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ABSTRACT

This case study of Taiwan’s language curriculum and policy is a rhetorical analysis of the claims-making regarding changes with Taiwan’s native languages and Chinese education.

To answer the research question of whether or not the Democratic Progressive Party (DPP) government claims support its language curriculum and policy changes, this study applied (a) Social problems research, and (b) Burke’s dramatism to analyze the claims. Two statements by the Taiwanese government about its educational policy, during the 2000-2008 presidencies, were analyzed along with the actual curriculum guidelines. Also, the opponents’ opinions regarding the government’s actions, which were represented in the newspapers, were examined to provide the context needed for an effective social problems research analysis.

The DPP government provided claims to persuade people that there was a need to shift the China-centered education to Taiwan-centered education to ensure the equality of different native language rights among the ethnic groups by implementing curriculum and policy changes in Taiwan. This study looked at the speech of the Minister of Education, the proposed Language Equality Act, and the Guidelines of 98 Chinese Language Curriculum to understand the claims the DPP government made to support their language curriculum and policy changes. The rhetorical analysis for these documents also provide an example of how the political power could influence education and society through claims-making as well as planning curriculum and policy in the sense of building Taiwanese identity instead of Chinese identity.
Based on the analysis of the DPP government’s claims regarding language equality, the findings showed that Ho-lo, a common native language, is not at risk and has a more favorable position in education. It surpasses Mandarin Chinese as the national language but does not demonstrate language equality or Taiwan-centered education. The DPP government cannot prove that studying native languages, especially Ho-lo, has a correlation to Taiwanese identity or helps Taiwanese consciousness. However, the DPP government’s suggestions regarding language education could create a split among the different ethnic groups about their Taiwanese identification. The new language curriculum and policy could become a controversy, because it increases the influence of Ho-lo as native Taiwanese and displaces Mandarin Chinese as the national language. The connection between Ho-lo as the Taiwanese language and national identity might threaten people who are not native Ho-lo speakers. In addition, it raises a concern about the DPP using Ho-lo to replace Mandarin Chinese as the national language to further Taiwan’s independence.

The importance of this study is that it examines the claims regarding the Taiwan-centered education and language equality, within a political and historical context, to understand the reasons and effects for making the language curriculum and policy changes. This is a rhetorical analysis that applies the findings of a real situation to meet practical needs in politics and education. This study helps to apply the use of rhetorical analysis to policy in order to understand the government’s claim making and the educational decisions within the political context.
CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

Students learn everything through language and live in the world constructed by language. Language education serves as a foundation for education. The selection of reading material can influence students' understanding of the world. Language curriculum is a guideline for teaching a language in order to prepare students to have proficiency of the language while it provides a perspective about the world. Because curriculum provides a perspective on the world, it often affects and is affected by political power, economic forces, and national aspirations (Apple, 1982; Brubaker, 2003; Tetrault, 2003; Tse, Shum, Ki, & Wong, 2001).

People often believe that educational reform of curriculum should be objective. However, if there were objective standards for the “good curriculum,” curriculum would not change frequently based on different perspectives about what is good for students. Ideally, experts in language learning could design an effective curriculum and instructional approaches for students to learn languages and master associated knowledge. Since 1990s, the language curriculum in Taiwan has changed frequently (Tu, 2007). Is this due to changing perspectives related to political power, economic forces, and national identity? This study will illustrate how a foundational aspect of language education may be shaped and influenced by politics, economy, and national identity. The analysis regarding language curriculum and policy will also explore the effects upon the Taiwanese people.
Language Controversy in Taiwan

In the 1990s, the Kuomintang (KMT) government developed the curriculum called “Understanding Taiwan” (Tu, 2007). The revised curriculum standards for primary school, in 1993, added native education to the official curriculum. Students, from grades 3 through 6, have to learn native education: history, geography, nature, language, and art (You, 2002). After the Democratic Progressive Party (DPP) won the presidential election in 2000, curriculum underwent more changes, such as adding the course “Taiwan History” to the senior high school curriculum rather than teaching the content under the course title “History,” along with Chinese history, in 2006 (Tu, 2007). Two years later, in 2008, the percentage of ancient Chinese literature taught was reduced (Xue, 2008a). Elementary school students are required to learn one native-tongue language (Taiwanese, Kakka, or a variety of aboriginal languages when there are proper teachers available; Lin, 2005).

The DPP government increased the class time for native education by reducing the time for Chinese language and literature (Xue, 2008a). The DPP government believed that a native education (homeland education) should be encouraged and supported by the government, because it preserves languages, knowledge, different ethnic and local history, and identity. It also goes along with the educational theory that students should learn from local to global in order to gain self-knowledge and national identity (Tu, 2007). The DPP government proposed the law of language equality to preserve and respect languages in Taiwan (Proposal of Language Equality, 2003). Some people have been concerned that the Taiwanese government’s promotion of native education intentionally promotes
national identity in education with the goal of enhancing Taiwan's political and cultural independence from the People's Republic of China.

According to a survey regarding native language education, the teaching of native languages had little support of students, families, or the community (Law, 2002). Mandarin Chinese is understood by most Taiwanese. Other languages are less important for communication within Taiwanese society or with the world. The parents who were surveyed have suggested that native languages should be taught at home and should not be included in school education (Chang, 2005). It may be possible that these people do not value native language education in the school system because they would rather learn other languages, such as Japanese or French.

The changes in language curriculum policy have created controversy in Taiwan. Some people think the goal is independence from China and removal of Chinese influence. The Taiwanese DPP government is known for its Sinophobia and its agenda for independence. This would be a redefinition of national identity through the "process of educational reform and essential characteristics of the Taiwan education system" (Law, 2002).

The language curriculum in Taiwan has been changed frequently. There are different opinions about the percentage and selection of Chinese literature. The increasing percentage of Taiwanese and modern Chinese literature represents a trade-off within the language curriculum, because to allow this has meant reducing class time for ancient Chinese literature and Mandarin Chinese.
The former Taiwanese government, the DPP, promoted the policies of native education and Taiwanese language education. People who opposed this policy believed that the curriculum and policy changes were intended to cut the connection with mainland China and prepare for Taiwan’s independence. However, some people who supported the policy believed that the opponents were not really concerned about Chinese language education but rather wanted to identify themselves as Chinese and reunite with the Chinese government. For many years, people from both sides blamed each other for trying to determine future decisions of Taiwan’s relationship with China, while they discussed how to make a good curriculum for language education. These suspicious attitudes made the language education discussion more difficult. Therefore, it is important to understand the different opinions regarding Taiwan’s language curriculum changes in order to discuss the educational decisions for Chinese language.

Problem Statement

The language curriculum changes frequently, and controversy associated with national identity and doubts about motives exist in Taiwan’s society. Students suffer when they need to adapt to and study different curriculums, especially when they have to prepare for entrance exams for senior high school and college. When students, parents, and educators face the frequent curriculum and policy changes, they wonder if it is necessary for educational purposes. If the motive of making these changes is not stated directly in the curriculum document, why does one side always sense that national identity is the motive behind curriculum and policy changes? This study will analyze the different opinions about the curriculum and policy changes. What effects might these different
positions have on education and society? The analysis would bring together different perspectives regarding the Chinese language education controversy to seek an explanation for the frequent changes in the Taiwanese government’s educational policies.

Research Question

This study will apply rhetorical analysis to examine the question: Does the DPP government’s claims-making support the curriculum and policy changes regarding language equality and Taiwan-centered education? In order to understand the claims of the DPP, the former Taiwanese government, toward language education and policy, the following three documents will be analyzed: (a) a speech by the Minister of the Education Department, (b) the Language Equity Act, and (c) the national Chinese language curriculum. These three texts were chosen to represent government claims regarding language education and policy.

Origin of the Study

I am a native Chinese speaker. My father is Taiwanese, and my mother’s family came from mainland China. Thirty years ago, when my mother married my father, she was the only person who spoke Mandarin Chinese in my father’s village. Their marriage began with both of their families’ disapproval. There were frequent disagreements, because my parents had different perspectives on cultural and political issues in Taiwan. Because my mother taught in elementary school and all parents of her students spoke Taiwanese, my mother can speak Taiwanese very well. My father is a college professor and he speaks Mandarin Chinese in public. When the mainlanders (people who came from mainland China after the civil war in 1949) withdrew to Taiwan, most of them were
government officers, educators, or connected to the military. At that time, most of the Taiwanese people were farmers. Few Taiwanese received much formal education.

My father’s parents cannot speak Mandarin Chinese at all, and my father talks to his friends in Taiwanese. However, all the people I know speak Mandarin Chinese in school and public. Even in my house, my father speaks Mandarin Chinese to us. As a result, I can understand Taiwanese, but I would rather speak in English than Taiwanese if I cannot speak Mandarin Chinese, because I speak better English than Taiwanese.

Unlike my mother, I would not be automatically labeled as a mainlander, someone viewed as “Chinese rather than Taiwanese.” My mother was angry when one of her colleagues said, “Chinese pigs get out and go back to China” at a tense moment in the presidential campaign. My father was also upset that he could not speak Taiwanese with pride and felt the oppression of the Kuomintang’s (KMT) policies. The KMT government implemented the Mandarin Chinese-only policy in Taiwan for education and media (Wu, 2005). I grew up with the KMT’s Chinese education. I was educated to know Chinese history, geography, and language as a Chinese. My native language is Mandarin Chinese, not Taiwanese. I am even more familiar with China’s geography than Taiwan’s, even though I have never been to mainland China. I also studied the history, geography, and literature of Taiwan as part of my education. However, within the 5000 years of Chinese history, the part about Taiwan was short and relatively unimportant. I feel I should view myself as Chinese, but I feel more comfortable identifying myself as Taiwanese. To be honest, I do not want to be ruled by the Chinese government (People’s Republic of China), but I am not sure that my country is Taiwan; there are only a few countries that recognize
Taiwan as a country. Based on the education I received, mainland China is a part of our territory, and our goal is to save our Chinese brothers and sisters who do not have freedom from the Communist Party. However, this thought seems very unrealistic in today’s world.

When I taught Chinese language and literature in Taiwan, the students were upset because they had to pass the standard exam, but there were several different textbooks in Chinese language education. When I was a student, I also had to pass standard exams, but I only had one standard textbook, which made the exam easier for which to prepare. It is difficult to understand which situation is worse, but I know that my students did not like to study ancient Chinese, because it is difficult and they were already very busy preparing for the exam. As a teacher, I feel that it is important to teach ancient Chinese, because it is beautiful and could be a foundation of great writing and understanding of Chinese literature and history. At that time, the class period for Chinese language and the selections of ancient Chinese had been reduced.

These broad political concerns (Apple, 1982; Brubaker, 2003) do not hold much interest or effect on my life, because my main concerns are more about getting a degree, finding a job, and having a family. However, sometimes I felt annoyed when Chinese people I met in the U.S said Taiwan was a part of China and that it was impossible for Taiwan to become an independent country. It is almost as annoying as some Taiwanese people who told me that we should not trade with China, should not recognize the Chinese diploma, or give Chinese who marry Taiwanese the identification of Taiwan residency. I understand this is a diverse and free world where everyone should be able to express one’s opinions, but I feel annoyed hearing about the topic of identity.
However, when more and more politics are involved with the concerns regarding the government’s agenda of national identity, such as the right of referendum, direct air and sea cargo links with China, and educational curriculum changes, more Taiwanese people with different perspectives are concerned. I feel that I should look at the situation to try to figure out how to address it.

I grew up with a national curriculum and standard exam background, so I know how a student feels and how cruel it is if they fail. Due to my experiences, I know that practice and tests help to get higher scores, but I do not know whether the curriculum content really influences students’ national identity. As a Chinese teacher, I do not want my students to miss the beauty of Chinese literature and hope that they would be able to apply the Chinese language as a tool in their writing and speaking. When the Chinese language curriculum changes along with the government, I feel confused and powerless regarding the government’s educational decisions. These decisions were made after many meetings that consisted of experts and elites. Why does “better or more effective” Chinese language curriculum seem to change with changes in government? Do they really have different ideas about which way will be better to teach Chinese? Do they really care about students’ learning?

As a Chinese teacher, I have to review different textbooks based on the same curriculum guideline every year in order to prepare my students for the standard exams. The frequent curriculum changes make me suspect that the government wants to teach students to become Chinese or Taiwanese through the language curriculum.
Significance of the Study

Many thinkers have suggested that a democratic government should be transparent so that people would be able to track its record and evaluate its policies (Al-Hakim, 2006). A responsible government should state its claims clearly and take actions to achieve its goals so that voters can evaluate the government’s policies and make a decision with full understanding of its political agendas. Therefore, the government should provide information consistent with its actions. As a result, the statements in the government documents should match what the government has claimed.

This study examines the claims-making regarding language education to understand why the Taiwanese governments changed language curriculums and policies and whether or not these changes can solve the problems they addressed. The analysis of the DPP government’s claims-making is an example of how a government rationalizes its curriculum and policy changes. Settling the controversy regarding language curriculums and policies will involve identifying the motives within language, analyzing the effects, and seeking solutions. The importance of this study is that it examines the claims around this language curriculum and policy issues as rhetorical analysis, but applies the findings to a real situation for practical needs in policies and education. This study helps to apply the use of rhetorical analysis to policy analysis in order to understand the curriculum changes in education within the political context.

Approach of the Study

In building a case study of the Chinese language curriculum, this study will explore the changes the Chinese language curriculum has undergone with different
governments in Taiwan. It will analyze the Taiwanese government’s statements regarding the curriculum and policy changes. It will review different perspectives on the government’s actions in order to understand the Chinese language curriculum decisions in context and discuss the relationship between political concerns and curriculum design.

There is research noting the relationship between educational decisions and political power (Apple, 1982, 1993, 1996; Apple & Oliver, 1998; Wong, 1994). By analyzing the different opinions and the process of changing curriculums, this study will also look at whether the politicalization of language education, manipulated by the Taiwanese government, has involved national identity. If so, this study will provide understanding and evidence of the politicalization of language education. People may realize that education is guided by political values.

As a case study, the related factors in the historical and political context that might influence the educational decisions will be analyzed. The arguments that opposed the curriculum and policy and some other major political actions that the government took, which might raise concerns about building national identity through education, will be the subject of analysis as well.

The first part of this research looks at what claims have been made regarding the policy changes within the government’s statements, proposals, and curriculums. For the second part, I will analyze different claims made by the government’s opponents regarding the language policy and curriculum in Taiwan and discuss why the anxiety and tension between both sides’ agendas occur and whether they can be solved. Effective
communication happens when each side is able to listen to what the other says and understand the meaning of their statements from the rhetor and the situation.

This study will first introduce the relationship between mainland China and Taiwan, the different written languages and phonetic symbols in Taiwan and China, and the changes of Taiwan’s language policies and curriculum. This study will probe why the Taiwanese government wants to promote native education and does not standardize written languages and phonetic symbols with the Chinese government. The context and content of the Chinese language in Taiwan will be introduced in order to understand the relationship between national identity and language curriculum.

Then, by looking at different claims and analyzing the statements the government made about native education and language equality, this study will examine the situation to provide a solution to the discussion of different political claims about language curriculum. As this study provides analysis of the DPP government’s symbolic actions, it will show that the government has an agenda of changing national identity (Tu, 2007) which will become more transparent and therefore easier to evaluate.

The opponents’ opinions regarding the government’s language curriculum and policies will be analyzed. If there are reasons for building national identity through language curriculum, people should be aware of how a government can use education as a tool to fulfill its political agenda and recognize that the matters of curriculum changes were about different views of national identity in Taiwan. As a result, the discussion about the language curriculum could become more effective. People would have to devise new arguments or solutions to the controversy. Therefore, the extent of curriculum changes
could be reduced and not need to change with every shift in political power. It is important to understand that education serves political interests and people should negotiate a balance instead of changing curriculum frequently to confuse students. Otherwise, there will be no end to changing curriculum to serve political objectives.

Overview of the Study

This study intends to present different claims regarding language curriculum and the consequences of policy changes in education. This is a case study to analyze the claims-making made for language curriculum and policy changes. How the variations in curricula might relate to different identities will be discussed as well. This dissertation includes five chapters: Chapter 1 provides an introduction. Chapter 2 is the context of the history and politics of language policy and related educational reforms. It provides historical and cultural background for understanding the context of Taiwan’s Chinese language education. This chapter also includes literature that introduces the relationships among choices a government has to implement curriculum. Chapter 3 introduces methods used in this study. Chapter 4 is the analysis of the DPP government’s claims-making. Chapter 5 includes the summary of findings, discussions, and suggestions.
CHAPTER 2

REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

For building a case study that works to understand the context of Taiwan’s language curriculum and policy changes, the position of the Taiwanese government regarding its Chinese language curriculum and policy will be introduced. The analysis of the perspectives and reasons to make policy and curriculum changes in the political, historical, and social context of Taiwan is a background to discuss the reasons for pursuing these possible changes in language education.

There are two parts of the literature review in this chapter. The first part addresses the topic of language and background information about the Chinese and Taiwanese native language curriculum issue. The purpose of this part is to provide knowledge of historical and cultural background for the contextual understanding of Chinese language policy and education. The second part of this study contains a literature review which will illustrate how political power can influence Taiwanese language education and policy.

Review of the Chinese Language Policy and Education

This section serves to introduce the history of how the Chinese language has been managed by the governments in Taiwan and China. This historical knowledge provides a foundation for understanding the current political reality of the Chinese language policies. This part of the literature review will introduce the different Chinese written languages in Taiwan and China and probe why political powers want to change Chinese language and education.
It is important to understand the differences in the Chinese language, as it is spoken and written in China and Taiwan. The understanding of the differences in the language instruction between Taiwan and China will show that “Chinese language education” is not the same in both countries from the knowledge or identity aspects. The review of their language policy is also valuable to assess the effects of the Taiwanese and Chinese governments on their national level. The research will introduce the historical and social context of the Chinese language in Taiwan and China to investigate the relationship between language, politics, and identity.

Regimes of Language: Politics and Identities

Just as with other policies, language choice and curriculum should be seen and analyzed as a political phenomenon which reflects the government’s motives and agenda.

The Taiwan language issue is a conflict because of the history of colonization which has resulted in diverse ethnic identities. As a result, unification-independence politics complicates choices about which language should be taught and spoken in Taiwan (Huang, 2007). In this chapter, the history review is introduced to explain the development of Taiwan’s identity and language choice.

Aside from Mandarin Chinese, the “new” languages in Taiwan’s education policies, such as the Local–Language–in–Education (LLE) policy and the English Education (EE) policy, have shortened the curriculum time for the study of the Chinese language. The effects of this curriculum change not only influence students’ Chinese proficiency but may also cause “de-chinaisation” and a separated “Taiwan identity.” (Chen, 2006). Because the school time allotted for the language curriculum remains the
same, the more languages students must learn will reduce the time spent on learning Chinese. When students spend less time on Chinese language, history, and literature, it is possible that their view of Chinese identity changes.

This hypothesis has been supported by research. In early 1993, 33.8% of the Taiwanese people surveyed considered themselves both Chinese and Taiwanese. By the end of the 1990s, that number increased to more than 50%. More people have this dual identity. However, the number of Taiwanese people who do not consider themselves Chinese has remained between 36% and 38%. In 2002, Chu reported that nearly 58% of people less than 35 years of age had a dual identity. This percentage was significantly higher than previous generations. The younger generations tend to have a more flexible identity between China and Taiwan (Chu, 2004, p. 503). The number of people who report having Taiwanese identity has increased in recent years. However, the results do not show that Taiwanese people reject Chinese identity in a broader sense of sharing Chinese language and culture because more people have an identity to be dual Taiwanese and Chinese in race and history. The word “Chinese identity” in this survey is different from the “Chinese identity” the Chinese people have in mainland China from many aspects, such as political or cultural view points.

Similar findings were noted in other public surveys. However, in the 1990s, these surveys also showed an increased number of people favored Taiwan’s independence and a decreased number supported reunification with China. Even though Taiwanese people no longer consider themselves as Chinese, “the shift has not been to ‘Taiwanese only,’ but rather to ‘both Chinese and Taiwanese’” (Chu, 2000, p. 304). People in Taiwan still do not
disassociate with the Chinese culture and identity, while they also identify themselves with Taiwan.

One perspective would interpret this identity shift as a middle stage toward having an exclusive Taiwanese identity and believe that people will eventually deny their Chinese identity. The language curriculum and policy changes of the government might be motivated by this viewpoint of identity politics. “Identity politics is the content over and conflict arising from claims to or about social or group identity. To assert an identity is to distinguish oneself or one’s group in a certain way and to differentiate oneself or one’s group from others” (as cited in Chu, 2000, p. 305). If the government promoted Taiwanese language education and identity successfully, it is possible that Taiwanese people would separate themselves from their China identity.

Nationalism works as an ideology to include some people who identify with the created national identity, but this also excludes other people who cannot identify with that national identity at the same time (Chu, 2000, p. 305). As an example of identity politics, the study by Chu (2000) discusses how the Kuomintang (KMT) government successfully promoted a China identity which later became less popular in Taiwan during the Democratic Progressive Party (DPP) presidency. Chu (2000) concludes this was because Taiwan had been fighting against the Chinese government for its sovereignty to advance a separated identity from China (p. 307). Chu (2000) says, “In the case of Taiwan, the issue of national identity is the inevitable consequence of the deterioration of international isolation and the subsequent disintegration of the dominant China-oriented identity” (p. 304). However, according to the comment by Maguire (1998) cited in Chu (2000), even
though the DDP Taiwanese nationalists and secessionists denied Chinese identity, they cannot ignore the fact that the majority of the population originally came from China, so that the majority of Taiwanese people actually have a Chinese racial and cultural identity (Chu, 2000, p. 311).

Decisions about language affect people’s identity and culture (Wang, H. L., 2000; 2004). Language choice and education can be ways to cultivate people’s development of a national identity. For example, people who grow up in the U.S. as English speakers might lose their original racial identity and adopt the American culture even though their parents were from another country. Weinstein (1990) states, “Language—often the most important symbol and instrument of cultures—can be linked causatively with development. Decisions about language are one way to promote development” (p. 5).

Language may be the most important symbol and instrument of cultures that may be used to promote a specific direction of a country’s development.

Mandarin Chinese has been the official language in Taiwan. If everyone speaks the same language, it is easier for a government to unify people and have them identify with the nation (Eastman, 1983). It leads people living in a nation to behave like a nation, but this one-language-only policy would also exclude people. “Language is one of the cultural factors used by people in complex societies to identify themselves as different from others” (Eastman, 1983, p. 45). Language makes people different from people in other countries, but speaking different languages in the same country can also separate people in their own nation. This could set boundaries for people because “language, especially
shared language, has long served as the key to naturalizing the boundaries of social groups” (Kroskrity, 2000, p. 23).

During the DPP presidency of the last eight years, there were changes in language curriculum and policies. As Eastman (1983) states, “Planning needs to consider with whom people need to communicate the most and then see that such communication be done effectively.” Whether or not the Taiwanese government has made appropriate language curriculum and policy choices may be discussed and understood from the viewpoint of identity politics (Wang, H. L., 2000, 2004). The changes in education might not only influence students’ language learning but also their identity.

Historical Context of Different Chinese Written Languages in Mainland China and Taiwan

Because Taiwan’s “China-centered” education and policy affected Taiwan’s education and politics (Tu, 2007), there is a need to provide a background for the relationship between Taiwan and China. Even though the Chinese government has claimed that Taiwan is part of China, Taiwan and China have separate histories. The Taiwanese government has ruled Taiwan and refers to China as “the Republic of China” (ROC) while the Chinese government rules mainland China and refers to itself as “the People’s Republic of China (PRC)” (“Taiwan Question,” 1993). Over the years, both governments claimed to represent China until the former Taiwanese Lee Teng-hui’s presidency. The Chinese government views Lee and the members of the DPP as troublemakers who lead Taiwan’s independence movement (Taiwan Affairs Office of the State Council, 2000). Lee has claimed, “Taiwan and China are ‘two governments,’ ‘two reciprocal political entities’; that Taiwan is already a state with independent sovereignty.
At the present stage the Republic of China is on Taiwan and the People’s Republic of China is on the mainland” (Taiwan Affairs Office of the State Council, 2000). The current Taiwanese administration keeps working to use “Taiwan” as a representation of the Taiwanese government instead of the ROC, China, or Chinese in all occasions (“Taiwan Leader,” 2007). Taiwan may have a separated identity from China and a democratic form of government which differs from China’s political interests. Both governments do not appear with the same name, “China.” However, people on both sides still speak the same language and are viewed as “Chinese.”

Aside from the spoken language, the Chinese written language has been practiced differently in Taiwan and China since 1956. In 1956, the Chinese government (PRC) in mainland China created new Chinese characters—simplified Chinese and China pinyin (Hanyu Pinyin), phonetic symbols intended to teach Mandarin Chinese (“Department of Education,” 2006). However, Chinese people in Taiwan are to this day using traditional Chinese, which has the same word characters used in China for thousands of years. Taiwan also has its own phonetic symbols (called Taiwan pinyin or Zhuyin Fuhao) to represent Chinese pronunciation. As a result, even though people in both Taiwan and China speak Mandarin Chinese, the two populations have different Chinese written languages and phonetic symbols to represent it.

Social Context of Different Chinese Written Languages in Mainland China and Taiwan

The Chinese government had a revolution in simplifying Chinese and creating Hanyu Pinyin, which is a Chinese phonetic system using the Latin alphabet, in order to standardize the Chinese language and to promote Mandarin Chinese as the official
language of China in 1956 ("Department of Education," 2006). At that time, about 80% of the Chinese people could not read or write Chinese and only 30% of the Chinese people could speak Mandarin Chinese rather than other Chinese dialects. The Chinese government apparently thinks a strong China needs to have the same spoken language. Currently, people in different provinces speak different dialects. Therefore, the government chooses Mandarin Chinese and publishes the rules of using the language. In 1956, the Chinese government published the first part of simplified Chinese words, which reduced strokes from Traditional Chinese ("Department of Education," 2006). The new Chinese words are less detailed so they are easier to learn and remember. Also, it takes less time to write them ("Department of Education," 2006). In 1977, the government released the second part of simplified words that used simple words to replace the more difficult words, when these words have the same sounds. The number of Chinese words was reduced by using words that were easier to write but have the same sound as the original word ("Department of Education," 2006). As a result, people learn fewer Chinese words and learn the words which are easy to remember.

The language planning in mainland China was a successful example of how a government could change language use through education. After the PRC government set up this language policy, the schools only used Mandarin Chinese and simplified Chinese to teach students. This language is used in the media and public ("Department of Education," 2006). The Chinese government claims that this language policy is very successful, because there were about 53% of Chinese who could speak Mandarin Chinese, and about 99% of the people could read and write simplified Chinese after the
government has implementing the policy for fifty years ("Department of Education," 2006). In the Department of Education’s press conference for the 50th anniversary of creating simplified Chinese characters, the government concluded that this language policy has helped Chinese people to speak the same language and be educated, even though most of the population of China are farmers.

On the other side of the Taiwan Strait, the Taiwanese government had its language planning activated to standardize language use in Taiwan. The Taiwanese (ROC), led by the Kuomintang (KMT), was also busy promoting Mandarin Chinese (Beaser, 2006). When the Chinese Communist Party (CCP) established “the People’s Republic of China” (PRC) in 1949 to represent China instead of “the Republic of China” (ROC), the administration of the ROC withdrew to Taiwan (“Taiwan Question,” 1993). At that time, people in Taiwan were speaking Taiwanese (a dialect of Chinese which is called Holo/Minnan/Hoklo) and Japanese, because Taiwan had been under the occupation of Japan (Beaser, 2006). Since the time of former president Lee Teng-hui, who was born in Taiwan and speaks Taiwanese as his first language, language use has seemed to become a symbol of national identity (Hsiau, 1997).

After the years of the KMT government’s Mandarin Chinese policy, some Taiwanese native languages have been lost to the younger generation of the Taiwanese people. Taiwanese youth can all speak Mandarin Chinese, but not all of them are familiar with the Taiwanese language. Their parents’ generation went through change of their first language (Japanese or the Taiwanese language). They were not allowed to
speak Taiwanese in schools and were viewed as being from a lower social class if they could not speak Mandarin well.

When people speak in a common language, they feel more connected to that language’s history and culture. It also affects their attitude to be open-minded about culture and identity. Beaser (2006) stated, “the older generations (40 years of ago and older), have much stronger convictions in their desire to promote a Taiwanese identity” (p. 11). Younger generations are more practical and flexible (Beaser, 2006).

As the political leadership changed in Taiwan, the language curriculum and policy also changed to serve their political agendas. The Taiwanese government noticed the influence of language and put effort into promoting Taiwanese. The former ruling political party, the DPP, promoted the Taiwanese language in public and media in President Chen’s eight year presidency. In 1989, when the DPP was still out of office, the members of the DPP promoted bilingual education (the Taiwanese language and Mandarin Chinese) in the elementary and junior high school, but this project was rejected by the government representatives controlled by the KMT (Hsiau, 1997). After the DPP won the presidential election, the members had more power to promote their language policy.

The Taiwanese government has been implementing the native education component of Taiwan’s language curriculum in order to promote Taiwanese cultures and languages. “The Ministry of Education introduced two important curriculum changes for schools: homeland languages [Taiwanese native languages] and homeland studies” (Law, 2002, p. 74). Native languages education starts in primary schools (Ministry of Education,
2002). The Ministry of Education plans to set the language learning order as native languages first, then the official language (Mandarin Chinese), and English last (Wang, 2007).

In 2008, the KMT politician, Ma Ying-jeou, won the presidential election in Taiwan, and his political agenda seems different than the agenda of the former president, Chen Shui-bian. In his inaugural speech, on May 20th, “he distanced himself from Mr. Chen’s confrontational policy towards the mainland” (Taiwan’s new president, 2008, p.60). While the DPP government always denied the “1992 Consensus” existed, President Ma reaffirmed the “1992 Consensus” with China to reconfirm that both sides agree to accept the concept that there is “one China,” but both sides have a different definition of it (Taiwan’s new president, 2008, p.60). Ma also agreed to start direct flights between mainland China and Taiwan, and the first Chinese tourists were allowed to Taiwan in July, 2008 (Taiwan’s new president, 2008, p.60). In the past, the Chinese government argued that the Taiwanese asked that flights cross a third place, such as Hong Kong, which was seen as an example of the DPP government’s blocking of the relationship with China (“Background,” 2005). The current Taiwanese government has not had a new curriculum and instruction for the new school year. Whether or not the new KMT government will change language curriculum and policy might also be a sign of its political agenda. Ma said that he is different from Chen and will “balance the pursuit of better China ties with safeguarding Taiwan’s sovereignty” (Taiwan’s new president, 2008, p.60).
Differences in Chinese Systems Between Taiwan and China

Different written languages. People in mainland China have adopted different Chinese language forms from ancient China. In the 1950s, the Chinese government created simplified Chinese characters to represent 2000 complicated Chinese characters in order to streamline Chinese word use (Higgins & Sheldon, 2001). Also, to adapt Chinese language use to the western style, Chinese characters in Mainland China were written from left to right. The traditional way is from right to left and top to bottom (Higgins & Sheldon, 2001). People who opposed this policy feel that when the Chinese government simplified Chinese words, it also lost the beauty and history of Chinese words. The Chinese language has remarkable pictographic written characters that have origins thousands of years old. Higgins and Sheldon (2001) said, “[Chinese characters] originated as stylized pictures of objects rather than alphabetic representation of sounds perhaps 10,000 years ago” (Higgins & Sheldon, 2001, ¶ 7). In mainland China, people who study Chinese at an advanced level, such as studying in ancient literature and calligraphy, still learn traditional Chinese. Simplifying Chinese trades the meaning and history of Chinese characters for practical purposes. The Chinese government, which claims to officially represent the only China in the world, actually does not use the traditional Chinese characters as a written language.

Because simplified Chinese characters are typically derived from traditional characters or created by the principle of creating word characters, those who learn traditional Chinese can easily understand simplified Chinese. For example, as a traditional Chinese user, I can go to a simplified Chinese website and understand the
simplified Chinese without any trouble. However, simplified Chinese learners will find it much more difficult to adopt traditional Chinese. Also, I found that all official websites in mainland China have different versions for both traditional Chinese and simplified Chinese users, but most of the Taiwanese websites do not have simplified Chinese versions. Thus, a communication gap results for simplified Chinese users, even though both are using Chinese language.

There might be hope for standardizing Chinese language in practice. For example, when it comes to writing in Chinese, traditional Chinese learners write some simplified characters when they take quick notes. Writing in traditional Chinese does take more time and energy; in fact, some simplified Chinese characters are quite popular in Taiwan. A member of the Chinese government noted that many of Taiwanese people write the name of Taiwan in simplified Chinese as proof that Taiwan could adopt simplified Chinese ("Department of Education," 2006). Also, people forget how to write some words which require a lot of detailed strokes if they do not use these words often. However, for people who computer type all the time, they may not notice a difference between using simplified or traditional Chinese. People use phonetic symbols to find the words so there is actually no time and energy difference between these two written languages. However, there are different phrases used commonly as slang in the language of China and Taiwan which may need further clarification on their specific meaning.

In mainland China, people are also concerned with the use of traditional Chinese characters and the role of dialects ("Department of Education," 2006). When the Chinese government simplified Chinese characters, some words that had essentially the same
pronunciation as one another, but different meanings, began to share the same written form. Because many Chinese characters carry the same pronunciation but have a very different meaning when they connect with other Chinese words, the process of simplifying the Chinese words eliminated much of the connotations carried by the original words.

**Different phonetic symbols.** Students in Taiwan learn the pronunciation of Mandarin Chinese by learning *Zhuyin Fuhao*. It does not consist of the characters of the Latin alphabet. On the other hand, learners in China’s system learn the sounds of Chinese by learning *Hanyu Pinyin*, which uses the Latin alphabet. Because of this, the Taiwanese government developed some phonetic systems which use the Latin alphabet, such as Taiwan *pinyin* (*Tongyong Pinyin; Her, 2005*). These phonetic systems are all based on the Latin alphabet, because English is the most used language in the world (Her, 2005). The Taiwanese government decided to promote *Tongyong Pinyin* to compete with the *Hanyu Pinyin*, because it is easier to transform to *Hanyu Pinyin* than *Zhuyin Fuhao* and more familiar to English learners (Her, 2005). When *Tongyong Pinyin* was originally developed in 1998, 91% of the spelling was the same as *Hanyu Pinyin* in the first version (Her, 2005). However, because some scholars wanted to design a separate *Pinyin* to represent the sounds of the languages used in Taiwan, including Mandarin Chinese, Taiwanese (Minnan/Ho-lo/Hoklo), and Kakka for Taiwan localism, the final version of *Tongyong Pinyin* is about 15% different from *Hanyu Pinyin* (Her, 2005). People transform the symbols of *Zhuyin Fuhao* to a system which is represented by the Latin alphabet; it has about a 37.8% difference from *Hanyu Pinyin* (Her, 2005). *Zhuyin Fuhao*
is not used in the world because *Hanyu Pinyin* has became the standard of the Chinese phonetic system when people transliterate Chinese to English (Her, 2005).

The Taiwanese government would have to spend more time and money to apply a different phonetic system than *Hanyu Pinyin* in order to standardize with the international system. For example, English names in Taiwan are different from the spelling foreigners know from different sources or their learning about the Chinese sounds. Because the controversy of not using *Hanyu Pinyin* to standardize the spelling with China, the *Tongyong Pinyin* is not commonly used in teaching Chinese (Her, 2005). Most students still use *Zhuyin Fuhao* to learn Mandarin. The books for children which have the phonetic symbols also only use *Zhuyin Fuhao*. As a result, *Tongyong Pinyin* which the DPP government promoted has never been fully accepted or implemented.

While the Chinese government continues to say that Taiwan is part of China, Chinese people in both areas do not use the same written languages and phonetic systems. Taiwan has its own educational systems and curricula as an independent country. Because of the difference between Taiwan and China, students of Chinese, in other parts of the world, will have to adapt their language learning and use to the different Chinese written languages and phonetic systems.

**Language and Identity**

The relationship between language and identity can be seen in some examples of language planning in different regions. Persons who are Chinese but have immigrated to other countries, such as Singapore or Thailand, use different languages. Also, the areas where these Chinese people live have a different relationship with China based on whether
or not they standardize their Chinese language system with China. Their choices develop different identities and relationships with mainland China. For the areas that use traditional Chinese, people still have Chinese identity. However, even though Taiwanese people use Mandarin as their national language, the Taiwanese language (viewed as mother-tongue language of Taiwanese by the DPP government) is now being used more often in public and during political campaigns. Language use has become a symbol of nationalism. Also, Taiwan’s independence is always an issue on the island, and that irritates the Chinese government (Tsao, 2007).

Hong Kong was a British colony from 1842 to 1997, so English was the official language until Chinese became an official language, alongside English, after 1974 (Tse et al., 2001). Even though Hong Kong is a part of China now, there is still a large group of people that cannot speak Mandarin because they speak Cantonese (one of the Chinese dialects) and use English as a communication language. Because Hong Kong is a Special Administrative Region (SAR) for China, it can maintain a freedom of policy decision making from China, in which its people maintain its unique identity through speaking Cantonese and using traditional Chinese characters (Tse et al., 2001). The Hong Kong government calls its language policy trilingualism (Cantonese, Mandarin Chinese, and English) and bi-literacy (Chinese and English), which gives it a different position compared to other areas of China (Tse et al., 2001). Because of its unique language policy, Hong Kong is different from other cities in China, such as Shanghai.

People from Singapore, who have Chinese as a mother language, may feel confused when asked whether or not they are Chinese. Singapore uses English as both a
spoken language and a written language because of the need to be competitive in international society, although ethnically Chinese people are the majority (75%) in this multi-ethnic country (Tse et al., 2001). However, the Singaporean government endorses English not only because it is an international language, but also because it is a neutral language for different ethnic groups (Tse et al., 2001).

Even though Singapore is an independent country, it shares aspects of Chinese culture because the majority of its population are of Chinese descent and the leaders of the country have been Chinese. The Chinese government also counts Singapore as a part of its successful language policy and points out that Hong Kong and Taiwan are frustrating the goal of language standardization ("Department of Education," 2006). While the Chinese government thinks that standard language use is helpful to unify Chinese people and solidify national identity, Hong Kong and Taiwan are determined in their wish not to identify themselves too closely with mainland China. However, the Chinese government is confident that one day all Chinese people will only use simplified Chinese because it will become the "standard" Chinese worldwide, due to its promotion by the Chinese government ("Department of Education," 2006). Realistically, Hong Kong might use simplified Chinese in the future because it is under the Chinese government’s control. However, because Taiwan has its own national identity and it is politically autonomous, Taiwan does not need to standardize the written language with China for the same reasons as Hong Kong.
Native Education and Equality of Languages in Taiwan

Native education. The Taiwanese people have been through several major language curriculum and policy changes. After the KMT government promoted Chinese language and culture education for years, the education program called “Understanding Taiwan” was initiated in the first half of the 1990s (Tu, 2007). Students of Grade 7 (13 years old) start to study Taiwan history, geography, and society for a particular course which consists of a textbook for each subject (Tu, 2007). In the revised curriculum standards for primary schools in 1993, the government added native education to the official curriculum, and students from Grade 3 to 6 will have to study native education, which is divided into history, geography, nature, language, and art (You, 2002).

In the latter half of the 1990s, Taiwan had a major curricular reform which broke primary and junior high school subjects down according to several areas, such as language and social study (Tu, 2007). The history course was divided into three parts: Taiwan history, Chinese history, and world history. Students learn the history of Taiwan, then China, and then the world (Tu, 2007). Before this reform, Taiwan history was a part of Chinese history. Students learned from the beginning of Chinese history every dynasty in China, modern history, and ended with the understanding of the modern Taiwan. The most recent development was in 2006 when the Taiwanese government added the course “Taiwan History” to the senior high school curriculum (Tu, 2007).

“The ministry of Taiwan spends NT$ 400 million (US$11.9 million) annually on native-language courses, while English classes have NT$200 million per year in funding (Lin, 2005). Elementary school students are required to learn a native-tongue language
(pick one language from Taiwanese, Kakka, and a variety of aboriginal languages when there are proper teachers available; Lin, 2005).

In 2008, the DPP Ministry of Education revised the Nine-Year Integrated Curriculum (applied to primary and junior high school) to reduce the percentage of ancient Chinese literature (Xue, 2008a). The percentage of ancient Chinese literature was greater than modern Chinese in the language curriculum, but the percentage of ancient literature will be less than 20% in the Grade 7, 30% in Grade 8, and 35% in Grade 9 (Xue, 2008a). Also, the committee of the ministry decided to change the name of the Chinese language to the Han language, national language to Chinese language, and native or Taiwanese literature to homeland literature (Xue, 2008b). This curriculum is planned to be put in practice in 2010 or 2011 (Xue, 2008b).

Language equality. The DPP government proposed a law to provide equity for languages in Taiwan in 2003 (Proposal of Language Equality, 2003). The population in Taiwan consists of three primary ethnic groups: Aborigine (including all tribes) 2%, Taiwanese (including Hakka and South Min) 84%, and Mainland Chinese 14% (Central Intelligence Agency, 2008). South Min is the group of people who speak Taiwanese (Minnan/Ho-lo/Hoklo) as their mother tongue. These people were born in Taiwan and did not move to Taiwan during the Chinese civil war (Brubaker, 2003). Mainland Chinese (Mainlanders) are people who travelled from mainland China to Taiwan and their descendants (Brubaker, 2003). South Min, Hakka, and Mainlanders are the same ethnicity. They are all Han Chinese and originally from different areas of mainland China. South Min and Hakka immigrated to Taiwan before 1895, and Mainlanders immigrated after
1945 (Brubaker, 2003). South Min is often labelled as a local province, and mainlanders are labelled as outer province people (Brubaker, 2003).

Before Han Chinese immigration developed, the population in Taiwan consisted of several aborigine groups of Austro-Polynesian descent. After mainland Han Chinese immigrants settled in Taiwan, the aborigine groups living in the western plains of Taiwan were assimilated into Han culture. Those living in the central mountainous areas were less subject to Han language and culture. They each have different languages and distinct cultural identities (Chiung, 2001).

During the Qing Dynasty, the last dynasty before the Republic of China (1683-1895), the great majority of Han Chinese immigrants came from the coastal cities of the Fujian province of mainland China, which is across the Taiwan Strait from Taiwan. Their Chinese dialect, Southern Min, was the major language of Taiwan. According to a 1924 census, 83.1% of Han Chinese in Taiwan were originally from the Fujian province (Chiung, 2001). Another group of Chinese immigrants were the Hakka, who came from different areas of mainland China. They have a distinctive culture and language that differs from South Min (Brubaker, 2003). Because a common national vernacular was not implemented in China until the 1920’s, Mandarin Chinese was only used by the few government administrators who were sent to Taiwan (Brubaker, 2003).

After the war between China and Japan (1894-1895), Taiwan was controlled by the Japanese, because the Qing dynasty was forced to cede Taiwan to Japan. The Taiwanese were forced to speak Japanese and learn Japanese culture and identity; however, the Taiwanese languages were still active (Brubaker, 2003). After Japan lost
W W II, Taiwan was handed over to the Republic of China and “nearly two million
government workers, soldiers, and refugees immigrated to Taiwan” (Brubaker, 2003, p.
20). Even though they came from different parts of China, they spoke Mandarin Chinese
and were united by their Chinese identity and culture, while the Taiwanese generally only
understood Japanese and Taiwanese languages (Brubaker, 2003).

The Kuomintang (KMT), the ruling political party at that time, standardized
language to control Taiwan. Mandarin became the national language, and the majority of
government positions were filled by officials with roots in mainland China. Chen (1996)
writes, “If the language planning of the KMT government in Taiwan differed in any way
from the policy it held on the mainland before 1949, or from that of the CCP on the
mainland after 1949, it is that the official measures adopted to promote the standard
language became harsher, sterner, and more effective” (p. 234). As a result, many
Taiwanese viewed the ROC government as “the Japanese colonial system revised” (Hsiau,
2000, p. 56).

Research in the use of native languages among South Min (Ho-lo), Hakka, and
Aboriginal groups, shows that the Taiwanese who speak Hakka had the greatest loss of
their mother tongue (Cao, 1997). South Min (Ho-lo) was the group that had the smallest
percentage of people learning Mandarin and therefore the lowest percentage losing its
native language (Cao, 1997). The Aborigine is the group that had the biggest percentage
learning Mandarin Chinese (Cao, 1997). This is because Hakka and South Min have more
opportunities to learn Mandarin Chinese than Aborigines do based on their living
environment. The aborigine groups have less access to education because they live in
more remote settings and they usually have less economic opportunities. The Taiwanese government formed the Council for Hakka Affairs in 2001. Their goal was to increase the number of young people who could speak Hakka to 50% (Council for Hakka Affairs, 2007). The Council for Hakka Affairs took a survey every year on the use of Hakka in different age groups. In 2003, only 13% in the group under 13 years old could speak Hakka, but in 2006, there were 17% (Council for Hakka Affairs, 2007). Thus, the government has achieved some success for Hakka language. The report did not indicate that South Min needs the language preservation based on their low statistics of losing their language (Cao, 1997). Also, the aborigine groups still did not have the same supports as Hakka or South Min.

Mandarin is the official language in school education today; however, the proposal of language equality, which was introduced in 2003, plans to list all other languages in Taiwan as official languages, such as Taiwanese (Minnan/Ho-lo/Hoklo), Hakka, and indigenous languages (the languages of Taiwan’s tribes). Under this proposal, the natural languages that different tribes use are called national languages and are considered to be equal. Citizens will have a right to use their own language in the courts. Public services, such as broadcasts or meetings held by the government should provide multiple language services. People who serve the local and central government may be required to take a language exam to determine their proficiency in one of the native Taiwanese languages (Proposal of Language Equality, 2003).
Language Curriculum and Policy Changes in Taiwan

Education is a larger part of Taiwan’s budget than any other category except the Defense Department (Lee & Pecht, 1997). Taiwan requires nine years of schooling, “Nine-Year National Education,” mandated by the 1982 Compulsory Education Law and the implementation guidelines in 1984 (Lee & Pecht, 1997). Elementary and junior high education comprised the major part of the education budget, as opposed to senior high school, vocational, junior college, college, and university education (Lee & Pecht, 1997). Between legislated national education and financial assistance, the Taiwanese government has the power to influence the education curriculum and implementation.

The Ministry of Education in Taiwan has a dominant role in textbook approval, school curriculum, and entrance examinations for senior high school and colleges/universities (Wang, C., 2005). Due to cultural and practical reasons, Taiwanese students are used to exam-driven education and work hard to be successful in the entrance examinations. In other words, Taiwanese people are committed to education (Jiang, 2002). Even though entrance examinations are no longer the only option for the selection of students for both senior high school and college since the educational reforms of the 1990’s, students still have to take standard examinations for school consideration (Wang, G., 2000). The Taiwanese government used to compile and publish the textbooks, so Taiwan has long had a nationally standardized educational system (Qian, 2003). After the reform, later called “410 Demonstration for Educational Reform,” intended to remove government control in education, more freedom of textbook selection and curriculum implementation was given to teachers, and students were given more flexibility in
choosing their post secondary education (Cheng, 2003). However, the government still decides which curricula need to be taught at each grade level and has the authority to approve textbooks (Qian, 2003).

The core of Taiwan’s curriculum changed from a focus on “becoming Japanese” in the period of 1895 -1945 to “becoming Chinese” after the KMT retreated to Taiwan at the end of the civil war with the Chinese Communist Party in 1949 (Liu, 2004). Taiwan’s identification as a part of China has changed with the process of liberalization and democratization since 1986 (Hughes & Stone, 1999). Taiwanese people have lived in a different political and cultural context from mainland China since Taiwan has been separated from China and created its own identity as Taiwanese.

In 2002, the former DPP president, Chen Shui-bian, instituted the use of Tongyong Pinyin. By 2008, the Ministry of Education reported that 68 % of Taiwanese central and local governments were using Tongyong Pinyin (He, 2008). In 2008, the new Taiwanese president, Ma Ying-jeou, of the Nationalist Party (KMT), decided that Taiwan will use Hanyu Pinyin so as to fit in the international usage, because the United Nations and the international community have already implemented Hanyu Pinyin (He, 2008).

During Chen Shui-bian’s eight year presidency, the Minister of Education, Tu Cheng-sheng, led a committee to create a new curriculum called 98 Curriculum to be implemented in Taiwan’s ‘98 academic year (2008). This new curriculum will change the name of the subject of Chinese language education from “National Language” to “Chinese Language.” Also, the Chinese written language will be called Han language. The native education curriculum for the South Min (Minnan/Ho-lo/Hoklo) language will be called
“Taiwanese Minnan language” (Chen & Chen, 2008). However, these were more than just name changes. A critic from the “Saving National Language Association” has stated that the curriculum will not only change the name of subject but also influence the perspective of Chinese history and identity for Taiwanese (Wang, 2008). The famous Chinese writer in Taiwan, Zheng Xiao-feng, accused the government of planning to call the famous Tang dynasty poet, Lee Bai, “Chinese Lee Bai” (Wang, 2008). Also, she has complained about the literary value of the Taiwanese articles selected and the reduced time for Chinese courses (Wang, 2008).

Because the DPP government did not win the presidential election in 2008, the new government of the KMT has decided to execute the 98 curriculum in 2010 and adjust the content (Yang, 2008). The initial plan for the curriculum shows that the new curriculum will add an additional class period for Chinese every week in 12th grade, and the percentage of ancient Chinese in the language curriculum will increase from 45 percent to 50 percent. Also, the Analects of Confucius and Mencuis (Mengtse) will become required courses (Yang, 2008).

**Issues that Influence the Taiwanese Government’s Policy Decisions**

The Taiwanese government has been struggling with its language policies and has been unable to develop a contemporary policy for the teaching of Chinese language (Brubaker, 2003; Tetrault, 2003). Research indicates that using a different written language and a separate phonetic system (Zhuyin Fuhao) influences how people think about their Taiwanese identity (Jiang et al., 2001). The Taiwanese government has also expanded the use of the Taiwanese language in public and in the standards-based curricula.
in schools. Controversies surrounding the country’s language policy have become a means for the government and political parties to gain politically by playing with the issue of Taiwan’s national identity (Brubaker, 2003; Tetrault, 2003). The expansion of Taiwanese language and reduction of Chinese language in the language curriculum, will mean less time for learning Chinese language, history, and culture. Strategies utilized by the government to generate consciousness of solidarity and national identity could be an example of identification construction (Burke, 1950).

In addition, based on survey data generated from long-term research into significant China-related political/social movements in Taiwan (Lake Thousand-Island Incident, Missile Test, 2000 President Election, and SARS), Yung-Ming Hsu, Chia-hung Tsai, and Hsiu-tin Huang (2005) found that there was a strong correlation between these movements and an increased awareness of Taiwanese identity among the people in Taiwan. According to Hsu and associates, the people in Taiwan were caught between two ill-defined identities (Taiwanese and/or Chinese) and each of these movements encouraged the Taiwanese people to reconsider their national identity. Each of the political/social movements was fueled by irritation at the less than perfect conduct of the Chinese government. Thus, during each of these movements, the Taiwanese people gained an enhanced sense of Taiwanese identity. That is, the irritating experiences generated by each of these movements provided the people in Taiwan a clearer sense of who they were, Chinese or Taiwanese. After each incident, more and more people in Taiwan identified themselves as Taiwanese, not Chinese. In this situation, the Taiwanese government has
little motive to standardize its written language or its phonetic system so as to match up with mainland China.

Political context of policy making. The political context of Taiwan influences the educational decisions regarding Chinese language education and native education, because identity politics have an important role in Taiwan (Wang, H. L., 2000; 2004). Different political parties have different perspectives about the relationship with China (Tu, 2007). These different perspectives not only influence their political decisions but also their curriculum design (Tu, 2007).

The Chinese government treats Taiwan as a part of China and threatens to use military force if Taiwan declares independence (Chow, 2000). When the Kuomintang (KMT) ruled Taiwan, from 1945 to 2000, the Taiwanese government also stated that China was unified but claimed that Taiwan represented China as the Republic of China (ROC; Chow, 2000). Also, the KMT government encouraged schools to teach the history and geography of mainland China. The policy of the KMT government was to advocate for the Chinese language and to represent the cultural and political aspects of China. Another Taiwanese political party, the Democratic Progressive Party (DPP), was against the KMT’s position, claiming that Taiwan’s future had to be decided by the Taiwanese people, and Taiwan’s independence should be an option. The DPP has promoted Taiwan’s independence but its leaders have talked less about the issue since Chen Shui-Bian, a member of the party who ran for the position of mayor of Taipei in 1994, stopped talking about this issue (Clark, 2000). When they try to win the next big-scale election, the independence rhetoric could scare off voters.
Chen won the mayoral election in 1994 but lost his position in 1998 to the KMT’s candidate. Subsequently, he ran in the 2000 presidential election and won, largely as the result of a vote split between the KMT candidate, Lien Chan, and the KMT-spin-off independence candidate, James Soong. During his presidency, Chen started promoting the Taiwanese language (Ho-lo) by using it as an official language in public and by incorporating it in the elementary curriculum. Also, the government increased the amount of Taiwanese literature, history, and geography in the curriculum for middle school and high school. When the government promoted Taiwanese history and language in order to help students understand their own country and to reduce the over-emphasis on Chinese education in Taiwan, its opponents saw it as an attempt to lessen the influence of Chinese culture (Tetrault, 2003).

In 2004, Lien Chan and James Soong ran as a team in the presidential election. They thought they could win the election since they had received 59.94% of the votes in the 2000 presidential election, compared to Chen’s 39.3% (Clark, 2000). Also, in the 2001 legislative election, the KMT, led by Lien, and the People First Party (PFP), led by Soong, together won 70% percent of the votes and controlled over half of the seats in congress (Kao, 2004). When the KMT chairman Lien ran for president, he and his running mate, Soong, had been leading in the polls. However, after Chen promoted Taiwan’s first referendum on independence and tied the referendum issue to the election, the DPP’s public opinion survey center showed that the support rating of Lien and Soong was 38.8 percent, compared with Chen’s 37.9 percent (‘DPP, pan-blues running,’ 2004). The numbers for Chen were clearly very close to those polled jointly by Lien and Soong. The
pair kept leading the polls in the 2004 presidential campaign. However, Chen won his second term with a mere 0.22% margin in 2004 (Liu & Luo, 2004). Even though Chen used the referendum issue in his 2004 campaign and survived an assassination attempt the afternoon before Election Day, the DPP maintained its authority in Taiwan until 2008.

Chen's party (DPP) does not support the idea of reunification and its rhetoric about reducing Taiwan's connection with mainland China is a campaign strategy intended to encourage its own supporters and to change people's ideas about their national identity vis-à-vis China. During Chen's presidency, images of Sun Yat-Sen, the national father of the ROC, and Chiang Kai-Shek, a former president and leader of the KMT, who once ruled both Mainland China and Taiwan, have disappeared from public buildings and the word "Taiwan" is now printed on ROC passports. The Taiwanese people had a presidential election in 2008 and previous to the election, President Chen claimed that he would work on writing a new constitution for Taiwan. It was predicted that the government would use the issue of Taiwanese independence in its political campaign (Lee, 2006). Because the Taiwanese identity has been emphasized in past elections, this could have an influence in other areas, such as education.

Educational reform is likely to be featured in its rhetoric about remaking the country. The Chinese language curriculum would not only be an educational issue; ideas regarding Taiwanese identity and the separation of Taiwan from Mainland China would be found in curricular discussions. Therefore, Taiwanese identity and separation are also ideological issues that are used by politicians through the mask of educational reform.
Historical context of policy decision. Politicians have clearly gained political advantage by using issues related to Taiwanese identity and the country's relationship with mainland China (Lee, 2006). The relationship between China and Taiwan has been particularly tense since the presidential term served by President Lee Teng-hui. China considers Lee a "separatist." China's *White Papers on Taiwan Issue* states, "Since the early 1990s, Lee Teng-hui has gradually deviated from the One-China Principle, trumpeting 'two governments,' 'two reciprocal political entities,' 'Taiwan is already a state with independent sovereignty,' and 'at the present stage the Republic of China is on Taiwan and the People's Republic of China is on the mainland'" ("One-China principle," 2000, ¶ 21). The 1992 consensus accepted the one-China principle but allowed both sides individually to define the meaning of China. This consensus was reached in 1992 by Lee Teng-hui's administration but he later went back on his word to claim that he has never said that there is only one China ("One-China principle," 2000).

On March 23rd 1996, Taiwan held its first-ever direct presidential election, and the former President Lee Teng-hui, whom China considered a separatist, was a candidate. Before the election, the Chinese Army held "a series of provocative military exercises and missile tests off Taiwan's coastline. The missile drill, a maneuver timed to coincide with the island's first direct presidential election, was closer to Taiwan than any conducted previously" (Hickey, 1998). The U.S. warned Beijing that any attack directed at the island would not be tolerated and "could" lead to an American military response (Wang, 1996). In addition, President Clinton sent aircraft carriers to the Taiwan Strait. Some American
officers considered it the biggest military gathering in the twenty-one years since the Vietnam War (Fu, 2005).

The Chinese government’s military exercises did not destroy Lee’s campaign. In fact, the standoff between Lee and China may have helped Lee’s campaign because the Taiwanese may well have thought of Lee as a leader who defended Taiwan’s interests against China. Lee won roughly 54% of the presidential vote and China concluded its military exercises two days later (Hickey, 1998). This showed that Beijing’s attempt to influence Taiwanese voters had failed. It also appeared that the U.S. was committed to the Taiwan Relations Act (TRA). The U.S. pledged to continue supplying Taiwan with weapons as codified in the TRA of 1979 (Brownback, 2004).

When Chen proposed Taiwan’s first referendum and raised the issue of a new constitution during his 2004 presidential campaign, the Chinese government considered this Taiwan’s first step toward independence. Chen urged the nation to stand up against China. In practice, this could lead to a greater sense of national identity without proposing a new state to challenge China. However, in China’s view, Chen was setting the stage for Taiwan’s independence (“One-China principle,” 2000). The referendum could be used to formulate Taiwan’s new constitution and to encourage the country’s rejection of reunification. This referendum would legalize Taiwan’s independence plan by amending the constitution. The referendum issue had been mentioned previously in a Chinese White Paper, which stated that, “We firmly oppose changing Taiwan’s status as a part of China by referendum” (“One-China principle,” 2000).
The official position of the United States was that the referendum was not necessary and could change the status quo in Asia. The U.S. did not oppose the referendum, unlike China, whose attitude was dead-set against any referendum. However, U.S. Deputy Secretary of State Richard L. Armitage said, “Referenda are generally reserved for items or issues that are either very divisive or very difficult… [The referendum] seems to be neither divisive nor difficult. So I think it raises some questions about the motives of those who want to put it forward” (“U.S. opposes unilateral actions,” 2004, ¶ 5). He repeated, “The United States opposes any unilateral action by either China or Taiwan that could affect the status quo in the region,” and added, “[We want] to study the referendum proposal in context ‘and how it’s used domestically’” (“U.S. opposes unilateral actions,” 2004, ¶ 7). However, President Chen still won his 2004 presidential election and learned that playing the issues regarding China could bring him political advantage in his campaign (Lee, 2006).

Looking back over the history of Taiwan, it seems clear that the government intentionally irritates the Chinese government and then benefits from the ensuing conflicts (Lee, 2006). However, such conflicts do not help Taiwan in its policy-making nor do they help the country’s relationship with either the Chinese or the U.S. government (Lee, 2006). Because the Chinese language curriculum has an ideological dimension, particularly in relation to issues of national identity, it could certainly be of service to the Taiwanese independence movement. Consequently it could also be a source of conflict with the Chinese government because China excludes Taiwan from the international society by intimidating anyone that considers treating Taiwan as a nation (Wang, H. L., 2000). If the
Taiwanese people feel that they are excluded from international society and lack connections with mainland China, the government could easily gain politically from the people’s sense of isolation and disenchantment.

Political Power and Education

Education is not a regime of neutral choices, and curriculum design often includes a hidden political agenda. Apple (1982) writes about this idea in *Education and Power* to raise consciousness about the fact that education reflects the hegemonic control of the government. The curriculum and teaching serve the interests of the dominant class as in other aspects of society. Apple argues that culture is different from a commodity, and the role of school is not to control students and identify deviance. He calls for progressive action to stop the commoditization of labor which the government places in hidden curriculum, technical/administrative knowledge, and the process of legitimization. What the DPP government planned to change in language curriculum is an example of using school to control perspectives of China and influence students’ Chinese/Taiwanese identity. The Taiwanese ideology is a hidden curriculum in the language curriculum and the textbooks will provide technical/administrative knowledge through the process of legitimization.

Apple (1982) stated that political power always has a role in curriculum design and implementation. It is a guide for people to understand educational criticism. His work is a layout of problems and suggestions about the ideological practices in education. Apple (1993) also explains how the “official knowledge,” which is found in the curriculum, is produced. He analyzes the relationships between the elite of society and the privilege of
education. The author harnesses Pierre Bourdieu, conservatism, neoliberalism, and Foucault to address why a government employs national curriculum to control education and then controls people's thinking to pursue its political agenda. Therefore, Apple's insights of national curriculum and official knowledge provide evidence that political power has an intention to make educational decisions for political interests as a mean of controlling people through education.

Apple (1996) uses the critical discourse analysis, identity politics, political economy and the labor process, and racial formation to explain how political powers established the official knowledge and popular mindsets. He warns people to pay attention to the silences in curriculum and research in order to raise political sensibilities. Educational research has a tie with political science. Wong (1994) indicates that the study in politics of education has roots in political science because it deals with power, effect, conflict, and values around authorities. He discusses how political science influences educational research in politics and policy. The debate between elitist and pluralist is rich with thinking about power structure and democratic practice. Educational choices, like policy decisions, are an example of how to operate the relationships between competing interests and conflict values. Hopefully, it should be a moral and practical choice. Thinking about the questions in education is to rethink democracy. Therefore, while some educational research focuses on learning effects, analyzing the motives of educational politics and paying more attention to the political process are also important.

For showing how power influences education, Apple and Oliver (1998) examine how the "Christian Right" is promoted in curriculum at the local level of education. They
argue that this construction of identity in formation and education is a democratic control. When people become aware of the political power of government and national curriculum and understand the effect of ideological control, their study draws extra attention to the formation of ideas and bureaucratic control that could be viewed as “free agency” to act neutrally. It has a hidden bias and serves to further the prestige of a certain group. People should notice that the curriculum is not formatted for cross-class, cross-culture, and race coalition. It also shows how a curriculum was formed by political concerns.

Educational policy is a playfield for conflict values. Scribner, Reyes, and Fusarelli (1994) analyze how this game is played by power. Their arguments explain the effect of educational reform and the policy outcomes and criticism. They illustrate ideological belief patterns and competing values that make a shift or change in the political arenas. Studying politics and policies of education or actually leading an educational reform is an action of politicians to manipulate the direction of a country.

In the U.S., even though there is no national English-only law, due to the fact that many state governments have supported English-only policies, these policies have influenced bilingual education and English as a second language (ESL) programs in school. “About half of all states [26] now have some form of English-only statute or constitutional amendment in place” (Zavodny, 2000, p 427).

This English-only policy is an example of how political power influences education. A non-peer-reviewed practice guide was presented at an English-only meeting of the Education Department. Russell Gersten, Executive Director of the Instructional Research Group of Long Beach, Calif., explained why the panel neither supported the
English-only policy nor took a bilingual approach. “Internally, we decided it was best to come out with practical guidelines about ways to teach, ways to assess, and ways to improve curriculum and instructional materials” (Zehr, 2006, p. 21). However, he admitted that politics as well as the different divided opinions in the field of education did make them avoid bilingual education partially (Zehr, 2006).

The English-only policy influenced not only education but also society. In Oklahoma, the city of Atlus had a legal case regarding the English-only policy. Because the city had a law which required its immigrant workforce to speak only English on the job, except for customer service for the city residents who cannot speak English, employees sued the city. The court sided with the city and dismissed all claims of the employees. However, the employees appealed to Denver’s 10th Circuit, and the higher court believed that required speaking English on meal breaks, during private phone conversations, and between employees just after shifts violated the Civil Rights Act of 1964 (Hatch, Hall, Kobata & Denis, 2006). The authors of the previous court summary also illustrated the point in the case of Colorado: “Courts and enforcement agencies strictly scrutinize English-only policies. Consideration must be given to whether an English-only policy … is supported by legitimate business reasons, is enforced only in accordance with its terms, and does not create a hostile work environment” (Hatch et al., 2006, p 7). This example showed how an issue arising in education can be connected with culture and social issues. Also, it was a showcase for political power to manipulate the direction of education and society.
National curriculum is another way that the political power determines official knowledge to manipulate people’s thoughts and actions (Apple, 1993). Taiwan used to have a national curriculum, but now it only has national curriculum guidelines for each subject to address which knowledge must be taught. Even though schools can choose textbooks from different publishers that provide different content, the government can still control education by the curriculum guidelines that require certain subjects, knowledge, and teaching time. Looking at language policy and curriculum is a way to look at how authority uses its power in Taiwan’s educational reform. It helps people to look deeper at how the government processes politics legally to change values and ideas in education. While looking at not only what the government did but also how it talked about what it did helps people to play a more important role in political communication to understand policy and politics.

Conclusion of Review of Language and Politics

During the time of the DPP government, there were several actions taken which raised concerns of Taiwan’s independence, such as a referendum that could be used to vote on Taiwan’s legalization of independence. Therefore, the possible changes regarding language policy and curriculum are easily involved of the concern of separating Taiwanese people from Chinese identity.

In all the areas using Chinese, only Taiwan uses traditional Chinese for spoken Mandarin Chinese which serves to preserve Chinese culture. However, the DPP government promoted native language curricula in education. The language curriculum and policy changes in Taiwan might be a way to separate Taiwan from mainland China in
language use and cultural identity. In Taiwanese schools, the Chinese language and literature class hours have been reduced to make time to learn other languages, usually English or Taiwanese (Ho-lo). The hours of history and geography classes are reduced to emphasize more Taiwanese-specific history and geography.

Because the Chinese and Taiwanese governments implement different Chinese written languages, different phonetic symbol systems, and different perspectives of Chinese history etc., Chinese language education in both China and Taiwan should not be considered the same. Even though the Taiwanese government has a China-centered educational curriculum, to teach Chinese language including Chinese literature and history, it is not the same as the curriculum used in China.

Researchers have showed that language can influence identity and become a reason or motive for a government to use its language policy as a mean to modify national identity (Tse et al., 2001). When the Taiwanese government, whether the KMT or DPP, makes curriculum changes, it might have an agenda with political goals through educational changes. The claims the government made for support of the language curriculum or policy are the means to understanding the government’s logic and intentions. However, the claims will be better understood within the political, historical, and cultural context. Therefore, controversy might come from filed claims or a distrust of the government.

The context of language policy and its influences should be taken into account while analyzing the relationship between Taiwan and China. In order to understand the government’s language policy decisions, this chapter introduced the historical and social
context of Chinese language, and points out that the different languages used would be an obstacle for unifying Chinese people. The Chinese government tends to believe that all people who learn Chinese should abide by its language standards, such as simplified Chinese and *Hanyu Pinyin*. However, because of the development of Taiwan’s democracy and the movement toward Taiwan’s independence, traditional Chinese will be constantly used in that country. It will be pretty much like the political position of Taiwan in the world. The Chinese government dominates international diplomacy, but Taiwan still lives like a different country. Language becomes one reason that Taiwan is not a part of China.
CHAPTER 3
METHODOLOGY

This study is intended to investigate the reasons for the curriculum and policy changes in Taiwan and analyze whether or not the Taiwanese government’s claims support its actions regarding Chinese language curriculum and policy. This case study about Taiwan’s Chinese language education also provides an opportunity to examine whether or not certain language curriculum decisions might be the result of political interests, and to look for possible consequences when political conflicts affect education. This chapter will first describe the theoretical framework and research approach used followed by the procedures employed.

Theoretical Framework of this Study

This section provides the intellectual foundation for the rhetorical analysis of claims related to the Chinese curriculum in Taiwan. This approach was based on (a) social problems research, and (b) Burke’s dramatism. The first of these subsections introduce the idea of rhetorical analysis. The next part presents how social problems research produces a deeper understanding of a problem within its social context. The third and final subsection shows how Burke’s idea of dramatism and identification has been used to analyze what a government says about its policies (Birdsell, 1987; Bury, 1986; Peterson, 1986). Burke’s pentadic analysis is used to identify the rhetorical motive within statements to help reveal the intentions of the government.
The Value of Rhetorical Analysis

Rhetoric is an instrument for persuasion and an epistemic for discovering truth. From a perspective of viewing rhetoric as an instrument, it reveals, transmits, and defends the truth which exists objectively. As Aristotle said, "Rhetoric is the counterpart of Dialectic" (1954, p. 19). People test a rational discourse through rhetoric as a means of finding truth about the objective world. Rhetoric can be learned as persuasion to use in effective communication.

However, rhetoric, as communication, is more than a tool. As Scott (1999) says, "Rhetoric...is a way of knowing; it is epistemic" (p. 138). Truth may be situational and created by rhetoric. For example, social constructionism will argue that what is called truth or knowledge is socially constructed (Berger & Luckmann, 1967). Therefore, rhetorical analysis is not only an approach to understanding the meanings of words but also a theoretical framework to understanding the constructed truth. In human affairs, what people believe is true is an observed objectivity; however, how the truth is presented and interpreted is based on people's values and experience as told by rhetoric.

Burke (1989) describes the human as the symbol-using animal and language as action to reflect, select, and deflect reality (p. 56, 114). Therefore, humans can structure and modify a truth through rhetoric. To quote Brummett (1999), "Reality is meaning, yet meaning is something created and discovered in communication" (p. 159-160). Since language creates meaning, which is reality in our world, studying rhetoric is a way to reveal the meanings of the constructed world and helps to make an evaluation or judgment
of it. Rhetorical analysis can help people see the process of claims-making and how the truth or knowledge is constructed by language advocates.

Discourse usually involves a judgment of value and fact by decision-making. An audience should learn rhetorical criticism to judge what they hear, and this is why rhetoric matters. As Wander (2000) says, “More than ‘informed talk about matters of importance,’ criticism carries us to the point of recognizing good reasons and engaging in right action” (p. 122). Each political system has a decision-making process, so rhetoric should be studied in a political context. However, rhetoric is more important in a democracy because democracy protects people’s freedom of speech, and people can decide policy through the public sphere, discussions, and elections. If people make a decision by manipulating emotions rather than rationality, it may be very dangerous. As Burke (2000) analyzed Hitler’s rhetoric in Germany, “Our job...is to find all available means ways of making the Hitlerite distortions of religion apparent, in order that politicians of his kind in America be unable to perform a similar swindle” (p. 221). Democracy is based on the decision of a majority. A democracy must be a republic of reason by majority rule. Otherwise, it may be even worse than other systems. Therefore, studying rhetoric is more important in democracy. As Condit (1990) says, “‘Rhetoric is essential to a democracy.... To add increased understandings of the shape and depth of a controversy, and of how one’s rhetoric functions, is to gain power to further the argument” (p. xii).

The Process of Rhetorical Analysis

Studying rhetoric is a process of understanding what is created through human’s language use. The process of studying rhetoric is to learn the way to use and test an
argument and to know some conceptual heuristics or vocabularies which might be used in rhetorical criticism. There is a process which people can follow, but it does not qualify as a method used in scientific research. However, there are some principals about how to analyze and read texts of rhetoric. This guideline is a way of organizing, thinking, and finding things in rhetorical study. From this perspective, studying rhetoric is like studying argument. How to analyze and read text is to find the proposition and warrant in logic and to think about why it has effects. According to Foss (1989), rhetoric criticism involves four steps: (a) choosing a text(s) to study; (b) choosing a specific type of rhetorical criticism; (c) analyzing the text(s) according to the method chosen; and (d) writing the critical essay (Frey, Botan & Kreps, 2000, p. 230). The word “rhetoric” is traditionally associated with Aristotle’s definition: “the available means of persuasion,” therefore, the criticism of rhetoric which is understood as rhetorical analysis is “the systematic process of illuminating and evaluating products of human activity” (Andrews, 1983, p. 4). There is no “method” in rhetorical criticism such as the scientific method, because researchers may create their own way to analyze human’s symbolic actions. As a result, criticism serves as both theory and method. For making a judgment of the analysis, the standards of scholarship in criticism could rely on the use of evidence (Wander & Jenkins, 1972, p. 449). The portions of an object equally available to the critic and his auditor are especially important (Wander & Jenkins, 1972, p. 449).

The process of studying rhetoric requires a rational argument and a clear procedure that other researchers can understand and follow, so their audience can judge their findings from their works. There might be no traditional method as conceptual heuristics
or vocabularies to be called a theoretical framework as a replacement for method. Calling rhetorical analysis a methodology might fail to be validated when people use the test of methodological rigor and systematicity. Rhetorical analysis is not a method as typically meant. However, the study has conceptual heuristic and vocabulary to be used to analyze the texts. For example, Burke’s dramatism is a rhetorical method, and I apply his pentadic analysis as an approach to identify the elements and the ratios within the texts. This method helps me to examine the text and determine how the text is read. Burke (1945) told how to identify elements in a text and how to find the dominant element of the text with his explanation of the pentad. Therefore, researchers can reveal rhetors’ motives through analyzing their rhetoric. Burke’s pentad works as a method to clarify the materials. Also, the rhetorical analysis shows how the language instruction and interplay of the political and social complex influenced language curriculum and policy. This is a rhetorical analysis, in a context of historical and cultural situation, to better understand the language curriculum and national identity.

Research Approach

Social Problems Research

The social problems research approach has the intellectual background of social constructionism and contextual constructionism. Social constructionism argues that knowledge is socially constructed and that validity is measured by the shared understandings of society (Berger & Luckmann, 1967, p. 3). Contextualism takes a position that all knowledge is situation-dependent and the analysis is based on the context in which the data is collected and understood (Madill, Jordan, & Shirley, 2000, p.9). Joel
Best (2003) sets a goal to "explore some of these constructions of society as a social problem to analyze the claims-making . . ." (p. 2).

Best (2003) see this research approach provides useful insights into the problems of society as constructed by the claim-makers (p. 4). In his article, "Rhetoric in Claims-Making: Constructing the Missing Children Problem," he demonstrates why claims-making is a persuasive activity and approachable through rhetorical analysis (Best, 1987).

In the analysis of his case study, Best finds that claims-making about missing children emphasized "missing" to include both runaways and child-snatchings as involving terrible risks in order to create the illusion that the problem is much bigger and wide-spread than it really is. The claims-maker described all missing children as hopeless and victims of child-snatching to suggest that existing policies and resources were not sufficient to handle the problem (Best, 1987, p. 110-111). The claims-maker conflated different ages and situations of missing children to de-concept the word "Missing Children." Best's case study of "Missing Children" offers an example of how rhetoric plays a central role in claims-making about social problems. He analyzes the claims and the process of claims-making. Rhetorical analysis becomes a method to understand social problems within a larger social context, as well as simply delineating claims-makers' rhetorical choices. The claims-makers will articulate their claims in the ways which are more persuasive rather than more honest. A case study, such as "Missing Children," highlights the rhetoric used in making claims and reveals the process of claims-making. After the audiences have a clear version of the problem, they thus would be able to understand the problem more comprehensively and decide what actions should be taken to
solve the problem. The suggestions regarding related policies in a larger cultural context would be considered more rationally.

Analyzing claims and claims-making regarding missing children, as a case study, offers useful methods for understanding meanings of claims and assisting policy analysis. He outlines the claims that were made by different social organizations, identifies the key constituencies in the process, indicates how claims-making is related to claims-makers' and audience's interests, and describes the principles of the problem's construction (Best, 1987, p. 101). My study will attempt a similar analysis of claims-making by different groups within the context of Taiwan's Chinese language curriculum.

**Pentadic Analysis of Political Policies**

Burke's dramatistic approach is a critical method which can be used in policy analysis. In Burke's dramatism, the pentad is used as a tool to track the motive embedded in a text. Critics understand drama and its meaning by analyzing the pentad in the same way a linguist understands language through grammar. The pentadic analysis is used to reveal the motive within a text and determine the meaning of statements to identify the speaker's attitude (Burke, 1945, p. xvi). The pentad operates as a grammar of text because it allows one to analyze a text to understand the meaning of a text. This textual analysis method has been applied to different areas of research. It is a critical methodology grounded in understanding of human relations and human motives shown in language.

Burke's pentad can be used to trace the effects of political positions on policy statements. Birdsell (1987) used Burke's pentad to analyze Reagan's rhetoric on Lebanon and Grenada and found differences in his framing of the two events. He analyzed
Reagan’s goals and definition of the national interest by using the pentad to identify persuasive factors in the speeches. He compared Reagan’s rhetoric in the two speeches and found that the notion of a single term or ratio guided the meaning of the text. The “scene” of the pentad dominated the Lebanon text, and the “agent” dominated the Grenada text. That explains why these two texts’ framings differ and require differences to be reconciled in the context of Reagan’s foreign policy. I will use a similar approach to do a textual criticism on the statements regarding Taiwan’s language education policy. The application of the pentad will be the tool to help me discern the meaning of the DDP government’s educational policies.

Also, researchers have found great utility in Burke’s discussion of identification. The pentad is a method to clarify terms used in the text, and identification is a strategy used to affect audiences. The two concepts usually work together in communication because the pentad structures the story, and the identification works to connect with people and make them believe the story. Every drama has its logic of the pentad, but a successful drama usually involves identification to affect audiences.

Mary Janet Bury utilized Burke’s discussion as an analytical tool to examine the speeches of Reverend Jerry Falwell. In her analysis of fourteen sermons delivered by Reverend Jerry Falwell between 1979 and 1982, Bury sought to reveal Falwell’s attempts at identification with his audience. According to Bury, Falwell achieved identification with his audience by creating dichotomies within his audience. Bury pointed out that Falwell used rhetoric to divide people who opposed him and his supporters in order to solidify his supporters and create controversy between different oppositional groups.
From Bury’s study (1986), readers learn that in a campaign, political or religious, the division of different groups becomes more important and vivid in identification than in other non-campaign communication. Moreover, Bury’s study demonstrates the utility of Burke’s approach by illustrating the use of the pentad to locate the elements of a drama, reveal motives, and discuss the effects of identification.

Another study that demonstrates the significance of Burke’s pentadic analysis and discussion of identification is Peterson’s study of Dust Bowl rhetoric and American farming motives (Peterson, 1986). Peterson (1986) used Burke’s theory of identification and pentadic ratios to identify the hierarchy of motives related to American land use. Peterson focused her analysis on government officials whose rhetoric reveals views established during the 1930s and 1940s about land use. Utilizing multiple sources collected over time, Peterson found that “scenic elements generally denote a materialistic philosophy, an emphasis on purpose usually indicates mysticism as the dominant philosophy” (1986, p. 11).

Peterson’s study brings attention to the value of using rhetoric as an avenue to identifying the persistent philosophy embedded in social practices. Via the rhetoric of land use, Peterson found that the identification used within Dust Bowl rhetoric influenced people’s land use because they identified with the philosophy of being the American that the government officials pursued.

For an approach similar to Peterson’s, it should be possible to discern some kind of identity of being Taiwanese as demonstrated in statements regarding native education
and Language Equity Law. Thus, this study will use similar methods of rhetorical analysis to look at language education and policy in Taiwan.

**Summary of Burke’s approach.** Through the examples presented in this section, the role of Burke’s pentad in dramatism was introduced by explaining the elements of the pentad and ratios in order to identify the rhetorical motive within a speech. Also, identification was explained to evaluate the effects of the communication. As Brock, Scott, and Chesebro (1990) say, “The pentad, together with a knowledge of identification and the innately dramatistic nature of human society, provides the critic with a vocabulary and way of proceeding” (p. 188).

**Procedures**

This section presents the research procedures used in the study. To provide grist for three documents were analyzed: two statements by the Taiwanese government about its language education and policy, along with the actual curriculum guidelines. Opponents’ opinions regarding the government’s actions, which were represented in the newspapers, will be used to provide context needed for an effective social problems research analysis.

**Document Analysis**

This study first analyzes a speech that the Taiwanese Minister of Education, Tu Cheng-sheng, presented at the London School of Economics and Political Science on January 10, 2007. Tu was the Taiwanese Minister of Education in Taiwan for the eight years of the Taiwanese Democratic Progressive Party (DPP) government’s presidency. In this speech, he introduced Taiwan’s history and education as well as his opinions about
the educational development in Taiwan. This speech is remarkable for expressing his interpretations of Taiwan's educational reform and curriculum change.

This speech was chosen for analysis because it is the longest one which can be found to address Tu's views on Taiwan's history and education. This speech has rich information about how he viewed the changes that happened along the way by different governments in Taiwan. Tu also explained his point of view about the education which should be provided for Taiwanese students. Since Tu had been the Minister of Education for eight years during the DPP presidency, his perspective could be considered as a position of the DPP government. Unlike an interview or short speech on a certain topic, Tu could fully present his perspective and agenda for Taiwan's education without much worry of being interrupted or misinterpreted by news reporters. This is a speech he gave with the transcription he approved. Therefore, I will use this speech as the first document to try to understand the DPP government's perspective and agenda about the language curriculum and policy in Taiwan.

Next, the study will analyze the Proposal of Language Equality to understand how the DPP government proposed a law to support their Taiwanese language policy and put their ideas in practice. The proposal was sent to the Congress shortly before the Minister of the Cabinet was removed from the office in 2007, and it raised concerns in Taiwan's society and the Chinese administration about the Taiwanese government's motives (Liu, 2007). Since the Taiwanese people were going to have a presidential election in 2008, the timing of this proposal made people suspicious of the government's agenda. The Proposal of Language Equality was the government's official statement, and it stated its rationale
and requirements for the law. Therefore, it is useful for understanding the Taiwanese government's perspective and agenda regarding its language policy.

The proposed Language Equality Law is the only act the DPP government proposed, during its presidency to legally change the position of Mandarin Chinese as the official language. However, this proposed law showed what the DPP government wanted to do in order to change the positions of languages used in Taiwan. The law brought about several policy changes in order to accomplish the DPP government's goal in language education and policy. The printed law is only two pages. This law failed to be passed in congress, therefore, it does not have an English version. I will introduce the purpose and specific actions which were empowered by the law.

Finally, the guidelines of Chinese language curriculums in the DPP government's presidency will be compared with the previous curriculum and current curriculum from the Kuomintang (KMT) government.

The document I chose for the analysis of the DPP government's language curriculum is the 98 Curriculum. This curriculum guideline was declared in 2008 and was planned to be implemented in 2009. During the DPP government presidency, the Minister of Education had only two guidelines for curriculum and instruction. One was the 95 Curriculum, which was to be the temporary guideline while the 98 Curriculum was prepared. Therefore, after years of discussions, the 98 Curriculum will be considered as the curriculum guideline that represents the DPP government's ideal curriculum design. Unlike the 95 Curriculum, which is simpler and uncertain, the 98 Curriculum is one that the DPP government could confidently announce and implement as its policy, after eight
years of discussion and study. The 98 Curriculum guidelines are much longer than the 95 Curriculum. Most of the 98 Curriculum are details about the assessments. I focus on the purpose of the 98 Curriculum and the differences from the previous Chinese language curriculum. In short, I look at the major differences that might be found in the 98 Curriculum from the previous Chinese curriculum, before the DPP presidency, and pay attention to the parts that reflect the perspective and agenda Tu mentioned in his speech to match the curriculum changes and his ideas of Taiwan’s proper education.

Situating the Documents within a Context

This study, as a case study, includes multiple components. After understanding the claims-making from different sides regarding language curriculum and policy changes, the study will also discuss the potential outcomes of the curriculum and policy changes in the context of Taiwanese politics. It is important to address the meaning of the statements and look at the interaction surrounding the statements to understand the situation in context.

The claims made by the opponents were represented in the newspapers within the period of time that the government proposed or implemented its policies. In addition, the newspaper reports of the language curriculums will be examined. All of the newspapers used for analysis in this study were obtained from news databases of the China Times, United Daily News, and Apply Daily News corporations, which are the three major databases for news research in Taiwan.
CHAPTER 4
ANALYSIS

This chapter will apply rhetorical analysis to examine statements to see whether or not the DPP government’s claims-making supports the language curriculum and policy changes in Taiwan. Social problems researchers use rhetorical analysis to examine claims-making to understand how social problems are constructed by claims-makers (Best, 2003). Kenneth Burke’s insight that there is a “pentad” and “ratio” within a text offers a useful basis for rhetorical analysis (Burke, 1945). In this chapter, three texts regarding Taiwan’s language curriculum and policy are analyzed to understand what claims are made and what effects they might have as symbolic actions in politics.

In order to understand the claims of the Democratic Progressive Party (DPP), the former Taiwanese government, toward language education and policy, the following three documents will be analyzed: (a) a speech by the Minister of the Education Department, (b) the Language Equity Act, and (c) the national Chinese language curriculum. These three texts were chosen to represent government claims regarding language education and policy. The purpose of this chapter is to reveal the rhetorical intentions within the claims, analyze the claims-making, and locate their effects in education and society.

The speech by the Minister of the Education Department represents the perspective of the DPP government on Taiwan’s education and policy. It is a speech in which the Minister introduces Taiwan’s history and system, the former government’s (KMT) policy, and Taiwan’s current and future policy as a background and agenda for changes in Taiwan’s education. Because the Minister presented this speech in an international and
academic occasion, this occasion gave him an opportunity to advertise the DPP government and the changes the government made for Taiwan’s education away from the opposition inside of Taiwan’s politics. He was thus able to give a long and extensive speech about his perspective on Taiwan. As a result, this text gives a useful overview for the DPP government’s perspective on Taiwan and an explanation for why educational and political changes needed to be made in Taiwan according to the DPP.

The proposal of the Language Equity law outlines a vision and agenda for language education and usage in Taiwan. This law was proposed during the DPP presidency and states the rationale and means, to ensure language equality in Taiwan. This language equality law also provides the legal basis for the DPP government to make changes in politics and education. This law lists Taiwan’s native languages and official languages. It shows how the government identifies native and official languages among all languages used in Taiwan. It thus can be viewed as a self-expression and future agenda for the government on Taiwanese identity.

The national guideline for the Chinese language curriculum addresses the purpose and manner for language education in Taiwan. This national guideline was designed by the committee chosen by the DPP government. The government also suggests that textbook publishers write textbooks based on the guideline and has authority to approve the textbooks before the curriculum is implemented. In this new curriculum, Chinese language education is separated from native language education and English education in Taiwan. The guideline lists the purpose, objectives, time arrangement, literature selections, and the percentage of ancient Chinese and modern Chinese literature.
The analysis of the three texts provides understanding of the Taiwanese government’s claims about Chinese language and other native languages’ teaching and usage in education and society. The claims provide a rhetorical setting to persuade people to support the educational and political changes. Rhetorical settings (scene) that are presented in these three texts not only condition political acts (act) but also mold the personalities of actors (agent; Burke, 1937, pp. 59-61). Also, the claims-making shows the DPP government’s assumptions about basic causation or motivation within the texts and that, “the political relevant setting is not merely physical but also social in character is fundamental to symbol formation” (Edelman, 1964, p. 103). As a result, the analysis of the claims-making helps one understand the government’s policy and its potential effects on Taiwan’s education and society.

The effects of the symbolic, educational, or political actions will be analyzed to discuss whether or not the language education and the language equality law were utilized as a political strategy to diminish the influence of Chinese culture and identity. Also, other potential influences among different ethnic groups living in Taiwan will be discussed.

There are three major sections in this chapter, one for each of the three texts to be analyzed: (a) Tu’s speech on Taiwan’s educational reform, (b) the proposal law on language equality and (c) the 98 Curriculum for Chinese Education. In each case, the claims provided by the DPP government will be introduced. The meaning of the texts will be identified and the claims-making that supports the language education and policy changes will be analyzed. The opponents’ claims regarding the government’s motives and the effects of the controversy in language education and policy will be introduced and
compared to the government’s perspective. The claims-making includes persuasive strategies and attitudes which are embedded within claim-makers’ rhetoric. After introducing the claims for language education and policy changes, the discussion will center on whether or not the claims the government made warrant the curriculum and law. As a result, the meaning of the government’s symbolic actions will be revealed.

The Claim-Making Regarding Taiwan’s Educational Reform

This section analyzes the Taiwanese Minister of Education, Tu Cheng-sheng’s, presentation about the effects and values of Taiwan’s educational reform. This speech includes: (a) the introduction of Taiwan as a nation and its educational reform, (b) a historical overview for Taiwan’s educational and political changes, (c) the DPP government’s perspective on native and Chinese education, and (d) the DPP government’s advanced plans for education.

Rhetorical Analysis of Tu’s Speech

Tu Chen-sheng gave the speech on January 10, 2007. The direct audience for Tu’s speech was the academic elite of the London School of Economics and Political Science, although the full text could be found on his website, and his speech was reported by media in Taiwan (“Minister of Education,” 2007). Tu visited England for the meeting of the Ministers of Education from around the world. He went back to the London School of Economics to give this speech as an alumnus (“Minister of Education,” 2007). Tu was representing Taiwan as the Minister of Education of Taiwan, who led the Education Department for eight years (the whole DPP government presidency) and his professional discipline as a historian and member of the Academia Sinica in Taipei. The Academia
Sinica is the highest academic research institution in Taiwan. Tu not only gave this speech as a politician but also used his title in the Academia to give the speech as a scholar of history. When Tu titled the speech, “Taiwan’s Educational Reform and the Future of Taiwan,” he established ethos (personal credibility) by representing the DPP government in educational policy as the Minister of Education and as a scholar of history.

Tu’s audience in the London School of Economics and Political Science might be important in academic or political areas that might influence support for the Taiwanese government in international society. The Taiwanese people are Tu’s secondary audience, because they could also hear the same information from the media or have an impression that Tu was successful in helping the international society understand and respect Taiwan. Tu’s audience, the London School of Economics and Political Science, was not the only audience he tried to persuade with his perspective on Taiwan’s educational reform and future. His speech was meant to influence everyone to believe that the story he told about Taiwan was the full story of its history, current situation, and future goals.

In the speech, Tu relies on the ideas of autonomy, awakening of self-consciousness, self-knowledge, and the liberalization of education to warrant the establishment of Taiwan’s core values. These progressive and democratic ideas are generally accepted and respected by western countries and scholars. Tu upheld the value of autonomy and liberalization with the DPP government’s policy, which he claimed as movements of self-consciousness, self-knowledge, and self-determination. For the second audience, the Taiwanese, to identify with the image he created, Tu also used autonomy and self-knowledge to persuade his audience. Because he presented the speech in a
western academic location, his actions would help persuade Taiwanese people to think that his plan in education was more progressive, since it had been supported by the elite of a democratic country, such as members in the London School of Economics and Political Science. His claims for advocating the DPP policy will be analyzed by the rhetorical analysis in order to assess whether the message did succeed in fulfilling his intentions.

**Analysis of the DPP Government’s Claims**

Tu addressed the educational reform which added more time in native language, history, and geography to the curriculum in Taiwan. It has been a progressive change in Taiwan’s education since the latter half of the 1990s. Tu claimed that the education before the reform of language curriculum was biased and China-centered. As he said,

> The all-out Sinonization education program, as put forth by the KMT, eulogized Chinese civilization as the epitome of world civilizations, embodying the highest achievements of humankind. Chinese history claimed to be greatest on earth. All subjects, including language, literature, history, geography and knowledge pertinent to character formation, were China-centered, strictly controlled by the government, while anything related to Taiwan was reduced to a minimum, or even forbidden to be introduced. (2007, p. 6)

Tu set up the scene that the China-centered education was created by the KMT government. He claimed that the KMT government had conveyed an inaccurate image of China that influenced the people’s perceptions of Taiwan (Tu, 2007).

Because he disagreed with the China-centered education of the former KMT government, Tu praised the accomplishment of changing the curriculum to including native education of the past. The initial native education in Taiwan’s educational system was designed and implemented in the 1990s under the KMT presidency, which was before the DPP won the presidential election in 2000. He believed the changes in the education
reform would be an important dawning of self knowledge because native education was initiated in the first half of the 1990s (Tu, 2007, p. 9). However, this accomplishment was not enough for changing the China-centered education. Tu claimed that “the KMT tried to re-form Taiwanese [people] into Chinese” (p. 9). He believed that the KMT government had planned to transform Taiwanese into Chinese through a China-centered education.

Because of its threat to, and interference in, Taiwan’s participation in international activities, Tu suggested that “it is imperative for Taiwanese to understand China as a culture” (2007, p. 11). He thus justified continuing education regarding China and Chinese culture, but shifted the direction and purpose. As he said,

Only through a full understanding of Chinese historical tradition and thinking models can people in Taiwan devise ways of surviving its threats with dignity and integrity. Therefore, throughout the process of Taiwan’s democratization and liberalization, Taiwan, on the one hand, must walk out of the shadow of an education which focuses on China, in order to search its own self-identity; on the other hand, it also must undertake a more objective study of China and gain a deeper understanding of China. (2007, p. 11)

In this statement, Tu again viewed the Taiwanese government (DPP) as an agent. The purpose of the story he referred to is to have an education which can bring real knowledge and benefit the Taiwanese.

Tu painted the picture that the educational reforms for Taiwan-centered education, which had been managed by the DPP government, was successful, in spite of strong opposition. As he said,

We have admittedly encountered incredible resistance and opposition during the stages of devising, proposing, and giving public hearings. Eventually, we overcome all these obstacles and officially launched our initiatives as planned. The main reason for our success is that we have had the public support of mainstream Taiwanese, whose subjectivity and consciousness had [sic] become stronger and stronger. Any reforms or changes in education are no more than the people’s
response to their needs and fulfilling their expectations. It is now an unstoppable tide for Taiwanese who are trying to find within their land, their own identity. (2007, p. 11)

The act he addressed in this statement is the work the DPP government has done to defend its Taiwan-focused education program from Chinese-centered supporters and to insist on Taiwan-centered education. The scene he addressed in his speech was that the Taiwanese need to have their own identity, and they have a need for native education to change the China-centered education that oppressed them in the past.

The pentad and ratios will be identified to reveal the rhetorical motives within the drama Tu created in his speech. His attitudes regarding Taiwan’s history, current situation, and future agenda were also expressed in this rhetorical act. As an agent, the Taiwanese government influences the attitudes of Taiwanese students to make a connection between the subjects they learned, such as language, literature, history, and geography. In Tu’s speech, Burke’s principles of the act, the agent, and the scene work together to make his persuasion effective. The act, which is the most important event performed by the agent, is represented in his speech as a continuum that presents the realization of self-knowledge in the time and place in which the Taiwanese live and the search for the Taiwanese people’s self-identity. The agency is how he described the hard work of Taiwan’s educational improvement in native education and values of the Taiwan-centered education.

The scene in which the orator believes the act (curriculum changes in the educational reform) takes place, is the setting in which the DPP government strived to end the China-centered curriculum and implement a Taiwan-centered curriculum and policy.
The scene, described by Tu, is a political setting where Taiwanese people were previously controlled by the KMT government that withdraw from mainland China, and is currently threatened by China. In Tu’s scene of the story about Taiwan, there is a need to make an important change to Taiwan’s education which would tell the real story about Taiwan to better their understanding of themselves and China. The KMT government would have a different perspective toward what Tu addressed. Therefore, Tu must redefine the scene from the KMT government’s perspective to emphasize the idea that the Taiwanese people had been oppressed and manipulated by the KMT government’s China-centered education. The new scene Tu redefined presented Taiwan as not being China and that the Taiwanese need to study a Taiwan-centered curriculum. Tu called attention to his redefined scene and presented his story conspicuously to call forth a response to the act. The act he suggested is to make changes in Taiwan’s curriculum in order to heighten the response to China’s threats and Taiwan’s self knowledge and identity. The KMT government was the agent misleading Taiwanese in the past. However, the DPP government is the new agent that will fulfill the purpose of Taiwan’s education and teach students about Taiwan and the threat of China. Tu praised Taiwanese educational reform and presented his government as an advocator of this new trend to help Taiwanese “find within their land, their own identity.”

In Tu’s speech, the KMT and DPP governments were both agents who led educational design. The Taiwanese government acted as the agent to determine the act, such as curriculum and policy. The government also had authority to tell the story of Taiwan through education. This is Burke’s example of the agent-act ratio, because the
nature of the agent determined the act; therefore, the nature of the agent consequently led to certain acts in the scene. Different agents might have different purposes, but the agent would always decide the act and have agency to fulfill their purpose. As a result, the nature of the agent and its act determines the story.

The former KMT government, which planned and implemented the language policies and curriculums, was the agent. Tu criticized the act, agency, purpose, and scene that were led and defined by the KMT. In Tu’s story, the KMT was the agent which determined the people’s understandings about China and Taiwan, and the KMT’s purpose and act were wrong. Tu stated that the knowledge people learned about themselves and China would influence their self-identity and view of China. When the agent (KMT) government did not portray an accurate view of scene, such as Taiwan is not China, it would always have a wrong act. The agent (KMT) would use its agency to mislead the people because the agent-act ratio would always determine the story. Tu redefined the scene to introduce the need of a new agent (DPP government). The new agent would have the act which responds to the redefined scene. As a result, the new agent would change the situation in Taiwan.

Tu described China’s threat against Taiwan as a reason to reconstruct the false China-centered education in Taiwan. Tu proclaimed that recognizing and responding to China’s threat is the reason to learn about China. The act was what the agent (the government) did about the curriculum and related language policies. This includes the part of curriculum design related to Chinese language and knowledge as an act to secure and foster Taiwan’s democracy. Also, implementing native education is an act to define
Taiwan's self-identity. In Tu's statement, the DPP Taiwanese government was a major force defending the country and people's understanding about the reality of the situation the Taiwanese people are in. Therefore, he stated that the KMT government's China-centered education made people misunderstand China and their relationship with China. However, the DPP government has developed the right curriculum to provide Taiwan-centered education.

"From the motivational point of view, there is implicit in the quality of a scene the quality of the action that is to take place within it" (Edelman, 1964, pp. 98-99) means that the act should be consistent with the scene (Burke, 1945, pp. 6-7). Therefore, after the DPP government redefined the scene, the acts will be consistent with the new scene and the new agent should take actions within the new scene. "In this sense scenes and acts both reinforce and motivate each other and also are spatially and temporally dynamic" (Edelman, 1964, p. 102). After the KMT political party lost the presidential election in 2000, the DPP government is the new agent who determined the political and education decisions. However, if the scene and the act is the same as the dramatic setting that the KMT presented, there will be no significance in having a new agent. Therefore, the DPP government had a need to redefine the scene, and thus there was a need for a new agent (new government) to gain people's attention and support for making changes. Therefore, Tu's speech has an Agent-act ratio in which the agent defined the scene and determined the acts.

The story Tu told in his speech showed that the agent-act ratio has a corresponding relationship between person (agent) and act. The old agent (the KMT
government) took the act (China-centered education and policy) in the scene and the new agent (the DPP government) called for the act (Taiwan-centered policy) by redefining the background (scene; Edelman, 1964, pp. 110-113). Introducing the background of Taiwan was the first part of Tu’s speech. Tu understood that identifying the background and redefining the scene from the KMT’s perspective was important for telling a persuasive story about Taiwan’s changes. “If people’s backgrounds are this important in shaping their values and responses, backgrounds have the most serious implication for policy formation” (Edelman, 1964, p. 111). Once the backgrounds have changed or been redefined, people (agent) have a need and drive to call for acts as responses to reflect their values. In the DPP claims-making, the DPP government is the agent who would have the correct act in the real situation of Taiwan (scene) to fulfill the purpose of Taiwan’s education.

By the logic of the agent-act ratio, if the agent has one certain characteristic or quality, the act invoked by this agent will assume the same quality no matter in which scene the agent lives. Because the agent will act along with the nature of the agent, the agent will define the scene that supported the acts. As Burke (1945) says, “the nature of acts and agents should be consistent with the nature of the scene;” there is a principle that the agent-act ratio would call for acts in keeping with scenes or scenes in keeping with acts (Burke, 1945, p. 3). Because the agent that implemented the act would define the scene as a background to support their act, the scene which was identified by Tu would “mold themselves and hence their political gestures through the choice of significant others, whose roles they take” (Edelman, 1964, p. 111). The old scene of the KMT was
redefined by the DPP and therefore raised a need for the new agent (the DPP) to call for the acts. The new agent (the DPP) and its acts (changes in education and policy) would be consistent with the nature of the scene Tu addressed to provide claims to support the acts.

The educational reform and language policy are the acts. The acts are implicitly contained in the quality of the agent. Different agents, such as the KMT or DPP government would have differently focused curriculum. The policies as the acts were adopted in certain situations as the scenes in Tu's statements. As a result, policies are acts that were necessary to be applied to Taiwan's situation (the scene) by the Taiwanese government (the agent).

Tu's speech showed that it was the nature of the KMT government (agent) to present a Chinese rather than a Taiwanese perception of identity (agency), and therefore it had a China-centered education and policy (act). On the contrary, the DPP government, as a new agent, would act in keeping with Taiwanese knowledge and help Taiwanese to respond to the real scene. Because of the agent-act ratio within his speech, Tu can connect the agent (the government) to the acts in his redefined scene to persuade people that it is a scene that they live in and call for supports to respond to the scene. If his story is persuasive, he could expect the people to support the government's act to make changes in education.

According to Burke's pentadic analysis, the purpose of the KMT within the speech of the Minister of Education Department is to teach Chinese language and culture to block Taiwanese self-knowledge and self-conscious. Tu presented the scene that Taiwanese people have been oppressed by different colonial governments. As Tu said in
his speech, “A large-scale migration of Han people from China began after the Dutch first colonized the island...212 years later, in 1894, after its defeat in a Sino-Japanese war, the Ch’ing government ceded Taiwan to Japan” (Tu, 2007, p. 4). The agent Tu addressed as a foreign power in his speech is the KMT government because it was the latest government that ruled Taiwan and set the China-centered education in Taiwan. Tu stated, “By the time the Nationalists (KMT) took over Taiwan in 1945...they [Taiwanese], once again, had to make drastic changes and major adjustments from learning a new language and culture to acquiring a new national identity” (2007, p. 5).

Tu described that the act of the agent (KMT) within this scene is to have China-centered education and policy to mislead Taiwanese people. Tu said, “The KMT has inculcated in Taiwanese society such contents as: ‘There is no such a thing as Taiwanese culture,’ ‘People living in Taiwan are all Chinese’” (2007, pp. 5-6). The agency within Tu’s speech is to present the KMT’s political control in education and Chinese identity. Tu illustrated “these impact came mostly through the means of education...Through the education mechanism, the rulers engineered the process of forming a new national character” (2007, p. 5). Because the agent (foreign powers) always controlled the act (policy and education) within the scene, the ratio within Tu’s speech is the agent-act ratio that the KMT government has the act of implementing China-centered education and policy. On the contrary, the DPP government as the agent would have as an implementation of Taiwan-centered education.

According to Burke’s pentad, the Taiwanese government (KMT in the past) was described as an agent, and its act to turn Taiwanese into Chinese through the Sinonization
education program was viewed as an agency in Tu’s speech. The purpose was to raise Chinese language and culture and block Taiwanese self-knowledge. The scene Tu presented about Taiwan’s education is that the Taiwanese students were oppressed and taught incorrect information by the KMT government. Taiwanese didn’t have a chance to know reality. He believed that “students should first know the place and the time that they are living in” (p. 10). He also emphasized that Taiwan has been under China’s threat by indicating that “it carries anti-Taiwan military exercise annually with 800 missiles aiming at this island and it never gives up with its attempts to take over Taiwan by force” (p. 10). He argued that Chinese-centered education in Taiwan was not appropriate for the Taiwanese in order to understand the reality about China.

The Applied Analysis of Social Problems Research

This section applies critical methods of social problems research to analyze the claims-making regarding language education and policy as educational and social problems for Taiwanese people. Claims-makers construct educational and social problems from their perspectives in the form of rhetorical actions, such as speech, law, and curriculum. In order to discern the meaning of their claims and determine appropriate actions to solve the problems, it is important to analyze the claims-making to understand the problems. Therefore, social problem researchers utilize textual or rhetorical analysis to understand the social problems as constructed by the claim-makers.

Social problem research has a background of social constructionism and contextual constructionism. Best (2003) has shown that some social problems are constructed by claims-makers in a way which misrepresents certain circumstances.
However, the claim-makers usually do not address the problems by considering the whole context of the educational and social problems, or they create the illusion of a larger problem to raise attention or support (Best, 2003). Therefore, the problems that Tu indicated regarding Taiwan’s past language education and policy will be analyzed based on the context of Taiwan. Tu’s claims pointed out some real problems in Taiwan, such as not all native Taiwanese languages and knowledge are taught in school. However, his perspective does not support the claim that the best way to solve it is through the DPP proposed changes in language education. People might not be able to determine whether the problems in education would be solved by his suggestions, but analyzing his claims-making would provide an opportunity to judge whether his statements are a misconstruction of educational and social problems in Taiwan. How his claims are judged is situation dependent. However, this section will present a different way of examining his claims by analyzing his claims-making and discussing the effects of his claims.

As Best (2003) demonstrates, social problems research, analyzing meanings of claims and the process of making claims about the problem is a constructive approach. In his article, “Rhetoric in Claims-Making: Constructing the Missing Children Problem,” he indicates that claims-making about missing children emphasized “missing” to including both runaways and child-snatchings as involving terrible risks in order to create the illusion that the problem is much bigger and more wide-spread than it really is (Best, 1987). There are some similar creations of illusion of Chinese education and policy problems in Tu’s speech. Tu claims that the major problem within the Chinese education in Taiwan is that the past education and policy is China-centered, but Taiwanese people
should have a Taiwan-centered education because “Taiwan-centered subjectivity has become the mainstream in the island-nation’s thinking” (Tu, 2007, p. 8).

Tu’s claims-making of Taiwan-centered education has two supportive claims. First of all, Taiwan is a nation that separated from China. As Tu says, “the term Chinese” and “Chinese culture” are merely two long-held concepts…The consciousness of Taiwanese subjectivity is based on the respect for the right of self-determination to which Taiwan’s inhabitants are entitled” (Tu, 2007, p. 9). Also, the ideal design of education is from local to global; “that is to say, students should first know the place and the time that they are living in” (p.10).

No matter what the Chinese government claims, the fact is that Taiwanese people have their own constitution and government. As a person who came from Taiwan, I have my passport issued by the Taiwanese government, not the Chinese government, and I can use this passport to travel throughout the world. Tu says, “After a long exposure to China-centered education, people living in Taiwan, consciously or subconsciously, have great difficulty in separating themselves from ‘Chinese culture’…cultural identity differs from national identity” (2007, p. 8). Tu provides this evidence himself in his speech, “the polls regarding the Taiwanese perception of their own identity clearly [reflect] that, when asked ‘Are you a Taiwanese or Chinese?’” (p. 8), the numbers who identify themselves as “Taiwanese” keeps increasing. The DPP only controlled the central government from 2000 to 2007. Therefore, most of the people who were able to answer those polls received “China-centered education” from the KMT government and can speak Mandarin Chinese because it is the official language. Tu uses these polls to show that “Taiwan-centered
subjectivity has become the mainstream in the island-nation’s thinking” (p. 8). However, it seems like he is the person who does not separate cultural identity and national identity, not the Taiwanese people like he assumed, because the polls have showed that people who speak Mandarin and received “China-centered education” still consider themselves as “Taiwanese.”

Moreover, language and culture are related to national identity, but using the same language and sharing the same knowledge does not necessarily threaten national identity. For example, no one would doubt that the United States is a sovereign nation even though Americans speak English and study Shakespeare as do the British. When Americans won independence and separated from Britain, their native language remained English as in British. Thomas Paine grew up under Britain education, but he wrote *Common Sense* to advocate colonial America’s independence from the Kingdom of Great Britain. Americans wrote the *Federalist Papers* in English. The history of the United State shows that using the same language and sharing the same culture will not necessarily confuse people’s sense of national identity. The fact that Taiwanese people speak Mandarin Chinese and study Chinese culture does not mean that Taiwan is not an independent nation with its own national identity.

Tu also emphasizes that students should learn knowledge and language “from local to global; that is to say,...first know the place and the time that they are living in” (2007, p.10). Is this a common consensus? Because his language education was controversial in Taiwan, there is not a common consensus on his educational view (Xue, 2008c; Wang, 2008). One might argue that people first know the knowledge and language
in their place and time, so they spend their time and money for education to know something they do not know from their own experiences. My first language is Mandarin Chinese and I have some general information and knowledge about Taiwan because I lived there for years. Even if I did not go to school, I could watch television and know people living in Taiwan. If I have limited time, I would hope that I could learn English or other languages, and have some knowledge about other countries. If I only have very limited time, I will realize that I can learn language and knowledge about Taiwan from my own experience and should improve my knowledge about other places and language skills for other languages. Education should open more windows for me to understand the world and any other valuable knowledge.

Tu says “from an educational view, I think we should pay more attention to the educational theories lying behind the philosophy of designing such a new course” (2007, p. 10). However, he never really established that the design of learning from local to global is the only educational view or the best educational theory. As a claim-maker, it is his responsibility to explain why learning from local to global for knowledge and language to support his agenda of teaching the Taiwanese knowledge and language rather than Chinese is the best way for Taiwanese student’s education.

Moreover, his claim did not include the rationale to support only teaching certain languages by reducing class time for Mandarin Chinese. Because Mandarin Chinese is still the most commonly used language in Taiwan, he did not warrant that all students must learn other languages used in Taiwan as their native languages, such as Taiwanese (Minnan/Ho-lo/Hoklo) or Kakka. Even more, when there are more and more cross-
country marriages in Taiwan, especially women coming from Vietnam to marry Taiwanese men, should students learn Vietnamese in school if their mothers is from Vietnam and Vietnamese becomes a local language in their villages? When there are more and more mail-order brides or interracial marriages in Taiwan, should students learn their mothers’ language? Where is Tu’s idea of learning a native language and the knowledge associated with it from local to global? Tu used the idea of “local to global” to support his native language and knowledge in education, but this perspective about students’ learning is only one perspective for education. How does one identity the “local language?” When we have more and more non-native spouses in Taiwan, how many languages does the government want to include in school as “native languages” based on the concept of “learning language and knowledge from local to global?” (Tu, 2007, p. 10).

Also, with a diversity of languages and ethnic groups in one place, it is difficult to identify “local language” and ask students to learn one specific native language in school. Because it is difficult to identify “native” and “local,” it will be unfair to exclude any kind of languages used in Taiwan. However, including all different languages courses in school as a part of native education is unfair to students as well. Students already have a lot of subjects to learn in school and they might not consider the language courses offered in their school as their native or local language.

Moreover, what is the purpose for students to receive education? Tu’s claim-making implies that students have to learn one native language as a Taiwanese national. However, education also has practical purposes for professional preparation. With limited time in school, students might want to spend their time learning a second foreign language,
such as Japanese or French. Tu's claim-making, which says that students should learn language from local to global, ignores that there are different educational views of learning language and where children should learn their native languages. For example, a lot of immigrants living in the U.S. learn their native languages from their family or living environment rather than studying them as a subject in school. For the people who fail to learn their native languages, it might mean that English is enough for them to communicate. There are few opportunities for them to use their native languages. Therefore, they become native English speakers, because there is no necessity for them to learn other native languages.

Also, even if the government could include all native Taiwanese languages as a part of the language curriculum and policy, schools could never provide equal learning opportunity for every native language because the government is short in budget for education (Xu, 2008). Also, there are problems the government cannot solve in native education, such as there being few licensed native language teachers, teaching materials do not transition to all levels, and parents do not support the policy (Weng, 2006). Therefore, it is unfair because students will have to learn a language that is not their ethnic language. Because schools cannot offer every native language for their students and the governments cannot provide sufficient resources and licensed teachers to support this policy, students will have one more painful subject to learn in school. Thus, the idea of language equality will actually exclude some ethnic groups whose languages are not listed in the law or taught in school.
Tu cannot show that students must learn the language and knowledge from local to global to be a well-educated citizen of Taiwan. Also, he cannot prove that the “China-centered” education, which he blames in his speech, did in fact change the Taiwanese people’s understanding of China and their national identity. Since he and those who support his party went through “China-centered” education, it is obvious that China-centered education, implemented by the KMT, did not change their understanding and identity. Even if his claims regarding Taiwan-centered education were correct, his policy of native language education still lacks for need and resources.

The Proposed Language Equality Act

This section analyzes the proposed language equality act. This section will build the groundwork for understanding the DPP government’s language policy and curriculum changes. Because the proposed language equality act would become a foundation of processing the changes in society, it shows the DPP government’s ideology and procedures with its language policy.

Ideas of Language Equality

In the language equality law itself, the stated purpose of the law was to preserve the rights of every ethnic group in the country to use its own language while participating in public affairs, such as politics, the economy, religion, education, culture, etc. In the second act, it states that the national languages (official languages) includes all Taiwanese indigenous languages, Hakka, South Min (Ho-lo), and Chinese (Mandarin Chinese; Educational Department, 2003). Research has found that the KMT government’s language policy tended to reduce the use of other native languages in Taiwan and uphold Mandarin
Chinese as the national language before 1989 (Huang, 2008, pp. 53-59). However, it also shows that the KMT government made some changes in language policy and education between 1989-1993 in order to solve the conflicts regarding different language usage in Taiwan (pp. 59-73). The unequal language usage and education in Taiwanese and the fact that the former KMT government did not respect and preserve the native languages in Taiwan equally warrant language equality being imposed by law according to the DPP (pp. 446-447).

The agent of the pentad in this proposal can be understood to be the Taiwanese government because it will use its power to ensure language equality. The agency is how the government changed policies in different areas, such as public service and education. These actions would be imposed by the government’s political power; therefore, the agency is a series of changes by the government’s hand. The act includes curriculum changes in order to provide language courses to teach different national languages of Taiwan.

The proposed act requires several changes to be made to ensure language equality. The eighth act says that every level of government has to provide proper courses to teach all the national languages as well as offer related courses, such as history and culture, to facilitate language and cultural communication across ethnic groups. The seventeenth act proposed changing the names of such things as streets, rivers, tribes, roads, and organizations from their Mandarin Chinese names to native language names which have local meanings. The eighteenth act states that the central government should set up national public media to broadcast in Taiwanese indigenous languages, Hakka and Ho-lo,
to both help preserve them and encourage other media to do the same. The nineteenth, twentieth, and twenty-first acts encourage people to learn national languages. Learning opportunities for government officials were provided, and their proficiency in native languages would be considered as a part of their promotion to encourage them to provide proper services for Taiwanese people.

Burke (1945) says that “a legal constitution is an act or body of acts (or enactments), done by agents (such as rulers, magistrates, or other representative persons), and designed (purpose) to serve as a motivational ground (scene) of subsequent actions, it being thus an instrument (agency) for the shaping of human relations” (p. 341). Burke (1945) discusses the meaning of a constitution and investigates the motives behind it as an example of his rhetorical analysis (pp. 341-445). Based on the same perspective, the law of language equality is an act done by agents when the government organized to propose this law. It was made to serve as a scene that Mandarin Chinese would no longer be the dominant language in Taiwan, and all other languages would be equally present. The acts of the law are subsequent actions as an instrument (agency) for the shaping of new human relations in society.

A constitution is a legal document as a body of acts, and this proposal of law is an enactment as well. “A constitution is a substance— and as such, it is a set of motives” (Burke, 1945, p. 342). When a law is imposed upon people, it is “a given complex of customs and values” (p. 342). When a society does not have a common set of customs or values, the government’s intention of implementing a policy might be felt as oppressive by certain groups. Policy that the government implements by law may appear as
representative of shared customs or values, but this action might also create controversy and even endanger the possibility of forming a common identification for society (Burke, 1950). Because the rhetoric of a constitution represents values and expects people to live by these values, Burke says this kind of document is “designed to serve as motives for shaping or transforming behavior” (Burke, 1945, p. 342). Burke (1945) suggested a way to justify the vision. A vision needs to be judged by “moral grandeur and stylistic felicity” (p. 345). However, a law has to be concerned with practicality. The law provides a vision of Taiwan’s language equality, but the government is not concerned about the tests of practicability. The claims-making should be examined as to whether or not the actions that are addressed in the law are practical. Because the effect of implementing a law depends on the support of the people, it is important to provide a persuasive claim to warrant the proposed actions. The government should design a policy to correspond to the language usage in practice. It should provide actions that match the values of the equality of languages for it to successfully change people’s customs and values.

Burke says that a constitution “as a ‘substance’ (hence, as a structure of motivation) propounds certain desires, commands, or wishes” (1945, p. 360). A constitution provides a vision for its country and represents the authors’ desires and wishes. Once it is approved, it commands its people to demonstrate what is written for all people in the same country. It contains people’s values and visions. A constitution is an idealistic agenda because it characterizes both the agent who makes the law and the agent who would be affected as the same group of people who share the same values and visions. A constitution is written by the agent who proposes the law to the agent who governs
(Burke, 1945, p. 360). Burke also says, “a Constitution is addressed by the first person to the second person” (1945, p. 360). The first person is those who proposed the constitution, and the second person is the people who are governed by the constitution. The first person wrote a constitution to commend the second person, but the first person is also a part of the second person. The constitution is a body of acts that drives the agent to complete the vision. The first person is the agent who determines the acts and the second person is the agent (all people in the country) who acts. The act, which is a constitution itself, determines the desires, commends, or wishes of the people (agent). According to Burke (1945), the ratio of the pentad in a constitution could be viewed as an act-agent because a constitution is the act that was addressed by one agent (the legal power) to a different agent (people) to determine the acts. For the same reason, the proposal of language equality has an act-agent ratio because the proposed act commends people to demonstrate what the DPP government’s desire and wishes are for all people in Taiwan.

A study which analyzed the news related to Taiwan’s language policy between 1987 and 2000 indicated that the government leaders (KMT) dominated the policy and determined the direction of language education (Wu, 2005). After 2000, because the DPP took office, there were different actions taken in language education depending upon the different local governments. For example, there were some local governments that encouraged native education for more native languages and cultures than before. Most leaders of these local governments were DPP members (Wu, 2005). Some local governments implemented the native language curriculum in their schools but did not work to ensure effective teaching. Some local governments did not have a clear policy and
so allowed the schools to decide how they would execute native curriculum and education (Wu, 2005). However, not all local governments implemented native language education in their schools. This policy of native language education was advocated by the DPP, but the central government did not have budget and design to meet the needs of education in order to implement the policy in all local governments. Even though the DPP government pursued the Language Equality Law to encourage native language education by its political power, it did not result in all native languages having an equal position, and it did not change the position of Mandarin Chinese as the only official language in Taiwan where the local governments were not all controlled by the DPP.

It is probably politically correct to agree that native languages should be respected and preserved. However, there is controversy about education in, and usage of, Mandarin Chinese and Taiwanese (Wu, 2005). Other native-tongue languages, such as Hakka or a variety of aboriginal languages, are not used as commonly as the Taiwanese language (Ho-lo). When there are not enough native language teachers and learners for Hakka and aboriginal languages, promoting native-tongue languages is akin to promoting the Taiwanese language (Ho-lo). When the DPP government does not provide sufficient resources for schools to provide instruction all of the native languages, Taiwanese (Ho-lo) tends to be chosen as a native language course in schools because Ho-lo is the native language most commonly spoken among different ethnic groups and has the largest population of speakers among the native languages in Taiwan (Huang, 2008, pp. 149-155). Native language education requires qualified teachers and a phonetic system (pinyin) for native-tongue language learning. Most of the native language courses lack qualified
teachers and resources, except for the teaching of Ho-lo (Weng, 2006). The goal of the Language Equality Law is to make all languages equal. However, implementing native language education did not make Hakka, aboriginal languages, and Ho-lo equal.

The Claim-Making Regarding the Proposal of Language Equality

Following the rhetorical analysis of language equality in the last section, the first part of this section will examine the purpose of the Language Equality Law as a claim and discuss if it is the claim-making that reflects the problems in Taiwan. Secondly, the law will be evaluated to discern whether the outcomes will fulfil the purpose of the law.

According to the law, the purpose of the Language Equality Law is to preserve the rights of every ethnic group in the country to use its own language in order to ensure freedom of language use. The native languages that are listed in the act include all Taiwanese indigenous languages, Hakka, Ho-lo (the Taiwanese) and Mandarin Chinese (Educational Department, 2003). The important questions that the government should have answered before proposing this law are “How many ethnic groups are in Taiwan?” and “Which languages are at risk in Taiwan?” This is because if the government is to ensure all ethnic groups and languages equality in law, they must be able to list all ethnic groups and know how their languages are being used. The government has decided which ones should be considered as Taiwan’s native languages and preserved. Because language equality is the purpose of the act, the government’s claims-making regarding this Language Equality Law should help every ethnic group in the country to ensure the usage of their languages equally. To support the native languages, which are at risk, the government needs to know the usage of every language used in Taiwan.
According to the most current report of the Department of Household Registration of the Ministry of the Interior (2003), there were 240,000 non-native spouses in Taiwan. There were 140,000 non-native spouses who came from mainland China. Out of the 100,000 who came from other areas, 57.5% were Vietnamese. Indonesians were 23.2%, as well as smaller numbers from different countries, such as Thailand and Russia. The majority of the population of the non-native spouses in Taiwan are from mainland China, but even they are from different provinces with different dialects. Seventy percent of the non-native spouses had children with their Taiwanese spouses (Department of Household Registration, 2003). The government's language equality proposal obviously excludes some ethnic groups in Taiwan and does not secure them the right of their language use. In addition, there are many non-nationals who work in Taiwan. They are usually from the Philippines or Indonesia, although some workers are from other countries as well.

The proposed Language Equality Law does not include every ethnic group in Taiwan. In fact, it ignores some ethnic groups living in Taiwan by denying their right to use their language equally or identifying themselves as Taiwanese. There are more ethnic groups living in Taiwan than the ethnic languages listed in the Language Equality Law. Therefore, the action that listed these ethnic languages in the law was an action that excluded the ethnic groups from sharing Taiwanese identity because their native languages are not protected by the language equality act. Moreover, when the non-native spouses married “Taiwanese,” their children actually are forced to learn a “native” language which is not their ethnic language. For example, there are Vietnamese women
who married Taiwanese men and their children’s mother tongue is Vietnamese. Their children could feel confused when the native language education is addressed as “speaking our mother’s language.” How we define “native” language will be an educational and social problem because Taiwanese people might have different native languages which are not included in the law or may not be taught in their school.

According to the report of the Council of Indigenous Peoples of Executive Yuan in Taiwan, there are 494,000 indigenous status persons in Taiwan, which represents about 1.9% of the total population of Taiwan (Council of Indigenous People, 2009). The Taiwanese indigenous groups include Atayal, Saisiyat, Bunun, Tsou, Rukai, Paiwan, Puyuma, Amis, Yami, Thao, Kavalan, and Truku, which make up the fourteen indigenous tribes of Taiwan. Tribal membership varies in size. As an example, the website of the Council of Indigenous shows Yami with a population of more than 2,700 (Council of Indigenous People, 2009). The population the Yami Taiwanese indigenous group is thus a much smaller population than Vietnamese spouses in Taiwan.

Mandarin has been the official language in Taiwan, almost all Taiwanese people know Mandarin regardless of their ethnicity (Huang, 2008, p. 144). Even though the government includes the native languages listed in the proposal to be official languages, the language equality in Taiwan is still not equal. The schools are not able to provide all language courses and people still cannot understand some native languages, such as indigenous languages. The government would spend a lot of resources to make all of them official languages. However, the claims-making that the purpose of the Language Equality Law is to preserve the rights of every ethnic group in the country to use its own language
in order to ensure the freedom of language is only a construction which would separate some groups and their languages from native Taiwanese.

If the DPP government really cares about language equality, the primary concern should be to provide educational opportunity for these new immigrants in Taiwan and have language services in the government organizations for them. The Taiwan-centered education is not necessary to connect with language learning in school. In 2008, there were two movies made in Ho-lo (Cape No. 7.) and Hakka (the Legend of Formosa in 1895) which were shown in the movie theaters, and the one made in Ho-lo was the best selling Taiwanese movie in the last ten years. The script of the movie in Hakka was written by a Taiwanese writer; the story was about how Taiwanese people defended the Japanese army when the Chinese Manchu (Ching) Dynasty ceded Taiwan to Japan. This movie was the first movie in Hakka. Although its box office was not as good as the Cape No. 7, it was moderately successful (“President Ma,” 2008). There are ways of preserving Taiwanese native languages without reducing the time and resources for Mandarin Chinese instruction. Some ways might be even more effective than teaching the languages in school, such as producing better quality TV programs or movies, such as The Legend of Formosa in 1895.

If we are concerned about the protection of a language, the first thing to do is evaluate whether the language is in danger. There is no official report about levels of use of and proficiency in the different native languages. However, from my own experience and several published surveys, Ho-lo (the Taiwanese) is not in danger (Huang, 2008, pp. 149-159). My hometown is in Taichung, which is the third largest city, in central Taiwan.
When I would go to the market with my mother, it seemed every seller spoke Taiwanese. From my experiences, Taiwanese is commonly used in daily life. My mother would not be considered as a Taiwanese but a mainlander because her ethnic group is not Hakka or South Min (Brubaker, 2003). However, her Taiwanese language skills are very good because not only did she grow up in Taiwan, with a lot of Taiwanese friends, but also because she is an elementary school teacher and her students’ families speak Taiwanese as their native language. There are also many TV programs using the Taiwanese language. Researchers estimate that about 82.5% of Taiwanese can speak both Mandarin and Taiwanese (Ho-lo) and 17.5% of Taiwanese cannot speak Mandarin at all, based on a 1990 survey (Huang, 2008, p. 229). Among the mainlanders, such as my mother, 60% can speak Ho-lo (Wang, 2008, p. 229). Also, about 70% of Hakka and 40% of the Taiwanese indigenous people can speak Ho-lo (Huang, 2008, p. 229). This result shows that different ethnic groups living in Taiwan commonly learned the Ho-lo language even though the Mandarin is the official language in Taiwan.

Mandarin is the only official language according to the national language policy, which had been implemented by the KMT government since 1945 (Huang, 2008, pp. 102-120). However, Huang (2008) found that during this time only 1% of Ho-lo lost their native language, but 22.4% to 26.4% of Hakka lost their native language (p. 146). After comparing the native language ability for children who speak a native language at home and learn Mandarin Chinese in school, the researcher found that the dialects from mainland China that these children speak at home are the only native languages where the skills decreased compared to Mandarin Chinese, Hakka, Ho-lo, Japanese, or English.
(Huang, 2008, p. 147). Because the users of different provincial dialects from mainland China often use Mandarin as well, their native language becomes Mandarin Chinese (p. 159). Therefore, the dialects of different provinces in mainland China are languages at most risk in Taiwan. In the research that compared Ho-lo, Hakka, and the Chinese dialects, the results show that only Taiwanese (Ho-lo) language usage increased over generations (p. 159). Thus, the Taiwanese language (Ho-lo) is not a native language that needs to be protected.

There are ways to preserve the native languages other than implementing native language education in school. For example, there are six wireless TV stations in Taiwan, of which three channels were designed to use Ho-lo (FTV), Hakka (HAKKTV/HTV), and Taiwanese indigenous languages (TITV). The Taiwanese language (Ho-lo) is also used on other channels in both wireless and cable stations in Taiwan. There is also one public TV station that offers TV programs that serve educational purposes. The usage of these languages on these channels shows that these native languages can be preserved and taught through to their use on wireless stations.

Research shows that Hakka and the indigenous languages are at risk of not being passed on to younger generations, but the reason seems not to be Mandarin language education and policy. For example, research on the three generation of Hakka shows that the Hakka people who live in Yunlin and Changhua (middle areas of the west Taiwan) have already lost their Hakka language ability, and since 1900, more than 60% of them identify themselves as Ho-lo (Huang, 2008, pp. 301-317). Because the areas where these Hakka people live have a large number of Ho-lo, they now speak Ho-lo as their native
language. The Ho-lo identity overtook the Hakka about 100 to 120 years ago (p. 317).
The Ho-lo language is not the native language that needs to be taught in school and
preserved through political power, because it is still active in a large population. Hakka
people, who are scattered among other ethnic groups, do not use their native language and
have, to a great degree, lost both their language and identity. The research shows that the
frequency of using Ho-lo at home for Ho-lo people is stronger than Hakka (p. 195). For
areas that have greater numbers of Hakka, such as Taoyuan, where they make up 48.2 %
of the population, the native languages for both Ho-lo and Hakka are maintained well (pp.
192-193). To preserve the Hakka language, removing Mandarin as the official language is
not the solution. The Hakka language needs more opportunities to be used as is Ho-lo.
Research suggests that Hakka parents should speak Hakka with their children at home if
they want to maintain their native language into the next generation because compared to
Ho-lo native speakers, Hakka has a lower percentage of persons speaking Hakka at home
(pp. 193-196).

Native Languages at Risk

The native languages that are in great danger are the Taiwanese indigenous
languages. The Taiwanese indigenous people are only 1.9 % (includes all different tribes
which have different languages) of the whole population of Taiwan and are scattered
throughout the country (Huang, 2008, p. 258). They are fewer in number than the Hakka
and have more difficulty living together in certain areas. Because there are few Taiwanese
indigenous people, they often interact and marry with people of different ethnicity. They
have little need to use their own native language. The loss of their native languages is only
one threat to the Taiwanese indigenous people. As cited in Huang (2008), evidence shows that they have problems receiving good education, finding jobs, and respecting their own language and culture because of their low social status in Taiwan (pp. 186-187). Their income is much lower than the average Taiwanese, and concern has been expressed that most of the Taiwanese indigenous women become prostitutes (p. 186).

The Taiwanese indigenous people need educational and economic assistance, but simply listing their native languages as official languages will not help their situation. Because the small population and limited area they lived, their languages are not passed on as Ho-lo. Implementing native language education also cannot ensure their language usage, because they will likely leave their homes to work in a city, where they will communicate in the more commonly used languages of other ethnic groups.

Compared to the Taiwanese language (Ho-lo) and Hakka, the Taiwanese indigenous languages are the most at risk. However, there is the Council of Indigenous Peoples of Executive Yuan in Taiwan. This is a central government organization for indigenous affairs. The Taiwanese indigenous people also have separate seats in elections, additional points on the standard exams, special offers on loans, and special opportunities to work in the government or get funding from the government for study abroad. The government has an affirmative action program for Taiwanese indigenous groups.

Because the Taiwanese language (Ho-lo) is still commonly used in the society, it is not viewed as being at risk. There are the Council for Hakka Affairs and the Taiwanese Indigenous of the Executive Yuan as central government organizations to help preserve their languages and cultures. The Language Equality Law ignores this evidence to
overstate the loss of the native languages, especially the Ho-lo language. In addition, the
government lacks evidence that preserving these native languages can be successful
through education and communication media rather than the current methods.

The fourth act of the Language Equality Law says that the nation should include
and respect all native languages because they are Taiwan’s cultural property, especially
the Taiwanese indigenous languages, Hakka, and Ho-lo (Educational Department, 2003).
People usually use the name “Taiwanese language” to refer to the language of Ho-lo
(Minnan/Hoklo). When the government only listed the indigenous languages, Hakka and
Ho-lo as the Taiwanese native languages, other languages, such as Mandarin Chinese
which is called “Chinese” rather than a national language in the act, would be considered
not a part of native Taiwanese. Therefore, the government could utilize the idea of
language equality to create the specific Taiwanese identification for people who speak
Ho-lo, Hakka, and indigenous languages. The statement implies that only native speakers
of Hakka and Ho-lo are native Taiwanese, even though ethnically they are also Han
groups from mainland China, who are different from the Austronesian Taiwanese
aborigines (Hong, 2004). Hakka and Ho-lo people are ethnically Chinese and belong to
Chinese culture. Only the Taiwanese aborigines are not Chinese and have cultures that are
substantially different from Chinese cultures (Hong, 2004). However, the government
separated the Taiwanese language and the Mandarin Chinese in the language equality law.
Because the government created a native Taiwanese identification for Ho-lo, Hakka, and
indigenous languages, this identification became a separation for Mandarin Chinese.
Chinese education and native Mandarin Chinese speakers would be labelled differently from Taiwan’s native education and native Ho-lo and Hakka speakers.

Under this law, native Mandarin Chinese speakers become Taiwanese who have a native language called Chinese, rather than simply speaking the national language as before. For other ethnic groups, such as non-native spouses or workers, their native languages become another label to show that they are not Taiwanese. Also, because Ho-lo, Hakka, and indigenous languages are all listed as national languages and Mandarin Chinese is no longer the only national language, there is no one specific language to unify all people as Taiwanese who speak the same language. As an example, in the U.S.A., there are many immigrants who came from different parts of the world, but they learn English in order to communicate with each other. The U.S. government could provide language services to certain language groups; it encourages all immigrants to learn English. When the Taiwanese government listed many native languages as national languages, it essentially said that there was no single national language. The fact is that proposing a law to ensure language equality does not ensure the usage of every language in Taiwan, but Mandarin Chinese loses the position of the national language.

Creating Identification with the Language Equality Law

In order to analyze how the Taiwanese government utilized the proposal of Language Equity Law to call forth an enhanced consciousness of Taiwanese identity among Taiwanese people, I employ Kenneth Burke’s work on identification (Burke, 1950) as a theoretical guide.
Burke describes communication as a dramatistic process, which shows claim-makers' motives within their words. The political statement and legal documents regarding policy changes are the government's mode of communication with the Taiwanese people. The government which proposed this law is a claim-maker, and the purpose of this analysis is to reveal the process of its claim-making.

Burke's pentad and identification usually work together in communication because the pentad structures the story, and identification works to connect with people and persuade them to believe the story. Every drama has its particular logic of the pentad, but a successful drama usually involves identification to affect audiences. As Brock et al. (1990) state,

Identification is the major tool used to discover the attitudes and the dramatistic process; the pentad provides a structural model for their description. Burke's dramatistic approach to rhetoric supplies a language that describes people as they respond to their world, but to be useful to critics, this language must be transformed into a more definite structure. Two concepts are basic to such a structure: identification and the pentad. (p. 186)

The pentad is a method to clarify terms used in the text, and identification is a strategy used to affect audiences. When a text is analyzed, the grammar of rhetoric and the goal of rhetoric are two important parts to study.

Burke's concept of identification is applied to the statements of this proposal to discuss why the government pursued the Language Equity Law. The purpose of preserving languages in Taiwan and providing an equal position for every ethnic group in Taiwan is the reason that the government designed the curriculum and policy changes. Therefore, the analysis of the Language Equality Law can also explain the reason for changing language curriculum in education. The analysis of the government's claims-
making also shows how the claims are identified with the audiences. The proposed law and curriculum are government actions. Why the government implements these actions and how the claim-making persuades people are important to understand. Speakers persuade audiences to identify with their interests, even though they might not have interests in common. If identification is the aim of communication, the effect of political or legal statements could be analyzed to make an evaluation on the usage of identification. Therefore, analyzing identification used in drama can reveal political agendas and evaluate their effectiveness.

When Burke describes identification in *A Rhetoric of Motives*, he sees identification as an “acting together” that grows out of the ambiguities of substance (1950, p. 21). A drama creates a meaning from ambiguities of substance. The storyteller and audience will determine the meaning of the ambiguities of substance. Identification is the method to connect the speaker and audience so that they act together to construct the reality of substance. Identification occurs when peoples’ interests are joined with the rhetors (claim-makers), or they feel their interests are similar to the rhetors’. Burke illustrates, “A is not identical with his colleague B, but insofar as their interests are joined, A is identified with B” (1950, p. 20). Also, A may identify with B if he/she assumes that their interests are joined, or he/she is persuaded to believe this claim (1950, p. 20). As a result, identification occurs when people have the same interests or are persuaded to assume that their interests are the same. As Burke (1950) states, “Rhetoric deals with the possibilities of classification in its partisan aspects” (p. 22).
Burke argues that ambiguities of substance appear here because A is both joined to B and separate from B. As Burke (1950) explains,

In being identified with B, A is “substantially one” with a person other than himself. Yet at the same time he remains unique, an individual locus of motives. Thus he is both joined and separate, at once a distinct substance and consubstantial with another. (p.21)

As a result, two persons may be identified with each other in terms of something they share in common, but the identification does not change their difference. “To identify A with B is to make A ‘consubstantial’ with B” and “men have common sensations, concepts, images, ideas, attitudes that make them consubstantial” (Burke, 1950, p.21).

Identification will build unity for audiences in a sense of having the same interest with the speakers, but it does not mean that the speakers and audiences have the same characters or could benefit from the same interest. They might live a very different life in reality and have different concerns in mind even if they both share the same identification for supporting one issue. Identification occurs within audiences when people feel that they can identify themselves in a manner of believing the story they heard.

People have to understand that the claims-making of the government is a political act and might not present the whole story. As Edelman (1964) says, “Practically every political act that is controversial or regarded as really important is bound to serve in part as a condensation symbol” (p. 7). Identification used in Tu’s speech regarding native language education and policy is a political act that “symbolizes a threat or reassurance” when “it evokes a quiescent or an aroused mass response” (Edelman, 1964, p. 7).

People experience social division and unity simultaneously. Persuasion is meant to combine speakers and audiences through identification in communication. Identification
is a process of unifying people, but it is dangerous if people do not realize that politicians intentionally use ambiguity of language to persuade more people to align with them.

Burke (1989) notes this in *On Symbols and Society*:

> Since identification implies division, we found rhetoric involving us in matters of socialization and faction. Here was a wavering line between peace and conflict, since identification is got by property, which is ambivalently a motive of both morality and strife. (p.190)

Identification is a property which people may agree and support, but it may also cause strife because it separates people who are different. The rhetors create property for identification, but the identification has a motive for both unity and difference. Audiences experience division because each person remains unique, and they experience unity or “consubstantiality” to the extent that they have common attitudes and beliefs (Burke, 1950, p. 21). This concept helps explain how rhetoric is used “to the extent that audiences accept and reject the same ideas, people, and institutions that the speakers do, identification occurs” (Brock et al., 1990, p. 187). Therefore, divisions among people are a byproduct of rhetoric when a rhetor establishes unity. Identification works in rhetoric with a simultaneous unity and division. It will cause them to unite with speakers, but when people turn to one group rather than another, it also divides them from the other groups.

Applying this insight of Burke’s to the situation in Taiwan, the study of text allows one to examine the possibilities of identification. The claim-maker seeks to establish among audiences identification with one rather than another entity. For example, the Taiwanese government might use the idea of equality rather than that of preserving the dying languages of different ethnic groups. Therefore, Burke acknowledges that “For one need not scrutinize the concept of ‘identification’ very sharply to see […] its ironic
counterpart: division” (1950, p. 23). Consciously or unconsciously, people's words reveal their attitudes or stylized answers to the obvious divisions. The situation is the most important element for identification because “identification is compensatory to division” (p. 23). Burke admits that “If men were not apart from one another, there would be no need for the rhetorician to proclaim their unity” (1950, p. 22). His thought reveals the nature of identification and warns readers of its potential damage, a danger of division.

Applying the idea of identification to the DPP's claims, the means and effects of identification can be traced in the words. The first act of the Language Equality Law states that “the purpose of this law is to preserve every ethnic group in the nation and allow its participation in politics, economy, religion, education, culture, etc.” (Proposal of Language Equality Law, 2003). The first act also says that the usage and preservation of every ethnic group's language should not be limited (Proposal of Language Equality Law). The government has taken the term “ethnic groups that are especially listed as Ho-lo, Hakka, and Taiwanese indigenous groups” as “every ethnic group living in Taiwan.” Also, when the proposal lists all languages as official languages or national languages, it has changed the term “national language” that refers to Mandarin Chinese to all languages used in Taiwan.

However, the term “Taiwanese language” refers to Ho-lo even though there are Chinese people living in Fujian of mainland China (Minnan area of China) also using this language. The government changed the term “national language or official language” that refers to Mandarin Chinese. When both Mandarin and Minnan (Ho-lo) are one kind of Chinese language, the government uses the term “Taiwanese” as “Minnan/Ho-lo” and
changed “Mandarin Chinese” to “Chinese.” The claims-making indicated the “Minnan/Ho-lo” as Taiwanese and referred to the “Mandarin Chinese” as Chinese. This action is to create an identification for Ho-lo speakers to identify with the idea that Ho-lo is the language for Taiwanese people. People who do not or cannot speak Ho-lo are Chinese because they speak Chinese as their native language rather than the Taiwanese language (Ho-lo).

The wider scope of “ethnic groups,” as the term used for every ethnic group living in Taiwan, was intended to create identification for all audiences to have a similarity. However, this action turned out to create separation between Taiwanese and Chinese, because only the ethnic groups’ native languages listed in the law are considered Taiwanese people. Because Mandarin Chinese was called the Chinese language rather than the national language as before, people who can only speak Mandarin Chinese would be considered Chinese. Other ethnic groups, such as non-native spouses who speak Vietnamese, will not be included as Taiwanese even though they live in Taiwan. This separation from identification of Taiwanese could refer to the names of different languages, such as Ho-lo and Mandarin Chinese, but could also refer to the people who use these languages as their native languages. As a result, the act’s claims are that people who speak Ho-lo as a native language, which is called the Taiwanese language, and that people who cannot speak Ho-lo are not native Taiwanese, such as people who only speak Mandarin Chinese. This claim-making also implied that people who can only speak Mandarin Chinese may not have Taiwanese identity because they cannot speak the Taiwanese language.
Burke (1950) described about how to change a meaning for a term to build a basis for people to identify with a claim. Burke (1950) stated that “Slaying” is a negative term for killing people, but it can be changed to be a more neutral term with a wider scope. “Slaying” can be described as “a special case of transformation” rather than “killing” which people might associate with an immoral action. Because “slaying” is viewed as a transformation, “the killing of something is the change of it.” Therefore, based on people’s choice of identification, they “can treat ‘war’ as a ‘special case of peace’-not as a primary motive in itself, not as essentially real, but purely as a derivative condition, a perversion” (Burke, 1950, p. 20). “Slaying” could become a special case of transformation in a war as an action to bring peace. In like manner, it would sound bad to come right out and say that certain inhabitants of Taiwan are not really Taiwanese, or do not share a Taiwanese identity, as it would to talk about killing in Burke’s example. Instead, by taking a more neutral, even positive tone of supporting minority languages, it conceals the fact that it will label many native Taiwanese people as being non-Taiwanese in identity. Reducing equity to some groups, then, becomes a way of creating “equality”.

Identification occurs when a form of similarity is established. Similarity depends on how classification is established. Word choice is essential to establish classification. The more ambiguous terms a rhetor chooses, the more different classifications he or she involves. Burke confirms that “When attempting to extend one’s classification into new regions of inference, one necessarily hits upon analogical extensions or linguistic inventions, not sanctioned by the previous usages of his group” (1935, p.136-137). He uses “walking” as an example of “analogical extension.” A child who is learning how to
walk may balance his/her body and move a little. This “walking” is different from a walking act such as walking adapted to floors and streets, or rough mountainsides. At first, he/she shared the classification of walking, but in new situations, the meaning of walking has “analogical extension.” The child may have learned “a general way to any act of walking” but not “a certain kind of walking” (Burke, 1935, p. 139).

“Equity” can be understood using the same analogy. Equity is generally valued for its democratic nature, so it is likely that the government claimed that the changes in the language curriculum to include more native languages and education are for equity. Learning more native languages in Taiwan, other than Mandarin Chinese, may transform the meaning of democracy. A new situation may call for a certain kind of democratic equity which has “analogical extension” in classification. As Burke asserts, “Eventually one may meet such new situations by ‘analogical extension,’ adding some device from a different context” (1935, p.139).

It is important to examine how this concept is employed in the statements regarding the language curriculum and policy because this usage of identification can be a danger for society. Identification is built successfully within audiences by manipulating the meanings of the terms and invoking emotions. Thus, Burke says, “The great danger of analogy is that a similarity is taken as evidence of an identity” (1935, p.128). Creating identification, especially build an ethnic or national identity for identification, can misrepresent similarity and exclude some groups of people from that similarity.

Tu’s speech as Minister of Education of Taiwan and the proposal of the Language Equality Law that was pursued by the DPP government has shown that the claims-making
was intended to allow people who speak the language of Ho-lo to represent Taiwanese. Also, this claims-making labeled Taiwanese people who cannot speak Ho-lo as their native language as Chinese who do not have Taiwanese identity. Even though native education has been implemented in education, Ho-lo became the most commonly taught native language in school because of the difficulty of finding teachers and teaching materials for other native languages. When the claim-makers advocated that every ethnic group in Taiwan should have an equal right in society and education, the claims-making included all Taiwanese ethnic groups thereby enlarging the problems of Taiwan’s native language education and equality. However, once the policy regarding the native education and language equality is implemented, the ethnic group that speaks Ho-lo as their native language is the one who will gain the most benefits and establish the meaning of being Taiwanese.

As Minister of Education, Tu is also a supporter of the DPP political party, which is labeled by other political parties as a Ho-lo group that supports Taiwan’s independence. When Tu gave the speech about why he wanted changes in Taiwan’s Chinese and native education, he intended to create an identification with the largest ethnic group in Taiwan (Ho-lo). He wanted people to believe that speaking Ho-lo as a national language was an important part of Taiwanese self-consciousness and identity. For the people who already accepted Tu’s identification, he could solidify their support of his political goals. For the people who speak Mandarin Chinese as their native language, regardless of their ethnic group, Tu persuaded or forced them to identify with Ho-lo interests so that they would be united behind the government’s positions regarding China. Tu did not spend time in
making claims regarding the practicality of native language education. A survey shows that 85.7% of Taiwanese speak Mandarin Chinese as their native language, therefore, the native languages which were identified in the act referred to people's ethnic language, and they are not people's mother tongue or native language (Huang, 2008, p. 246). When Mandarin is an official and native language for the majority of Taiwanese, Tu's claims-making shows that the purpose of the native language equality act is to increase the importance of the Taiwanese language (Ho-lo) by replacing Mandarin Chinese as the national language; creating an identification to unify certain people, while at the same time dividing others in Taiwan.

The process of creating identification and understanding of the effect is important for a policy analysis. Analyzing the utilization of identification in statements is a way to evaluate the effects of language policy or curriculum changes. When the connection of identification between the government and its people is ambiguous, it is difficult to assess its effectiveness. Identification is a concept used to explain why audiences accept speakers' dramas and the way dramas determine meanings which audiences accept. Peoples' identification is based on similar interests they find in the claims. As Burke says, "When [a person] changes the nature of his interests, or point of view, he will approach events with a new identity, reclassifying them, putting things together that were in different classes, and dividing things that had been together" (1935, p.140). The changes of language curriculum or policy in Taiwan might not only affect the learning of language in education but divide things that had been together to influence society as a whole.
An Analysis of the Guidelines of the 98 Curriculum

This section analyzes how native education and the idea of Language Equality as the DPP language policy were implemented in the Chinese language curriculum. The claims-making of both supporters and opponents will also be analyzed.

The Government Design of the 98 Curriculum

The DPP Minister of Education, Tu Cheng-sheng led the design of the 98 Curriculum planned to be executed in 2009. This curriculum guideline was declared in 2008 and was planned to be implemented in 2009. During the DPP government presidency, the Minister of Education had only two guidelines for curriculum and instruction. One was the 95 Curriculum, which was to be the temporary guideline while the 98 Curriculum was prepared. Therefore, after years of discussions, the 98 Curriculum can be considered as the curriculum guideline that represents the DPP government’s ideal curriculum design. However, the DPP government did not win the presidential election in 2008. The new KMT government decided to apply Tu’s version for Chinese language education, but this plan was stopped because the curriculum was strongly criticized. The new Minister of Education has decided to implement the 98 Curriculum in 2010 after redesigning it and searching for more consensus among different ethnic groups (Yang, 2008).

The first section of the 95 Curriculum states the goals of the curriculum. There are four outcomes listed. The first and second address language ability in listening, speaking, reading, and writing. The third goal says that the curriculum should display the value of ancient and modern literature to help students deeply understand related cultural
background, and reflect life. The fourth goal says students should develop a habit and ability for reading literature to enlarge their view of life and culture of caring about others. In the 98 Curriculum, the goals become three. The first goal contains the language ability expectation. The second and third goals are different from the 95 Curriculum. In goal three, it says to develop the ability to reflect between the classic literature and modern living environment. The 98 Curriculum assumes that there is a conflict between ancient classic and modern society. Also, there is a problem of understanding the culture, differences, and equality in Taiwan, so the curriculum must emphasize these goals.

The percentage of ancient Chinese in 95 Curriculum—60% modern Chinese and 40% ancient Chinese—is the same in 98 Curriculum, but the use of Taiwanese selections changed dramatically. There were two selections of Taiwanese literature in the 95 Curriculum but eight in the 98 Curriculum.

According to the 98 Curriculum for national language education (Mandarin Chinese course) in high school, the curriculum outlines the class time per week: four class periods for Chinese, including three classes for teaching selected articles and one class for Chinese writing on average (technically, two class periods every two weeks for Chinese writing). Also, the time for writing should also be used to read classic works in literature and culture (98 Curriculum, 2008, p. 11). Compared to the old curriculum, class time for Mandarin Chinese was reduced (Yang, 2008).

The 98 Curriculum asks textbook publishers to increase the number of articles related to Taiwan and written in modern Chinese rather than ancient Chinese. The guideline states that "the purpose of 98 Curriculum is to select articles that are moderate
in difficulty, reflect local experiences, and fit in the time frame of modern society” (98 Curriculum, 2008, p.12). The purpose of 98 Curriculum is to have more Taiwanese and modern Chinese literature as the selected articles for textbooks. The curriculum says that the selection of ancient Chinese should come from different time periods and literary forms and suggests that “selected literature should have native and local experience topics as the guide for selection” (p. 12). For textbook publishers to follow the curriculum, the 98 Curriculum not only states the guideline but also lists the articles that must be included in the textbooks. The guideline of 98 Curriculum itself includes forty ancient Chinese articles as an attachment (p. 16).

The selections in the 98 Curriculum from the dynasties before the Republic of China (R.O.C) appear similar to the ancient Chinese article selections in the former curriculum guide. Even though there are some articles which were not included in the former curriculum, articles from the same authors are included. Therefore, the content and quality of ancient Chinese literature before the period of R.O.C. appears similar to that of the old curriculum. However, the number of these selections of ancient Chinese literature is considered by critics to be too few to fill the 45 %, which is required for ancient Chinese literature in the whole Chinese curriculum (Yang, 2008). At the high percentage in the whole Chinese curriculum” does not make sense with the previous phrase. The major difference in 98 Curriculum is that there are eight articles under the category “Taiwan Topics.” Only one author of these eight articles was included in the former curriculum (98 Curriculum, 2008, p. 16).
The 98 Curriculum also asked schools to add time for an elective course, “Area Literature,” for the selection of articles related to the schools’ location to “help encourage students’ understanding and affection for the local area” (98 Curriculum, 2008, p. 17). This elective course was designed as two credits for one semester, or four credits for two semesters, with two class periods a week (p.17). The Analects of Confucius and Mencius (Mengtse) used to be required courses but are now listed as elective courses (p. 21), which would occupy the time as an “Area Literature” elective providing local or native education. Also, the classical Chinese philosophy and literature, such as Confucius, is changed from a required to an elected course. Considering what Tu states in his speech about learning from local to global and shifting China-centered education to Taiwan-centered education, these changes in 98 Curriculum could be viewed as the government’s actions to implement his policy.

The Opposition View on the 98 Curriculum

Some professors strongly criticized the curriculum and worked to revise the entire curriculum (Xue, 2008c). The education reform organizations, such as The Forum of Summative Evaluation of Educational Reform and Saving National Language Association, disagreed with many parts of the 98 Curriculum, such as time allocation and the percentage of ancient Chinese. They wanted to postpone 98 Curriculum to discuss curricular differentiation and which courses should be electives. They not only disagreed with the content but also the design, such as students being placed in their academic track later than in the current curriculum and having more class periods in elective courses. These opponents suggested that the 98 Curriculum should be canceled entirely. They feel
that the government should design a new curriculum as an “Integrated Twelve-Year Curriculum” that could be implemented for tenth graders and connect with the “Integrated Nine-Year Curriculum” (Xue, 2008c). Because the 98 Curriculum would be implemented in high school first, while the elementary students already have native language education and native education is taught in junior high school, the opponents state that the government should stop implementing the new curriculum in high school and first solve the problems in the “Integrated Nine-Year Curriculum.” The opponents suggest that the government redesign a curriculum that could be implemented throughout the K-12 system, based on their suggestions regarding Mandarin Chinese, such as increasing ancient Chinese to more than 45%, learning the Analects of Confucius and Mencius as required courses, and teaching Chinese in the cultural context rather than as just a language (Xue, 2008c).

The DPP government has put in place 95 Curriculum, which is a temporary curriculum that served as the basis for 98 Curriculum, in 2006. According to the opponents, the members of the curriculum committee were chosen by Tu and made a hurried decision. The process of creating the 98 Curriculum did not allow time to refine the contents of the 84 Curriculum and did not include high school teachers’ opinions. The 98 Curriculum was branded as ideological, and its opponents suggested that the government should select new committee members and design a new curriculum (Wang, 2008). In 2009, students who used the 95 Curriculum will take the college entrance exam. Teachers suggested that the government design a new curriculum, after seeing the test results for implementing 95 Curriculum under the “Integrated Nine-Year Curriculum.”
They also want the government to develop the 98 Curriculum as a part of the “Integrated Twelve-Year Curriculum” which integrates all grades, elementary through high school (Xue, 2008c). The co-chair of the Saving National Language Association, the famous Chinese writer Zheng Xiao-feng, said “We ask for canceling the 98 Curriculum, not just focusing on the percentage of ancient Chinese and modern Chinese in the curriculum to have one or two more selections of ancient Chinese” (Xue, 2008c). They hope to see major changes from the 98 Curriculum (Xue, 2008c).

Pentadic Analysis of the Government’s National Curriculum

The DPP government led the design for, and planned to implement, the 98 Curriculum in the 2009 school year (Yang, 2008). The goals of the national language course (Mandarin Chinese language) list the objectives for listening, speaking, reading, and writing the Chinese language. Except for the general objectives of learning a language, the last sentence of the first section says that one goal is to develop an ability to reflect culture and to respect multiple values between the culture’s classical literature and modern living. With the major changes in this language curriculum, in time allotted for teaching Mandarin Chinese and selecting materials, the time allocated for learning Mandarin Chinese was less than before, and the materials selected have more examples of modern Chinese than ancient Chinese. Also, for both modern and ancient Chinese literatures, the curriculum says that the principle is to select articles from native topics and Taiwanese authors (98 Curriculum, 2008).

Therefore, the purpose within this Chinese language curriculum seems to be to establish a Taiwan-centered education, as was described in Tu’s speech. The curriculum
itself is an act that is called for by the Minister of Education Department. The background of implementing this curriculum is the scene about Taiwan’s history and situation that Tu (2007) addressed in his speech. This scene is the background to call for the acts, such as the proposal of Language Equality Law and the 98 Curriculum. The curriculum is an act to respond to the new scene that values Taiwan-centered education over China-centered education. According to Tu (2007), Taiwan’s education should respect multiple Taiwanese native ethnic cultures and languages, and the new curriculum is the act to fulfill this goal. This act might also have the effect of teaching Chinese language without connection to Chinese culture and literature, which were transplanted from mainland China by the KMT government and dominated the previous curriculum. The act that responds to the new scene that Tu (2007) addressed and has the quality of the new agent (DPP government) is the new Chinese language curriculum (98 Curriculum). The national curriculum requires the schools and publishers to follow the guideline for Chinese education. The agent is the DPP government, which exerts its power through the schools and the publishers of the textbooks. It wants Taiwanese students to become the new agents which act in accordance with the redefined scene of the DPP government. The agency is to educate students with the 98 Curriculum in order to help them understand Taiwanese knowledge and identity through language education.

As with the language equality law, the text of the 98 Curriculum has an act-agent ratio because it has an act (language curriculum) to determine the quality of the agent (Taiwanese students). The act determines what people (agent) need to know. The agent who decided the curriculum was the DPP government representing the Taiwanese
people. Eventually, the Taiwanese students become the agent who is molded by the national curriculum. The agent role extends from the government, which led the curriculum, to textbook publishers who wrote textbooks, and then school teachers who teach the curriculum in order to implement the curriculum as the act; Taiwanese students finally become the agent that respond to the scene. As a result, Taiwanese people would be the agent who would act to respond to the scene by implementing the national curriculum as an act. According to an act-agent ratio, the curriculum is an act that determines the quality of the agent (Taiwanese students) and responds to the scene that has a need of the Taiwan-centered education to replace the China-centered education.

Claims Made by the Government and Opposition’s Views

According to the opponents, the problems of 98 Curriculum are not only that current students are doing less well on Chinese language due to the fact that they do not meet as frequently (Xue, 2008c), but the content and implementation have problems as well. Therefore, opponents asked for reconsideration of 98 Curriculum entirely (Xue, 2008c). The opponents did not say that Taiwanese students should not have other native language experiences and cultural knowledge to live in a society that has multiple ethnic groups. However, they believed that the new curriculum would squeeze out class time of Chinese language education and thus would decrease students’ Mandarin Chinese proficiency. They stated that the DPP government increased the percentage of native education to decrease the importance of Mandarin Chinese due to the government’s Taiwanese ideology (Xue, 2008c). People who opposed the 98 Curriculum criticized the time given for learning Mandarin Chinese and asked for more class time. Both native
education and English compete with Mandarin Chinese instruction for the available time because they are all in the language area of "Integrated Nine-Year Curriculum" and share the class time allocated for learning language.

The DPP government claimed that Taiwanese people should learn native languages because these languages are a part of native culture. This claim sounds politically correct, but may not be correct according to people who have different perspectives about education. The claim that preserving native languages ensures language equality sounds politically correct as well. However, we argued above that unseating Mandarin Chinese as the only national language and renaming it the Chinese language will not help preserve native languages nor ensure the rights of the languages at risk. Native education provides the opportunities for students to learn native languages. However, this educational policy has not ensured that students would learn their own native languages. Students who want to learn Hakka might have to learn Ho-lo because the school only provides licensed Ho-lo language teachers.

In addition, because Ho-lo, Hakka, and the Taiwanese indigenous languages do not have a written means to fully represent the spoken language, it is difficult to implement the language curriculum or use them as official languages. For example, the DPP government has worked on creating a written language for the Taiwanese language (Ho-lo). However, even people who can speak the Taiwanese language cannot recognize the words. Tu Cheng-sheng, the former Minister of Education, was asked to pronounce some words listed in the Taiwanese language textbook but could not match the written to the spoken language, even though he was a Ho-lo native speaker (Taiwan Television,
Creating a new written language for Ho-lo makes the possibility of changing the position of the Taiwanese language from a local language to a real national language as Mandarin Chinese is in China (Shin & Tiun, 2003).

According to Shin and Tiun (2003), successful native language education requires having a written language to represent native language and more class time to learn the language. However, the government’s claims-making for language equality (the proposed law) and for the importance of native language education (Tu’s speech) lack connections between language equality and implementing native language education in school. Creating a written language, such as Ho-lo, would cost money and time, but does not prove its necessity for ensuring language equality in Taiwan. There are questions that could be raised, such as: Is it possible to create a written language for all the ethnic languages spoken in Taiwan? Would this be worth the time and resources needed?

The DPP Education Department initially developed a Ho-lo native language curriculum as part of the “Integrated Nine-Year Curriculum” for the students from elementary to junior high school (Xue, 2009). Tu, as Minister of Education Department, released Ho-lo native language curriculum which required high proficiency (Xue, 2009). This native language curriculum was planned to be implemented after two years (Xue, 2009). However, some native language teachers and parents were critical of the objectives for Ho-lo language proficiency (Xue, 2009). Therefore, it was not implemented because teachers and parents objected to the curriculum design (Xue, 2009).

Native language education does not ensure the equality of languages in Taiwan. For example, the new KMT government, which won the presidential election in 2009,
reorganized the Ho-lo language curriculum (Xue, 2009). However, the curriculum would only postpone the learning of the Ho-lo phonetic system in the first 2 or 3 grade levels (Xue, 2009). Compared to the Hakka language curriculum, which is planned for implementation in 2011, the Hakka curriculum only requires students to be able to say simple greetings in Hakka by the end of grade 1, while the Ho-lo language curriculum requires students to be able to have conversations in Ho-lo by the end of grade 1 (Xue, 2009). Hakka and the lesser spoken indigenous languages are at greater danger of being lost than is Ho-lo (Huang, 2008, pp. 159-164). The government might need to work on preserving and teaching these languages and their cultures rather than emphasizing the Ho-lo education in Taiwan if their goal were truly to preserve native languages.

There are many parents and others who do not support teaching native languages in school because they do not see the necessity and dislike their children to learn new written language (Weng, 2006). These Taiwanese people are not just mainlanders who originally from mainland, but they are against the language curriculum and policy. It is reasonable to conclude that at least some of the people who the government planned to help do not think the changes can help with their children's native language learning this way.

Other native languages and ethnic groups do not have an equal position with the Ho-lo speaking community. Even if being Taiwanese means learning native languages, creating different written scripts and phonetic systems for these languages would take much time and resources. Ho-lo would become the new dominant language that oppresses
other ethnic cultures as Tu claimed Mandarin Chinese education did to the Taiwanese
culture. It also threatens the equality of other ethnic groups living in Taiwan.

The Taiwanese language (Ho-lo) has been used commonly in public and election
campaigns. Also, schools provide the Taiwanese language (Ho-lo) as a native language
course in the elementary schools. These actions make Ho-lo a representative native
language for all Taiwanese. Therefore, if the DPP government implemented the proposed
language equality act and language curriculum based on its claims, Ho-lo ethnic group
benefits among all ethnic groups living in Taiwan. However, Ho-lo (South Min) was the
ethnic group which had the smallest percentage of people who spoke Mandarin Chinese
but lost their Ho-lo native language (Cao, 1997). Compared to Ho-lo, which is called the
Taiwanese language, Hakka had a greater percentage of loss in the use of their spoken
language (Cao, 1997). Those people speaking indigenous languages have the largest
percentage of persons learning Mandarin Chinese (Cao, 1997). These indigenous peoples
frequently do not have enough educational opportunities to learn Mandarin Chinese as well
as other ethnic groups.

Hakka and indigenous languages are native languages that need to be preserved
rather than Ho-lo. These native languages are at risk, but the people who speak them also
have the greatest need to learn Mandarin Chinese for better educational and job
opportunity because Mandarin Chinese is still the most common language in Taiwan
(Huang, 2008, pp. 159-164). As a result, there might be a need to preserve the native
languages, such as Hakka and the Taiwanese indigenous languages, but Ho-lo is not in the
same situation. The Ho-lo language is still commonly used and taught in the home and community.

Native education might be valuable knowledge for students, but it should not take away time from Chinese language education because Mandarin Chinese is the most commonly used language for all Taiwanese ethnic groups and many people with Chinese heritage living in other countries. According to the poll from the United Daily News in 2009, most mainlanders and Hakka can also speak Ho-lo, although the survey does not show the level of their language proficiency. Only 11% of Hakka and 19% of Mainlanders said that they do not understand Ho-lo at all. This shows that Ho-lo language has a possibility to be used in daily life rather than other native languages, so members of other ethnic groups, such as Hakka and Mainlanders, would have to learn Ho-lo. Only 10% of Ho-lo people do not understand Mandarin Chinese at all. The younger generation of Ho-los, who are under 40 years old, self-reported that their Mandarin Chinese proficiency is better than their Ho-lo language proficiency (“Opinion Polls,” 2009). This situation shows that the Mandarin Chinese, as a national language, has standardized Taiwanese people’s language use and become Taiwanese’s native language no matter which ethnic language they originally spoke.

The same survey found that about 50% of the participants reported that they cannot tell people’s ethnicity unless they have known them well for a long time. Forty-six% of the participants said that they can recognize people’s ethnicity. A survey made by the same newspaper in 1990, reported that 76% of the participants felt that they could identify people’s ethnicity. This is a dramatic decrease, between 1990 and 2009, of 30%
of participants who feel they could identify another's ethnicity. The survey also showed that no matter whether Ho-lo or Hakka, there are about 60% who said that they like Mainlanders' food. Eighty-five percent of Mainlanders said they like Taiwanese food. Eighty percent of Mainlanders said that they would not refuse to try the food. The survey report concludes that Taiwanese people are not as sensitive about people's ethnicity as before. The result of the survey shows that the language usage and eating habits among Taiwanese are growing more culturally uniform ("Opinion Polls," 2009).

Mandarin Chinese is the only spoken native language in Taiwan that has a written system that accompanies it. Students are used to working on their Mandarin Chinese written language rather than learning a new and unique written language of the Ho-lo language. Mandarin Chinese is not a dialect of Beijing. It has been the official language for all Chinese, while the written language is the only language for writing, even for different Chinese dialects. Even though there are simplified and traditional Chinese characters used in mainland China and Taiwan, these two written language systems can still be understood by people on both sides. Therefore, learning Mandarin Chinese is important for students' success with other Chinese speakers in writing and speaking.

The Ho-lo language did not have a written system to be taught in school, so the government developed a curriculum based on a phonetic alphabet and created new written words to represent certain sounds of the Taiwanese language. Some schools are still working on the Taiwanese written language system, such as Tongiong Taiwanese Dictionary (Wu, 2003). Some people advocate that Taiwanese people should have their own written language for the Taiwanese language, which is different from the written
language of Mandarin Chinese ("Taiwanese language," 2006). However, the value of creating, teaching, and learning this unique written system in school is doubtful because there is already a written language for all Taiwanese with which to communicate, which is Mandarin Chinese. In addition, having a unique language is not a necessary feature of an independent country. Americans speak English and many independent countries have Spanish as their national language. The fact is that people living in these independent countries speak the language of the original country, such as Great Britain, France, or Spain, does not change their status as countries or the people's identity.

If the language education is for communication, students should have high proficiency in Mandarin Chinese because it is the official language used among people who speak Chinese in all areas. Learning a language, no matter native or foreign, might be a great educational opportunity for students because language is a useful tool by which to communicate and understand different peoples and cultures.

In conclusion, the government should not implement the language equality law and 98 Curriculum based on its claims-making. These acts would not ensure the equality of all native languages but would affect the education and usage of Mandarin Chinese by reducing the class time and unseating its position of national language. Also, these actions might make some people have concerns that the DPP government plans to separate Chinese education and native education and make a distinction between Mandarin Chinese and other native languages speakers. In addition, before the government prepares enough licensed native language teachers for all native languages, and develops the pedagogy to teach native languages effectively, it should not implement native language
curriculum. Based on its claims-making regarding Taiwan-centered education or language equality, all native languages should have an equal opportunity to be taught in school. Thus, the DPP government's claims fail to warrant the implementation of the language act and the 98 Curriculum.
CHAPTER 5

CONCLUSION

This case study of Taiwan's language curriculum and policy is a rhetorical analysis. To answer the research question of whether or not the DPP government claims can support its language curriculum and policy changes, this study applied social problems research analysis to examine the government's claims-making regarding language equality and Taiwan-centered Education. Burke's pentadic analysis helps to systematically analyze the meaning of the texts. His motivational perspective and idea of one's identification through language choice are means by which researchers may identify the hidden motives within the texts and examine the effects of the claims-making. The analysis in Chapter 4 serves to introduce the claims regarding Taiwan's Chinese and native language education and to analyze the claims-making that supports the Taiwanese DPP government's language education and policy.

Summary of Findings

After analyzing the claims-making of the DPP government presented in Tu's speech, concerning the proposed language equality act and 98 Curriculum, the claims-making did not show justification to implement the law and curriculum. The importance of preserving native languages and ensuring language equality should be agreeable with Taiwanese society. However, Ho-lo, as a commonly used native language, is not at risk and has the more favorable position in education. It beats Mandarin Chinese as the national language but does not help language equality and Taiwan-centered education. The DPP government cannot prove that studying native languages, especially studying Ho-lo, has a correlation
to Taiwanese identity or helps Taiwan become an independent country. The claims-making regarding the DPP government’s Taiwan-centered education and language equality law does not have substance to support its language curriculum and policy changes. Removing Mandarin Chinese as the only national language in Taiwan and calling it the Chinese language would distinguish Mandarin Chinese native speakers who have lost their native languages (Huang, 2008, p. 159) and the Taiwanese native speakers who would be mainly Ho-lo native speakers (it is the largest native language population) (Huang, 2008, p. 155). Also, because the Ho-lo population is large (Huang, 2008, p. 155-159), native language education would increase the power of Ho-lo native speakers to oppress other native language speakers.

Learning Native Languages to Have Taiwanese Consciousness

According to the document analyzed in Chapter 4, the claims-making regarding language education and policy promotes Taiwan as an independent democratic country respecting multiple cultures and values. The concern is that Taiwanese people should learn their native languages to ensure language equality in public use. The claims-making within Tu’s speech representing the DPP government’s perspective and agenda for education, the language equality law proposed by the DPP government, and the Chinese language curriculum approved by the DPP government do not show that the changes in language education and policy would solve social problems, such as the unequal treatment of indigenous Taiwanese, in education and the job market, or non-native spouses living in Taiwan. The DPP’s claims-making did not provide proper actions which would ensure equality for different ethnic groups living in Taiwan.
The government makes the claim that native languages should be preserved and taught in school. This claims-making not only exaggerates the loss of the Ho-lo language and culture but also expands the advantage of Ho-lo among all ethnic groups living in Taiwan. The claims-making highlights the threat of losing native language and education for a native speaker. However, the government did not include all languages used in Taiwan as part of its native language education and language equality policy. This action could create a split among the different ethnic groups for their Taiwanese identification and become a controversy because it increases the influence of Ho-lo as native Taiwanese and displaces Mandarin Chinese as the national language. The connection between Ho-lo as the Taiwanese language and Taiwanese national identity might threaten people who are not native Ho-lo speakers. In addition, it raises a concern about the DPP using Ho-lo to replace Mandarin Chinese as the national language to build a new country for Taiwan’s independence.

Learning Native Languages to Ensure Language Equality

The greatest loss of language appears in the Mainlanders population, who originally spoke different Chinese dialects (Huang, 2008, p.159), and the Taiwanese indigenous languages (Huang, 2008, p. 164). However, the DPP does not include Chinese dialects as native languages in the proposed language equality act. Also, the DPP government refers to Mandarin as Chinese even though Ho-lo, Hakka, and other Chinese dialects are Chinese as well. When Mandarin Chinese is listed as one native language in the language equality law, the DPP government inaccurately used Mandarin Chinese to represent the many Chinese ethnic languages that are spoken as native languages. If the DPP government
really cares about language equality, the government should strive to develop written 
languages to match the spoken languages for these ethnic groups and implement the 
curriculum for these threatened languages as its priority in education.

Even if the DPP government implemented the Language Equality Law, it still does not ensure the usage of all native languages in Taiwan. Different ethnic groups do not have an equal opportunity to learn their own native languages in school for reasons, such as lack of resources. Also, they would not be able to use their native languages in public equally as Ho-lo or Mandarin Chinese because there would be few people who would understand their languages. Removing Mandarin Chinese as the official language cannot preserve other native languages nor ensure all languages equality.

The U.S. government does not list all languages in this country as native or national languages or provide language courses in school to ensure that language equality or human rights are protected. If there is a need for preserving a certain language or ensuring human rights, the government can work on it without executing its power in the educational system. For example, a lot of American students learn Spanish because there is a large group of Spanish immigrants in some parts of the U.S. and in South America. When Spanish is a native language for the immigrants in the U.S. or becomes a local language in some areas, American students will learn this language at home or school. The government does not have to list Spanish as a national language and force students to learn it as if it were all students’ native language. Native language education should be considered as a part of local education and students’ choice of language learning.
Therefore, students will not be forced to learn one specific language of a certain ethnic group. Also, ethnic groups whose languages are not taught in school will not feel offended.

Because native and Chinese language courses are different, they compete for students’ class time and resources. These circumstances highlight the separation between Chinese education and Taiwanese native language education. The claims-making misrepresents Chinese language education as China-centered and native language education as Taiwan-centered education. The claims-making, which is supposed to solve social problems, might raise more concerns about unequal status among different ethnic groups and make some feel they are excluded from Taiwanese identification.

For people who speak certain languages as native speakers, there is an affection of listing their native languages as national languages to create identification for Ho-lo, Hakka, or aborigine. However, with the understanding of diversity and language equality, all people living in Taiwan would be able to identify themselves as Taiwanese no matter their language proficiency of Mandarin Chinese or other native languages. The claims-making of the DPP government does not connect the language which people use to their national identity, and this action could threaten people’s equality in Taiwan. If people speak native languages other than Mandarin Chinese, it should not determine whether or not they receive Taiwan-centered education or have Taiwanese identity.

The identification for Ho-lo, Hakka, aborigine, and Chinese (Mandarin Chinese) people based on their ethnicity and language may be a strategy for dividing people by the different languages they speak. Since Ho-lo is called the Taiwanese language and has the majority of native speakers, other than people who speak Mandarin Chinese, people who
cannot speak Ho-lo but only speak Chinese (Mandarin Chinese) as their native language would be inaccurately labeled as Chinese rather than native Taiwanese. Also, even though Hakka and the Taiwanese indigenous languages are all a part of native language education, their children are encouraged to learn Taiwanese (Ho-lo) as their native language.

Learning Native Language to Have Taiwan-Centered Education

The Ho-lo language is the ethnic language for the majority of Taiwanese people (Huang, 2008, p. 155) and it is commonly used in daily life and the media. Native language education could easily be equated to Ho-lo language education to teach its language, literature, and perspective of history as native education for all Taiwanese. Even though the Taiwan-centered education is supposed to build an equal and respective environment to understand multiple cultures and valuable knowledge of Taiwan, the claims-making of the DPP government showed it is a possibility for the political power to use language equality to uphold Ho-lo as the Taiwanese language and to connect Mandarin Chinese speakers to a China-centered identity.

If the language equality and curriculum were implemented, because there are fewer teachers and resources to teach Hakka or other indigenous languages as native languages, Ho-lo will become the only native language to be taught in school and used in public as a national language. If the government has resources for language instruction, the major need in language instruction might be for the new immigrants, such as non-native spouses or workers. They often need language instruction for Mandarin Chinese or other native languages using in their living areas. Depending on where they live and work, they might need to learn Taiwanese native languages rather than Mandarin Chinese.
However, the DPP government has not worked on their needs to ensure equality rather than increasing the power of Ho-lo.

The Taiwanese already have specific public television channels for Ho-lo, Hakka, and indigenous languages, and there are government organizations for Hakka and Taiwanese indigenous languages, so the work of preserving the languages and cultures is not ignored. The current Taiwanese president, who is from the KMT, attended the premiere of the Hakka movie, the Legend of Formosa in 1895 ("President Ma," 2008). The budget of the Councils of Hakka and Taiwanese indigenous will show how the government values preserving the languages and cultures. The budget of providing language education and services for different ethnic groups in Taiwan will also show how the government values language equality.

The school time has been used for non-native but useful language learning. For example, all Taiwanese students have English class. I am still learning English, and I understand American culture better by learning this language. However, it is my choice to spend time in learning this specific language, and I still do not think I am an American rather than Taiwanese. My English is better than my Ho-lo language in terms of speaking, because I have more opportunity to speak in English than Ho-lo even though I fully comprehend the Ho-lo language. Ho-lo is my ethnic language, but I speak Mandarin Chinese as my native language. If I could make a wish to speak one language perfectly, I would choose English rather than Ho-lo. Language is for communication. Language might have a connection with identity, but national identity does not equate to the use of language.
Native Languages Are not Ethnic Languages

Davies (1991) follows Bloomfield (1933) in claiming that the definition of “native speaker” is the following: “The first language a human being learns to speak is his native language; he is a native speaker of this language” (as cited in Cook, 1999, pp. 185-186). Cook (1999) says that native speakers have various characteristics; therefore, there is no necessary part of the definition of “native speaker” to disqualify a person from being a native speaker. Cook provides an example: “A monk sworn to silence is still a native speaker” (p. 186). If native language education is for people to learn the native language as a native speaker, this policy fails to understand the definition of “native speaker.” The meaning of being a native speaker is not dependent on a person’s original ethnic group, their language ability, or the area in which they live. Languages, such as Ho-lo, Hakka, or Taiwanese indigenous languages, which are taught in school, will not cause that person to become a different native speaker.

Also, the proficiency with a native language should not be taken as evidence of being a native speaker or having certain native identity. For a lot of immigrants living in the U.S., English has become the native language of their children. Because they were born in the U.S., they are Americans. They might or might not be fluent in their ethnic language or interested in learning about their background. Even though their ancestors came from another country, their native language might be still English. However, no matter which native language they learn and how proficient their language skill is, they are Americans because they are American citizens. No matter which ethnic group they originally belonged to, they are Americans and they speak English. English is not the
native language for all ethnic groups living in the U.S., but this national language unifies people who live here and communicate with each other. Even though English is the language from Britain, the U.S. has its own independent status in politics and develops its own cultural differences from Britain. English as the national language and English education did not influence Americans to reunify with the United Kingdom or have England-center identity. Mandarin Chinese as the national language and Chinese education should not influence Taiwanese people in their future determination in politics. In past years, Taiwanese people have developed differences in the political system, Mandarin usage, social behavior, and etc. from that of mainland China. Because both Taiwanese and Chinese speak Mandarin Chinese as their national language, it does not change the fact that Taiwan has its own government, culture, and identity.

Literally, Ho-lo language is the Taiwanese language and Mandarin Chinese is the Chinese language. My father is a Ho-lo native speaker and I inherit his ethnicity to be a Ho-lo. Ho-lo language could be my native language. If I were an elementary school student, I should take the Taiwanese language course for my native education. However, according to the definition of native speaker, I am not a Ho-lo native speaker but rather a Mandarin Chinese, because I was raised in a family that speaks Mandarin Chinese (Bloomfield, 1933, p. 43). Because my father is a native Ho-lo speaker and his family has lived in Taiwan since before the Chinese civil war, I should be included in the Ho-lo ethnic group, which is Taiwanese rather than Mainlanders. However, I will have to identify myself as a native speaker of Mandarin Chinese because my Ho-lo speaking skill is even worse than my English even though my listening is better in Ho-lo than in English.
Huang (2008) stated that in Taiwan a high percentage of people marry someone from a different ethnic group (p. 229). However, no matter which native language they speak, from either side of the family, 85.7 percent of interviewees said their native language is Mandarin Chinese (Huang, 2008, p. 246). Also, the survey in 2009 showed that most of Mainlanders and Hakka can speak Ho-lo language (“Opinion Polls,” 2009). Only 11 percent of Hakka and 19 percent of Mainlanders said that they do not understand Ho-lo at all (“Opinion Polls,” 2009). Only 10 percent of Ho-lo people do not understand Mandarin Chinese at all (“Opinion Polls,” 2009). The younger generation of Ho-los, who are under 40 years old, self reported that their Mandarin Chinese proficiency is better than their Ho-lo language proficiency (“Opinion Polls,” 2009). When Mandarin Chinese has been used as the national language and been viewed as most people’s native language, the claims-making that pursued removing Mandarin Chinese from the position of the official language because Taiwanese people should be able to speak their native languages is not realistic and could be problematic.

Based on the claims-making of the DPP government, I would be identified as a Taiwanese who has a misunderstanding about Chinese and Taiwanese identity; the same as people who believe Mandarin Chinese is their native language and lose their native languages (Huang, 2008, p. 246). However, the claims-making of DPP government did not reflect the relationship between language education and national or self-identity. I have met Chinese people who came from mainland China and Hong Kong. Some Chinese people who came from Hong Kong cannot speak Mandarin Chinese because they are used to speaking English and Cantonese. The spoken language never changes the fact that they
consider themselves as Chinese. I also met Chinese immigrants who came from Indonesia, Thailand, Singapore, and Malaysia who speak Mandarin Chinese as their native language. Even though they are Chinese immigrants and speak Mandarin Chinese, they have a different nationality. When I say that I came from Taiwan, people understand that I am a Taiwanese. According to Tu’s speech, he reported that most Taiwanese people identity themselves as Taiwanese (Tu, 2007, p. 8). In making their claim about the use of “Chinese language” leading to “Chinese identity,” they are conflating two different meanings of “Chinese.”

Even though my mother is a Mainlander (her family came from the province named Zhejiang in mainland China), she cannot speak the language of Zhejiang, although it should be her native language. She should be able to learn it in school based on the claims-making of language equality and native education. She speaks Mandarin Chinese and the Taiwanese language (Ho-lo). My father is a native Ho-lo speaker, but Mandarin Chinese is the official language for him to teach in college and the language in which he talks to us. As a result, I am a native speaker of Mandarin Chinese. I have never learned Ho-lo at home or school as part of my education, but I understand Ho-lo language and can carry on a conversation in Ho-lo. I do not know how I learned Ho-lo as a comprehensive Ho-lo native speaker, but I can fully understand this language even though I cannot speak it fluently. I most likely learned the language because I have occasionally heard this language on television or in daily life.

Most Taiwanese people learn the native languages in a similar way without native language courses in school. Research shows that there is a high percentage of people who
can speak Ho-lo among different ethnic groups (Huang, 2008, p. 149). Fifty percent of Mainlanders and 72 percent of Hakka can speak Ho-lo (Huang, 2008, p. 149). Forty percent of the Taiwanese indigenous people and 65 percent of people who do not have Ho-lo parents can speak Ho-lo (Huang, 2008, p. 149). The claims-making for implementing Ho-lo language education is not as crucial as the DPP government asserts. In contrast, if a school only has resources to provide one native language course, it should be any native language other than the commonly used Ho-lo language.

My father’s parents cannot speak Mandarin Chinese at all, but they can speak Japanese because of the occupation of Taiwan by the Japanese. I remember my grandfather always talked in Ho-lo to me even though I only speak Mandarin Chinese. He died when I was very young. I do not remember ever really having a conversation with him. Probably that was because I cannot speak Ho-lo and did not really understand what he said. The only thing I remember about him is that he always came in the afternoon and took me out to buy some candy. I sensed that he felt sad because I could not speak the Taiwanese language. If he knew that I studied Ho-lo from elementary school through high school, he would probably be very happy with the policy of the government. The claims-making was made to support the government’s political actions and would affect all Taiwanese people.

Native Languages Need to Be Learned in School

It is useful and meaningful for students to learn the local language as one native language to fit in the society. For example, I was surprised that one of my friends who moved to California can speak Guangdongese. He said that was because when he was sent
to the U.S. to study in high school, his English was poor and that all of the Chinese there were from Hong Kong where they speak Guangdongese. The Chinese restaurants in his area are operated by Chinese people from Hong Kong as well. He said, “When your friends are all speaking Guangdongese, you can speak Guangdongese.” Research shows that people can learn a language in three to four months if one is in that language environment (Shin & Tiun, 2003, p. 50).

Listing a language as an official language does not ensure the usage of that language. According to Shin and Tiun (2003), most of an education budget was used to propose the law, implement the policy, and translate between different languages; therefore, there was little money left to ensure that instruction was adequate (p. 63). Not much of the budget was used in preserving language usage in the local community (Shin & Tiun, 2003, p. 63). Based on the claims-making of language equality, the DPP government should work on preserving the native languages that are at risk, such as the Taiwanese indigenous languages, and should spend resources for the educational or social works in their community rather than proposing the language equality law and implementing a national language curriculum.

What are considered to be the native languages of Taiwan, such as Ho-lo, Hakka, and indigenous languages, are more like local languages used in certain areas whereas a lot of people speak Mandarin Chinese to communicate with different ethnic groups. Also, students must learn Mandarin Chinese because it has a written language to match the spoken language for Chinese. Even though some scholars believe that the Taiwanese language could have a written language (Huang, 2008, p. 374-392), the claims-making
regarding Taiwan-centered education and language equality does not prove that the
government should implement Ho-lo language education. Also, the Ho-lo curriculum was
criticized and not supported by some native language teachers and parents (Taiwan
Television, 2006; Xue, 2009). As a result, the languages, other than Mandarin Chinese,
should not be taught as a required native language course or native education but as an
elective or supportive program for local language, because the claims-making failed to
prove that teaching Ho-lo as a native language is a foundation of identifying as Taiwanese.
It also does not ensure the equality of all native languages, except increasing the power of
Ho-lo over other ethnic groups and separate Mandarin Chinese native speakers from the
identification of being native in Taiwan.

Providing some kind of local language course is not only useful and meaningful
for students who want to learn a native or local language but also for non-native spouses
and workers who come from different countries. With the diversity of Taiwanese
languages and people, the claims-making of listing specific native languages or national
languages limited the educational opportunity and language equality for other ethnic
groups living in Taiwan. With the limit budget the government could provide, the local
governments should provide different local language courses depending on the needs and
situations in their districts. The school education could include some knowledge of
different ethnic groups in Taiwan, but should focus on the Chinese and English language
education for communication and professional purposes, because these two languages
might be more useful for student, and they can still learn a native language in their living
environment or community.
Discussions

This case study of Taiwan’s language curriculum and policy identified a situation wherein the claims-making of the government did not actually represent the social problems regarding Taiwan-centered education and language equality. Therefore, their perspective of what changes in education should be done are not necessary to solve the problems the government addressed. The claims-making features of language education and policy helped the DPP government use the curriculum and policy of native language education to oppress some ethnic groups and to influence Chinese education. Native education was not effective in students’ learning due to the curriculum design and instructional methods (Xue, 2009). However, before the government spends more money and makes more changes in education, it should provide more persuasive claims to support its actions.

Even though educational decisions are subjective and reflect designers’ values, frequent changes do not seem to be rational for students’ optimum learning. A curriculum should be prepared and fully discussed, then implemented for a long period of time for evaluation. The case of Taiwan in language curriculum illuminates how a curriculum design could raise controversy and affect society. It provides an example of how political power could influence educational decisions and how the claims-making can confuse people about the real issues.

This study sheds light on a situation where language education is heavily influence by political considerations. If people do not want frequent change in education with each change of government, this analysis of claims-making provides an opportunity to carefully
examine what the government said and discuss what changes could be made based on the
claims. Communication and persuasion are important for a persistent policy. Instead of
attacking each other, with limited evidence, about the other’s political motives concerning
education, the rhetoric analysis helps one understand the motives of a person’s words and
could be used to evaluate policy. As a result, voters would have a greater possibility to
understand how their political choices might influence their children’s education.

After analyzing the claims of the DPP government, I found that the language
curriculum and policy changes cannot achieve the goals the government stated in the
claims. If the government really believes the purpose of the claims and wants its vision to
happen, based on their own logic, they should have worked on the following suggestions
rather than implementing the new language curriculum and policy.

For the language equality of every ethnic group living in Taiwan, the government
could provide different native language courses in different areas as a community service
or education rather than implement native language courses in school. There are not
enough teachers and resources for teaching every native language in school, and not every
student has this learning need. Mandarin Chinese has been the official national language
for Taiwanese people, and it is the language that is most commonly used. The government
should require Mandarin Chinese to be the official language for a number of reasons: this
could save resources to be used for providing different native languages as national
languages in the government announcements. Furthermore, Mandarin Chinese has a
written language which corresponds to the spoken language.
Compared to spending resources to create a new written language or using phonetic symbols for other native languages, maintaining the practice of Mandarin Chinese usage and teaching it as the only national language is more convenient for communication. During the public debate for the presidential election, there is a service which provides sign language. Different public television services could broadcast their programs in various native languages for public affairs, such as news or TV programs. The courts should provide language assistants and services for different languages. This is a part of human rights. Protecting the rights of different language users does not need to list all native languages as the national language of Taiwan. Preserving native languages is important, but it does not need to include the native language course as a required course in school, especially when this action reduces the content and time for Mandarin Chinese education.

For the modern Chinese literature curriculum, the curriculum could include some Taiwanese authors' articles. There are some important writers who contributed to Taiwanese literature and history (Images of Writers, 2000). These writers have been introduced by "the Public Television Service" of Taiwan (Images of Writers, 2000). It would be appropriate to include more of their works in the selection of modern Chinese literature. However, for the ancient Chinese literature, there are more famous works from writers living in mainland China. This is partially due to the fact that Taiwan was far away from China’s cultural center. The goal of literature education is to teach valuable literature no matter where the story takes place or where the writers live. For example, American
students still study classical English literature, which was written by authors who were not from America, such as Shakespeare. I read Shakespeare to learn English as well.

The 98 Curriculum increased the percentage of modern Chinese literature. There is a controversy about modern and ancient Chinese literature education in the language curriculum design. As a Chinese teacher, I value the ancient Chinese literature education because I personally think students could enhance their Chinese reading and writing skills by reading more ancient Chinese literature. However, they would need instruction and assistance with reading ancient Chinese literature. In my generation, the language curriculum included more ancient Chinese literature. I majored in Chinese literature in college, so I have studied more ancient Chinese literature than the average Chinese student. This Chinese language is more difficult and not used in modern society, but it is the core of Chinese culture and literature. Even though students only read and study it, their writing skills of modern Chinese will be better. It is like learning English. Students will not talk or write English like Shakespeare, but reading and studying Shakespeare is an important part of English literature education. The language is old and difficult, but it is a beautiful expression of the English language and a valuable part of English culture. Because ancient Chinese is difficult but important, I suggest that the curriculum should maintain the same percentage of ancient Chinese literature or even increase it.

This concern that the percentage of ancient Chinese should not be reduced in the language curriculum becomes the major attack for the DPP government’s Chinese curriculum design. The government should understand the purpose of increasing the importance of native language education and Mandarin Chinese literature education. The
native language course will forcibly pressure students to learn a new phonetic systems and written language beyond what is already required. The lack of licensed teachers for native education will also contribute to the failure of the native language courses. Moreover, the plan for native language education also interferes with the Chinese language education. A better way to achieve the purpose of preserving native language usage and proficiency of Chinese language might be to separate “Taiwan-centered” education from native language education and “China-centered” education from Mandarin Chinese literature education.

The government could build more academic organizations for the study and preservation of these native languages and focus on Taiwanese literature and history. When more students major in Taiwanese literature or history, in different native languages, the native languages will continue to live within the people who have passion for studying them. The government could support the universities which have these departments instead of implementing required courses in the native languages. The changes do not need to be made in the schools where there may be the possibility of oppressing students. The changes could be made through community and supportive programs in media or society.

There are reasons that Taiwanese should have more chances to learn the Taiwanese language (Ho-lo) and use this language in their lives. However, the claims-making of the DPP government to propose the language equality law and then implement a Taiwan-centered national curriculum is not one of these reasons. It might be necessary for scholars to develop a new written language or phonetic symbol system for teaching or studying native languages. However, this work should not occupy the resources and
budget in education needed to help different ethnic groups have an equal access to the working and living opportunities in Taiwan. Also, it is not sensible to force all students to learn a written language and phonetic system which they might not use in their lives.

**Conclusion of Findings**

When the DPP government paid particular attention to changing language curriculum and policy instead of working on other suggestions that would be less controversial, it is a possibility that the government had a political agenda or interest that is different from what is stated in the claims. Based on the literature of language and identity, the DPP government might also believe that changing the Chinese language education and usage would change the Chinese identity. Also, the Taiwanese language and literature would build a new Taiwanese identity, separate from the Chinese identity in Taiwan. As a result, the language curriculum and policy changes in Taiwan are an example of how the government used its political power both to advocate their views on Chinese and Taiwanese education and to implement policy and curriculum in order to change people’s understanding of China/Taiwan identity. Without a discussion of Taiwan’s future relationship with China and an understanding that Taiwanese Chinese identity could be a different cultural and national identity, the DPP government wants to build a new cultural and national identity for Taiwanese people through language curriculum and policy changes.

The DPP government’s claims did not support their suggested policies. The language equality law had yet to be passed in congress, but the curriculum could have been implemented if the DPP government had won the 2008 presidential election. The
DPP government lost the election so the 98 Curriculum has not been implemented and has been sent back to committee for discussion of a new version. It is impossible to implement the 98 Curriculum in 2009 and I do not know how it will look in the new language curriculum. However, the curriculum and policy changes in Taiwan, as the DPP government planned in the speech, the proposed law, and the 98 Curriculum showed how a political power could use education for its own political ends without first having any discussion around its aims and without building any kind of consensus among its people.
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