a contact with a research project that involves homeroom teachers teaching English. She was a little tired of being a homeroom teacher, and while not interested in administration, a subject teacher was a good option. She kept learning new things, growing and improving herself. Her thoughts were clear and logical, taking most factors into consideration. For her, the most important was always students’ learning, their growth in the long run. She hoped to bring up EVERY child.

Ray
Ray was the supervisor of the academic office (教務主任) at the time of interview. She taught English in all grades. The school was tiny, only 6 classes in total, with a little over 100 students. She was expected to be a teacher by her family, but just missed by one point for normal college. After graduating from a general university, she started part-time teaching as a substitute teacher, and later due to lack of teachers in remote areas, after substitute teaching for 5 years and finishing the credits, she became a certified teacher. She enjoyed being with children, and most of all, enjoyed teaching, which, in her views, is supposed to be interesting and fun. She liked to have variations, diversity, and different ways of teaching. Meanwhile she loved learning new things.

Her attitude toward English was quite positive, perhaps related to the fact that she liked new things. English and internationalization offer her students opportunities and she
herself had fun learning and using a new language. She was positive toward the policy, which provided children in remote areas more resources and a chance to learn the global language.

**Yang**

Yang was a fourth-grade homeroom teacher in the same school as Ray at the time of interview. He became a teacher for practical reasons, to have a better and more regular job. Previously an engineer in a factory, he could not stand the long hours of working, so decided to switch his career. He rode a motorcycle from city to the mountains (90 minutes) everyday. He had been a homeroom teacher mostly in higher grades, with expertise in information science. His attitude toward English and English education in the elementary education was generally positive. As an observer, he believed English should benefit students in the remote areas.

**Don**

Don, Super and Snow’s school was located in a developing suburban center. Its parenthood consisted of diverse SES background, and the school was well-known for its high-quality afterschool program. A large percentage of students were enrolled in the program. English was not the main focus in school, just a normal school subject. It was an old school, with a long history and tradition.

Don had only taught for 7 years in 2012, currently an administrator teaching English in the middle grades. She had been a homeroom teacher for six years, in lower and middle grades. She described her teaching style as strict but with intensive care, and most students were close to her.

It was quite surprising to know that Don’s attitude toward English went beyond typical public discourse. She was aware of the language ideology, the dominance of English, and the fact that English is not the first language. Consequently a different standard should be applied to Taiwanese learners. Few other participating teachers expressed this view, and the fact that Don was the youngest participant may be related. She was more aware of the inequality in the public discourse concerning English’s status in Taiwan, and thus she approached English differently from other teachers.

**Super**

Super graduated from a normal university. He was interested in English since junior high school, though he later chose math education as his major. But once he became a teacher, he resumed his learning in English. He was studying in an English department in a nearby university at the time of interview. When opportunity appeared, he decided to get training in teaching English. After the training, he was about to teach English as a subject teacher. Somehow he was not assigned the job, and he continued to be a homeroom teacher. At the time of the interview, he was a sixth-grade homeroom teacher while previously he also served as a homeroom teacher in the middle grades, a science subject teacher and a chief in the office of students’ affairs. 2013 was his eleventh year as a teacher in the elementary school.

He showed quite positive attitudes toward English and hoped to have more English classes in the elementary school. Several trips abroad further reinforced his emphasis on English. Once in the beginning year of his teaching career, he decorated his homeroom with English signs during a summer, but later could not maintain it because of too many duties.
as a homeroom teacher. As a diligent student, Super enjoyed learning together with his students.

**Snow**

At the time of the interview, Snow had already taught in the elementary school for more than twenty-four years. She was an experienced teacher, but still full of passion in teaching. She took charge of an after-school class to help those students with lower academic levels. In her teaching career, she mostly taught lower graders. Throughout these years, she started to observe that recent students lacked focus and attention, low discipline, and not paying attention to learning.

She had taken the credits in the English training program to become a qualified English teacher, but remained reluctant to teach English as a subject teacher because of its work load. Subject teachers need to teach many classes and English classes tend to be quite burdensome. However, she had a positive attitude toward homeroom teachers teaching English. Not enough exposure to English was a great concern for her in terms of English learning, and she believed that if homeroom teachers also teach English, the situation would be quite different. But perhaps due to her age and English learning experience, she still emphasized reading and writing literacy in English, not listening and speaking which has been the curriculum goal at the elementary level.

**Wu**

With an easy-going personality, Wu seemed to approach all the challenges in her teaching career with a positive mindset. She was greatly influenced by her friends, accepting new positions and learning new things all the time. In her first eight years of teaching, she was a homeroom teacher, having taught in all grades. Then she obtained the English training credits and started to teach English not as a subject teacher, but as an administrative chief (組長). She went to the US for a year, courtesy of an exchange program offered by the Ministry of Education. There she observed bilingual schools and helped with the production of teaching materials for Chinese as a second language.

Her English learning experience was not joyful, which she blamed on unsuitable teaching method. Later in her life, as she started to learn English again by hiring private tutors, she found out that she became interested in English. In the process, she also changed her mindset about speaking in English: she no longer cared that much about how others perceive her. Confidence developed and she had the courage to keep trying out new things. But she saw herself as anomaly among peer teachers, who seemed to be nested in their comfortable life.

**Han**

Han was the only participant who majored in English among all interviewees. A smart-looking youngster, he originally intended to study finance but settled for majoring in English teaching in a normal university. But so far he had been a homeroom teacher throughout his teaching career, because the school where he worked had already had enough English teachers. At least he taught the English class in his own class.

Han analyzed the issues rationally to take all possible factors into consideration. He understood the priority of elementary education as laying down the moral foundation and character development. He was also worried about the fact that students could not learn the two main subjects (national language and math) well. He complained about the
purposelessness and lack of coherency in Taiwan’s educational policies. The big picture had been lost among political changeovers. His concerns about educational policies are echoed by many other participants.

**Rich**
Rich candidly admitted that she was a so-called typical elementary school teacher, waiting for retirement to start a new life. Teaching as a stable and lucrative job (compared to other occupations) was the main reason that she gave up her job in a company and transferred to teaching for the sake of raising children. She accompanied her husband to Vietnam for three years and that experience fortified her belief in the importance of English. She once taught her homeroom first graders English for one semester, and this experience further convinced her that most homeroom teachers are able to teach English at lower levels.

**Pin**
Pin saw herself as a common teacher who had no other talents but teaching. She enjoyed teaching and being with children. In her 24 years of teaching, she had always been a homeroom teacher, mostly in the lower grades. As a homeroom teacher, she seldom paid attention to English education policy or English classes unless any disciplinary problems occurred. This is quite typical among homeroom teachers who had no particular interests in English. But she also supported more English classes in the elementary school, because it affects students’ future.

**Nana**
In high school Nana wished to become a banker, sitting in the air-conditioned building and counting money. Of course she did not become a banker, but rather a teacher as she studied in a normal university. She once claimed that she would never become an elementary school teacher, but the destiny just brought her there. After teaching, she started to accept the job, and feel that it is a good fit because she is an energetic and childish person, a good companion for her students.

The way Nana approached English was more like a parent rather than a teacher. As a typical homeroom teacher, she was seldom involved with English education in school. But as a mother, she regretted much that she did not send her son to an English cram school earlier. Her son performed well in all subjects except English, because many of his classmates received additional English lessons in cram schools. Based on her experience as a mother, she suggested the parents of her students to send their children to cram school from the first grade because sooner or later the students would have to go to a cram school, which would take care of the English subject and parents would no longer need to worry about it.

**Results**
A major impact of English on the elementary education is that it makes the schools more unequal. English increases inequality not only between students, but also between teachers and schools. Teachers may label students based on their English level, thus hurt students’ confidence and self-esteem. In addition, among teachers, those who adopted English and received relevant training kept upgrading themselves, transforming themselves into qualified English teachers. They attend workshop, conference, in-service programs and keep growing. Others just stay put. In the past, most teachers were ‘equally qualified’ but
now, different qualifications make the composition of teachers in schools more diverse. The same divergence also has occurred between schools, as some schools gain the label of ‘stars’ based on their additional resources spent on English education.

Another major impact is less conspicuous, but rather embedded in the participants’ answers. The introduction of English at the elementary level further perpetuates English’s role in Taiwan, as if the authority endorses the importance of English in the local society. However, in reality, English in the elementary school so far has more symbolic meaning than real educational function. The time allocated is definitely far from enough to learn a language and most parents and teachers perceive private cram schools as a more significant provider of English education.

The addition of English in elementary schools also brings attention to the rationales behind the allocation of class periods for each school subject. Homeroom teachers complained about some subjects given too much time while they had insufficient instruction time for key subjects; that is, national language and math. They held a positive attitude toward increasing the instruction time for English because of its importance, but definitely not at the price of the two key subjects. In the following sections, these impacts are elaborated.

**Inequality**

Inequality has increased in many ways. Besides the obvious differences in students’ English achievements, which have been often-mentioned in previous studies on English education in Taiwan, there are other types of inequality associated with the addition of English as a new school subject in elementary schools. Differences in many aspects are enlarged compared to the situation in the past when English instruction started from the junior high school.

**Low achievers**

As Han stated worriedly, “Double peak/inequality has become more serious. As for the proportions, in elementary schools, there is still a large portion of high achievers, but those who lag behind, are very far behind.” Compared to the situation in the junior high schools, the inequality was still not so serious because the English curriculum at the elementary level focuses on listening and speaking, and the content has remained relatively easy. The policy intended to amend the inequality in the access to English by including it in the elementary curriculum, but in urban areas due to high percentages of students attending after-school English cram schools, English teachers were somewhat forced to adjust to the level of the majority of their students. For students in the remote areas, this policy benefited them by providing the opportunity to learn English, but with over eighty percent of Taiwanese population in urban areas, the side effects outweighed the intended effects.

Not only low-achievers in English suffered. Another side effect of English was that teachers lost the flexible remedial teaching time for low-achievers in other school subjects. Low-achievers suffered from the intrusion of English into the curriculum. If flexible time was given to English teaching, then homeroom teachers would not have time for remedial teaching, and those low-achievers would be sacrificed.

When I was a homeroom teacher, I felt that due to the addition of English, some resources were deprived. This is because flexible periods in the curriculum were
assigned for English classes. I need those periods for remedial teaching in national language and math, and due to English, the time was gone...I had no time to help those low achievers.

[當導師時覺得因為英文，資源被剝奪，因為彈性課程都彈到英文去了。我想要拿來補救國語數學，就不見了…我沒時間去輔導學生落後的課業]

(Yanni)

While most homeroom teachers acknowledge the importance of English, the priority in the elementary school is still national language and math. If the way that English is added into the curriculum is at the price of flexible periods or other time that used to be under homeroom teachers’ control, then it would be a detrimental impact on the overall elementary education.

Several homeroom teachers who had taught many years in the lower grades also mentioned that those not good at learning the national language also struggled in English. “Those with lower language abilities, who could not learn the phonological symbols in our national language, they also had difficulties learning English well.”

[語言能力差的，國語注音符號學不好的，英語也不好](Rich)

A new subject in language means that those without linguistic talents have to suffer more and the differences are again magnified.

**High achievers**

High achievers, on the other hand, have received even more attention and resources. Inequality increases at both ends. In the case of English, since in nature it is a living language, if parents offer their children more resources and provide the environment exposing them to the language, naturally they can acquire the linguistic knowledge. In classrooms, it is human nature for teachers to pay more attention to high achievers because they respond well and perform well. As Nana lamented, “In English classes, teacher would say, this student is gifted, which means, he knows everything. In contrast, for some students this is their first contact with ABC alphabets.”

[上英文課的時候，老師就會說，這是資優生；意思就是，他什麼都會。有些人真的連abc都是第一次接觸。]

The implication is that high achievers become more confident, more interested in English, and thus this phenomenon further perpetuates their status as high achievers. With the inclusion of a new subject in the curriculum, new contests related to English (read-aloud, story-telling, spelling, etc.) have appeared and all classes and schools would need to select good performers to participate in these contests. These contests actually draw more resources, benefiting high achievers in various ways. Among all, the most worrisome for most homeroom teachers is their effect on the interests and motivation of other common students who start their English learning in public school:

If everyone starts at the same place, a student may develop interests from all the learning games. There would be no problem. But if from the beginning, they were already lower than others, they may give up right away, not willing to learn, or feel it difficult since no matter how hard they learn, they would not be as good as their classmates. This is a great blow to students’ confidence.

[如果大家起跑點一樣，他可能從玩中學習，還沒問題，激發學習興趣。但如果一來就被比下去，可能就放棄、不想學了，就一直認為很困難，因為怎麼都贏不過同學，打擊信心。](Pin)
High achievers start earlier and receive more resources, and the current school environment favors these high achievers even though many teachers are aware of the fact that these high achievers are not more talented than their classmates. The Pygmalion effect in education, namely, those labeled smarter actually perform better, inevitably creates sharper inequality in English education.

**Inequality between teachers and schools**

Elementary schools are a stable environment and teacher education programs have been known to cultivate conservative teachers who tend to lag behind contemporary social changes. As Wu observed, “Indeed the majority of elementary school teachers are rule-followers who do not emphasize creativity, probably due to the training system.” In many schools there are two kinds of teachers, one that avoids change and the other that embrace and enjoy changes. The former is contented to just stay in their comfort zone and teach the same things over and over. The latter keeps learning new skills and knowledge. Most homeroom-teacher-turned English teachers belong to the latter. They usually also have expertise in technology because they have a positive attitude toward changes and novelties. Increasingly this group of abler teachers takes more responsibility while the other group stays unchanged, thus creating more differences among teachers.

Newer school subjects are also more likely to be adopted earlier in newer schools because these newer schools are more likely to have younger teachers and fewer traditions. From the data, we notice that newer schools tend to emphasize more on English, since they tend to have fewer constraints from traditions. Older schools are more likely to follow traditions, so new subjects and changes take more time to get into mainstream. In the current decentralized system, the school principal has great influence on the allocation of resources. Consequently, unlike in the past, wherever you studied, you received similar education, nowadays many differences exist among different schools.

**Cram schools**

A side effect of the policy was that it aroused parents’ attention to English in the elementary level. When English becomes a critical subject in deciding future tracking, parents’ reaction was to pour more extra resource by sending their kids to cram schools just to make sure that they would not lose in the arm race. According to Yanni, “after the inclusion of English in the elementary curriculum, more students attend English cram schools. Though not the intended outcome, but certainly what is happening.”

The introduction of English at the elementary level aims to familiarize children with a new language. Most homeroom teachers saw English in elementary schools as a preparation and orientation for their future English learning in the secondary level. It is supposed to be motivational and introductory, but such an intention would probably lead to unexpected results in a culture in which educational competition remains fierce.

Nowadays everyone has a strange belief; teaching English earlier is supposed to better prepare students for future learning. But many people push for more content at earlier stages. The earlier instruction is supposed to give learners more time to learn, letting them get used to it. But the reality seems like, the earlier the instruction, the more content, as if all the lessons previously taught in the junior high school are now taught in the elementary school. This is not right.
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This illustrates the gap between the policy intention and the reality. Good intentions are seldom implemented through proper policies, and cultural norms often exert greater influence than institutional policies. The pressure to excel in school with better test scores has always been the source that creates cram schools. English offers a conspicuous battleground.

English is the only academic subject in the elementary level that most parents cannot help their children. “It is not easy to learn English by students themselves.”

Compared to other subjects like math, language, social studies and science, English in primary school is unique because most parents cannot help, and this is a major reason why the number of English cram schools have not declined amid the low-birth-rate trend. English language schools are everywhere. Coupled with the situation that in most families both parents have to have a full-time job to support themselves, they have to send their children to after-school day-care centers, which provide English lessons to cater to parents’ needs. This explains the popularity of English cram schools.

The popularity in turn alters the role of English education in school. Private cram schools gradually replace public school as the English education provider. Teachers do not receive much expectation from parents on English education. “Parents feel, also we English teachers also feel this way, that if children have good English, it is not because of us; same if they do not have good English.”

Perpetuation of English’s role as the global language

Another major impact of institutionalizing English at the elementary school level is that English’s role as the default global language was further established or reiterated. Homeroom teachers who used to pay little attention to English had to acknowledge it, if not advocate for it.

Most teachers recognized the role of English as a global communication tool, and they should not emphasize too much on forms and accuracy. Most participants learned English smoothly, while a few struggled (Yanni growing up in a rural area, Wu who encountered an incompetent teacher). Generally speaking, teachers usually were good students so their English tended to be above average. Since they all realized that the role of English has changed from purely a school subject to global communication tool, they all hoped that students can use English to communicate, not just for tests.

All homeroom teachers expressed consent to the necessity of English teaching in the elementary school, and they would like to see more time allocated to English. Such view is consistent with Nunan’s (2003) findings. “Homeroom teachers accept such important subject (English) to a very high degree.”

But the issue is when to start teaching, the emphasis and methods of teaching. Many teachers were aware of the inequality problem accompanying the inclusion of English in
the elementary school curriculum, and had shown concerns over this problem. However, overall judgment was that benefits outweigh problems.

All homeroom teachers except Yanni, who taught in a new school (established in 2000), saw insufficient attention to English. In Yanni’s case, “I feel that the school overemphasizes English. The administration wants to see consequences, but we care more about what helps students more.”

She felt that her school emphasized too much on seeing the achievements, winning contests, and showing the public that the school paid much attention to English. With such an orientation, students’ learning is usually not the priority, sometimes even sacrificed. From this perspective, perhaps it was a blessing in disguise that the other schools did not label themselves as schools that emphasize English.

Younger teachers are more aware of the language ideology problem, the dominance of English in the public and school discourses, the detrimental effects, and older teachers tend to accept the dominance, just focusing on the instrumental uses of English, while lacking confidence (a result of the influence from the discourse). The youngest interviewee Don approached English from a local perspective:

As a homeroom teacher, I would also tell my students that it is very normal not knowing anything about English, because we do not learn it as our mother tongue. Language is of course a school subject, an art, but more importantly, a way of life.

Other homeroom teachers presumed the instrumental values of English, seeing it as an indispensable skill for students’ future life, expecting them to learn it well. Many of them would use a few English words or phrases in daily conversations with their students to show that they also know English and hope to encourage their students to learn English.

Homeroom teachers teaching English and the relationships between different school subjects
Homeroom teachers are supposed to be in charge of students’ overall development, particularly their character and basic literacy. This role has rendered no direct relationship between homeroom teacher and English. They did not see English any differently than any other subjects besides national language and math. The priority in lower grades should be national language and math, which serve as the foundation for all subjects.

Views on homeroom teachers teaching English are ambivalent; most participants understand the advantages and disadvantages of homeroom teachers teaching English. The positive side relates to English being a language and to learn a language it is best to have exposure to it every day. In addition, homeroom teachers have more flexible time to help those low achievers. This presumes that homeroom teachers have sufficient professional knowledge and proper mentality in English teaching. The negative problems involve the role of English in the elementary school:

“It (English) is a major subject, but since formal monthly exams do not include it, homeroom teachers would use its time to teach national language. Meanwhile they are full aware that this is not right. So dissonance in cognition would arise, causing pain in homeroom teachers.”
Most participants acknowledged that they would be tempted to use the English class to teach national language or math because of not enough teaching time for these two main subjects.

The existence of English as a school subject further reminds teachers that some other subjects should not be given so much teaching time. Students are not learning what is really useful for them in their future. Teachers do not blame the addition of English in the curriculum, but rather those additional activities imposed top-down from Ministry of Education. “Homeroom teachers complain first about school activities, extra-institutional, additional class activities. Secondly they complain of the subjects which should not have existed at all in the first place, such as calligraphy.”

Homeroom teachers who had taught lower grades for an extensive period of time stated that the school subject ‘life’ (生活) and ‘integrated subject’ (綜合) overlap much and were given too many periods, particularly in comparison to main subjects of national language and math. The addition of English received no complaint from homeroom teachers except when it was implemented by using a time period of another subject.

Overall speaking, most participants voiced discontent on the incoherent educational policies that distract the main missions of teachers, as if the government pushed for any policy prompted by any interest groups. As Han insightfully indicated,

Resources should be concentrated. Some other subjects such as integrated learning, local language; the implementation of these subjects blurred the policy focus. This leads to the helpless feeling by practicing teachers. Perhaps we feel English is important, but teachers have to take care of too many subjects at the same time.

In this view, English could also be regarded as one of the many policies that were enforced onto the schools and teachers. It was implemented under the stress from the parents and supporting interest groups. There were no overall clear educational aims for the policy in the eyes of homeroom teachers. Though they recognized its importance, they did not see the current policy as making much difference.

Discussions
Tension between instrumentalist and humanist views
As pointed out earlier, most previous research literature (e.g. Butler, 2004; Hoa & Tuan, 2007; Mikio, 2008; Su, 2006) seems to assume English teaching even at the elementary level to be taught by English subject teachers, not homeroom teachers. This assumption has seldom been questioned, but most participants believed that they were qualified to teach English because the content level at the elementary level is quite easy. What prevents this to be a wise policy is that the other two main subjects, national language and math, have not been given sufficient time of instruction. Consequently, homeroom teachers would be tempted to use the English class to teach the other two main subjects given the role of
English instruction as motivating rather than equipping students with hard linguistic knowledge. This illustrates the tension between instrumentalist and humanist values. The Nine-Year Comprehensive Curriculum, which introduces English in 2001, is supposed to manifest curricular integration, a humanist value, but the addition of English reinforced curricular division, an instrumentalist agenda. The connections among subjects taught by different teachers are rare in the current system in which most teachers simply take care of their respective duties, as if teaching is territorial. Curricular integration would be more beneficial from learners’ perspective, but unfortunately the implementation has been much more complicated and time-consuming, thus much less feasible. As a result, what survives is still the curricular division model, which assigns teachers into specific roles teaching specific subjects.

From homeroom teachers’ perspective, English education in the elementary school might be limited to a decorative and symbolic role because English teachers were not given enough time to teach English just like they did not have enough time to teach national language and math. While schools and teachers (both homeroom and English teachers) juggle with the tensions between prioritizing four skills and fostering positive attitudes, parents have already made their decision to put their children’s English learning in the hands of shadow education. The addition of English in the elementary education served as a reminder for parents to start preparing for the competitions in the secondary education. Private cram schools seem to be offered a golden opportunity to take over the English education at the early stage. In the next section we shift to the discussion on cram schools.

Shadow education

One major impact of English in the elementary education is that it stimulated the need for private instruction of English by cram schools or after-school programs. Several studies have shown this impact (Yu, 2003; Su, 2006). The mass media also noticed this phenomenon, but so far adjustments in education policies have yet to be spotted. Shadow education has been a unique phenomenon in East Asia (Bray, 1999), and in EFL settings it has played an even more important role in educating learners. In normal cases shadow education play the supplementary role to formal school education. (It is ‘shadow’, after all!) But in EFL countries, private English cram schools could provide something that the public school could not offer, particularly at the elementary level.

Traditionally, public formal schools boasted well-qualified teachers, often the best minds in Taiwan due to its high salary and benefits. Had it not for the low-birth rate in recent decades, elementary schools would not have any problem adding qualified English teachers. Unfortunately, the timing when English was added into the elementary curriculum since 2001 coincides with the societal trend of the decreasing number of incoming students. Teacher quotas were frozen or even cut, leaving new certified teachers few available teaching positions. As a result, a large portion of the source of new English teachers had to come from existing teachers who did not major in English. Moreover, the constraints of English curriculum and class settings often limit what English teachers were able to achieve. Thus this creates the situation described in the previous section that parents do not expect the school to teach their children English.

At the current stage, the general consensus on the development of English education in the elementary school in the near future suggests that the most periods English as a subject can obtain would be two periods in lower/middle and three periods in middle/high grades. If things stay similar in the next two decades, it is expected that more and more
parents would send their children to private English cram schools to receive English education because most parents in Taiwan would still believe that education will help their children move upward in social status. The consequence is the privatization of English instruction, rendering English teaching in public schools as supplementary for private lessons. This would be an interesting yet saddening development, though fitting the general neoliberal trend that comes along with globalization.

**Inequality**

The last issue to be discussed also relates to neoliberalism. It is the negative by-product of free market and choices in education. While many previous studies (e.g. Yu, 2003; Nunan, 2003) already pointed out the issue of inequality, the current study further elaborates the details of inequality and possible ideological and discursive forces that reinforce inequality. Generally, when inequality was discussed in the field of EFL, it means the inequality in students’ access, resources, and achievements. The inclusion of English as a compulsive subject in the elementary school brought ideological and discursive forces that justify the rationality and necessity of learning English at such a young age. Despite the fact that the policy was intended to ameliorate the inequality by providing equal access, if practicing English teachers are not able to resonate with the policy goal and prioritize it, then often times normal teaching naturally favors those high achievers, thus enlarging the differences between students’ proficiency and confidence levels.

Some homeroom teachers brought up the proposal of tracking based on proficiency level, an educational taboo during the educational reform era. Tracking certainly has its instrumental value since it provides an environment in which teachers can teach more efficiently and effectively. The problem with tracking is that though its efficiency and effectiveness are well recognized, its side-effect of the damage on students’ confidence and attitude toward academic studies is regarded as too serious to ignore from the humanist perspective. Knowledge and skills always come after character development, particularly at the elementary level if humanist values remain its foundation. However, if instrumentalist values continue to ascend, in the near future we may see more schools adopting tracking in English teaching since many homeroom teachers also support it.

A neoliberal approach to deal with inequality would be to focus on those low achievers. As long as ‘no child left behind’, the great differences between high and low achievers can be ignored. The goal is to make sure low achievers reach the required level before they graduate. Remedial programs deserve more attention, and several participants also support them. Students of slow development usually lag behind in most school subjects, thus adjusting the goal of English class would be necessary. More flexibility in regulation to give practicing teachers more room to maneuver when dealing with different populations of students may also be helpful.

**Conclusion**

The omnipotent role of English basically has been recognized by almost all participants. Previous studies on English teachers and the current study on homeroom teachers show similar results that teachers perceive learning English as necessary and natural. No teachers questioned the policy at all, but this consensus conceals the diverse expectations on English education in the elementary school. The worrying trends identified by the current study, namely increasing inequality, perpetuation of English dominance, and the questionable
curriculum timetable that fails to reflect the new demands of the global society, pose great challenges for the government, schools, and all educators involved.

In light of the findings, here some policy suggestions are offered. First, the curriculum timetable should be adjusted to increase the periods of main subjects (national language, math, and English). It has become quite clear that these main subjects do not receive sufficient instruction time. While most people agree to add more teaching time for English based on its instrumental usefulness, before this, the more critical priority is that we must ensure that our children have learned the fundamental literacy in national language and math. This prerequisite would greatly facilitate the process of increasing English instruction in the elementary school.

Second, if English is to become a vital school subject, then there should be more teachers able and willing to teach it. In the past elementary school teachers were required to teach almost all subjects, since delivering professional knowledge is not the goal, but rather character development. Elementary school teachers are character developers first, and in terms of knowledge acquisition, they are like guiders that introduce the fascinating world to the children. They do not have to be knowledgeable in all fields, nor is it possible. Therefore, this mentality is crucial in teacher education, and particularly important when transforming more homeroom teachers into qualified English teachers. A qualified English teacher at the elementary level does not require high proficiency, but rather an attitude that motivates students to be curious about a new language, which functions as a window to the world. When most homeroom teachers possess this kind of mentality, students are better prepared for further learning in English and the mission of English education at the elementary school can be achieved.

In order to nurture a healthy discourse of English in Taiwan and other EFL countries, here post-colonialism values would be of great help. First is calling for awareness in the hidden assumptions and values in the current discourse. As can be seen in the result section, younger teachers like Don were more aware of the power difference in languages and the dominance of English in various ways. Teachers, particularly homeroom teachers who interact daily with children, have great discursive power over students’ worldview. NNS inferior complex (Ke, 2010) seems to be common. Thus the authorities or the institutions with power (like universities and research faculty) should promote the equal view on different languages, exposing the hidden connections between languages and their symbolic power. This would be a long-term process, but to break free from English linguistic imperialism, discursive approach should be the most feasible. We need more understandings, elaborations, and articulations on the discourse of English in Taiwan, exposing the various symbolic meanings of English in Taiwan. This has been done in Korea (Park, 2009) and Japan (Seargeant, 2009), so we can learn much from their experience.

Limitations of the study
There are several notable limitations to be recognized for this study. First is the inherited sampling bias for the accessible interviewees. Those homeroom teachers who are willing to be interviewed tended to be more open-minded. The interview methodology has inherited bias that leans more on active participants who tend to express their opinions more and more articulately. The selection and recruitment of participants also influence the findings. The researcher’s own bias and situated experience may also play a role in the interpretation of interview data.
Future studies could use quantitative survey to reach out to more homeroom teachers to examine the results of this study. Other stakeholders such as parents, cram school owners, businesses, and students themselves should also be studied to compare different perspectives.
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