

國立政治大學校務發展研究計畫

107 學年第 2 學期成果報告

政大第二外語課程之教學成效研究：

學習者跨文化能力發展分析

執行期間：106 年 10 月 1 日至 107 年 9 月 30 日

執行單位：外語學院

計畫主持人：尤雪瑛

共同主持人：黃淑真

計畫參與人員：曾慈儀、張芃婕

政大第二外語課程之教學成效研究:學習者跨文化能力發展分析

中文摘要

跨文化能力是外語教學很重要的一部份，為探討政大第二外語學習者之跨文化能力成長，本研究用跨文化能力量表，來探討英語以外的語言學習者的跨文化能力是否在一學年之中有所成長。此研究同時收集在政治大學所教授的八種最受歡迎的外語課程（東北亞語、東南亞語及歐洲語言）之課程大綱共 34 份，並進行師生訪談，共三種資料。但是由於研究範疇龐大，目前只完成文化量表及課程大綱分析。師生訪談已轉成文字稿，目前只初步分析老師訪談部分。課程大綱部分，研究結果顯示，「文化」二字並不平均地出現在課程大綱的內容中（包含課程描述、課程目標及週計畫表），不同外語課程也呈現不同「文化」二字出現的次數，但也顯示所有教授英語以外的外語老師都將文化融入課程內容。跨文化量表部分，本研究於學年初、學年中、學年末對第一年及第二年修課的學生發放了共三次的問卷調查，經資料配對後，同時填畢三次問卷的樣本數為 281。學習者的跨文化能力量表樣本顯示，跨文化互動情意傾向在三次的問卷調查中皆位居第一，跨文化敏覺感的呈現皆為第二，跨文化溝通相關知識、跨文化溝通行為表現能力、跨文化互動時的自我勝任感三項則無固定排序。當探討其五種能力是否因學習時間而改變時，除了跨文化互動情意傾向沒有呈現測量前後的顯著差異外，跨文化敏覺感的呈現、跨文化互動時的自我勝任感、跨文化溝通相關知識、以及跨文化溝通行為表現能力四個項目的增進皆達到顯著差異。研究結果也顯示女學生在跨文化溝通能力成長面向比男學生多且更早；歐語學習者的跨文化溝通能力在每方面都成長，東北亞語及東南亞語學習者則無；第一年英語以外的語言學習者的跨文化溝通能力在調查期間有所成長，第二年學習者則無。

關鍵詞：第二外語學習、多元外語、跨文化能力

英文摘要

The development of intercultural competence (IC) is considered a companion of foreign language learning, but most research reports focus exclusively on English or on special learning situations such as study abroad. To understand IC development in the regular classroom of languages other than English (LOTEs), this project uses data collected through questionnaire survey, interviews with teachers and students, and analysis of course descriptions. However, at this stage the researchers only complete the analysis of survey and course description. The rich data of interview will be analyzed in follow-up studies. The study examined the IC development of learners of eight LOTEs during one school year. Participants were college students enrolled in the first two years of eight most popular LOTE courses (Japanese, Korean, Vietnamese, Thai, Indonesian, German, French, and Spanish) at National Chengchi University. They participated in an IC questionnaire survey at the beginning, middle, and end of the 2017 school year. A total of 281 complete data sets were matched from the three waves of survey. Results indicated that, among five constructs of affect, consciousness, knowledge, behavior, and self-efficacy, these LOTE learners' affect was ranked the highest since the onset but resisted to change for the rest of the year. Knowledge, although the lowest among five IC constructs, improved most significantly. Most changes occurred in the first semester and then levelled off for second-year learners. Differences in IC and its levels of changes also existed between gender and among language clusters.

Keywords: second foreign language learning, multilingualism, intercultural competence

政大外語學院自 94 學年開始在教育部高教司補助下成立北區大學外文中心，為全國大專院校學生及社會人士開設第二外語(英文為第一外語)課程。至今政大外語學院已經開出 26 種第二外語課程，包括歐洲、非洲及亞洲各地使用之語言，甚至也涵蓋拉丁文。這些課程授課方式多元，包含遠距、線上及實體課程。其中實體課程主要開設在政大，提供政大同學多元語言文化的學習環境及刺激，這是台灣其他大學無法提供的特殊資源，目前每學年修習第二外語(第一至三年)及學程同學均維持在接近兩千人的水準。

當前外語教學理論已經調整教學走向，其目標不只是語言知識及技巧傳授，更重要的是引導學習者獲得實際語言使用能力，和跨文化溝通及移動力。本校外語學院推行二外教學已進入第 12 學年，值此高等教育環境丕變，本校進行課程改革之際，擬藉此計畫評估多年來政大第二外語課程的教學成效及學生的評價和回饋意見。

本研究預期效果有二。其一是將研究成果撰寫成論文，投稿至國內外期刊，將政大外語學院經營多年的第二外語教學成果及經驗分享給國內外之外語教學界。本案共同主持人黃淑真已經完成兩篇論文，其中一篇已經於 2019 年二月上線發表於 *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development* (SSCI) 之專刊，該專刊探討以英語為主流的外語學習環境下，華人地區大學的第二外語教學發展及影響，包括政策、課程設計、教學效益、及學習者之評估。本研究是其中唯一探討台灣二外教學之論文，本文的發表讓其他國家學者知道政大在高教領域創造多元語言文化教學的貢獻，論文全文詳見附件(一)。第二篇論文以政大第二外語學習者的跨文化能力改變為題 (*Motivation and intercultural competence: a study of second foreign language learning in a Taiwanese tertiary context*) 已投稿至另一 SSCI 期刊，論文全文詳見附件(二)。

本研究第二項預期效果是分析學習者在學期初及期末的跨文化能力改變。其研究結果，可以做為未來政大第二外語課程在制定統一教學目標、課程大綱、教學活動、及教學評量之依據，期使本校外語教育更健全。

研究方法分量化統計，及質性主題分析：

量化部分，本研究使用了改編自趙子嘉教授(2014)所編制的跨文化能力量表，來探討英語以外的語言學習者的跨文化能力是否在一學年之中有所成長，跨文化能力量表請見附件(三)。本研究針對選修第二外語的學生，透過線上問卷，進行跨文化能力量表研究。調查之語言以選修人較多，且代表不同區域的語言為主，分別是歐洲(德、法、西)、東北亞(日、韓)及東南亞語文(越、馬/印、泰)。為觀察學生跨文化能力發展，針對同一群學生，分別在 106 學年第一學期期初(第 3 至 5 週)及期末(第 16 至 18 週)，第二學期期末(第 16 至 18

週)，用同一份能力量表測試三次。目的是要看同一批學生在修課剛開始、第一學期結束和第二學期結束，為期一學年三個時間點的跨文化能力改變。同時填畢三次問卷的樣本數為 281，其結果進行量化統計分析。為確保問卷作答品質，學期初由研究助理利用下課時間到各班說明研究目的、作答方法、及獎勵方式。附件(四)為致任課老師函，文件發送及資料收集流程。

學習者跨文化能力量表樣本問卷統計分析結果顯示，跨文化互動情意傾向在三次的問卷調查中皆位居第一，跨文化敏覺感的呈現皆為第二，跨文化溝通相關知識、跨文化溝通行為表現能力、跨文化互動時的自我勝任感三項則無固定排序。當探討其五種能力是否因學習時間而改變時，除了跨文化互動情意傾向沒有改變外，跨文化敏覺感的呈現、跨文化互動時的自我勝任感、跨文化溝通相關知識、以及跨文化溝通行為表現能力的增長幅度皆達到統計上的顯著差異。研究結果也顯示女學生在跨文化溝通能力成長面向比男學生多且更早；歐語學習者的跨文化溝通能力在每方面都成長，東北亞語及東南亞語學習者則無；第一年英語以外的語言學習者的跨文化溝通能力在調查期間有所成長，第二年學習者則無。統計分析見附件(五)。

除客觀數據外，質性研究部分，本研究收集在政治大學所教授的外語課程（歐洲語言、東北亞語、及東南亞語）之課程大綱共 34 份。分析文化議題在課堂中的分量或重要性。研究結果顯示，「文化」二字並不平均地出現在課程大綱的內容中（包含課程描述、課程目標及週計畫表），不同外語課程也呈現不同「文化」二字出現的次數，但也顯示所有教授英語以外的外語老師都將文化融入課程內容。分析之課程大綱請見附件(六)。

質性研究另一部分是本研究主持人及共同主持人邀請修課且完成問卷的同學 30 位，任課老師 6 位進行訪談。分別從教師及學生觀點整理二外課程對學習者的影響，如動機（愛好或排斥之原因，學習目的），學習經驗（困難及收穫），文化素養（知識及行為）等。訪談內容已經轉成文字稿，這部分資料尚未分析完畢，但是初步整理教師訪談內容，可以歸納以下幾點共同觀點。一是語言學習離不開文化，老師授課時一定會經由介紹節慶、禮儀、時事新聞、音樂藝術、甚至文學來引領學生熟悉該國文化。其次，善用現代科技，可以從事各種教學活動，引發學生興趣，活化課程內容。本研究的蒐集大量資料，未來可以進一步更多質性之研究分析。教師及學生之訪談問題請見附件(七)。

結論

本研究進行之政大第二外語學習者跨文化能力改變，有以下主要結論：

- (一) 在五項主要能力分類中，這些學習者跨文化互動情意和跨文化敏覺感傾向最高。顯示他們喜歡與不同語言文化的人溝通交流，同時在進行交流時，他們也能注意到不同文化差異，會特別為此作準備，隨時觀察，並事後檢討。
- (二) 雖然這些學習者在情意方面跨文化溝通動機強，但是五項能力中跨文化互動時的自我勝任感(自信)則分數偏低。
- (三) 五項主要能力中跨文化溝通知識雖然平均分數最低，但是成長最多。顯見政大學生跨文化知識吸收能力強。
- (四) 學習者跨文化能力成長最快速是在第一學期，其後則減緩。可能是學習者剛開始對接觸的外國語言文化有新鮮感，隨著逐漸熟悉，就沒繼續保持學習的注意力。
- (五) 不同課程大綱裡，文化議題的含量不一，但是初步比較課程大綱和其學生之跨文化能力成長，發現大綱特別關注文化內容的課程，學生跨文化能力表現較佳。

建議

在歐盟及北美，跨文化能力已經被列入教學綱要(如 ACTFL)。在台灣，新的十二年國教新課綱也是把文化議題列為教學重點之一。未來進入政大就讀的學生，在國高中時期就已經有豐富的跨文化學習經驗。政大第二外語教學，目前已經有良好表現，但是面對快速改變的教育環境，我們可以在部分內容加強。

- (一) 目前學教育的一項問題是，沒有和高中密切銜接。近年來因為教改，多元入學管道，考招制度變化，以及推行新課綱，高中教育已經進行許多變革，但是許多大學老師不知道高中教學的改變。政大應提供教師國教新課綱參考，以了解大學生在中學階段的語言學習經驗。
- (二) 目前政大外語教學已經相當關注文化議題，但是實際授課內容尚未有具體原則或規範，由任課老師自行規劃。未來可考慮在教學會議中，更明確討論哪些文化議題，或跨文化能力面向，可以納入語言教學課程。

(三) 政大是社會科學教育重要學校，跨文化能力培養有助於政大學生未來進入國際社群。外語學院未來可以和相關學院，及國合處的國際學生，舉辦跨文化，跨領域的研習營、工作坊或演講。讓不同外語的母語人士與學生進行實際的跨文化溝通交流。

附錄(中英文參考文獻)

References

- Abduh, A. and R. Rosmaladewi. 2018. "Promoting Intercultural Competence in Bilingual Programs in Indonesia." *Sage Open* July-September: 1-7.
- Alptekin, C. 2002. "Towards Intercultural Communicative Competence in ELT." *ELT Journal* 56: 57-64.
- Avgousti, M. I. 2018. "Intercultural Communicative Competence and Online Exchanges: A Systematic Review." *Computer Assisted Language Learning* 31 (8): 819-853.
- Bennett, M. J. 1993. "Towards Ethnorelativism: A Developmental Model of Intercultural Sensitivity." In *Education for the Intercultural Experience*, edited by R. M. Paige, 21-71. Yarmouth, ME: Intercultural Press.
- Bennett, J. M., M. J. Bennett, and W. Allen. 2003. "Developing Intercultural Competence in the Language Classroom. In *Culture as the Core: Perspective on Culture in Second Language Learning*, edited by D. L. Lange and R. M. Paige, 237-270. Greenwich, CT: Information Age.
- Byram, M. 1988. "Foreign Language Education and Cultural Studies." *Language, Culture and Curriculum* 1 (1): 15-31.
- Byram, M. 1997. *Teaching and Assessing Intercultural Communication Competence.* Clevedon, UK: Multilingual Matters.
- Byram, M. 2014. "Twenty-five Years On—From Cultural Studies to Intercultural Citizenship." *Language, Culture and Curriculum* 27 (3): 209-225.
- Chao, T.-C. 2012. "A Diary Study of University EFL Learners' Intercultural Learning through Foreign Films." *Language, Culture and Curriculum* 26 (3): 247-265.
- Chao, T.-C. 2014. "The Development and Application of an Intercultural Competence Scale for University EFL Learners." *English Teaching & Learning* 38 (4): 79-124.
- Çiftçi, E. Y. 2016. "A Review of Research on Intercultural Learning through Computer-Based Digital Technologies." *Educational Technology & Society* 19 (2): 313-327.
- Deardorff, D. K. 2006. "Identification and Assessment of Intercultural Competence as a Student Outcome of Internationalization." *Journal of Studies in International Education* 10: 241-266.
- Fantini, A. E. 2009. "Assessing Intercultural Competence: Issues and Tools." In *The Sage Handbook of Intercultural Competence*, edited by D. K. Deardorff, 456-476. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Fischer, R. 2011. "Cross-cultural Training Effects on Cultural Essentialism Beliefs and Cultural Intelligence." *International Journal of Intercultural Relations* 35: 767-775.
- Lantz-Deaton, C. 2017. "Internationalisation and the Development of Students' Intercultural Competence." *Teaching in Higher Education* 22 (5): 532-550.
- Liaw, M.-L. 2006. "E-learning and the Development of Intercultural Competence." *Language Learning & Technology* 10 (3): 49-64.
- Marijuan, S., and C. Sanz. 2018. "Expanding Boundaries: Current and New Directions in Study Abroad Research and Practice." *Foreign Language Annals* 51: 185-204.
- Pinner, R. S. 2016. *Reconceptualising Authenticity for English as a Global Language.* Bristol, UK: Multilingual Matters.

- Schartner, A. 2016. "The Effect of Study Abroad on Intercultural Competence: A Longitudinal Case study of International Postgraduate Students at a British University." *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development* 37 (4): 402-418.
- Su, Y.-C. 2018. "Assessing Taiwanese College Students' Intercultural Sensitivity, EFL Interests, Attitudes Toward Native English Speakers, Ethnocentrism, and Their Interrelation." *Asia-Pacific Educational Researcher* 27 (3): 217-226.
- Terzuolo, E. R. 2018. "Intercultural Development in Study Abroad: Influence of Student and Program Characteristics." *International Journal of Intercultural Relations* 65: 86-95.
- Ushioda, E., and D. Dörnyei. 2017. "Beyond Global English: Motivation to Learn Languages in a Multicultural World: Introduction to the Special Issue." *Modern Language Journal* 101 (3): 451-454.
- Yarosha, M., D. Lukicb, and R. Santibáñez-Gruberc. 2018. "Intercultural Competence for Students in International Joint Master Programmes." *International Journal of Intercultural Relations* 66: 52-72.
- Young, T. J., and I. Sachdev. 2011. "Intercultural Communicative Competence: Exploring English Language Teachers' Beliefs and Practices." *Language Awareness* 20 (2): 81-98.



Learning experience reigns – Taiwanese learners’ motivation in learning eight additional languages as compared to English

Shu-Chen Huang 

Foreign Language Centre, National Chengchi University, Taipei, Taiwan, Republic of China

ABSTRACT

Informed by Dörnyei’s L2 Motivational Self System and intended to fill a gap in learning motivation research on languages other than English Accepted 12 January 2019

(LOTEs), this study investigated learners’ motivation for three language clusters – Southeast Asian (Vietnamese, Thai and Malay), Northeast Asian

ARTICLE HISTORY

(Japanese and Korean) and European (German, Spanish and French) – Language learning motivation; languages other and compared the results against the same learners’ English learning than English (LOTE); English motivation. Regression analyses revealed that for all three language as a foreign language (EFL); groups, the strongest predictors of intended effort were learning L2MSS; Taiwan experience, followed by ideal self and culture/community interest. Ought-to self and instrumentality, both promotional and preventive, were ruled out in all three LOTE regression models. The significance of learning experience as a motivational predictor was comparatively new in LOTE-related findings. These learners’ English learning motivation presented a similar but more complicated picture, with predictive variables being, in descending order, learning attitude, culture/ community interest, learning experience, ideal self and instrumentality. While externally imposed motivators played a role in English, they did not do so for the same learners in LOTE situations. Discrepancies with earlier results concerning LOTE motivation as well as with similar learner populations are discussed. Implications for both pedagogical practice and the theoretical development of foreign language motivation are suggested.

Introduction

As English has become the global lingua franca with high utilitarian values and has blurred its association with specific ethnic and cultural groups, its characteristics are quite distinctive from those of other languages in many ways. However, research in second language motivation to date has largely been built upon English as a foreign/second language (EFL/ESL), leaving a myriad of other languages absent from the research landscape (Boo, Dörnyei, and Ryan 2015; Dörnyei and Al-Hoorie 2017; Ushioda and Dörnyei 2017). This may be misleading if educators and policymakers base their decisions for other languages on such EFL/ESL-laden findings (Ushioda and Dörnyei 2017). In Boo, Dörnyei, and Ryan’s (2015) review of 416 publications on L2 motivation between 2004 and 2015, 73% of the empirical investigations were on ESL, and the study concluded that ‘motivation research in Asian settings is almost exclusively concerned with the learning of English’ (151). Such imbalance and possible bias are discussed extensively in a 2017 special issue of *The Modern Language Journal* (MLJ) dedicated to the motivation to learn languages other than English (LOTEs). With LOTEs missing from our understanding of L2 motivation, there is a pressing need for empirical studies on the motivation of LOTE learners. Nevertheless, when outlining research

directions, Dörnyei and Al-Hoorie (2017) cite Henry (2010) in maintaining the importance of English as a referential yardstick for our understanding of LOTE motivation, and point to competition and interference among languages, presumably negative influences on LOTEs caused by the globalisation of English. Thus, gauging LOTE motivation research upon the referent of English motivation may shed some light and help us reap benefits from previous research efforts. Finding out about the motivation for EFL and LOTEs within the same learner group may be especially informative in our attempts to understand LOTE motivation.

Another issue associated with language motivation, in spite of its strong individual-psychological nature, is the macro geopolitical and sociocultural contexts where the language, whether English or a LOTE, is taught and learnt. In fact, earlier development of the influential dichotomy of integrative and instrumental orientations (Gardner 1985) was modified partly because it fell short of accounting for contexts outside of Canada (Humphreys and Spratt 2008, 314). By contrast, the aforementioned 2017 MLJ special issue, in an effort to explore LOTE motivation, showcases a wide coverage of various languages in diverse geographical settings as varied as America, Europe and Japan. All the authors of the seven empirical studies provide unique contextual details to foreground their research for international readers and use this information in explaining their results.

The study reported here, as part of an aggregated effort to depict LOTE education in the greater Chinese-speaking areas, focused specifically on LOTE learners' motivation in Taiwan, where systematic government efforts to promote LOTE education at the tertiary level started in 2005 at one university in Taipei. The number of LOTEs started at four, increased to 20 within two years, and has remained in the twenties ever since. The number of registered learners grew from 116 in 2005 to 1892 in 2017. The most popular LOTEs have been Japanese, Spanish, French and German. Other languages taught include Korean, Thai, Vietnamese, Malay, Portuguese, Italian, Turkish, Czech, Persian, Polish, Arabic, Hebrew, Swahili, Latin, Ancient Greek, Tibetan, Mongolian, Zhuang and Uyghur. LOTE courses were open to all students and were not compulsory. Among the above plethora of LOTEs, eight languages from three geographical areas, namely Europe, Northeast Asia and Southeast Asia, were chosen as the targets of investigation because they consistently account for nearly 90% of the entire LOTE learner population.

Based on the above introduction, this study set out to compare the motivational profiles of Taiwanese college students who, in addition to fulfilling the English requirement, chose to enrol in courses to study one of these eight LOTEs. By building regression models for each of the three clusters of LOTE learners as well as for the entire sample of English learners using questionnaire responses, the similarities and differences in motivational characteristics among these language groups were identified in the hope that these would allow us to examine how the same learners' LOTE motivation could deviate from or resemble their English motivation. The specific research question that guided this study was: What were the Taiwanese college LOTE learners' motivational characteristics, and how did their LOTE motivation characteristics compare to those for English?

Literature review

The current study adopted Dörnyei's second language motivational self system (L2MSS) as a theoretical framework. L2MSS is currently the most referenced framework in second language motivation studies (Boo, Dörnyei, and Ryan 2015). It takes into account Gardner's (1985) earlier socio-psychological model and its dichotomy of integrative and instrumental orientation, but changes the direction of reference from outwardly gauging the target language community to inwardly gauging the future vision of the learner's self. Relevant motivational factors are incorporated into three major variables – ideal L2 self, ought-to L2 self, and language learning experience (Dörnyei

2009). Ideal L2 self, the L2-specific aspiration of the learner's future image, a domain related to Gardner's integrativeness, is a desire to be integrated to the target language community. Ought-to L2 self, by contrast, is closely related to instrumentality, i.e. the utilitarian aspects of learning a language that embody the expectations and obligations the learner perceives from significant others or society. Language learning experience is related to a person's past and current learning experiences.

Generally speaking, ideal self has been identified as a very robust predictor of language learning motivation across age groups and geographical areas (e.g. Csizér and Dörnyei 2005a; Csizér and Kormos 2009; Ryan 2009; Taguchi 2013; Taguchi, Magid, and Papi 2009). For ought-to self, however, some studies indicate that it contributes less to motivated behaviour (e.g. Csizér and Kormos 2009; Kim 2012; Papi 2010), while others report complexity in its psychometric property (Kormos and Csizér 2008; Lamb 2012). Finally, language learning experience has been found to play a crucial role in motivated learning behaviour (e.g. Kormos and Csizér 2008; Lamb 2012; Papi 2010; Ryan 2009).

Findings from LOTE studies

In the dearth of studies on LOTE motivation, integrativeness was identified in earlier reports as an important antecedent of motivation. This was found for learners of Russian, German, French, Italian, and English in Hungary (Csizér and Dörnyei 2005a, 2005b; Dörnyei and Clement 2001) and of Spanish in the US (Hernández 2006). However, scholars later found some mismatch between the concept of integrativeness and real-life scenarios. This 'signaled the need to replace "integrativeness" with a more holistic concept' (Dörnyei and Al-Hoorie 2017, 456).

In later research when L2MSS has been applied as the framework, the strongest predictor of motivation for LOTEs has predominantly been found to be the ideal self. This holds true for learners of German and English in Hungary (Csizér and Lukács 2010), of Mandarin and English in Hong Kong (Dörnyei and Chan 2013), and of German in Britain (Busse 2013). Interestingly, Busse (2013) reported that integrative orientation, when competing with the ideal self as one of the predictor scales, failed to predict German learners' motivation.

The above findings from LOTE studies are generally similar to those from research on learners of EFL/ESL. Despite these similarities, Thompson (2017) found that learners of up to 34 different LOTEs in Anglophone America had particularly low ought-to-self scores, and noted a large gap between ought-to and ideal selves. This 'differs from previous research using the L2MSS framework when the language in question is English' (495). It was suggested that while many English learners felt both strong internal desire (ideal self) and externally imposed necessity (ought-to self) to learn English, these American learners of LOTE possessed strong internal desire but did not feel the same kind of obligation as their EFL/ESL-learning counterparts did. For the ought-to self, Dörnyei and AlHoorie (2017) postulate that its very nature for LOTE learners may be more fragmented, sensitive to particular languages in particular contexts, and 'might reach such a degree that it cannot be considered a unified self-dimension anymore?' (460). In particular, they point out that, unlike English learning around the world that receives even and constant social support, the learning of LOTEs could face either support, indifference or discouraging attitudes.

The third mainstay of the L2MSS, language learning experience, is suggested by Dörnyei (2005) as another potential motivational path (in addition to the ideal self) to language learning success when it is positively perceived (106). However, learning experience has been discussed relatively infrequently and has shown non-significant results in existing LOTE studies. Unlike in English learning where there is evidence for its importance, as mentioned earlier, learning experience does not seem to play a role in LOTE motivation studies to date. In particular, Csizér and Lukács (2010) point out that for their German and English learners, learning experience did not emerge as a significant latent dimension. Moreover, Henry and Apelgren (2008) found a decline in attitudes to

the learning situation between grades 5 and 6 among Swedish pupils studying German, French, Spanish and a sign language.

A number of LOTE studies make deliberate comparisons with English. Humphreys and Spratt (2008) compared motivation to learn the required English, Mandarin and a chosen language (French, German or Japanese) among college learners in Hong Kong. These learners expressed more positive affect and motivation for English, the global language, and for their selected LOTE than they did for Mandarin. In Sweden, Henry and Apelgren (2008) found positive attitudes toward LOTE, which, despite a decline after a year, was still higher than that toward English. These results seem to suggest that positive affect and attitude are related to utilitarian value and, moreover, free choice.

In addition to comparing English with LOTE, some LOTE research addresses the impact of global English on LOTE. Such impacts are found to be mostly negative (and are therefore labelled as interference), as demonstrated in pupils learning French in Sweden (Henry 2010) and college students learning French, Chinese, Spanish, German, Korean, Russian and other LOTE in Japan (Sugita McEown, Sawaki, and Harada 2017). Ushioda (2017) critically analyses such impact and suggests that it mainly stems from both an instrumentalist view of global English and the fact that motivation could be socially distributed onto individuals. However, Dörnyei and Al-Hoorie (2017) indicate that this impact from English could also function in a positive manner, such as in transferring linguistic confidence from one language to the other.

Another issue relates to the language specificity of learning motivation. Dörnyei and Chan (2013) found distinct language-specific visions in learners studying different languages. Similarly, Henry (2010) found that learners who simultaneously learned English and French had different language-specific images of themselves.

The learner population in Taiwan and the greater Chinese area

Learner population is one important aspect in language motivation studies. Although national identities are not as rigid in today's globalised world, it is generally believed that the cultures, social values and societal norms associated with ethnic groups play a significant role in shaping language motivation. Boo, Dörnyei, and Ryan's (2015) review found a shift in the contexts of study from North America and Europe to East Asia during 2004–2015. Among the 53 countries where motivational studies were conducted, Boo, Dörnyei, and Ryan (2015) found that mainland China ranked after Japan and the US, but the Chinese-as-L1 learner group became the largest cluster when studies carried out in Taiwan and Hong Kong were incorporated.

In Taiwan, Warden and Lin (2000) surveyed non-English-major students enrolled in required English courses in one vocational-track university and found that integrativeness was nonexistent among this learner group. Instead, their motivation was influenced by instrumental orientation and course requirements. The authors warn classroom teachers to be wary of adopting imported materials that assume learners can be motivated through cultural integration. Likewise, Chen, Warden, and Chang (2005) surveyed 15- to 40-year-olds, including students and office workers, and found the strongest predictor of skills to be requirement motivation, with no significant role played by integrative motivation. Drawing on the culture of Confucian meritocracy embedded in Chinese society, they coin the term 'Chinese imperative' to describe this phenomenon, pointing to the influence of culture on learning motivation and questioning the construct of integrativeness in a nonWestern context.

Huang and Chen (2017) surveyed junior high English learners aged 11–16 across Taiwan. Their regression analyses indicated that a positive attitude toward language learning and classroom experiences fuelled these young learners' motivation. Similar to findings from Warden and Lin (2000) and Chen, Warden, and Chang (2005), the ought-to self was a more prominent predictor of intended learning effort and class involvement than the ideal self. For the same participants, Huang (2017)

divided them into groups of those with and those without additional out-of-class tutoring and compared their motivational profiles. Those receiving tutoring demonstrated higher motivation and more frequent learning behaviours. For both groups, prominent motivational predictors were similar – the ought-to self, learning attitudes, and learning experiences. The ideal self again played a minor role; it was only pertinent in one of three criterion models among those who received tutoring.

Going beyond English, Huang, Hsu, and Chen (2015) investigated Taiwanese college students' motivation for learning English, Japanese, Korean, French and German. In light of the L2MSS and previous empirical findings, the authors were particularly interested in how social role obligations played out in a Confucian-influenced society. Other predictor variables which they examined included cultural interest and career opportunities. For all five languages, the ideal self and cultural interest emerged as the strongest predictors, a finding contrary to other Taiwanese studies on English motivation discussed above but consistent with many studies outside Taiwan. The ought-to self and social role obligations were predictive of motivation in some, but not all, of the languages studied.

A large-scale survey on English learning motivation conducted by You and Dörnyei (2016) across geographical regions and educational institutions in China provides a reference point that is representative and timely. A consistent rank ordering of the three components of the L2MSS was found across subpopulations; that is, learners' attitudes toward their learning experiences were by far the most highly associated with intended effort, followed by ideal self, with ought-to self coming third. They conclude that for Chinese learners 'the desire to invest time and energy in language learning seems to be associated first and foremost with the evaluation of the learning process' (512), and that Chinese learners are not so different from many of the Western learners reported in the literature. Their results provide powerful counterevidence to the concept of the 'Chinese Imperative' raised by Chen, Warden, and Chang (2005), as well as findings from Warden and Lin (2000), Huang and Chen (2017), and Huang (2017) regarding English learners in Taiwan.

The literature reviewed provides insights into LOTE learning motivation in other parts of the world, mainly European and North American contexts. While research results on the specific motivational characteristics of learner populations in Taiwan and the greater Chinese area are also informative, they are mostly limited to the learning of English. The current study was thus designed to focus on Taiwanese learners' motivation to learn LOTES, and compare it directly with the same learners' motivation to learn English.

Method

Participants and sampling

Participants in this survey were students enrolled in the eight chosen LOTES at National Chengchi University in Taipei in the autumn of 2017. They came from disciplines including various sciences, social sciences, liberal arts, business, law and mass communication. According to the university's course regulations, the students' foreign language requirement was two semesters of College English I and II, each worth two credits. All the other LOTE courses were electives in a three-credit-hour design, with some only available as I and II for a year and others as I through IV spanning two years. Those who had completed the English requirement or who qualified for exemption could take a LOTE. At the time of the study, the total number of students learning these eight LOTES was 1655, representing 87.5% of the total 1892 students registered in the 21 languages offered in 43 course sections. As shown in Table 1, our sample represented an average of 35.6% of the eight-language population (ranging from 27.9% for Spanish to 44.8% for Vietnamese). The average

Table 1. Distribution of participants among language groups.



	Southeast Asian			Northeast Asian		European			Total/Average
	Vietnamese	Malay		Japanese	Korean	German	French	Spanish	
Thai									
# of learners	67	82	112	343	84	272	333	362	1655
% sampled	44.8	40.2	29.5	43.1	38.1	39.3	31.8	27.9	35.6
# sampled	30	33	33	148	32	107	106	101	590
Male	7	17	11	38	4	28	25	31	161
Female	23	16	22	110	28	79	81	70	429
% in sample	5.1	5.6	5.6	25.1	5.4	18.1	18.0	17.1	100

age of the participants was 19.83 years, and female learners accounted for 72.7% of the sample. When surveyed, 362 (61.4%) reported having started learning English before entering elementary school, and 203 (34.4%) had started within the first three years of elementary school; together these individuals accounted for 95.8% of the sample. Also, 445 participants (77.1%) reported having learned a LOTE before, but the rest of them had not.

Data collection procedure

In order to find out about the same learners' EFL and LOTE motivation, the survey was administered in two waves, the first at the beginning of the semester for English, and the second at the end of the semester for the participants' respective LOTE; this was when all the learners had enough experience with their LOTE to respond to the survey questions. In the two waves, 853 and 828 complete responses were gathered respectively. Among these, 590 learners participated in both waves and the paired data from their responses was used for analysis.

Right before the Autumn 2017 semester, the researcher contacted all 12 instructors of the eight languages via email to explain the study and ask for their assistance. After obtaining the instructors' permission, two research assistants brought and distributed leaflets to the 31 class sections during 10-minute breaks between class periods from weeks three to five, to inform the students of the survey's purpose and logistics. On the leaflets, in addition to information about the background of the study, was a QR code providing easy access for smartphone users to enter the survey website. Participation was voluntary and incentives were provided in a raffle drawing system, with 20% of those who completed all procedures in both waves having a chance to win a convenience store voucher or a movie ticket worth NT\$200 (approximately US\$7). Two weeks before the end of the 18-week semester, the research assistants visited and distributed leaflets again to remind students about the second-phase survey.

On the online survey portal, participants read the researcher's invitation letter, provided consent, rated learning- and motivation-related statements, and gave personal demographic information. In the second wave, participants chose their own course number from a dropdown list and were automatically directed to the version that matched their LOTE.

Instrument

The questionnaires developed and used in both phases, for English and LOTE, were parallel in content. Both consisted of 30 items and used 5-point Likert scales with 1 indicating 'never' or 'strongly disagree' and 5 indicating 'always' or 'strongly agree'. The items used were adopted from established motivation questionnaires with adequate validity and reliability (e.g. Huang 2017; Lamb 2012). Intended learning effort, represented by six items, was the criterion measure because compared to other self-report criterion variables used for the Taiwanese college learner population, regression models using this measure yielded higher explanatory power (Huang, Hsu, and Chen 2015). Language proficiency scores, although desirable as an objective criterion measure, were not

included because of the high variability in languages, course levels, course sections, instructors, and grading schemes within and between LOTEs. It was also unfeasible for participants to sit a single English test.

In addition to major L2MSS predictors, both forms of instrumentality, promotion and prevention, were included because past studies on Taiwanese learners have shown instrumentality to be an important factor (Chen, Warden, and Chang 2005; Warden and Lin 2000). The same reasoning applied to two more variables: language learning attitude (Huang and Chen 2017) and culture/community interest (Huang, Hsu, and Chen 2015). Nine versions of the questionnaire, tailored for English and the eight LOTEs, were written in the learners' native language, Mandarin Chinese, and were piloted with three student informants who did not participate in the formal study. Discussions followed regarding the clarification of meaning and wording. The same procedure was repeated with the research assistants involved in this project. All seven predictor scales in the questionnaire are briefly summarised below with item examples, in which Language represents the language being surveyed in different circumstances.

- (1) Learning Experience (5 items): the extent to which learners enjoy their learning experience. Example: 'I found learning Language very interesting.'
- (2) Ideal Self (4 items): the learner's future self-vision related to the language being studied. Example: 'I can imagine myself communicating with people in Language.'
- (3) Ought-to Self (3 items): learners' sense of duty and obligation towards learning the language. Example: 'Learning Language is what I should do.'
- (4) Instrumentality–Promotion (3 items): the regulation of pragmatic benefits associated with learning the language. Example: 'Being proficient in Language will help me get a good job or make more money.'
- (5) Instrumentality–Prevention (3 items): regulation of fears for negative consequences associated with language learning failure. Example: 'I may be looked down upon if I don't have a good command of Language.'
- (6) Learning Attitude (3 items): the extent to which the learner enjoys learning the language. Example: 'I enjoy learning Language.'
- (7) Culture/Community Interest (3 items): the learner's interest in learning about the culture related to the target language community. Example: 'I want to travel to places where people speak Language.'

Results

The data obtained were analysed using R Studio 9.9. Learner responses at the end of the semester regarding the eight LOTEs were grouped by the three geographic areas. Results from the same learners' beginning-of-term responses on English were analysed, both: (1) as a whole for comparison with the three LOTE clusters; and (2) by LOTE learner group for within-subject comparisons between English and the LOTEs. Preliminary assumptions regarding the normality, linearity and homogeneity of variance were examined, and no violation of assumptions in data sets was found. Statistical examinations are explained below.

Reliability, descriptive statistics and correlation analyses

The results of the reliability analyses, shown in Table 2, indicated that the Cronbach alphas of subscales under the different language groups and for the entire sample in English were mostly in the .80s and .90s. Learning experience and learning attitude were the two most reliable variables, with

Table 2. Cronbach alpha coefficients of scales.

	# of	Southeast Asian Language Learners		Northeast Asian Language Learners		European Language Learners		Entire Learner items (n = 96) Sample (n = 590)
		English	LOTES	English	LOTES	English	LOTES	
Intended effort	6	.83	.83	.85	.86	.83	.88	.85
Learning experience	5	.93	.94	.93	.92	.92	.94	.93
Ideal self	4	.87	.78	.87	.75	.87	.84	.87
Culture/community interest	3	.88	.66	.81	.73	.82	.80	.84
Learning attitude	3	.93	.93	.92	.91	.93	.94	.93
Ought-to self	3	.72	.67	.67	.53	.65	.69	.68
Instrumentality–promotion	3	.80	.75	.72	.74	.81	.79	.79
Instrumentality–prevention	3	.82	.87	.77	.81	.81	.85	.80

alpha values above .90 for all the language clusters and subpopulations. On the other hand, the ought-to self had alpha values constantly lower than the other variables. All the alpha values were above .60 except for one item, which was the ought-to self value of .53 for Northeast Asian languages. The criterion variable, intended effort, had all alphas above .80, and the same was also true for ideal self except for Northeast Asian Languages.

Descriptive statistics are presented in Table 3. Within-subject t-tests were also performed between English and the LOTES. On the Likert scale of 1–5, only three of the 56 means were below 3 (italicized), and they all related to instrumentality–prevention for LOTES, while 26 means had values above 4 (underlined). T-test results showed consistent patterns between English and the LOTES. For all three LOTE clusters, learners' intended effort, learning experience and learning attitudes were uniformly higher for LOTES than for English, whereas English was higher than all LOTES in ideal self, ought-to self, instrumentality–promotion and instrumentality–prevention.

Correlation analyses were conducted to understand the strength of the linear relationships between the predictor and the seven criterion variables. Most of the correlation coefficients reached the .01 significance level (apart from on three occasions, i.e. in instrumentality–prevention for all three LOTE clusters). The preventive instrumentality measure was statistically significant only for English. The strongest linear relationship was found in learning experience in all language groups, followed by learning attitude and culture/community interest. Comparatively, the correlation coefficients of ideal self with intended learning effort were generally lower than the aforementioned measures. Coefficients for the ought-to self and promotional instrumentality were mostly around .400, ranging from .310 to .507. Correlations of instrumentality–prevention with the criterion measure were low across all the languages (Table 4).

Regression analysis

Stepwise multiple regression analyses were conducted to examine the predictive power of the selected motivational variables. The resultant final models and the remaining variables are presented in Table 5. The adjusted R^2 values indicate that 52%, 54%, 66% and 62% of the variance were accounted for by the final models for Southeast Asian, Northeast Asian, European and English languages, respectively.

For Southeast Asian languages, significant contributors to intended learning effort included, in descending order, learning experience, ideal self and culture/community interest. For Northeast Asian languages, the strongest predictor was again learning experience, followed by

culture/community interest and ideal self. For European languages the picture was almost the same, with learning experience having a standard beta of .37 followed by .28 and .21 for ideal self and culture/community interest respectively. Learning attitude played a minor role in the European model with a beta of .11. The English model showed a more complicated scenario. The most prominent predictor was again learning experience. Here, learning attitude, despite having no significant roles in predicting effort for LOTEs, obtained a beta of .24. Ideal self and culture/community interest, the two secondary variables in all three LOTE models, had a similar position in English motivation. They were then followed by two variables that were entirely absent from all LOTE models, i.e. the two types of instrumentality – promotion and prevention.

In summary, regression models for LOTEs – Southeast Asian, Northeast Asian, and European languages – all demonstrated that learning experience was the strongest predictor of intended learning effort, followed by ideal self and culture/community interest, with each explaining roughly a quarter of the variance. Excluded from all LOTE models were externally imposed motivation, ought-to self, instrumentality–prevention and instrumentality–promotion. Although differences among language groups had been conjectured, such as instrumentality boosted by current governmental policy for Southeast Asian languages, in fact no difference was found. The motivational profiles of different LOTE clusters were strikingly similar. Regardless of which language they were learning, these LOTE learners were driven by their learning experience, ideal self and culture/

Table 3. Descriptive statistics and t-test results.

	= Southeast Asian Language Learners (n = 96)					Northeast Asian Language Learners (n = 180)					European Language Learners (n = 314)					Entire Learner Sample (n = 590)	
	English		LOTES		t	English		LOTES		t	English		LOTES		t	English	
	M	SD	M	SD		M	SD	M	SD		M	SD	M	SD		M	SD
Intended effort	3.62	0.71	3.97	0.62	-4.045**	3.49	0.78	<u>4.24</u>	0.64	-10.838**	3.86	0.69	<u>4.00</u>	0.68	-2.801**	3.71	0.74
Learning experience	3.52	0.91	<u>4.20</u>	0.76	-5.543**	3.40	0.93	<u>4.60</u>	0.57	-14.780**	3.81	0.85	<u>4.32</u>	0.73	-8.687**	3.64	0.90
Ideal self	3.98	0.85	3.57	0.72	4.471**	3.89	0.85	3.51	0.72	5.449**	<u>4.24</u>	0.74	3.43	0.80	15.639**	<u>4.09</u>	0.81
Culture/community interest	<u>4.24</u>	0.79	<u>4.30</u>	0.59	-0.679	<u>4.24</u>	0.73	<u>4.58</u>	0.52	-5.423**	<u>4.50</u>	0.63	<u>4.37</u>	0.65	2.997**	<u>4.38</u>	0.70
Learning attitude	3.79	0.90	<u>4.23</u>	0.73	-3.699**	3.56	0.96	<u>4.58</u>	0.64	-11.861**	<u>4.03</u>	0.86	<u>4.34</u>	0.78	-5.228**	3.84	0.90
Ought-to self	<u>4.12</u>	0.79	3.50	0.74	6.599**	<u>4.17</u>	0.70	3.62	0.68	8.685**	<u>4.30</u>	0.69	3.60	0.80	13.575**	<u>4.23</u>	0.71
Instrumentality-promotion	<u>4.25</u>	0.72	3.50	0.90	7.023**	<u>4.28</u>	0.66	3.36	0.90	12.757**	<u>4.48</u>	0.68	3.61	0.85	15.626**	<u>4.38</u>	0.69
Instrumentality-prevention	3.24	1.10	2.44	0.99	6.010**	3.36	0.95	2.49	0.99	9.788**	3.28	1.02	2.54	1.02	11.587**	3.30	1.01

**p < .01.

Table 4. Correlations between predictor and criterion variables.

Intended learning effort	Southeast Asian Languages	Northeast Asian Languages	European Languages	English
Learning experience	.641**	.613**	.737**	.677**
Ideal self	.503**	.485**	.612**	.609**
Culture/community interest	.543**	.612**	.665**	.597**
Learning attitude	.614**	.590**	.703**	.687**
Ought-to self	.404**	.362**	.483**	.480**
Instrumentality–promotion	.431**	.310**	.460**	.507**
Instrumentality–prevention	.172	.111	.055	.221**

**p < .01.

Table 5. Final regression models.

	Southeast Asian Languages (n = 96)			Northeast Asian Languages (n = 180)			European Languages (n = 314)			English (n = 590)		
	Beta	S.E.	Std.β	Beta	S.E.	Std.β	Beta	S.E.	Std.β	Beta	S.E.	Std.β
Learning experience	0.28	0.09	0.34*	0.40	0.12	0.36*	0.35	0.06	0.37*	0.26	0.04	0.27**
Ideal self	0.21	0.07	0.25*	0.22	0.06	0.24*	0.24	0.03	0.28*	0.25	0.05	0.18**
Culture/community interest	0.18	0.09	0.17*	0.36	0.09	0.29*	0.21	0.05	0.21*	0.37	0.07	0.18**
Learning attitude	0.14	0.10	0.16	–	–	–	0.10	0.06	0.11*	0.58	0.11	0.24**
Ought-to self	–	–	–	0.08	0.07	0.09	–	–	–	–	–	–
Instrumentality–promotion	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	0.15	0.07	0.07**
Instrumentality–prevention	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	0.15	0.04	0.10**
Adjusted R ²	0.52			0.54			0.66			0.62		

*p < .05; **p < .01.

community interest, and unequivocally not by ought-to self or by promotional or preventive instrumentality.

A few contrasts were observed between LOTES and English. First, preventive instrumentality was uniformly the lowest among the predictor variables for all LOTES, but this was not the case for English. Second, learning experience was consistently higher in all LOTES than in English. Finally, promotional instrumentality was consistently higher in English than in LOTES. The English motivation model was in general similar to those of LOTES, but was more complicated. Similarly, the English model revealed that learning experience was the most robust predictor, followed by learning attitude, ideal self and culture/community interest. The difference lay in the fact that both types of instrumentality were ruled out in LOTE models but played a role in English, albeit minor. Unlike in learning LOTES where they were driven solely by positive aspirations, these learners were also influenced by external expectations and utilitarian values while they were learning English.

Discussion

Unlike the empirical evidence reviewed earlier that revealed integrativeness (Csizér and Dörnyei 2005a, 2005b; Dörnyei and Clement 2001; Hernández 2006) or ideal self (Busse 2013; Csizér and Lukács 2010; Dörnyei and Chan 2013) to be the major predictors in LOTE motivation, this study

provided consistent evidence across eight LOTEs in three clusters – European, Northeast Asian, and Southeast Asian languages – in addition to English, that the strongest predictor was learning experience for these Taiwanese learners of both LOTE and English in their learning of LOTEs and English. The three major L2MSS components are discussed in detail later.

Second, although some previous studies have pointed to the negative and competing influence from English on LOTE learning (Henry 2010; Sugita McEown, Sawaki, and Harada 2017; Ushioda 2017), this study added to the findings of Henry and Apelgren (2008) and offered evidence that LOTE motivation was reliably higher than English motivation in the same learners. Previous reasons given for English motivation being higher and outdoing that of LOTEs mostly centred on its global presence and pragmatic value (e.g. Ushioda 2017), whereas in other studies higher LOTE motivation

has been attributed to failures in English or the uniqueness and competitive edge associated with LOTEs (Siridetkoon and Dewaele 2017). The transfer from English to a LOTE seems to be more than a positive/negative binary and warrants more research.

Third, this study found distinct motivational patterns between LOTEs and English, partially supporting Dörnyei and Chan (2013) and Henry (2010) on the language specificity of motivation. However, no difference was found among the three clusters of LOTEs. Instead, the three LOTE regression models were very similar, despite these LOTEs representing diverse cultures and histories, different geographical distances from Taiwan and disparate economic power. One common denominator was that the LOTEs studied were all foreign, rather than second, languages in general day-to-day life in Taiwan. As LOTEs cover a wide range of languages around the world with various social norms and practices, a more important question to explore may be the underlying causes of either specificity or commonality in LOTE motivation.

Consistently in four regression models for LOTEs and English, learning experience was the most robust predictor of intended learning effort, explaining more than 30% of the variance while the influence of all other variables stood well below this level. In fact, although it is one of the three pillars of L2MSS, learning experience seems to have received less attention than the concepts of ideal and ought-to selves. It was purposefully omitted from the instruments and analyses in a number of important motivational studies (Csizér and Dörnyei 2005a, 2005b; Csizér and Kormos 2009; Kormos, Csizér, and Iwaniec 2014) to focus more on self concepts. However, when learning experience was included (e.g. Csizér and Kormos 2009; Islam, Lamb, and Chambers 2013; Lamb 2012) it was often the most powerful predictor. Similarly, for Taiwanese adolescents, the role of learning experience was significant in Huang (2017) and Huang and Chen (2017). More importantly, You and Dörnyei's (2016) large-scale survey in China arrived at the same conclusion.

It has to be noted, however, that the target language in these past studies was English, and the same results may not apply to LOTEs. In rarer studies of LOTEs, Huang, Hsu, and Chen (2015) found that learning experience played a role in only one of four LOTEs. Furthermore, counterevidence to the importance of learning experience was offered by Csizér and Lukács (2010) and Henry and Apelgren (2008). Results from the current study suggested the significance of learning experience in LOTE motivation could be explored further.

It is interesting that while the learners in this study were voluntarily enrolled in elective courses and, as they self-reported, 77% of them had learned a LOTE before, their motivation was still very much dependent upon learning experience. It could be speculated that in daily life in Taiwan where LOTE contact is rare, interaction with teachers and peers dedicated to these LOTEs was still the major source of impact on effort, even when learners proactively took the initiative to learn. This could be an important message for language educators. In a time when resources are abundant and

freely available through the internet, the influence of learning experience in language courses does not seem to become insignificant or even obsolete. Motivated students still rely on their class experience, which is largely related to classroom teachers and peers.

Learning experience and learning attitude were also highly related, although the former played a more significant role in LOTEs than the latter, which reached significant levels only for English and European languages. In their operationalisation in this study, learning experience was more related to immediate classroom contexts, while attitude was more of an accumulation of experiences over time. The distinction between these two factors deserves additional study, especially given their significance and the fact that they have been neglected in the past.

While the ideal self has been found to be the most powerful predictor in large-scale surveys (Busse 2013; Csizér and Lukács 2010; Dörnyei and Chan 2013), its role was only secondary here, a result consistent with the Chinese English learners studied by You and Dörnyei (2016). As the predictor next to learning experience in all four regression models, the ideal self's beta values were higher for LOTEs than for English (.25, .24, .28 for Southeast Asian, Northeast Asian, and European languages respectively, compared to .18 for English). This suggests a higher influence of future self-vision in LOTEs than in global English for these multi-language learners.

As expected, culture/community interest was a significant factor. Its connotation for global English has evolved and become different from that for LOTEs, whose underlying cultures are more discernable. Although beta values were higher in Northeast Asian and European languages, cultural interest did not stand out as more salient for LOTE learning than for English.

Ought-to self and instrumentality, the more externally imposed types of motivation, did not account for intended effort among these learners of LOTEs. However, instrumentality was one part of their English motivation. The especially low LOTE ought-to self scores, and the large gap between LOTE and English ought-to self, presented a scenario similar to Thompson's (2017) American LOTE learners. While Thompson's learners did not have to learn global English, findings from participants in this study showcased the contrast between a LOTE and English in the same learners. The above findings further supported Dörnyei and Al-Hoorie (2017) in their reservation about the inclusion of ought-to self in LOTE motivation models.

Focusing specifically on Chinese-as-L1 learners, external motivators deserve more discussion. Warden and Lin (2000), Chen, Warden, and Chang (2005), Huang (2017), Huang and Chen (2017), and Huang, Hsu, and Chen (2015) found instrumentality or ought-to self to be highly related to Taiwanese learners' English motivation, and attributed this phenomenon to the Confucian tradition of meritocracy (Chen, Warden, and Chang 2005) and social role obligation (Huang, Hsu, and Chen 2015). However, You and Dörnyei's (2016) results from English learners in China largely refuted these assertions. The current study supported You and Dörnyei's (2016) conclusion with empirical findings from learners in Taiwan that the ought-to self did not do full justice to language motivation in the Confucian-dominated societies.

Nevertheless, some important differences exist between the current study and previous ones. First, the target language was mostly English in earlier studies (except for Huang, Hsu, and Chen 2015), but target languages in the current study were three LOTE groups and English. Second, while the language in most previous studies was a course requirement, the LOTEs in this study were studied by choice. It should be noted that the existence of choice is an important factor in motivation (Humphreys and Spratt 2008). Third, learner demographics differed. Populations in the past included: (a) vocational-track students, whose academic achievement was usually lower, in Warden and Lin (2000); (b) 15- to 40-year-old students and office workers in Chen, Warden, and Chang (2005); and (c) junior high students in Huang (2017) and Huang and Chen (2017). Only the college students in Huang, Hsu, and Chen (2015) were similar to the participants in this study. It is possible that those who chose to study a non-compulsory LOTE were an exclusive group very different from the average

English learner. They may have a high interest in learning languages, like the LOTE learners described in Dörnyei and Al-Hoorie (2017), given that 77% of them had learned a LOTE before.

Conclusion, limitations and implications

In conclusion, Southeast Asian, Northeast Asian and European language learners in Taiwan demonstrated similar motivational patterns that were experience-based and not externally imposed. Instead of differences among language groups, this study found homogeneity. The students' motivations for learning European languages were not so different from their motivations for learning Northeast and Southeast Asian languages. The English learning motivation of these learners was similar, with learning experience explaining most of the variance, followed by learning attitude, which seemed to be an aggregation of past learning experiences. Secondary predictors in English were also the ideal self and culture/community interest. The uniqueness of English motivation in contrast with that of LOTEs lay in the fact that instrumentality played a role, both promotional and preventive.

A few limitations should be noted. Other than being limited to sampling, uneven gender distribution, self-reporting and the variables chosen for the survey, this study was also constrained by the types of languages chosen and how they were clustered. Despite a focus on LOTE motivation in general, claims cannot be made about other LOTEs. Moreover, this cross-sectional study provides only a static picture; temporal changes or causal relationships between languages were not captured. Also,

attempts were not made to differentiate between learners with more or less LOTE experience, or in terms of their proficiency levels. Given these limitations, however, pedagogical and theoretical implications are drawn below.

The fact that learning experience was the most powerful predictor across LOTEs is significant for language teachers and curriculum designers, especially in a time when machines are replacing humans and free online courses are replacing traditional classrooms. Even for such voluntary learners, who in our imagination may be more independent and self-sufficient, the classroom learning experience was the most important factor driving their efforts. High-quality teaching and positive learning experience that is fulfilling may well still be the fundamental basis for motivating language learners.

At a time when scholars are trying to redress the imbalance between English and LOTEs in motivation research, this study has contributed a piece of the puzzle from Taiwan using data from learners of both English and LOTEs. It has also added to our understanding of the concept of the Chinese imperative and its role in LOTE learning.

Acknowledgements

In addition to the participating students and their teachers who helped with data collection, I would also like to thank the anonymous reviewers, Professor Xuesong Andy Gao, and Professor John Edwards for their valuable comments and assistance during the review process.

Disclosure statement

No potential conflict of interest was reported by the author.

Funding

This study was supported by the Ministry of Science and Technology of Taiwan, Republic of China, [Grant #MOST105-2410-H-004-180-MY3].

ORCID

Shu-Chen Huang  <http://orcid.org/0000-0002-0446-7711>

References

- Boo, Z., Z. Dörnyei, and S. Ryan. 2015. "L2 Motivation Research 2005–2014: Understanding a Publication Surge and a Changing Landscape." *System* 55: 145–157.
- Busse, V. 2013. "An Exploration of Motivation and Self-Beliefs of First Year Students of German." *System* 41: 379–398.
- Chen, J. F., C. A. Warden, and H.-T. Chang. 2005. "Motivators That Do Not Motivate: The Case of Chinese EFL Learners and the Influence of Culture on Motivation." *TESOL Quarterly* 39 (4): 609–633.
- Csizér, K., and Z. Dörnyei. 2005a. "The Internal Structure of Language Learning Motivation and Its Relationship with Language Choice and Learning Effort." *The Modern Language Journal* 89 (1): 19–36.
- Csizér, K., and Z. Dörnyei. 2005b. "Language Learners' Motivational Profiles and Their Motivated Learning Behavior." *Language Learning* 55 (4): 613–659.
- Csizér, K. and J. Kormos. 2009. "Learning Experiences, Selves and Motivated Learning Behavior: A Comparative Analysis of Structural Models for Hungarian Secondary and University Learners of English." In *Motivation, Language Identity and the L2 Self*, edited by Z. Dörnyei and E. Ushioda, 98–119. Bristol: Multilingual Matters.
- Csizér, K. and G. Lukács. 2010. "The Comparative Analysis of Motivation, Attitudes and Selves: The Case of English and German in Hungary." *System* 38: 1–13.
- Dörnyei, Z. 2005. *The Psychology of the Language Learner: Individual Differences in Second Language Acquisition*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.
- Dörnyei, Z. 2009. "The L2 Motivational Self System." In *Motivation, Language Identity and the L2 Self*, edited by Z. Dörnyei and E. Ushioda, 9–42. Bristol: Multilingual Matters.
- Dörnyei, Z., and A. H. Al-Hoorie. 2017. "The Motivational Foundation of Learning Languages Other Than Global English: Theoretical Issues and Research Directions." *The Modern Language Journal* 101 (3): 455–468.
- Dörnyei, Z., and L. Chan. 2013. "Motivation and Vision: An Analysis of Future L2 Self Images, Sensory Styles, and Imagery Capacity Across Two Target Languages." *Language Learning* 63 (3): 437–462.
- Dörnyei, Z., and R. Clement. 2001. "Motivational Characteristics of Learning Different Target Languages: Results of a Nationwide Survey." In *Motivation and Second Language Acquisition*, edited by Dörnyei, Z., and R. Schmidt, 399–432. Honolulu: University of Hawai'i, Second Language Teaching and Curriculum Center.
- Gardner, R. C. 1985. *Social Psychology and Second Language Learning*. Arnold, London.
- Henry, A. 2010. "Contexts of Possibility in Simultaneous Language Learning: Using the L2 Motivational Self System to Assess the Impact of Global English." *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development* 31 (2): 149–162.
- Henry, A., and B. M. Apelgren. 2008. "Young Learners and Multilingualism: A Study of Learner Attitudes Before and After the Introduction of a Second Foreign Language to the Curriculum." *System* 36: 607–623.
- Hernández, T. 2006. "Integrative Motivation as a Predictor of Success in the Intermediate Foreign Language Classroom." *Foreign Language Annals* 39 (4): 605–617.
- Huang, H.-T. 2017. "Private English Tutoring and Adolescents' Motivation to Learn English as a Foreign Language: A Self System Perspective." *Taiwan Journal of TESOL* 14 (1): 1–36.
- Huang, H.-T., and I. L. Chen 2017. "L2 Selves in Motivation to Learn English as a Foreign Language: The Case of Taiwanese Adolescents." In *L2 Selves and Motivations in Asian Contexts*, edited by M. Apple, D. da Silva, and T. Fellner, 51–69. Bristol: Multilingual Matters.
- Huang, H.-T., C. C., Hsu, and S. W. Chen. 2015. "Identification with Social Role Obligations, Possible Selves, and L2 Motivation in Foreign Language Learning." *System* 51: 28–38.
- Humphreys, G., and M. Spratt. (2008). "Many Languages, Many Motivations: A Study of Hong Kong Students' Motivation to Learn Different Target Languages." *System* 36: 313–335.

- Islam, M., M. Lamb, and G. Chambers. 2013. "The L2 Motivational Self System and National Interest: A Pakistani Perspective." *System* 41: 231–244.
- Kim, T. Y. 2012. "The L2 Motivational Self System of Korean EFL Students: Cross-Grade Survey Analysis." *English Teaching* 67: 29–56.
- Kormos, J. and K. Csizér. 2008. "Age-Related Differences in the Motivation of Learning English as a Foreign Language: Attitudes, Selves and Motivated Learning Behavior." *Language Learning* 58: 327–355.
- Kormos, J., K. Csizér, and J. Iwaniec. 2014. "A Mixed-Method Study of Language-Learning Motivation and Intercultural Contact of International Students." *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development* 35 (2): 151–166.
- Lamb, M. 2012. "A Self System Perspective on Young Adolescents' Motivation to Learn English in Urban and Rural Settings." *Language Learning* 62: 997–1023.
- Papi, M. 2010. "The L2 Motivational Self System, L2 Anxiety, and Motivated Behavior: A Structural Equation Modeling Approach." *System* 38: 467–479.
- Ryan, S. 2009. "Self and Identity in L2 Motivation in Japan: The Ideal L2 and Japanese Learners of English." In *Motivation, Language Identity and the L2 Self*, edited by Z. Dörnyei and E. Ushioda, 120–143. Bristol, UK: Multilingual Matters.
- Siridetkoon, P. and J.-M. Dewaele. 2017. "Ideal Self and Ought-To Self of Simultaneous Learners of Multiple Foreign Languages." *International Journal of Multilingualism*. Published Online, 25, February 2017. doi:10.1080/14790718.2017.1293063
- Sugita McEown, M., Sawaki, Y, and Harada, T. 2017. "Foreign Language Learning Motivation in the Japanese Context: Social and Political Influences on Self." *The Modern Language Journal* 101 (3): 533–547.
- Taguchi, T. 2013. "Motivation, Attitude and Selves in the Japanese Context: A Mixed Method Approach." In *Language Learning Motivation in Japan*, edited by M. Apple, D. Da Silva, and T. Fellner, 169–188. New York: Multilingual Matters.
- Taguchi, T., M. Magid, and M. Papi. 2009. "The L2 Motivational Self System Among Japanese, Chinese and Iranian Learners of English: A Comparative Study." In *Motivation, Language Identity and the L2 Self*, edited by Z. Dörnyei and E. Ushioda, 66–97. Bristol: Multilingual Matters.
- Thompson, A. S. 2017. "Language Learning Motivation in the United States: An Examination of Language Choice and Multilingualism." *The Modern Language Journal* 101 (3): 483–500.
- Ushioda, E. 2017. "The Impact of Global English on Motivation to Learn Other Languages: Toward an Ideal Multilingual Self." *The Modern Language Journal* 101 (3): 469–482.
- Ushioda, E., and Z. Dörnyei. 2017. "Beyond Global English: Motivation to Learn Languages in a Multicultural World: Introduction to the Special Issue." *The Modern Language Journal* 101 (3): 451–454.
- Warden, C. A. and H. J. Lin. 2000. "Existence of Integrative Motivation in an Asian EFL Setting." *Foreign Language Annals* 33 (5): 535–545.
- You, C., and Z. Dörnyei. 2016. "Language Learning Motivation in China: Results of a Large-Scale Stratified Survey." *Applied Linguistics* 37 (4): 495–519.

附件 (二)

Development of College Students' Intercultural Competence through Learning Eight Asian and European Languages

Abstract

The development of intercultural competence (IC) is considered a companion of foreign language learning, but most research reports focus exclusively on English or on special learning situations such as study abroad. To understand IC development in the regular classroom of languages other than English (LOTEs), this study examined the IC development of learners of eight LOTEs during one school year. Participants were college students enrolled in the first two years of eight most popular LOTE courses (Japanese, Korean, Vietnamese, Thai, Indonesian, German, French, and Spanish) at one university in Taiwan. They participated in an IC questionnaire survey at the beginning, middle, and end of the 2017 school year. A total of 281 complete data sets were matched from the three waves of survey. Results indicated that, among five constructs of affect, consciousness, knowledge, behavior, and self-efficacy, these LOTE learners' affect was ranked the highest since the onset but resisted to change for the rest of the year. Knowledge, although the lowest among five IC constructs, improved most significantly. Most changes occurred in the first semester and then levelled off for second-year learners. Differences in IC and its levels of changes also existed between gender and among language clusters.

Keywords: intercultural competence, languages other than English, foreign language teaching and learning, higher education, Taiwan

Introduction

The necessity to prepare learners as global citizens who can function effectively in an increasingly complex and inter-connected world has been well acknowledged by educators at all levels around the world. This ability to interact appropriately with people from different cultures is closely associated with foreign language (FL) communicative competence (Alptekin, 2002; Bennett, Bennett, & Allen, 2003; Byram, 1997). As having been pointed out

by Byram (1988), communicative competence is not merely an aggregation of neutral, culture-free linguistic skills but involves ‘the development of new perceptions and insights into foreign and native cultures alike’ (p. 15). Consequently, educational authorities in many countries have now incorporated cultural and/or intercultural dimensions in their policy documents and FL curriculum guidelines (Byram, 2014). Although practices are changing and research on the concurrent development of FL and intercultural competence (IC) has proliferated, a recent review of empirical studies indicated that the dominant target language studied has been English (80%), and the cultures in question have been mostly Anglophone and western cultures (Avgousti, 2018). This phenomenon may be a natural result from the fact that English as a lingua franca (ELF) is now ubiquitously the first choice of FL learning, but the current ELF-laden conceptualizations may be insufficient for a complete understanding of multilingual and multicultural development. To redress possible biases, scholars have called for attention to and research efforts in many languages other than English (LOTEs) (Ushioda and Dörnyei, 2017). One major reason for the need of such a rebalance has to do with the distinctive nature of today’s ELF, which has evolved into a language transcending national and cultural boundaries (Pinner, 2016), in contrast to that of the myriad of LOTEs which mostly bear discernable cultures with their own uniqueness.

Another problem in current research has to do with the diverse ways culture could be embedded in FL courses. Despite the fact that IC development is usually presumed an expected natural companion of FL learning and that teachers from different countries appear to have the consensus that interculturality is part of their work (Young and Sachdev, 2011), researchers studying learners’ development of IC tend to focus on specifically arranged intercultural interventions such as study abroad (e.g. Marijuan and Sanz, 2018; Schartner, 2016; Terzuolo, 2018), bilingual programs (Abduh and Rosmaladewi, 2018), cross-border telecollaborations using internet and digital facilities (e.g., Avgousti, 2018; Çiftçi, 2016; Liaw, 2006), trainings involving simulations and behavior modifications (Fisher, 2011), international joint degree programs (Yarosha, Lukicb, and Santibáñez-Gruberc, 2018), and movie viewing (Chao, 2012), among others. While such thoughtful interventions may be desirable, in the majority of day-to-day FL classrooms teachers and students do not always have the financial, technological, time, or administrative resources to access the aforementioned opportunities. The relationship of the learning of FL and IC may not be adequately explained by what we already know from current literature that focuses more on

deliberate treatments of culture. To date, little is known about learners' IC development within the more prevailing FL classes where IC is not so conspicuously incorporated.

Based on the two problems explicated above, the current study attempted to examine learners' IC development in a number of LOTEs in the course of one school year at a university where deliberate intercultural intervention was neither prescribed to teachers and their curricula from top down, nor was it deliberately arranged by outside researchers. More specifically, the study tried to uncover 1) LOTE teachers' manifestation of culture in their self-determined syllabi, 2) LOTE learners' IC as measured at the beginning, middle, and end of a year, 3) patterns of IC change or lack thereof, and 4) similarity or differences among learner subgroups of gender, language clusters, and seniority of LOTE learning.

Literature Review

IC is of relevance beyond disciplinary boundaries, which may also explain why IC is represented in a multitude of slightly different terms and theories from scholars in psychology, sociology, business management, communication studies, in addition to education in general and FL education in particular. While some of these theories highlight distinctive stages of IC development (e.g., Bennett, 1993), compositional theories that look at components of IC, especially those signifying the earlier stages of IC development, seem to be more helpful in the current study where participating learners did not go through remarkable experiential changes in their LOTE classrooms. Among them, Byram's (1997) multimodal model of IC is adopted and briefly discussed first.

Developed from his FL teaching context in Europe, Byram's IC model (1997) perceives IC as separated from linguistic competence in the target language. It pertains to one's attitude, knowledge, skills of discovery and interaction, skills of interpreting and relating, and critical awareness related to his/her own and other cultures. In this perspective, a person with IC is curious about other cultures and is ready to reflect on and refine beliefs about one's own and other cultures, rather than believing that his/her perspective is natural and unquestionable. Although a detailed discussion of other IC theories is not possible in the limited space here, Byram's model does share common grounds with many other frameworks (e.g. Deardorff, 2006; Fantini, 2009) in their core IC building blocks, which involve knowledge, attitude,

skills, and awareness, often referred to as KASA (Yarosha, Lukicb, and Santibáñez-Gruberc, 2018), despite being represented by different terms.

Results from empirical studies in higher education seem to be mixed, as students' IC reportedly did not always improve when IC training or intercultural encounter was present. With a focus on the increasingly internationalized college campus, Lantz-Deaton (2017) examined the UK and non-UK freshmen students' IC development over seven months at a culturally-diverse British university. Results of her two-wave questionnaire survey revealed that students' initial stage was characterized by ethnocentrism. Moreover, there was little IC change over time, despite the fact that most of the participants stated having intercultural friendship and positive feelings toward interactions. Lantz-Deaton (2017) thus cautions against the naïve belief that cultural experience or immersion itself can automatically lead to learning. In a similar context, Schartner (2016) investigated the effect of studying in UK on non-UK graduate students' IC. Over nine months, these sojourners' attitudinal and cognitive aspects of IC, i.e. cultural empathy and open-mindedness scores, dropped significantly while the behavioral aspects, i.e. social initiative and flexibility, remained unchanged. Like Lantz-Deaton (2017), Schartner (2016) challenges the presumption that simply being abroad could result in IC development. In a shorter timeframe of six weeks and in the absence of authentic intercultural immersion, Fisher (2011) implemented an IC training program containing lectures, a simulation game, and a behavior modification session. His pre- and post-treatment comparison indicated that cultural essentialist beliefs became more serious after the training. Significant decline was also observed in cognitive cultural intelligence, i.e. the capability to function and manage in culturally diverse settings. Fisher's (2011) explanation suggest that students may have been transitioning from an unconscious incompetence stage to a stage of conscious incompetence which is more advanced and have enhanced awareness of the limits on their cultural knowledge.

Two recent reviews offered a more comprehensive picture of learner IC development by consolidating findings from empirical studies employing online exchanges and telecollaboration (Avgousti, 2018; Çiftçi, 2016). Avgousti's (2018) analysis of 57 publications summarized research characteristics such as types of web 2.0 tools and modes of communications used. Among them and in addition to the fact that 80% of target language was English, as mentioned earlier, Avogusti (2018) pinpoints the evident scarcity of

quantitative studies and attributes this to the complexity of IC skills. Another notable discovery was, in the prevalent use of Byram's model (1997), the most frequent mention of the knowledge of one's own and others' culture when IC development was evaluated, indicating that the knowledge aspect of IC, as opposed to attitude, behavior, etc., may be more malleable. Similarly, Çiftçi's (2016) synthesis of 26 papers points to an overall increased knowledge of one's own and others' cultures, although there were varied levels of IC development in other aspects. Despite generally positive reports of satisfaction with IC learning, Çiftçi (2016) is quite reserved, describing learner IC development as merely being 'on the way' (p. 318). The major reason for this caution, according to Çiftçi (2016), is the lack of in-depth analysis and of detailed reports because most studies reviewed were designed around language learning/teaching and the reports in terms of IC development tend to be superficial.

Particularly in the higher education FL learning context in Taiwan, quite a few studies offered relevant insights on the IC development of similar populations. Liaw's (2006) English-as-a-foreign-language (EFL) students read English articles related to their own culture and exchanged reflections with American counterparts on an electronic discussion forum. Applying Byram's criteria in analyzing students' email exchanges, Liaw found evidence of IC improvement in both interest in and knowledge about students' own and other people's cultures. In another study, Chao (2012) designed a course using nine movies of various culture topics to foster EFL learners' IC. Based on analysis of students' diary entries, Chao found progress in the development of intercultural motivations, attitudes, knowledge, and awareness.

Two more studies provided descriptions of Taiwanese college students' IC. Chao (2014) consulted six published IC scales and developed one especially for college EFL learners in Taiwan. Her scale contains five IC factors, and a subsequent nationwide survey revealed that students scored highest on affective orientation, followed by intercultural consciousness, self-efficacy, knowledge of intercultural interaction, and behavioral performance. On the first two factors, female students scored significantly higher than male students. Moreover, by dividing participants into four geographic areas and two types of universities, Chao found students from regular universities in the northern part, i.e. higher academic achievers from the more cosmopolitan area of Taiwan, consistently outperformed their peers from other locations and

technological universities in all the five aspects of IC. For a subpopulation, Su (2018) focused on a technological university in southern Taiwan, i.e. students from the lower end (ranked 6th among 8 groups across five IC aspects) in Chao's (2014) IC comparison, and examined the relationship between intercultural sensitivity, ethnocentrism, and a few factors related to EFL learning. The highest correlation was found between learners' intercultural interaction engagement and confidence. Interestingly, these two factors also had positive correlation with ethnocentrism. Su explained that more ethnocentric learners may also have higher self-esteem, which may lead to higher confidence and desire to converse with people from other cultures.

Methodology

The research context

The study was conducted at a regular university in northern Taiwan (similar to those participants with the highest IC in Chao, 2014) which has a total of around 10,000 undergraduate and 6,000 graduate student studying in 34 departments of law, science, commerce, communication, education, international affairs, liberal arts, social sciences, and foreign languages and literature. A variety of LOTE courses have been offered as electives to the entire student population since 2004 on this campus. As of 2017, 1892 students registered in 43 course sections learning 21 different LOTEs, but individual class sizes ranged from a handful of students to nearly a hundred. Among these 21 LOTEs, almost 90% of learners concentrated on 8 languages in 3 geographical areas. They were the European languages of German, Spanish, and French, the Northeastern Asian languages of Japanese and Korean, and the Southeastern Asian languages of Thai, Vietnamese and Malay/Indonesian. These LOTE courses all bore 3 credits with 3-hour weekly class meetings and lasted for an 18-week semester. Most were offered as I and II for two consecutive semesters in a school year. Additionally, III and IV for second-year learners were available one section each for German, Spanish, French, Japanese, Thai, and Malay/Indonesian at the time of this study. Decisions for offering such second-year courses were partly due to learner demand and partly restricted by teacher availability. Each school year from the first to the second semester, there was a regular attrition in number of students remaining registered. For the 2017 school year, attrition rate stood at 24%, with total student number dropping from 1655 in Fall 2017 to 1252 in Spring 2018.

Twelve teachers taught these eight selected LOTEs and, in the absence of top-down curriculum guidelines, they had full autonomy in designing their courses and choosing materials. However, university mandated requirements, such as publicizing syllabi on the university website in designated format ahead of course selection period, were followed by all. Five of the twelve teachers were full-time lecturers teaching a minimum of fifteen hours per week and others were part-timers. Seven of these lecturers were native speakers of the language they taught and others had Mandarin Chinese as their native tongue.

Procedures

The procedure involved two separate parts: syllabi collection and analysis as well as three waves of questionnaire survey and statistical analyses. A total of 34 unique online syllabi (17 each semester) written in Chinese or bilingually in Chinese and English for the 2017 school year from all involved courses were downloaded from the university website. These syllabi were examined by course description, teaching objectives, and weekly plan for topics and statements related to culture.

For the questionnaire survey on LOTE students' IC, all 12 instructors were contacted by email in early September 2017 with an explanation of the study to request permission to inform students of the survey and to invite them to participate. With permission, the invitation was then extended by two research assistants visiting students during their breaks in between class periods with leaflets detailing the background, purposes and logistics of the survey. A QR code on the leaflet provided electronic access to the survey website for smartphone users. Participation was voluntary and incentives were provided in a raffle drawing system. Questionnaire items were identical throughout three waves of data collection, which were conducted in weeks 3-5 of Fall 2017, weeks 16-18 of Fall 2017, and weeks 16-18 of Spring 2018. On the online survey portal, participants read the researcher's invitation letter, were informed of their rights, provided consent, rated their agreement level on a 5-point Likert scale to the IC statements, and gave personal demographic information. The survey was anonymous and participants were reminded that they were expected to express their true feelings, which was independent from their course performance. Each participant was assigned a code in the survey system so that data matching among the three waves was made possible.

Participants

For each of the three waves of data collection, 593, 821, and 595 participants completed the questionnaire. After data matching, it was found 281 students (22.44% of the population) completed all three waves of survey and these data sets were used for statistical analysis. As shown in Table 1, female accounted for 71% of the population and 73% of the sample. The majority of learners took the LOTE course for the first year; only 13% of the population and 16% of the sample were in the second year of their LOTE studies. In terms of languages in the three geographical clusters, about 60% took European languages; more than a quarter took Northeastern Asian languages; and 11% in the population and 16% in the sample chose Southeastern Asian languages. Their average age was 19.83.

Table 1. Distribution of participants in the population and sample

		By Gender		By Year of Study		By Language Clusters			Total
		Male	Female	1 st year	2 nd year	European	NE Asian	SE Asian	
Populati	Number	362	890	1089	163	756	363	133	1252
	% Population	28.91%	71.09%	86.98%	13.02%	60.38%	28.99%	10.62%	100%
Sample	Number	75	206	235	46	164	72	45	281
	% Sample	26.69%	73.31%	83.63%	16.37%	58.36%	25.62%	16.01%	100%

Instruments

The IC scale developed by Chao (2014) was adapted for use in this study mainly because it was designed specifically for the learner population in this study, i.e. Taiwanese college FL learners, and it was available in both English and the participants' first language Chinese. Based on relevant IC theories, Chao's (2014) IC scale had been validated with data from 1117 Taiwanese EFL learners in eight universities. The five IC constructs are:

- **Affective** orientation to intercultural interaction (including motivation, willingness, and attitudes) toward intercultural communication,
- Display of intercultural **consciousness** (attentive preparation, self-monitoring, and reflection before, during, and after intercultural contact),
- **Knowledge** of intercultural interaction (cultural-general, culture-hybrid, and cultural-specific knowledge),

- **Self-efficacy** in intercultural situations (self-confidence and appropriate self-adjustments), and
- **Behavioral** performance in intercultural interaction (language abilities, use of communication strategies, and interactive behavior).

According to Chao (2014), her scale ‘not only includes the primary features of IC literature but also takes language ability (i.e., ELF ability) into consideration, which has been ignored in most IC studies...’ (p. 89). Although it was used on EFL learners, only one item directly referred to the respondent’s English language ability (i.e. *I can effectively use English to communicate with other people of different cultural backgrounds.*), and all other statements referred to culture in general terms without reference to specific languages or cultures. That is, statements regarding culture in this instrument are generic with such wordings as ‘other cultures’, ‘different cultures’, ‘a particular culture’, ‘intercultural communication’, and ‘intercultural situations.’

The scale was piloted with five student informants who did not participate in the formal study at the university where this study was conducted, followed by researcher-informant discussions. One item (i.e. *I know how to use the culture-value approach to understand the attitudes and behaviors of people from different cultures.*) was deleted due to informants’ inability to fully understand the meaning. For the purpose of this study, one item was added right below the one on English ability to contrast English specifically as a lingua franca as opposed to all LOTEs in general. Therefore, these two parallel and adjacent items became ‘*I can effectively use English (or foreign languages) to communicate with other people of different cultural backgrounds.*’ With one deletion and one addition, the adapted IC scale (see Appendix) had thirty items—6, 5, 8, 8, and 3 each for affect, consciousness, knowledge, behavior, and self-efficacy.

Results

Culture elements in LOTE syllabi

In the 34 unique syllabi collected, there were 134 explicit mentions of the word ‘culture.’ By using the search function in *Word* to locate these 134 mentions, it was found that they did not distribute evenly across languages. A breakdown of the explicit ‘culture’ mention in the

syllabi as it appeared in course descriptions, course objectives, and weekly plans was shown in Table 2. The number of mentions ranged from 1 for Vietnamese to 75 for French, showing substantial variation. The frequency of the word ‘culture’ was the highest in the French syllabi, followed by Spanish. Such frequency was relatively small in the two Northeast Asian languages with a combined total mention of 8 only. More specifically, the word ‘culture’ in the syllabi was collocated with verbs such as understand, know, introduce, explain; nouns such as life, nation, society, thoughts, customs, practices, activities; and adjectives such as local, authentic, social, and names of countries related to the particular LOTEs.

Table 2. Explicit mentions of ‘culture’ in the 34 LOTE syllabi

		Course description	Course objectives	Weekly plan	Subtotal	Total
Northeast	Japanese	2	2	2	6	8
Asian	Korean	0	1	1	2	
Southeast	Vietnamese	0	0	1	1	27
Asian	Malay	12	4	0	16	
	Thai	5	4	1	10	
European	German	0	0	2	2	99
	French	5	5	65	75	
	Spanish	2	4	16	22	

Statistical results of three IC surveys

Statistical analyses were performed using the software R. The reliability of scales and subscales, as represented in Cronbach alpha values, across measurements at the beginning, middle, and end of the school year, was shown in Table 2. Figures ranged from .81 to .91 with consciousness generally at the lower end and affect and behavior constantly having higher values.

Table 2. Reliability of scales (Cronbach alpha values)

ICC subscales	# of items	Time 1	Time 2	Time 3
Affect	6	0.91	0.91	0.89
Consciousness	5	0.81	0.81	0.81

Knowledge	8	0.90	0.87	0.89
Behavior	8	0.89	0.89	0.90
Efficacy	3	0.86	0.86	0.88
Entire IC scale	30	0.89	0.88	0.87

Correlation coefficients among the five subscales at three measurement points were calculated. All of the 30 coefficients stood at the $p < .01$ significance level, with the lowest figure being 0.408 between affect and knowledge at Time 3 and the highest being 0.728 between affect and efficacy at Time 1.

Descriptive statistics of the subscales measured at the three time points are presented in Table 3. On a scale of 1 to 5, the means ranged from 3.70 to 4.43 in the first time, from 3.84 to 4.48 in the second time, and from 3.88 to 4.51 in the third. The IC subscales with the highest means and lowest standard deviations at the three measurements were consistently affect, with its means going from 4.43 to 4.48 and to 4.51. Consciousness steadily remained the second, with the three means at 3.99, 4.14, and 4.12. Rankings of the other three subscales did not maintain such steady patterns. Comparatively, self-efficacy had the lowest of means and highest standard deviations.

Table 3. Descriptive statistics of ICC subscales from 3 waves of survey

	3 measurements across time (n=281)								
	Time 1			Time 2			Time 3		
	M	SD	Rank	M	SD	Rank	M	SD	Rank
Affect	4.43	0.58	1	4.48	0.54	1	4.51	0.49	1
Consciousness	3.99	0.60	2	4.14	0.53	2	4.12	0.55	2
Knowledge	3.70	0.71	5	3.90	0.58	3	3.91	0.61	3
Behavior	3.73	0.70	3	3.88	0.61	4	3.89	0.63	4
Self-Efficacy	3.72	0.84	4	3.84	0.75	5	3.88	0.79	5

Some interesting patterns were found when reviewing results in terms of individual items. While the maximum values remained at 5 throughout for 30 items, the minimum values changed over time. In the second time, the minimum values became 2 for items 1, 2, 4, 5, 17, 21, 28, 29, 30. In the third time, the minimum values became 3 for items 10, 12, 13 and 2 for

items #1, 6, 7, 9, 11, 14, 17, 20, 23, 24, 26, 27, 28, 29, 30. Among these, items 28, 29, and 30, which all belonged to the subscale of consciousness, had its minimum values steadily gone up from 1 to 2 to 3. Minimums for items 2, 4, and 5 of the knowledge subscale went up to 2 in the middle of the year, but dropped back to 1 at the end. The 6 items of affect, in descending order for items 10, 14, 12, 13, 9, and 11, had been steadily ranked on the top with no change in order throughout the three measurements. Consistently at the bottom of 30 items was item 19 of self-efficacy regarding FL communicative abilities. Its counterpart of ELF stood at 21 and 20 among all 30 items. Detailed means and ranking are presented in Table 4.

Interestingly, although increase was observed from Time 1 to Time 2, both items remained unchanged in ranking as well as mean value from Time 2 to Time 3.

Table 4. Descriptive statistics of language specific items

Linguistic performance	Time 1		Time 2		Time 3	
	Rank	mean	Rank	mean	Rank	mean
English	21	3.75	20	3.92	20	3.92
Foreign Languages	30	3.10	30	3.36	30	3.36

To examine if any change in IC subcomponents over time reached a significant level, within-subject repeated measure one-way ANOVA were performed for all five factors. First, Mauchly Tests for Sphericity, i.e. the test for homogeneity of variance, indicated that the assumption of sphericity of paired data was not violated in any of the subscales. ANOVA were then run to examine the level of significance of the changes. Results summarized in Table 5 showed that there was no change in affect over time, but the increases in other dimensions reached various levels of significance, ranging from self-efficacy at the .05 level, consciousness and behavior at the .01 level, and knowledge at the .001 level.

Table 5. Overall ANOVA results

	Df.	Sum Sq.	Mean Sq.	F value	<i>p</i> value
Affect	2	0.82	0.4124	1.431	0.24
Consciousness	2	4.04	2.0181	6.363	0.00181**
Knowledge	2	7.60	3.7960	9.397	9.2e-05***
Behavior	2	4.40	2.1822	5.234	0.00551**
Self-efficacy	2	3.90	1.9495	3.093	0.04590*

* $p < 0.05$; ** $p < 0.01$; *** $p < 0.001$

For factors other than affect, follow-up multiple comparisons were made with paired t -tests and Bonferroni post hoc analyses. Results revealed that significant differences occurred from Time 1 to Time 2 for behavior ($p < .05$), knowledge ($p < .01$), and consciousness ($p < .01$). However, no significant difference was found from Time 2 to Time 3 for any of the five factors.

Further comparisons among subgroups were made to find out about the differences related to gender, language clusters, and years of study. ANOVA results of subgroup comparisons were summarized in Table 6. It was found that female students improved significantly in 3 of the 5 IC subscales, namely consciousness, knowledge, and behavior, and all these improvements occurred at the end of the first semester. Male students, on the other hand, improved only on knowledge and this improvement did not occur until the end of the second semester. As for language clusters, no difference among measurements were found for both Northeast Asian and Southeast Asian language learners. However, for European language learners, differences were consistently observed for all five IC subscales. Among them, improvement came earliest for knowledge at Time 2 while for the other four IC aspects improvement was not observable until Time 3. In terms of years of study, it was clear that for learners who were in the second year of LOTE study, IC did not change across the school year. But for first-year beginning learners, all IC subscales had significant improvement except affect, and most improvement came early in the middle of the year (for consciousness, knowledge, and behavior). Observable improvement for self-efficacy came later at the end of the year. Furthermore, it could be noted that none of the differences found occurred between Time 2 and Time 3. Table 6 provided a summary of the presence and timing of changes in the subgroups.

Table 6. Summary of ANOVA for different gender, language cluster, and years of study

ICC subscales	Gender		Language Clusters			Years of Study	
	Male	Female	NE Asia	SE Asia	Europe	1 st year	2 nd year
Affect	-	-	-	-	+ 1/3	-	-
Consciousness	-	+ 1/2	-	-	+ 1/3	+ 1/2	-
Knowledge	+ 1/3	+ 1/2	-	-	+ 1/2	+ 1/2	-
Behavior	-	+ 1/2	-	-	+ 1/3	+ 1/2	-

Efficacy	-	-	-	-	+ 1/3	+ 1/3	-
----------	---	---	---	---	-------	-------	---

(-): No significant difference was found among the measurements across time.

(+): Significant differences were found among the measurements across time.

1/2: Difference existed between Time 1 and Time 2.

1/3: Difference existed between Time 1 and Time 3.

Discussion

Answers to the four research questions are summarized below. First, without intervention, culture-related elements appeared to be incorporated by LOTE teachers in their courses to various extent. Secondly, among the five constructs of IC measured at the beginning, middle, and end of the school year, affect and consciousness were constantly ranked as the highest- and second highest aspects with relatively low variations. In contrast, self-efficacy showed much lower means and highest variations in all three measurements. Thirdly, with regards to change over time, affect, despite having the highest scores at all three time points, was the only construct experiencing no improvement. On the other hand, knowledge, although ranked the lowest at the beginning, demonstrated the most significant improvement. Major changes were observed from Time 1 to Time 2, i.e. in the first semester, and little change was found during the second semester. Notably, there was not any significant decrease in any of the IC constructs from earlier time points to later ones. Finally, further comparisons pointed to significant differences among subgroups. Female students improved on more IC aspects and earlier than males. Differences among language clusters were also observed. While both Southeastern and Northeastern Asian language learners showed no improvement at all, European language learners improved on every single IC construct. When learners were grouped as either learning the LOTEs for the first or the second year, the former improved on four of the five aspects and such improvement was found in the first semester on three of the four aspects, but second-year learners demonstrated no improvement between any two time points.

The findings regarding LOTE learners' initial IC, and in fact no less true in the later stages, indicated that affect and consciousness were ranked the first and second by learners as compared to the other three IC elements. This is identical with the findings from Chao's (2014) survey in Taiwan. In particular, participants in this study were similar to one of Chao's

eight groups of students that came from the same geographical area and the same type of university who scored higher in all IC aspects than all her other groups, which may probably explain the remarkably high means of affect at between 4.43 and 4.51 in a scale of 5. This means that participants were quite willing to engage in intercultural interactions and remained so throughout the course of their one-year LOTE studies. They were also conscious of possible dangers such as overgeneralization and essentialist beliefs. The affect and consciousness aspects of IC, as operationalized in the instrument in this study, resembled the attitude and awareness elements of KASA (Yarosha, Lukicb, and Santibáñez-Gruberc, 2018) that are attitudinal, affective, motivational, and attentional, all pointing to learners' positive mindset and willingness for intercultural encounters. Notably, affect was not enhanced during the course of LOTE learning, although it didn't regress either. Whether the lack of improvement had to do with its initial high point requires more careful study. How this level and ranking of affect and consciousness compares to that of LOTE learners from other parts of the world and what societal or contextual factors may relate to their formation are questions worth exploring in future research.

At the other end of the spectrum, self-efficacy was constantly rated low (means: 3.72-3.88) with more variations (SD: 0.75-0.84) among learners. This is different from Chao's result in which self-efficacy was in the middle among the five IC elements. Another relevant study (Su, 2018) suggests that confidence was positively related with desire for interaction and ethnocentrism. However, participants in this study, despite demonstrating low self-efficacy, had high levels of interaction desire as shown in the affective domain and low ethnocentrism as in high intercultural consciousness. More specifically, relevant to this finding was the scores and rankings of the two language-related behavioral items as highlighted in Table 4. Learners' lack of confidence may have to do with their beginner level of LOTE proficiency, yet little is known from existing literature about how LOTE proficiency, especially when it is compared unfavorably to ELF, may influence learners' intercultural confidence. The discrepancy between this and previous studies suggests areas for further study.

One major finding that resonates with many previous studies is the malleability of knowledge in IC development. Despite being at the bottom in the first measurement, scores of intercultural knowledge showed improvement most significantly. This finding provides further support to conclusions in the syntheses of Avogusti (2018) and Çiftçi (2016), as well

as in empirical findings such as those from Chao (2014) and Liaw (2006). That is, knowledge is the IC dimension where the most obvious progress occurred. The fact that increase was found in European language learners but not Southeastern and Northeastern Asian language learners and that culture was mentioned much more frequently in the syllabi of European language courses together reinforce the conviction of the plasticity of knowledge. In other words, among five IC constructs, knowledge could be enhanced most successfully, especially when culture was manifested in the syllabi. Additionally, the differences among language clusters may have to do with the degree of familiarity associated with the LOTEs and their cultures. In the current study, Europe, European languages, and European cultures are much farther from Taiwan, thus less familiar, compared to the more adjacent Northeastern and Southeastern Asian countries, languages, and cultures. One may speculate that the malleable characteristic of knowledge in IC is more prominent when the target languages are LOTEs rather than ELF because LOTEs are not as omnipresent as ELF and LOTE learning in itself may easily bring learners unique and novel intercultural experiences. The same comparison may be applied to the pair of less familiar and more distant LOTEs against more familiar and geographically closer LOTEs. The exact discrepancy between LOTE and ELF or among various LOTEs in boosting intercultural knowledge warrants further investigation.

Answers to the third and fourth research questions suggest that effects of LOTE lessons on IC development were immediate but could saturate soon after the first semester. Increases in scores happened mostly by the end of the first semester and became sparser and smaller in scale afterwards. Furthermore, when second-year learners were compared to first-year ones, this saturation with time was even more apparent in that the former did not experience any change at all. However, unlike some regressions observed with IC interventions (e.g. training program in Fisher, 2011; study abroad in Schartner 2016), scores of different IC components did not go through any downturn. The findings in this study seem to suggest that LOTE learning at the beginner level, perhaps with a novelty element, could itself be an effective and efficient means in enhancing IC, but it would be unrealistic to expect IC improvement beyond that initial level if no specific interventions on IC was planned and implemented.

Limitations and Implications

Before extending to implications from the above findings, it is necessary to discuss constraints based on the research design. First, this longitudinal quantitative study relied mainly on learners' self-report data from a three-wave survey. There was no inclusion of learners' articulation or elaboration beyond numerical data collected using the instrument adapted from a relevant publication. Secondly, despite the variety of LOTEs involved, these selected LOTEs studied were more popular among learners in the current context, leaving a number of less popular LOTEs out of the picture. Findings here, therefore, may not be generalized to other LOTEs bearing different characteristics and to learning contexts where there are substantial differences in social norms and values as compared to the context here.

In summary, this study contributes to our understanding of IC development in a college FL learning context. Instead of using ELF which has been widely reported in relevant literature as the target language, focus was placed on LOTEs that have been underrepresented for a long time. More specifically, IC interventions from outside of the FL classes were constrained so that what was observed could reveal more closely about the relationship between regular LOTE learning and IC development. It was discovered that LOTE learning itself could improve IC at significant levels, especially on the knowledge dimension. Other parts of IC, such as affect and consciousness, despite being higher than other IC dimensions since the onset, were less likely to improve in a LOTE learning setting. Most of the IC improvements happened for beginning LOTE learners in the first semester, although some changes happened later toward the end of the first year. Learners' IC gradually plateaued as they moved into the second year of LOTE learning. Further analysis indicated that female improved more and faster than male. Differences of IC development also existed among language clusters. Such improvement was associated with the degree of inclusion of topics on culture in the LOTE teachers' syllabi. Additionally, the fact that European language learners outperformed their Asian counterparts seems to suggest the possibility of impact related to the familiarity of the target language and the distance of the countries where the target language is spoken.

References

- Abduh, A. and R. Rosmaladewi. 2018. "Promoting Intercultural Competence in Bilingual Programs in Indonesia." *Sage Open* July-September: 1-7.
- Alptekin, C. 2002. "Towards Intercultural Communicative Competence in ELT." *ELT Journal* 56: 57-64.
- Avgousti, M. I. 2018. "Intercultural Communicative Competence and Online Exchanges: A Systematic Review." *Computer Assisted Language Learning* 31 (8): 819-853.
- Bennett, M. J. 1993. "Towards Ethnorelativism: A Developmental Model of Intercultural Sensitivity." In *Education for the Intercultural Experience*, edited by R. M. Paige, 21-71. Yarmouth, ME: Intercultural Press.
- Bennett, J. M., M. J. Bennett, and W. Allen. 2003. "Developing Intercultural Competence in the Language Classroom. In *Culture as the Core: Perspective on Culture in Second Language Learning*, edited by D. L. Lange and R. M. Paige, 237-270. Greenwich, CT: Information Age.
- Byram, M. 1988. "Foreign Language Education and Cultural Studies." *Language, Culture and Curriculum* 1 (1): 15-31.
- Byram, M. 1997. "*Teaching and Assessing Intercultural Communication Competence.*" Clevedon, UK: Multilingual Matters.
- Byram, M. 2014. "Twenty-five Years On—From Cultural Studies to Intercultural Citizenship." *Language, Culture and Curriculum* 27 (3): 209-225.
- Chao, T.-C. 2012. "A Diary Study of University EFL Learners' Intercultural Learning through Foreign Films." *Language, Culture and Curriculum* 26 (3): 247-265.
- Chao, T.-C. 2014. "The Development and Application of an Intercultural Competence Scale for University EFL Learners." *English Teaching & Learning* 38 (4): 79-124.
- Çiftçi, E. Y. 2016. "A Review of Research on Intercultural Learning through Computer-Based Digital Technologies." *Educational Technology & Society* 19 (2): 313-327.
- Deardorff, D. K. 2006. "Identification and Assessment of Intercultural Competence as a Student Outcome of Internationalization." *Journal of Studies in International Education* 10: 241-266.
- Fantini, A. E. 2009. "Assessing Intercultural Competence: Issues and Tools." In *The Sage Handbook of Intercultural Competence*, edited by D. K. Deardorff, 456-476. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

- Fischer, R. 2011. "Cross-cultural Training Effects on Cultural Essentialism Beliefs and Cultural Intelligence." *International Journal of Intercultural Relations* 35: 767-775.
- Lantz-Deaton, C. 2017. "Internationalisation and the Development of Students' Intercultural Competence." *Teaching in Higher Education* 22 (5): 532-550.
- Liaw, M.-L. 2006. "E-learning and the Development of Intercultural Competence." *Language Learning & Technology* 10 (3): 49-64.
- Marijuan, S., and C. Sanz. 2018. "Expanding Boundaries: Current and New Directions in Study Abroad Research and Practice." *Foreign Language Annals* 51: 185-204.
- Pinner, R. S. 2016. *Reconceptualising Authenticity for English as a Global Language*. Bristol, UK: Multilingual Matters.
- Schartner, A. 2016. "The Effect of Study Abroad on Intercultural Competence: A Longitudinal Case study of International Postgraduate Students at a British University." *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development* 37 (4): 402-418.
- Su, Y.-C. 2018. "Assessing Taiwanese College Students' Intercultural Sensitivity, EFL Interests, Attitudes Toward Native English Speakers, Ethnocentrism, and Their Interrelation." *Asia-Pacific Educational Researcher* 27 (3): 217-226.
- Terzuolo, E. R. 2018. "Intercultural Development in Study Abroad: Influence of Student and Program Characteristics." *International Journal of Intercultural Relations* 65: 86-95.
- Ushioda, E., and D. Dörnyei. 2017. "Beyond Global English: Motivation to Learn Languages in a Multicultural World: Introduction to the Special Issue." *Modern Language Journal* 101 (3): 451-454.
- Yarosha, M., D. Lukicb, and R. Santibáñez-Gruberc. 2018. "Intercultural Competence for Students in International Joint Master Programmes." *International Journal of Intercultural Relations* 66: 52-72.
- Young, T. J., and I. Sachdev. 2011. "Intercultural Communicative Competence: Exploring English Language Teachers' Beliefs and Practices." *Language Awareness* 20 (2): 81-98.

Appendix. English Version of the IC Scale Items (adapted from Chao, 2014)

Affective orientation to intercultural interaction

- #9. I enjoy communicating with people from different cultures.
- #10. I am willing to acquire knowledge regarding different world cultures.
- #11. I am willing to manage emotions and frustrations when interacting with people from different cultures.
- #12. I am willing to demonstrate my interest in understanding people of other cultures that are unfamiliar to me.
- #13. I am willing to modify my attitude and behavior for interacting appropriately with people of other cultures.
- #14. I am willing to communicate with people of other cultures to broaden my worldview.

Display of intercultural consciousness

- #26. I do not generalize a person's behaviors as representative of a particular culture.
- #27. I am well prepared before any intercultural contact.
- #28. I can realize the cultural knowledge I apply to intercultural interaction.
- #29. I can sense how my cultural background influences my attitudes and approaches to managing emerging problems during intercultural communication.
- #30. I can sense that the responses other people provide during intercultural communication often reflect their own values and beliefs.

Knowledge of intercultural interaction

- #1. I know the routine aspects of life in other cultures (e.g., cuisine and customs).
- #2. I know the rules of non-verbal behaviors in other cultures.
- #3. I know the visible achievement cultures, related to the facts and knowledge of world civilizations (e.g., arts, literature).
- #4. I know the rules of verbal behaviors in other cultures.
- #5. I know the signs of cultural stress and strategies for overcoming culture shock.
- #6. I know how historical and socio-political factors influence the attitudes and behavior of people from different cultures.
- #7. I know how to appropriately negotiate with people from different cultures in intercultural contexts.

#8. I know the interactive behaviors common among people of different cultures in professional areas.

Behavioral performance in intercultural interaction

#18. I can effectively use English to communicate with other people of different cultural backgrounds.

#19. I can effectively use foreign languages to communicate with other people of different cultural backgrounds.

#20. I can eat what others eat in culturally diverse situations.

#21. I can use functional languages (e.g., invitation, refusal, and apology) flexibly for achieving appropriate intercultural communication.

#22. I can develop appropriate interactive strategies (e.g., directness and face-saving) to adjust to the diverse styles of intercultural communication.

#23. I can modify the way I dress when it is necessary in intercultural situations.

#24. I can change my verbal behavior (e.g., speed, accent) when it is necessary in intercultural situations.

#25. I can change my non-verbal behavior (e.g., gestures, facial expressions) when it is necessary in intercultural situations.

Self-efficacy in intercultural situations

#15. I am confident that I can interact with people of other cultures appropriately and effectively.

#16. I am confident that I can adjust to living in different cultural contexts.

#17. I am confident that I can adjust to the stress of culture shock.

題目	完全不同意 0	不同意 1	有些不同意 2	有些同意 3	同意 4	非常同意 5
態度與行為。						
14. 為了提升自己的國際觀，我願意與世界上其他文化的人交流互動。	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
15. 對於能否與世界上其他文化的人士進行合適有效溝通一事，我很有信心。	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
16. 在不同文化的環境中生活，我確信自己有足夠的適應力。	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
17. 我相信自己能夠調適處理在面對文化衝擊時所產生的壓力。	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
18. 我具備流利的英語能力，能與世界上其他文化的人有效溝通。	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
19. 我能因著不同跨文化情境的需要來調整自己的飲食方式。	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
20. 我能因著不同跨文化情境的需要，彈性地使用各式行為用語(例如：道歉用語、邀請用語、拒絕用語)，以期達到合適溝通的目的。	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
21. 我能發展合適的互動方式(例如：直接、面子維持)來適應不同文化的溝通風格。	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
22. 我能因著不同文化情境的需要，而調整自己的穿著。	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
23. 我能因著不同跨文化溝通的需要，而改變自己的語言行為(例如：速度、口音、表達方式)。	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
24. 我能因著不同跨文化溝通的需要，而改變自己的非語言行為(例如：手勢、面部表情、眼神、肢體動作)。	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
25. 我不會把某個人的行為簡化解讀為某種特定文化代表。	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
26. 在與不同文化背景人士互動前，我會事先作好準備。	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
27. 我瞭解自己在與不同文化背景人士互動時，所運用到的文化知識。	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
28. 我知道自己的文化背景，會如何影響我面對跨文化溝通問題時，所持的態度與處理方式。	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
29. 我知道在跨文化溝通過程中，不同文化背景人士對我的回應，通常反映了他們自己的價值觀。	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

The Culture Voyage 大學英文 (一) 學習成果展演：

30. 你在此次展演中準備的作品為何？它對你帶來什麼影響？

31. 請舉例說明在展演中學習到有關自身或其他文化的知識。

32. 四天的展演活動中最喜歡哪一個部分？（教案、上台報告、書面作品、影片觀賞等等）

33. 對於展演的各項安排（時間、場地、布置等）有什麼想法或建議？

謝謝您的填答，祝您學業順利。

附件（四）

各位政大第二外語的老師們好：

再次感謝您上學期給予我們在研究上的協助，讓我們得以在期初及期末分兩波邀請學生們填寫問卷以蒐集資料，經過寒假期間的統計分析及最近的整理和撰寫，已完成一份約 8500 字的英文草稿，後續的投稿與審查一般會花費不少時間，文章的論述也會被挑戰且需要來回修改。因此我想在這邊先向您報告我們初步的結果，希望有機會得到您的寶貴意見與指教，更期待後續還有機會進行深入的研究，讓我們政大在第二外語經營多年的努力可以更具體的被外界了解。以下我簡要說明研究的背景及結果，並隨信附上英文摘要供您參考。

我們上學期所做的問卷有兩部分，第一部份是跨文化覺識能力，第二部分是外語學習動機。我這裡要報告的是第二部分。

外語學習動機的研究在過去二十年間有很大的理論變化，且研究數量的成長十分快速。這類研究有時會讓第一線老師們失望，因為多數談的是「學生為何學外語」，這樣的研究與我們在教室裡想要「激發學生動機」還有一段距離，結果往往不是立即可用。先做說明，希望不要讓您太失望。

外語學習動機理論的討論一般都會追溯到 1985 年一名加拿大學者提出的 integrative/instrumental 概念。簡單說，integrativeness 指的是學習者很嚮往所學語言背後的文化與社群，希望融入他們；instrumentality 指的是學習者希望透過外語學習得到實用的功能，如求學工作等。原本用來解釋加拿大雙語環境下的現象，一般來說，學習動機傾向 integrativeness 的比傾向是 instrumentality 的人學得好，較持久，較成功。

這個理論經過一些批評修改後，被一名匈牙利籍在英國大學教書的學者融入他 2005 提出的理論中，這個理論把上述對外的想望轉成個人對自己的想望，他認為動機就來自個人現狀及對自己未來想望的差距，這個差距驅使我們行動。在這裡理論中，促成學生學外語的動機有三大要素：1) ideal L2 self 理想中未來的我跟這語言的關係，2) ought-to self 父母老師社會對我學習及使用這語言的期待，3) learning experience 學習經驗。一般來說，1) 是很強的預測因子，2) 就較有爭議，3) 的討論似乎比較少。過去曾有台灣的研究指出，台灣學生學英文多是出自必修考試的要求，父母師長的期待等等。

另外一個近一兩年被大幅討論的主題是：我們對外語學習動機的研究雖快速累積，但都集中在學英文。學者們認為英文已成為國際溝通的語言，在各國自中小學都已是必修，它的性質跟其他外語很不同。相對的，其他外語的學習似乎受到英文霸權影響，日漸式微。我們需要多了解其他外語的學習動機，且不見得能夠用過去對動機的了解來看待各種第二外語的學習動機。

我將學生依所學語言分成三群—東南亞語(越馬泰)，東北亞語(日韓)，歐洲語(德法西)。學習初的問卷問的是學英文的動機，因為英文是大家共通的語言，且學期初時這些學生還沒有足夠的二外學習經驗。學期末同樣的動機問卷題項就改成針對個人所學的第二外語。

在做過統計分析後，我發現三個語群的動機模型都很像，不管他們學的是哪個第二外語，針對學生對學習投入的意願，最強的預測因子是學習經驗 learning experience，其次是理想我 ideal self 和文化及社群接觸 culture/community interest。此外，ought-to self 和 instrumentality 這些被認為是外加的，較負面的動機因子都不是影響我們學生學習的因素。在英文部分，看到的現象也類似但較為複雜，最強的還是 learning experience，其次有 ideal self 和 community interest。但是，instrumentality 在影響他們學英文的動機上也佔有一席之地，ought-to self 則沒有。

這樣的結果跟文獻中台灣學生學外語的動機有些不同，當然學生年齡，來自甚麼學校還有學甚麼外語都可能有影響。我個人認為，我們這群學二外的學生並非一般典型的大學生，他們是較主動願意學習外國語言的一群，跟被動學英文的大多數學生不同。很特別的是影響他們學習動機最強的還是學習經驗，也就是各位老師在課室中對他們的學習有重要的影響，不管什麼語言都一樣。他們對所學語言背後文化社群的興趣，還有對自我未來使用這個語言的想望，也應該是老師們可以有效促進他們學習的方向。

以上免不了要做一些背景說明，因此有些冗長，謝謝您耐心了解。其他的資料仍在整理中，雖有想法還不成熟，就先這樣了。

原本計畫僅在上學期收集資料，但這學期同樣這批學生還在繼續修習他們的第二外語，因此我們打算在這學期末之前，也就是一學年的末尾，再蒐集一次資料，以追蹤文化覺識和學習動機的發展，期待能再次得到您的同意與協助。感謝您！

這次在研究的過程中，我特別感受到過去校內及院內師長們推動第二外語教育的努力，十多年來我們的第二外語教育已成政大鮮明的特色，也是我們學生寶貴的學習資源，當然多虧各位老師長期辛苦耕耘，才有我們優質的外語教育。謝謝老師！

Week 14, 5/29 (二) 寄信給各位老師 (設簽收功能或直接勾選同意回信功能, 請慈儀代為發信), 請老師同意由我們直接發信邀請同學填寫第三波問卷, 也請老師協助告知學生此次問卷即將開始, 並將問卷網址置於課程平台, 提醒同學記得上網填寫.

Week 14, 6/1 (五) 沛滢系統發信給八語種目前所有授課老師及修課學生, 以研究人員署名, 附上簡要說明, 網站連結, 及聯絡人慈儀聯繫方式.

Week 15, 6/8 (五) 重寄提醒

Week 16, 6/14 (四) 重寄提醒, 並述明問卷截止填答日期為 6/20

Week 17, 6/20 (三) 午夜截止, 開始資料整理並轉芃婕進行後續

5/29 請慈儀發給各位授課老師, cc 外文中心陳主任, 沛滢, 尤老師和我
各位政大外文中心第二外語老師您好:

第二外語學習研究團隊感謝您上學期的協助, 使我們於 106 學年上學期期初與期末順利收集學生問卷資料, 並完成第一階段研究報告 (報告摘要已於 x/x 以 email 附檔寄送給您). 為持續追蹤同一批學生後續學習在文化覺識與動機上的變化, 我們即將展開 106 學年下學期期末的第三波問卷調查, 調查對象仍為目前在您班上修課的學生, 問卷內容亦與前兩次相同. 我們將嚴守研究倫理審慎處理資料, 填答者均匿名且資料僅供學術研究用途, 也歡迎您或同學跟我們索取進一步的研究計畫資料, 或惠賜您的寶貴意見.

不同於上學期到班利用下課時間向學生宣傳問卷填寫事項, 這次我們不再到班, 而是將在 6/1 (五) 以 email 寄信給修課學生 (將於 6/8, 6/14 分別進行兩次提醒), 說明此次第三波問卷調查開始(6/1) 及截止(6/20) 日期, 並附上問卷網站連結, 邀請學生參加.

為求周延，在發信前特來信徵求授課教師您的同意，敬請准許我們發信邀請您的學生參與。以下懇請您勾選回覆意見，並希望您能協助我們將以下問卷網站連結置於您的課程平台以提醒學生參加，謝謝您！

() 同意

() 不同意

問卷網址: ...

研究團隊

政大外文中心 黃淑真

政大英文系 尤雪瑛

助理 曾慈儀 敬上

6/1 系統發信給修課學生的內容

標題：敬邀參加政大第二外語研究問卷調查

同學您好

政大多年來投注資源推動多元第二外語教育，為了解現況，已於上學期進行兩波的問卷調查，並完成初步報告。在您本學期修課結束之前，我們徵得授課教師同意，再次邀請您填答這份問卷，以便追蹤後續，深入瞭解政大同學修習第二外語的情形。這次問卷調查將於6 / 20截止，請點選以下連結進入問卷網頁填寫，謝謝您的參與。

網址：

研究團隊署名 敬上

6/8 提醒信發一次

標題：後續提醒——敬邀參加政大第二外語研究問卷調查

同學您好

多元第二外語教育是政大的寶貴資產，我們對第二外語教育的研究需要您的協助。這次問卷調查將於6 / 20截止，僅此提醒您，如果尚未填寫，請點選以下連結進入問卷網頁，如已填寫，請忽略此信。非常感謝您的參與。

網址：

研究團隊署名 敬上

6/14 提醒信再發一次

同上

以下是填答網頁最上面的那封信，只有第一段和末尾跟第二波略有不同 抽獎拿掉。

同學您好

政大多年來投注資源推動多元第二外語教育，為了解現況，已於上學期進行兩波的問卷調查，並完成初步報告。在您本學期修課結束之前，我們再次邀請您填答這份問卷，以便追蹤後續，深入瞭解政大同學修習第二外語的情形。

在這次的線上問卷中，內容均與前兩次類似，第一部分是有關您此時的文化認知，第二部分關心您目前學習第二外語的經驗，第三部分則是個人基本資料。

下面就重複之前的三四段，最後加上“如果您對本研究內容有任何疑問或想進一步了解，請聯繫本計畫研究助理曾慈儀，email: _____，我們歡迎您的來信。感謝您的參與，預祝您暑假愉快！”

第五段關於抽獎的要拿掉

然後署名，然後再一次同意書，然後 part I, part II, part III

Part I 照舊

Part II 照第二波的版本

Part III

個人資料

姓名

學號（有學號就可知主修對吧？但還要花功夫去對。所以我建議加下兩樣）

主修（如果選要設計很麻煩 就填空好了 雙主修也不怕）

在校第幾年

性別

年齡（怎樣比較好勾？出生年好嗎？）

目前二外班級（可用下拉選單嗎？）

自評目前二外學習成果 非常不滿意 不滿意 普通 滿意 很滿意 12345

除目前課程外，還學過那些英文以外的外語（填空）

附件（五）

ANOVA 分析

	affect	consciousness	knowledge	behavior	Efficacy
男	-	-	+ 1/3	-	-
女	-	+ 1/2	+ 1/2	+ 1/2	-
東北亞	-	-	-	-	-
東南亞	-	-	-	-	-
歐語	+ 1/3	+ 1/3	+ 1/2	+ 1/3	+ 1/3
一年生	-	+ 1/2	+ 1/2	+ 1/2	+ 1/3
二年生	-	-	-	-	-

一、性別：

I. 【男性】：

1、【Affect】：

(1)、ANOVA 分析:

	Df.	Sum Sq.	Mean Sq.	F value	Pr(>F)
三次受測	2	0.86	0.8563	3.018	0.0837
Residuals	223	63.28	0.2838		

結果顯示 F 檢定值=3.018，顯著性 p 值=0.0837>0.05，表示受測男性學生在三個時間點之文化部分 **Affect** 構面沒有明顯差異。

2、【Consciousness】：

(1)、ANOVA 分析:

	Df.	Sum Sq.	Mean Sq.	F value	Pr(>F)
三次受測	2	0.19	0.1944	0.568	0.452
Residuals	223	76.28	0.3420		

結果顯示 F 檢定值=0.568，顯著性 p 值=0.452 > 0.05，表示受測男性學生在三個時間點之文化部分 **Consciousness** 構面沒有明顯差異。

3、【Knowledge】：

(1)、ANOVA 分析:

	Df.	Sum Sq.	Mean Sq.	F value	Pr(>F)
三次受測	2	3.68	3.682	8.302	0.00435**
Residuals	223	98.89	0.443		

**表示 p<0.01

結果顯示 F 檢定值=8.302，顯著性 p 值=0.00435 < 0.05，表示受測男性學生在三個時間點之文化部分 **Knowledge** 構面有差異。

(2)、事後檢定(Post hoc)：使用 paired t-test 配合 Bonferroni 法校正多重比較，檢定哪幾組間的差異有達顯著：

	1 st	2 nd	3 rd	增長率	增長率	增長率	t-test	t-test	t-test
	平均數 (標準 差)	平均數 (標準 差)	平均數 (標準 差)	1 st → 2 nd	2 nd → 3 rd	1 st → 3 rd	1 st → 2 nd	2 nd → 3 rd	1 st → 3 rd
構 面 一	3.66 (0.73)	3.92 (0.64)	3.98 (0.61)	7.10%	1.53%	8.74%			**

**表示 p<0.01

透過檢定的方式觀察此構面，在第一次至第三次有達到顯著提升的現象(p < 0.01)。

4、【Behavior】：

(1)、ANOVA 分析:

	Df.	Sum Sq.	Mean Sq.	F value	Pr(>F)
三次受測	2	0.9	0.9009	1.98	0.161
Residuals	223	101.5	0.4551		

結果顯示 F 檢定值=1.98，顯著性 p 值=0.161 > 0.05，表示受測男性學生在三個時間點之文化部分 **Behavior** 構面沒有明顯差異。

5、【Efficacy】：

(1)、ANOVA 分析:

	Df.	Sum Sq.	Mean Sq.	F value	Pr(>F)
三次受測	2	2.08	2.0807	3.26	0.0723
Residuals	223	142.34	0.6383		

結果顯示 F 檢定值=3.26，顯著性 p 值=0.0723 > 0.05，表示受測男性學生在三個時間點之文化部分 **Efficacy** 構面沒有明顯差異。

II. 【女性】：

1、【Affect】：

(1)、ANOVA 分析:

	Df.	Sum Sq.	Mean Sq.	F value	Pr(>F)
三次受測	2	0.23	0.2347	0.81	0.368
Residuals	616	178.46	0.2897		

結果顯示 F 檢定值=0.81，顯著性 p 值=0.368 > 0.05，表示受測女性學生在三個時間點之文化部分 **Affect** 構面沒有明顯差異。

2、【Consciousness】：

(1)、ANOVA 分析:

	Df.	Sum Sq.	Mean Sq.	F value	Pr(>F)
三次受測	2	2.64	2.6432	8.51	0.00366**
Residuals	616	191.32	0.3106		

**表示 p<0.01

結果顯示 F 檢定值=8.51，顯著性 p 值=0.00366 < 0.05，表示受測女性學生在三個時間點之文化部分 **Consciousness** 構面有差異。

(2)、事後檢定(Post hoc)：使用 paired t-test 配合 Bonferroni 法校正多重比較，檢定哪幾組間的差異有達顯著：

	1 st	2 nd	3 rd	增長率	增長率	增長率	t-test	t-test	t-test
	平均數 (標準 差)	平均數 (標準 差)	平均數 (標準 差)	1 st → 2 nd	2 nd → 3 rd	1 st → 3 rd	1 st → 2 nd	2 nd → 3 rd	1 st → 3 rd
構 面 五	3.97 (0.60)	4.14 (0.53)	4.13 (0.54)	4.28%	-0.24%	4.03%	**		**

**表示 p<0.01

透過檢定的方式觀察此構面，在第一次至第二次及第一次至第三次有達到顯著提升的現象(p <0.01)。

3、【Knowledge】：

(1)、ANOVA 分析:

	Df.	Sum Sq.	Mean Sq.	F value	Pr(>F)
三次受測	2	2.91	2.9099	7.426	0.00661**
Residuals	616	241.39	0.3919		

**表示 p<0.01

結果顯示 F 檢定值=7.426，顯著性 p 值=0.00661 < 0.05，表示受測女性學生在三個時間點之文化部分 **Knowledge** 構面有差異。

(2)、事後檢定(Post hoc)：使用 paired t-test 配合 Bonferroni 法校正多重比較，檢定哪幾組間的差異有達顯著：

	1 st	2 nd	3 rd	增長率	增長率	增長率	t-test	t-test	t-test
	平均數 (標準 差)	平均數 (標準 差)	平均數 (標準 差)	1 st → 2 nd	2 nd → 3 rd	1 st → 3 rd	1 st → 2 nd	2 nd → 3 rd	1 st → 3 rd

構 面 一	3.72 (0.70)	3.89 (0.56)	3.89 (0.61)	4.57%	--	4.57%	*		*
-------------	----------------	----------------	----------------	-------	----	-------	---	--	---

*表示 $p < 0.05$

透過檢定的方式觀察此構面，在第一次至第二次及第一次至第三次有達到顯著提升的現象($p < 0.05$)。

4、【Behavior】：

(1)、ANOVA 分析:

	Df.	Sum Sq.	Mean Sq.	F value	Pr(>F)
三次受測	2	2.66	2.6633	6.579	0.0106*
Residuals	616	249.35	0.4048		

*表示 $p < 0.05$

結果顯示 F 檢定值=6.579，顯著性 p 值=0.0106 < 0.05，表示受測女性學生在三個時間點之文化部分 **Behavior** 構面有差異。

(2)、事後檢定(Post hoc)：使用 paired t-test 配合 Bonferroni 法校正多重比較，檢定哪幾組間的差異有達顯著：

	1 st	2 nd	3 rd	增長率	增長率	增長率	t-test	t-test	t-test
	平均數 (標準 差)	平均數 (標準 差)	平均數 (標準 差)	1 st → 2 nd	2 nd → 3 rd	1 st → 3 rd	1 st → 2 nd	2 nd → 3 rd	1 st → 3 rd
構 面 四	3.72 (0.69)	3.87 (0.60)	3.88 (0.61)	4.03%	0.26%	4.30%	*		*

*表示 $p < 0.05$

透過檢定的方式觀察此構面，在第一次至第二次及第一次至第三次有達到顯著提升的現象($p < 0.05$)。

5、【Efficacy】：

(1)、ANOVA 分析:

	Df.	Sum Sq.	Mean Sq.	F value	Pr(>F)
三次受測	2	1.8	1.8134	2.889	0.0897
Residuals	616	386.7	0.6278		

結果顯示 F 檢定值=2.889，顯著性 p 值=0.0897 > 0.05，表示受測女性學生在三個時間點之文化部分 **Efficacy** 構面沒有明顯差異。

二、語群：

【東北亞】

1、【Affect】：

(1)、ANOVA 分析:

	Df.	Sum Sq.	Mean Sq.	F value	Pr(>F)
三次受測	2	0.02	0.01563	0.05	0.823
Residuals	214	66.52	0.31082		

結果顯示 F 檢定值=0.05，顯著性 p 值=0.823 > 0.05，表示受測修習東北亞語群學生在三個時間點之文化部分 **Affect** 構面沒有明顯差異。

2、【Consciousness】：

(1)、ANOVA 分析:

	Df.	Sum Sq.	Mean Sq.	F value	Pr(>F)
三次受測	2	0.72	0.7225	2.118	0.147
Residuals	214	73.02	0.3412		

結果顯示 F 檢定值=2.118，顯著性 p 值=0.147 > 0.05，表示受測修習東北亞語群學生在三個時間點之文化部分 **Consciousness** 構面沒有明顯差異。

3、【Knowledge】：

(1)、ANOVA 分析:

	Df.	Sum Sq.	Mean Sq.	F value	Pr(>F)
三次受測	2	0.69	0.6944	1.811	0.18
Residuals	214	82.05	0.3834		

結果顯示 F 檢定值=1.811，顯著性 p 值=0.18 > 0.05，表示受測修習東北亞語群學生在三個時間點之文化部分 **Knowledge** 構面沒有明顯差異。

4、【Behavior】：

(1)、ANOVA 分析:

	Df.	Sum Sq.	Mean Sq.	F value	Pr(>F)
三次受測	2	0.07	0.0734	0.155	0.694
Residuals	214	101.32	0.4735		

結果顯示 F 檢定值=0.155，顯著性 p 值=0.694 > 0.05，表示受測修習東北亞語群學生在三個時間點之文化部分 **Behavior** 構面沒有明顯差異。

5、【Efficacy】：

(1)、ANOVA 分析:

	Df.	Sum Sq.	Mean Sq.	F value	Pr(>F)
三次受測	2	0.03	0.0278	0.041	0.839
Residuals	214	144.12	0.6735		

結果顯示 F 檢定值=0.041，顯著性 p 值=0.839 > 0.05，表示受測修習東北亞語群學生在三個時間點之文化部分 **Efficacy** 構面沒有明顯差異。

【東南亞】

1、【Affect】：

(1)、ANOVA 分析:

	Df.	Sum Sq.	Mean Sq.	F value	Pr(>F)
三次受測	2	0.079	0.07901	0.396	0.53
Residuals	133	26.55	0.19962		

結果顯示 F 檢定值=0.396，顯著性 p 值=0.53 > 0.05，表示受測修習東南亞語群學生在三個時間點之文化部分 **Affect** 構面沒有明顯差異。

2、【Consciousness】：

(1)、ANOVA 分析:

	Df.	Sum Sq.	Mean Sq.	F value	Pr(>F)
三次受測	2	0.01	0.00711	0.025	0.874
Residuals	133	37.22	0.27988		

結果顯示 F 檢定值=0.025，顯著性 p 值=0.874 > 0.05，表示受測修習東南亞語群學生在三個時間點之文化部分 **Consciousness** 構面沒有明顯差異。

3、【Knowledge】：

(1)、ANOVA 分析:

	Df.	Sum Sq.	Mean Sq.	F value	Pr(>F)
三次受測	2	0.65	0.6460	1.312	0.254
Residuals	133	65.47	0.4923		

結果顯示 F 檢定值=1.312，顯著性 p 值=0.254 > 0.05，表示受測修習東南亞語群學生在三個時間點之文化部分 **Knowledge** 構面沒有明顯差異。

4、【Behavior】：

(1)、ANOVA 分析:

	Df.	Sum Sq.	Mean Sq.	F value	Pr(>F)
三次受測	2	0.95	0.9507	2.758	0.0991
Residuals	133	45.85	0.3447		

結果顯示 F 檢定值=2.758，顯著性 p 值=0.0991 > 0.05，表示受測修習東南亞語群學生在三個時間點之文化部分 **Behavior** 構面沒有明顯差異。

5、【Efficacy】：

(1)、ANOVA 分析:

	Df.	Sum Sq.	Mean Sq.	F value	Pr(>F)
三次受測	2	0.60	0.5975	1.012	0.316
Residuals	133	78.53	0.5905		

結果顯示 F 檢定值=1.012，顯著性 p 值=0.316 > 0.05，表示受測修習東南亞語群學生在三個時間點之文化部分 **Efficacy** 構面沒有明顯差異。

【歐洲】

1、【Affect】：

(1)、ANOVA 分析:

	Df.	Sum Sq.	Mean Sq.	F value	Pr(>F)
三次受測	2	1.22	1.2195	4.036	0.0451*
Residuals	490	148.05	0.3022		

*表示 $p < 0.05$

結果顯示 F 檢定值=4.036，顯著性 p 值=0.0451 < 0.05，表示受測修習歐洲語群學生在三個時間點之文化部分 **Affect** 構面有明顯差異。

(2)、事後檢定(Post hoc)：使用 paired t-test 配合 Bonferroni 法校正多重比較，檢定哪幾組間的差異有達顯著：

	1 st	2 nd	3 rd	增長率	增長率	增長率	t-test	t-test	t-test
	平均數 (標準 差)	平均數 (標準 差)	平均數 (標準 差)	1 st → 2 nd	2 nd → 3 rd	1 st → 3 rd	1 st → 2 nd	2 nd → 3 rd	1 st → 3 rd
構 面 二	4.41 (0.61)	4.48 (0.56)	4.54 (0.47)	1.59%	1.34%	2.95%			*

*表示 $p < 0.05$

透過檢定的方式觀察此構面，在第一次至第三次有達到顯著提升的現象($p < 0.05$)。

2、【Consciousness】：

(1)、ANOVA 分析:

	Df.	Sum Sq.	Mean Sq.	F value	Pr(>F)
三次受測	2	2.29	2.2889	7.155	0.00772**
Residuals	490	156.74	0.3199		

**表示 $p < 0.01$

結果顯示 F 檢定值=7.155，顯著性 p 值=0.00772 < 0.05，表示受測修習歐洲語群學生在三個時間點之文化部分 **Consciousness** 構面有明顯差異。

(2)、事後檢定(Post hoc)：使用 paired t-test 配合 Bonferroni 法校正多重比較，檢定哪幾組間的差異有達顯著：

	1 st	2 nd	3 rd	增長率	增長率	增長率	t-test	t-test	t-test
	平均數 (標準 差)	平均數 (標準 差)	平均數 (標準 差)	1 st → 2 nd	2 nd → 3 rd	1 st → 3 rd	1 st → 2 nd	2 nd → 3 rd	1 st → 3 rd
構 面 五	3.99 (0.61)	4.13 (0.54)	4.16 (0.55)	3.51%	0.73%	4.26%			*

*表示 $p < 0.05$

透過檢定的方式觀察此構面，在第一次至第三次有達到顯著提升的現象($p < 0.05$)。

3、【Knowledge】：

(1)、ANOVA 分析:

	Df.	Sum Sq.	Mean Sq.	F value	Pr(>F)
三次受測	2	5.0	5.001	12.7	0.004**
Residuals	490	192.9	0.394		

**表示 $p < 0.01$

結果顯示 F 檢定值=12.7，顯著性 p 值=0.004 < 0.05，表示受測修習歐洲語群學生在三個時間點之文化部分 **Knowledge** 構面有差異。

(2)、事後檢定(Post hoc)：使用 paired t-test 配合 Bonferroni 法校正多重比較，檢定哪幾組間的差異有達顯著：

	1 st	2 nd	3 rd	增長率	增長率	增長率	t-test	t-test	t-test
	平均數 (標準 差)	平均數 (標準 差)	平均數 (標準 差)	1 st → 2 nd	2 nd → 3 rd	1 st → 3 rd	1 st → 2 nd	2 nd → 3 rd	1 st → 3 rd
構 面 一	3.70 (0.69)	3.88 (0.59)	3.95 (0.60)	4.86%	1.80%	6.76%	*		**

**表示 $p < 0.01$ ，*表示 $p < 0.05$

透過檢定的方式觀察此構面，在第一次至第二次及第一次至第三次有達到顯著提升的現象($p < 0.05$)。

4、【Behavior】：

(1)、ANOVA 分析:

	Df.	Sum Sq.	Mean Sq.	F value	Pr(>F)
三次受測	2	3.17	3.171	7.813	0.00539**
Residuals	490	198.88	0.406		

**表示 $p < 0.01$

結果顯示 F 檢定值=7.813，顯著性 p 值=0.00539 < 0.05，表示受測修習歐洲語群學生在三個時間點之文化部分 **Behavior** 構面有明顯差異。

(2)、事後檢定(Post hoc)：使用 paired t-test 配合 Bonferroni 法校正多重比較，檢定哪幾組間的差異有達顯著：

	1 st	2 nd	3 rd	增長率	增長率	增長率	t-test	t-test	t-test
	平均數 (標準 差)	平均數 (標準 差)	平均數 (標準 差)	1 st → 2 nd	2 nd → 3 rd	1 st → 3 rd	1 st → 2 nd	2 nd → 3 rd	1 st → 3 rd
構 面 四	3.73 (0.70)	3.87 (0.58)	3.93 (0.62)	3.75%	1.55%	5.36%			*

*表示 $p < 0.05$

透過檢定的方式觀察此構面，在第一次至第三次有達到顯著提升的現象($p < 0.05$)。

5、【Efficacy】：

(1)、ANOVA 分析:

	Df.	Sum Sq.	Mean Sq.	F value	Pr(>F)
三次受測	2	3.88	3.878	6.25	0.0127*
Residuals	490	304.07	0.621		

*表示 $p < 0.05$

結果顯示 F 檢定值=6.25，顯著性 p 值=0.0127 < 0.05，表示受測修習歐洲語群學生在三個時間點之文化部分 **Efficacy** 構面有明顯差異。

(2)、事後檢定(Post hoc)：使用 paired t-test 配合 Bonferroni 法校正多重比較，檢定哪幾組間的差異有達顯著：

	1 st	2 nd	3 rd	增長率	增長率	增長率	t-test	t-test	t-test
	平均數 (標準 差)	平均數 (標準 差)	平均數 (標準 差)	1 st → 2 nd	2 nd → 3 rd	1 st → 3 rd	1 st → 2 nd	2 nd → 3 rd	1 st → 3 rd
構 面 三	3.70 (0.86)	3.83 (0.73)	3.91 (0.77)	3.51%	2.09%	5.68%			*

*表示 $p < 0.05$

透過檢定的方式觀察此構面，在第一次至第三次有達到顯著提升的現象($p < 0.05$)。

三、學習語言之年數：

I. 【1年】：

1、【Affect】：

(1)、ANOVA 分析:

	Df.	Sum Sq.	Mean Sq.	F value	Pr(>F)
三次受測	2	0.63	0.627	2.2	0.138
Residuals	703	200.34	0.285		

結果顯示 F 檢定值=2.2，顯著性 p 值=0.138 > 0.05，表示受測修習語言為一年之學生在三個時間點之文化部分 **Affect** 構面沒有明顯差異。

2、【Consciousness】：

(1)、ANOVA 分析:

	Df.	Sum Sq.	Mean Sq.	F value	Pr(>F)
三次受測	2	2.46	2.4596	7.501	0.00632**
Residuals	703	230.51	0.3279		

**表示 $p < 0.01$

結果顯示 F 檢定值=7.501，顯著性 p 值=0.00632 < 0.05，表示受測修習語言為一年之學生在三個時間點之文化部分 **Consciousness** 構面有明顯差異。

(2)、事後檢定(Post hoc)：使用 paired t-test 配合 Bonferroni 法校正多重比較，檢定哪幾組間的差異有達顯著：

	1 st	2 nd	3 rd	增長率	增長率	增長率	t-test	t-test	t-test
	平均數 (標準 差)	平均數 (標準 差)	平均數 (標準 差)	1 st → 2 nd	2 nd → 3 rd	1 st → 3 rd	1 st → 2 nd	2 nd → 3 rd	1 st → 3 rd
構 面 五	3.99 (0.62)	4.16 (0.52)	4.14 (0.57)	4.26%	-0.48%	3.76%	**		*

*表示 $p < 0.05$, **表示 $p < 0.01$

透過檢定的方式觀察此構面，在第一次至第二次及第一次至第三次有達到顯著提升的現象($p < 0.05$)。

3、【Knowledge】：

(1)、ANOVA 分析:

	Df.	Sum Sq.	Mean Sq.	F value	Pr(>F)
三次受測	2	7.07	7.065	17.17	3.84e-05***
Residuals	703	289.35	0.412		

***表示 $p < 0.001$

結果顯示 F 檢定值=17.17，顯著性 p 值=3.84e-05 < 0.05，表示受測修習語言為一年之學生在三個時間點之文化部分 Knowledge 構面有明顯差異。

(2)、事後檢定(Post hoc)：使用 paired t-test 配合 Bonferroni 法校正多重比較，檢定哪幾組間的差異有達顯著：

	1 st	2 nd	3 rd	增長率	增長率	增長率	t-test	t-test	t-test
	平均數 (標準 差)	平均數 (標準 差)	平均數 (標準 差)	1 st → 2 nd	2 nd → 3 rd	1 st → 3 rd	1 st → 2 nd	2 nd → 3 rd	1 st → 3 rd
構 面 一	3.69 (0.72)	3.92 (0.56)	3.94 (0.62)	6.23%	0.51%	6.78%	**		**

**表示 $p < 0.01$

透過檢定的方式觀察此構面，在第一次至第二次及第一次至第三次有達到顯著提升的現象($p < 0.01$)。

4、【Behavior】：

(1)、ANOVA 分析:

	Df.	Sum Sq.	Mean Sq.	F value	Pr(>F)
三次受測	2	5.06	5.057	12.1	0.000536***
Residuals	703	293.86	0.418		

***表示 $p < 0.001$

結果顯示 F 檢定值=12.1，顯著性 p 值=0.000536 < 0.05，表示受測修習語言為一年之學生在三個時間點之文化部分 **Behavior** 構面有明顯差異。

(2)、事後檢定(Post hoc)：使用 paired t-test 配合 Bonferroni 法校正多重比較，檢定哪幾組間的差異有達顯著：

	1 st	2 nd	3 rd	增長率	增長率	增長率	t-test	t-test	t-test
	平均數 (標準 差)	平均數 (標準 差)	平均數 (標準 差)	1 st → 2 nd	2 nd → 3 rd	1 st → 3 rd	1 st → 2 nd	2 nd → 3 rd	1 st → 3 rd
構 面 四	3.72 (0.71)	3.89 (0.60)	3.93 (0.62)	4.57%	1.03%	5.65%	*		**

*表示 $p < 0.05$, **表示 $p < 0.01$

透過檢定的方式觀察此構面，在第一次至第二次及第一次至第三次有達到顯著提升的現象($p < 0.05$)。

5、【Efficacy】：

(1)、ANOVA 分析:

	Df.	Sum Sq.	Mean Sq.	F value	Pr(>F)
三次受測	2	4.6	4.634	7.168	0.00759**
Residuals	703	454.4	0.646		

**表示 $p < 0.01$

結果顯示 F 檢定值=7.168，顯著性 p 值=0.00759 < 0.05，表示受測修習語言為一年之學生在三個時間點之文化部分 **Efficacy** 構面有明顯差異。

(2)、事後檢定(Post hoc)：使用 paired t-test 配合 Bonferroni 法校正多重比較，檢定哪幾組間的差異有達顯著：

	1 st	2 nd	3 rd	增長率	增長率	增長率	t-test	t-test	t-test
	平均數 (標準 差)	平均數 (標準 差)	平均數 (標準 差)	1 st → 2 nd	2 nd → 3 rd	1 st → 3 rd	1 st → 2 nd	2 nd → 3 rd	1 st → 3 rd
構 面 三	3.71 (0.87)	3.84 (0.76)	3.91 (0.78)	3.50%	1.82%	5.39%			*

*表示 $p < 0.05$

透過檢定的方式觀察此構面，在第一次至第三次有達到顯著提升的現象($p < 0.05$)。

II. 【2 年以上】：

1、【Affect】：

(1)、ANOVA 分析:

	Df.	Sum Sq.	Mean Sq.	F value	Pr(>F)
三次受測	2	0.17	0.1739	0.57	0.451
Residuals	136	41.48	0.3050		

結果顯示 F 檢定值=0.57，顯著性 p 值=0.451 > 0.05，表示受測修習語言為二年之學生在三個時間點之文化部分 **Affect** 構面沒有明顯差異。

2、【Consciousness】：

(1)、ANOVA 分析:

	Df.	Sum Sq.	Mean Sq.	F value	Pr(>F)
三次受測	2	0.21	0.2104	0.788	0.376
Residuals	136	36.30	0.2669		

結果顯示 F 檢定值=0.788，顯著性 p 值=0.376 > 0.05，表示受測修習語言為二年之學生在三個時間點之文化部分 **Consciousness** 構面沒有明顯差異。

3、【Knowledge】：

(1)、ANOVA 分析:

	Df.	Sum Sq.	Mean Sq.	F value	Pr(>F)
三次受測	2	0.0	0.0027	0.007	0.932
Residuals	136	49.9	0.3669		

結果顯示 F 檢定值=0.007，顯著性 p 值=0.932 > 0.05，表示受測修習語言為二年之學生在三個時間點之文化部分 **Knowledge** 構面沒有明顯差異。

4、【Behavior】：

(1)、ANOVA 分析:

	Df.	Sum Sq.	Mean Sq.	F value	Pr(>F)
三次受測	2	0.17	0.1739	0.436	0.51
Residuals	136	54.28	0.3991		

結果顯示 F 檢定值=0.436，顯著性 p 值=0.51 > 0.05，表示受測修習語言為二年之學生在三個時間點之文化部分 **Behavior** 構面沒有明顯差異。

5、【Efficacy】：

(1)、ANOVA 分析:

	Df.	Sum Sq.	Mean Sq.	F value	Pr(>F)
三次受測	2	0.03	0.0302	0.056	0.813
Residuals	136	73.47	0.5402		

結果顯示 F 檢定值=0.056，顯著性 p 值=0.813 > 0.05，表示受測修習語言為二年之學生在三個時間點之文化部分 **Efficac**

附件(六)

	course description	objectives						
周從郁 德 (一)	<p>本課程為大學外文 (一)：德文，第一個學期。</p> <p>適合對象： 從未學過德文之學生，但有學習動機，包括很有興趣認識德國語言文化，期待未來到德國擴增視野、願意與德國學生交友或赴德交換、攻讀學位 本課程將協助同學建立德語基礎認識，並了解德國文化，透過互動練習說寫</p> <p>不適合對象： (1)雖想「多學一歐語並拿學分」，但學分排太多無組織複習 (2)已學過每週三小時、50 小時以上(可自行複習，下學期再來) (3)過度害羞不主動開口者(歡迎害羞卻願意自我克服者) (4)無學分責任的旁聽生</p> <p>本課程要求：學習德國良好的準時與管理，不遲到或曠課，課後自我負責 本課學習方式：屬於大班學習外語，設計四人小組密切互動，練習說聽讀寫基本功夫 不接受旁聽：班級人數眾多，固定小組互動頻繁，不接受旁聽生</p> <p>第一次上課將自己決定全學期固定合作之小組，開始</p>	<p>配合歐洲目前對各種歐語的考試方向與題材，訓練同學第二外語的最基礎說聽讀寫能力，以每週三小時進度，每學期五百到六千字生字，為語言初級 A1.1 打下第一學期基礎。A1 根據歐洲德語語言能力鑑定指標設定。由於大班學習速度較緩，使用本冊書籍一本將用上下兩學期</p> <p>1.課外補充認識基本德文字母，理解拼字與發音，基礎發音與重音聽力 2.說話：固定四人夥伴，彼此互動溝通；使用字彙與句法，根據書本題材練習與發展日常對話 3.文法：掌握基礎德文文法概念，提供補充以中文描述德文文法的概念 4.寫作：學習書面信件表達。與夥伴通德文信</p> <p>以上各項目，若是自我管理學習有效，一年後可以參加基本語言外考測驗</p>						
		考試	報告	專題	前後測	其他	測驗藍圖	評量尺規
具備規劃學習地圖與生涯發展路徑的能力			心得與討論					
有效運用大學各項學習資源			小組合作學習					
具備深度閱讀的能力		※	※				※	
具備探索、熟悉新型態的數位學習模式						外語電郵寫作	※	
養成自主與終身學習的態度與策略		※	互相討論 觀摩		※			

	<p>基本打招呼再見德語 請勿缺課，缺席者如同放棄上述自主權</p> <p>課本：Schritte international 1 neu 第一冊有七課，上學期四課半，下學期四課半 至少隔周放映德國短片介紹德國節慶或風土民情</p>	<p>具備團隊合作與專題製作能力</p>		<p>磨合與產出劇本</p>			<p>夥伴口說表演</p>	<p>※</p>	
<p>周從郁德 (二)</p>	<p>本課為大班學習外語，須與夥伴主動誠心建立良好關係以利互動與說話練習。</p> <p>確定選課成功，請即安排個人上課複習計畫。</p> <p>課本符合德語檢定 A1.1 基本語彙文法。</p> <p>主題包括：房間家具、數字、租屋、鐘錶時間、星期、每日行程、氣候季節、休閒嗜好。</p> <p>文法包括：分離動詞、不規則動詞變化、受格、助動詞 können, wollen 完成式。</p> <p>對話內容包括：描述家具、整日與整周活動、野餐休閒、上餐館、學習（例如呼拉圈）過程、學習外語。</p>	<p>建立實用與多元基礎能力 A1.2。採用德國教材，切合國際學習軌道，並符合歐洲德語檢定進程主題。</p> <p>指導閱讀、寫作、表達，聽力與補充，督促建立自主學習德文習慣。</p> <p>但語言學習實際成效，與個人整體學習心態與個人開發度成正比，包括是否認真上課、與夥伴互動開口意願能力、課後規劃複習能力。學外語若無個人目標認知，即使授課認真，大班學習成效必定偏低。</p>							
<p>周從郁德 (三)</p>	<p>大學外文(三)：第二年第一學期德文課程 適合對象： 上學年順利修完大學外文(一)和(二)兩學期，且保持中度到高度學習動機興趣之學生；或在外補習上課約 90 小時學生(請先來信告知上課地點與學習鐘點數，將給予諮詢)</p>	<p>配合歐洲目前對各種歐語的考試方向與題材，訓練同學第二外語的最基礎說聽讀寫能力，以每週三小時進度，每學期六百字生字，為邁向語言初級 A1.2 打下基礎。A1 根據歐洲德語語言能力鑑定指標設定。大班學習速度較緩，使用本冊書籍一本將用上下兩學期。</p> <p>1.課外補充認識基本德文字母，理解拼字與發音，基礎發音與重音聽力。 2.說話：固定四人夥伴，彼此互動溝通；使用字彙與句法，根據書本題材練習與發展日常對話。</p>							

凡上述學生，有動機興趣繼續認識德國語言文化，期待未來到德國擴增視野、願意與德國學生交友或赴德交換、或準備努力攻讀學位皆歡迎

本課程將協助同學建立德語基礎文法認識，增加了解德國文化，互動練習說寫

不適合對象：

- (1)學分太多，難以執行個人管理責任
- (2)無學分責任的旁聽生

本課程要求：實踐德國良好的守時與個人管理挑戰，不遲到曠課，課後自我負責

本課學習方式：屬於大班學習外語，設計四人小組密切互動，練習說聽讀寫基本功夫

※

課本：Schritte international 2 neu 第二冊七課，上學期四課半，下學期四課半

3.文法：掌握基礎德文文法概念，提供補充以中文描述德文文法的概念。

4.寫作：學習書面信件表達。與夥伴通德文信。

以上各項目，按照課本設計，學習達到效果，一年內有條件參加外考基本語言測驗 A1

	考試	報告	專題	前後測	其他	測驗藍圖	評量尺規
具備規劃學習地圖與生涯發展路徑的能力		心得與討論					
有效運用大學各項學習資源		小組合作學習					
具備深度閱讀的能力	※	※				※	
具備探索、熟悉新型態的數位學習模式					外語電郵寫作	※	
養成自主與終身學習的態度與策略	※	互相討論觀摩		※			
具備團隊合作與專題製作能力		磨合與產出劇本			夥伴口說表演	※	

周從郁德 (四)

本課為大班學習外語，須與夥伴主動誠心建立良好關係以利互動與說話練習。

確定選課成功，請即安排個人上課複習計畫。

課本符合德語檢定 A1.2 基本語彙文法。

建立實用與多元基礎能力 A1.2。採用德國教材，切合國際學習軌道，並符合歐洲德語檢定進程主題。

指導閱讀、寫作、表達，聽力與補充，督促建立自主學習德文習慣。

但語言學習實際成效，與個人整體學習心態與個人開發度成正比，包括是否認真上課、與夥伴互動開口意願能力、課後規劃複習能力。學外語若無個人目標

	<p>主題包括：市區環境與方向問路、顧客服務、購買衣物、節慶。</p> <p>文法包括：方位介係詞、時間介係詞、指示代名詞（主格受格）、簡單比較級、序數日期。</p> <p>對話包括：指路方向地點位置、搭乘交通工具、修理物品、百貨公司、日用品購物、禮貌請求、談彼此喜好、討論風景、月份日期時間、節慶祝福、邀請。</p>	<p>認知，即使授課認真，大班學習成效必定偏低。</p>
<p>李立林 法(一) (全法文 授課)</p>	<p>本課程將教授法文重要文法、基本閱讀能力、聽力理解力、表達能力、發音、基礎文法教學將以口說及書面的練習方式加強文法學習。盡可能給學生機會於課堂上練習互動。</p> <p>★本課是全法語授課</p> <p>一開始學法文就能密集地接觸到標準的發音，並且透過全法語授課的環境提升自己推理能力是能幫助你們更快速地進入法文的世界，學習和法國人溝通。</p> <p>★本課最適合對象：</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1.已學過法文的「半」初學者。 2.已學過西班牙語，義大利語的同學。 3.計畫去法國/法語系國家留學或當交換學生。 4.喜歡用不同方式學習語言的同學。 5.從歐洲或中南美洲來的國際學生。 	<p>目標：使學生能應付基本旅遊需求，以及具備基本社交能力，能夠對於熟悉的主題進行對話。初步法國社會、傳統、風俗、文化介紹。</p>

	<p>★以修過中文授課大學外文：法文（一）～（四）的同學請不要選這一門課，把名額留給其他同學。</p>	
<p>李立林 法(二) (全法文 授課)</p>	<p>本課程將教授法文重要文法、基本閱讀能力、聽力理解力、表達能力、發音、基礎文法教學 將以口說及書面的練習方式加強文法學習。盡可能給學生機會於課堂上練習互動。</p> <p>★本課是全法語授課</p> <p>一開始學法文就能密集地接觸到標準的發音，並且透過全法語授課的環境提升自己推理能力是能幫助你們更快速地進入法文的世界，學習和法國人溝通。</p> <p>★本課最適合對象：</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1.已學過法文的「半」初學者。 2.已學過西班牙語，義大利語的同學。 3.計畫去法國/法語系國家留學或當交換學生。 4.喜歡用不同方式學習語言的同學。 5.從歐洲或中南美洲來的國際學生。 <p>★以修過中文授課大學外文：法文（一）～（四）的同學請不要選這一門課，把名額留給其他同學。</p>	<p>目標：使學生能應付基本旅遊需求，以及具備基本社交能力，能夠對於熟悉的主題進行對話。初步法國社會、傳統、風俗、文化介紹。</p>
<p>李立林 法(一)</p>	<p>本課程將教授法文重要文法、基本閱讀能力、聽力理解力、表達能力、發音、基礎文法教學將以口說及書面的練習方式加強文法學習。盡可能給學生機會於課堂上練習互動。</p>	<p>目標：使學生能應付基本旅遊需求，以及具備基本社交能力，能夠對於熟悉的主題進行對話。初步法國社會、傳統、風俗、文化介紹。</p>
<p>李立林 法(二)</p>	<p>本課程將教授法文重要文法、基本閱讀能力、聽力理解力、表達能力、發音、基礎文法教學</p>	<p>目標：使學生能應付基本旅遊需求，以及具備基本社交能力，能夠對於熟悉的主題進行對話。初步法國社會、傳統、風俗、文化介紹。</p>

	將以口說及書面的練習方式加強文法學習。盡可能給學生機會於課堂上練習互動。	
李立林 法(三)	本課程將教授法文重要文法 閱讀能力，口說表達能力，聽力理解能力加強 強調發音標準 使用更生活化的教材，讓學生更進一步能夠了解法式邏輯	目標：可應付更複雜的日常情境，能夠更完整的表達個人意見，進行日常對話，增進詞彙、俚語、成語知識
李立林 法(四)	本課程將教授法文重要文法 閱讀能力，口說表達能力，聽力理解能力加強 強調發音標準 使用更生活化的教材，讓學生更進一步能夠了解法式邏輯	目標：可應付更複雜的日常情境，能夠更完整的表達個人意見，進行日常對話，增進詞彙、俚語、成語知識 Proposer et accepter/提供建議、回應建議 Questionner et marchander/比價、殺價 Demander à quelqu'un de faire quelque chose/請求他人 Présenter quelqu'un/描述一個人(傳記、外貌、個性) Raconter et commenter un incident/敘述與評論事件 Donner son opinion sur quelque chose/表達立場與想法
羅清菁 法(一)	Premiers contacts / 初次見面 Saluer, se presenter, remercier / 打招呼, 自我介紹, 致謝 Interroger quelqu'un sur son identité, donner des informations sur soi-même, s'excuser / 身分詢問, 給予自我身分, 抱歉 Demander et donner des informations sur quelqu'un, dire ce que l'on aime / 詢問並給予某人資訊, 說出喜好	培養法語聽說讀寫基本能力，學生將認識並表達法國生活文化重點及其興趣，接觸法國新聞時事，以利學生具備進入法國旅遊生活及社交之能力.

	<p>Dire où on va, dire d'où on vient / 說出前往地點, 啟程地</p> <p>Demander une information sur un lieu, un horaire, épeler son nom, indiquer son numéro de telephone, son e-mail / 詢問地點資訊, 時刻, 表達自我資訊</p> <p>Expliquer un itinéraire, proposer quelque chose, remercier et refuser / 解釋路程, 建議某事, 感謝及拒絕</p> <p>Demander son chemin, situer quelque chose / 問路, 物品方位</p>	
<p>羅清菁 法(二)</p>	<p>培養法語聽,說,讀,寫基本能力, 認識法國生活文化(如: 食衣住行育樂...), 以利學生具備進入法國旅遊, 社交, 求學之能力; 或不論你在哪裡, 學習法語這個工具, 將能漸漸地開闊對世界的視野...</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Au marché 市場購物(採買, 付費) - On déjeune ici ? 餐廳用餐(點菜, 結帳) - On va chez ma copine ? 介紹朋友(內, 外在) - Chez Susana 房子介紹 - Qu'est-ce qu'on leur offre ? 送好友什麼禮物呢? - On solde ! 大打折(夏季, 冬季) - Découvrir Paris en bus avec l'Open Tour 巴黎觀光巴士(認識巴黎重要景點) - Si vous gagnez, vous ferez quoi ? 中獎了噢!! (如果你中獎了, 你想做甚麼呢?)
<p>李文康 西(一)</p>	<p>本西班牙文課程提供基礎 DELE A1(對以西班牙文為外語者的語文檢定程度 A1)的對話工具。課程當中並提供多樣生活西文練習 (聽力、閱讀、口說、寫作), 讓初級學生增加對本語言學習的興趣, 並在練習中靈活運用各種西文溝通技巧。同時, 也會介紹西語系國家的文化(傳統、習俗、節慶...等)。</p>	<p>課程目標</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. 訓練學生說出清楚與正確的西班牙語發音。 2. 建立學生對西班牙語文法的基本概念。 3. 培養學生開口說西班牙語的能力。 4. 提升學生西班牙語的會話能力, 能夠與西語母語人士進行日常溝通。 5. 培育學生的西班牙語聽、說、讀、寫之能力, 達到歐洲語言規範 DELE A1/A2 程度。

		<p>6. 提供學生接觸中南美洲各國不同口音之機會。</p> <p>7. 協助學生認識西班牙與拉丁美洲的社會文化。</p> <p>8. 透過學習小組的活動安排，促進口語西語的表達能力。</p> <p>學習成效</p> <p>1. 課堂中盡量以西班牙語講解和溝通。</p> <p>2. 透過學習小組活動提供學生互相對話與練習的機會，加強口語西語會話能力。</p> <p>3. 設計師生互動式的課堂練習，提升學生對西班牙語的掌握度。</p> <p>4. 介紹西班牙與中南美洲各國社會與文化，提高學生學習興趣。</p> <p>本學期將固定 6 人小組。</p>
<p>李文康 西(二)</p>	<p>本西班牙文課程提供基礎 DELE A1(對以西班牙文為外語者的語文檢定程度 A1)的對話工具。課程當中並提供多樣生活西文練習 (聽力、閱讀、口說、寫作) ，讓初級學生增加對本語言學習的興趣，並在練習中靈活運用各種西文溝通技巧。同時，也會介紹西語系國家的文化(傳統、習俗、節慶...等)。</p>	<p>課程目標</p> <p>1. 訓練學生說出清楚與正確的西班牙語發音。</p> <p>2. 建立學生對西班牙語文法的基本概念。</p> <p>3. 培養學生開口說西班牙語的能力 。</p> <p>4. 提升學生西班牙語的會話能力，能夠與西語母語人士進行日常溝通。</p> <p>5. 培育學生的西班牙語聽、說、讀、寫之能力，達到歐洲語言規範 DELE A1 程度。</p> <p>6. 提供學生接觸中南美洲各國不同口音之機會。</p> <p>7. 協助學生認識西班牙與拉丁美洲的社會文化。</p> <p>8. 透過學習小組的活動安排，促進口語西語的表達能力。</p> <p>學習成效</p> <p>1. 課堂中盡量以西班牙語講解和溝通。</p> <p>2. 透過學習小組活動提供學生互相對話與練習的機會，加強口語西語會話能力。</p> <p>3. 設計師生互動式的課堂練習，提升學生對西班牙語的掌握度。</p>

		<p>4. 介紹西班牙與中南美洲各國社會與文化，歌曲，舞蹈，電影提高學生學習興趣。</p> <p>本學期將固定 6 人小組。</p>
馬德睿西(三)	<p>本課程是在西文一、西文二的基礎上，繼續加強學生的西語表達能力與知識。課程進行原則上，依循 ELE Actual A1, ELE Actual A2 課本的結構。藉由本課程的學習，學生可以達到 A1 程度的充足知識與能力。</p>	<p>課程結束後，學生應該能夠用西語來：</p> <p>表達自己的狀態，如身體狀態和情緒</p> <p>表達自己最基本的 需求與願望</p> <p>表達未來的計畫</p> <p>與其他人在簡單的情況下構通，如與剛認識的人問候及交談、在餐廳點菜、在商店買東西等</p> <p>表達過去的事情</p> <p>表達自己的意見</p>
馬德睿西(四)	<p>在本課程我們會繼續閱讀 CEFRLA2 級相對應的語言內容。本課程包含豐富的課堂活動、練習以及家庭作業，旨在讓學生盡可能多使用西班牙語， 透過這樣的課程，學生可加強 4 種基本技能：聽力理解，閱讀理解，口頭表達和人際互動，書面表達和往來。 本課程的結構及課程的內容是根據 Virgilio Borobio 的書“ELE Actual A2”設計的。</p>	<p>學生會擁有以下能力：</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - 在衣飾店購物。 - 尋求協助。 - 要求許可。 - 預定約會。 - 以簡單的方式表達過去的經驗。 - 描述和談論過去的事件，例如過去的旅行經歷。 - 談論歷史上重要人物的主要生平事蹟。
彭南儀日(一)	<p>外文中心開設之日語課程共有「大學外文：日文(一)(二)(三)(四)」，四個科目，各一學期。「大學外文(一):日文」是最基礎的課程，從假名的認識開始，希望透過一個學期的學習，能夠了解日語的文法基本架構及日常生活的單字。</p> <p>當然，語言課程首重培養四基礎技能：聽說讀寫</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. 熟習相當於『日本語能力檢定』5 級前半程度之語彙約 400 個。 2. 了解相當於『日本語能力檢定』5 級前半程度之文法概念或句型約 30 個。 3. 具備基礎聽力。 4. 具備基本對話之能力。

	<p>的能力，而本課程除此之外，還希望激發學生主動思考，大膽推論，勇於發言的態度，並且透過課堂上與學伴的相處，增強會話能力，促進人際關係</p>	<p>評量方式 學習目標</p>	<p>App : kahoot 或 nearpod</p>	<p>觀看廣告</p>	<p>師生對話</p>	<p>小組討論後發表</p>	<p>課後作業</p>																														
<p>彭南儀 日(二)</p>	<p>語言課程當然首重培養聽說讀寫的能力，而本課程除了此四基礎技能的培育外，還希望激發學生主動思考，大膽推論，勇於發言的態度，並且透過課堂上與學伴的相處，增強會話能力，促進人際關係。</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. 熟習相當於『日本語能力檢定』5級程度之語彙約 450 個。 2. 了解相當於『日本語能力檢定』5級程度之文法概念或句型約 40 個。 3. 具備基礎聽力。 4. 具備基本對話之能力。 																																			
<p>彭南儀 日(三)</p>	<p>語言是工具，而非目的。故本課程一貫注重以下二種能力。</p> <p>一、對話溝通。希望藉由日文的學習，獲得與日本人基本的溝通能力，因此本課程非常重視與學伴之間的互動。</p> <p>二、思考力。課堂上常會提出問題要同學與學伴一起動腦筋探討，找出答案或解決之道。</p> <p>希望藉此訓練學生主動思考，歸納演繹，解決問題的能力及激發勇於發言的態度。</p> <p>另外，也期待透過課堂上與學伴的相處，增強會話能力，了解人際關係的重要性。</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. 熟習相當於『日本語能力檢定』4級前半程度之語彙約 500 個。 2. 了解相當於『日本語能力檢定』4級前半程度之文法概念或句型約 50 個。 3. 具備能與人溝通之基礎聽力。 4. 具備基本表達意見及對話之能力。 <table border="1" data-bbox="1048 997 2085 1465"> <tr> <td data-bbox="1048 997 1249 1134"> <p>評量方式 學習目標</p> </td> <td data-bbox="1249 997 1469 1134"> <p>App : kahoot 或 nearpod</p> </td> <td data-bbox="1469 997 1599 1134"> <p>觀看廣告</p> </td> <td data-bbox="1599 997 1729 1134"> <p>師生對話</p> </td> <td data-bbox="1729 997 1955 1134"> <p>小組討論後發表</p> </td> <td data-bbox="1955 997 2085 1134"> <p>課後作業</p> </td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="1048 1134 1249 1206"> <p>熟習語彙</p> </td> <td data-bbox="1249 1134 1469 1206"> <p>V</p> </td> <td data-bbox="1469 1134 1599 1206"> <p>V</p> </td> <td data-bbox="1599 1134 1729 1206"></td> <td data-bbox="1729 1134 1955 1206"></td> <td data-bbox="1955 1134 2085 1206"> <p>V</p> </td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="1048 1206 1249 1278"> <p>了解文法句型</p> </td> <td data-bbox="1249 1206 1469 1278"> <p>V</p> </td> <td data-bbox="1469 1206 1599 1278"> <p>V</p> </td> <td data-bbox="1599 1206 1729 1278"></td> <td data-bbox="1729 1206 1955 1278"> <p>V</p> </td> <td data-bbox="1955 1206 2085 1278"> <p>V</p> </td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="1048 1278 1249 1350"> <p>具備基礎聽力</p> </td> <td data-bbox="1249 1278 1469 1350"></td> <td data-bbox="1469 1278 1599 1350"> <p>V</p> </td> <td data-bbox="1599 1278 1729 1350"> <p>V</p> </td> <td data-bbox="1729 1278 1955 1350"></td> <td data-bbox="1955 1278 2085 1350"> <p>V</p> </td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="1048 1350 1249 1465"> <p>具備基本表達及對話能力</p> </td> <td data-bbox="1249 1350 1469 1465"></td> <td data-bbox="1469 1350 1599 1465"></td> <td data-bbox="1599 1350 1729 1465"> <p>V</p> </td> <td data-bbox="1729 1350 1955 1465"> <p>V</p> </td> <td data-bbox="1955 1350 2085 1465"></td> </tr> </table>						<p>評量方式 學習目標</p>	<p>App : kahoot 或 nearpod</p>	<p>觀看廣告</p>	<p>師生對話</p>	<p>小組討論後發表</p>	<p>課後作業</p>	<p>熟習語彙</p>	<p>V</p>	<p>V</p>			<p>V</p>	<p>了解文法句型</p>	<p>V</p>	<p>V</p>		<p>V</p>	<p>V</p>	<p>具備基礎聽力</p>		<p>V</p>	<p>V</p>		<p>V</p>	<p>具備基本表達及對話能力</p>			<p>V</p>	<p>V</p>	
<p>評量方式 學習目標</p>	<p>App : kahoot 或 nearpod</p>	<p>觀看廣告</p>	<p>師生對話</p>	<p>小組討論後發表</p>	<p>課後作業</p>																																
<p>熟習語彙</p>	<p>V</p>	<p>V</p>			<p>V</p>																																
<p>了解文法句型</p>	<p>V</p>	<p>V</p>		<p>V</p>	<p>V</p>																																
<p>具備基礎聽力</p>		<p>V</p>	<p>V</p>		<p>V</p>																																
<p>具備基本表達及對話能力</p>			<p>V</p>	<p>V</p>																																	

彭南儀 日(四)	本課程重視培養聽·說·讀·寫四技能，除此之外，還希望訓練學生主動思考，歸納演繹，解決問題的能力及激發勇於發言的態度，並且透過課堂上與學伴的相處，增強會話能力，了解人際關係的重要性。	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. 熟習相當於『日本語能力檢定』4級程度之語彙約 560 個。 2. 了解相當於『日本語能力檢定』4級程度之文法概念或句型約 30 個。 3. 具備能與人溝通之基礎聽力。 4. 具備基本表達意見及對話之能力。 																									
彭南儀 線上 日(一)	選修線上課程者首重「自制力」，亦即須自我要求主動上線規律學習。學習者依照網站規劃之步驟按部就班地學習基礎的聽說讀寫技能，希望透過一學期的努力，於日文語彙、文法、聽力上具備『日本語能力檢定』5級前半之程度，並擁有基本對話之能力。	<p>熟習相當於『日本語能力檢定』5級前半程度之語彙約 350 個。 了解相當於『日本語能力檢定』5級前半程度之文法概念或句型約 30 個。</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="1048 507 1933 853"> <thead> <tr> <th data-bbox="1048 507 1288 655">評量方式 學習目標</th> <th data-bbox="1296 507 1420 655">線上問答</th> <th data-bbox="1429 507 1581 655">師生對話</th> <th data-bbox="1590 507 1756 655">課後作業:錄音</th> <th data-bbox="1765 507 1933 655">課後作業:選擇題(文法·廣告聽解)</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td data-bbox="1048 662 1288 703">熟習語彙</td> <td data-bbox="1296 662 1420 703">V</td> <td data-bbox="1429 662 1581 703"></td> <td data-bbox="1590 662 1756 703"></td> <td data-bbox="1765 662 1933 703">V</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="1048 710 1288 751">了解文法句型</td> <td data-bbox="1296 710 1420 751">V</td> <td data-bbox="1429 710 1581 751"></td> <td data-bbox="1590 710 1756 751"></td> <td data-bbox="1765 710 1933 751">V</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="1048 758 1288 799">具備基礎聽力</td> <td data-bbox="1296 758 1420 799">V</td> <td data-bbox="1429 758 1581 799">V</td> <td data-bbox="1590 758 1756 799"></td> <td data-bbox="1765 758 1933 799">V</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="1048 805 1288 847">具備基本會話力</td> <td data-bbox="1296 805 1420 847">V</td> <td data-bbox="1429 805 1581 847">V</td> <td data-bbox="1590 805 1756 847">V</td> <td data-bbox="1765 805 1933 847"></td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	評量方式 學習目標	線上問答	師生對話	課後作業:錄音	課後作業:選擇題(文法·廣告聽解)	熟習語彙	V			V	了解文法句型	V			V	具備基礎聽力	V	V		V	具備基本會話力	V	V	V	
評量方式 學習目標	線上問答	師生對話	課後作業:錄音	課後作業:選擇題(文法·廣告聽解)																							
熟習語彙	V			V																							
了解文法句型	V			V																							
具備基礎聽力	V	V		V																							
具備基本會話力	V	V	V																								
彭南儀 線上 日(二)	學習者於日文語彙、文法、聽力上具備『日本語能力檢定』5級之程度，並擁有基本對話之能力。	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. 熟習相當於『日本語能力檢定』5級程度之語彙約 350 個。 2. 了解相當於『日本語能力檢定』5級程度之文法概念或句型約 30 個。 3. 具備基礎聽力。 4. 具備基本對話之能力。 																									
王麗香 日(一)	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1 日語語法結構的學習 2 日語聽說讀寫能力的養成 3 日本文化及風土民情的瞭解 	希望學生藉由本課程的學習，除了能充分瞭解日語的文字及語法結構，也能瞭解日本的風土民情及文化思想；同時，也將積極營造輕鬆愉快的學習氣氛，引發學生的學習興趣，並積極養成學生開口說日語的習慣，以期達到本課程目標，即訓練學生具備日語的聽說讀寫能力。																									
王麗香 日(二)	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1 日語語法結構的學習 2 日語聽說讀寫能力的養成 3 日本文化及風土民情的瞭解 	希望學生能於第二學期更加瞭解日語的語法結構，也能瞭解日本的風土民情及文化；同時，延續上學期課程，積極營造輕鬆愉快的學習氣氛，藉由「跟述練習」，讓學生能養成開口說日語的習慣，以期早日具備日語的聽說讀寫能力。																									
董文君 韓(一)	認識韓文: 教授母音子音辨別能力, 基礎文法能力, 日常生活常用單字語句, 簡易會話能力.	以未曾學習韓文之學生為對象, 奠定基礎韓文能力, 認識韓文由來和子音母音																									

		簡易生活會話, 自我介紹及韓國文化等.
董文君 韓(二)	培養韓文聽,說,讀,寫基本能力, 透過課本以及講義, 了解韓文語順, 正確發音以及文法應用	明確了解韓文的語順以及文法, 靈活練習基本會話, 讓學生自然開口說韓文, 激發學生對韓文的興趣, 更了解韓文與韓國.
陳鳳鳳 越(一)	越南語稱 <u>Chữ Quốc ngữ</u> 而現在的越南文字, 就是羅馬拼音使用的拉丁字母文字體系。受過漢字和外來文字影響, 現代的越南文字中, 基本上包括, 漢越詞、純越詞、外來語等。除了外來語外, 越南語的每個單字都是單音節。越南語的單字結構較複雜, 但很有系統性, 所以學會發音就能掌握越南語的講述。初級越語著重在拼音練習與發音技巧幫助學生在越南語發音打下基礎。	課程介紹越南語的發音系統, 從發音練習過程中讓學生認識新的字彙、句型並以字彙練習造句, 進一步練習對話。透過課程學生能掌握越南語發音的準則並能夠以越南語講述生活中的需求。
陳鳳鳳 越(二)	老師介紹、講述課程的重點字彙、語法並帶領學生進入聽說讀寫練習環境 同學分組練習	從生活會話內容帶領學生進入生活會話環境, 自然地以越南語講述自己的想法並學習表達及討論相關議題。
王麗蘭 馬/印 (一)	1. 印尼語(馬來語)語法結構的學習 2. 印尼語(馬來語)聽說讀寫能力的養成 3. 印尼語(馬來語)文化及風土民情的瞭解	1. 增加台灣學生對世界第五大語言, 有 2 億 5 千萬語言人口東南亞語言之一的馬來文的認識與了解。 2. 增進台灣學生對印尼和馬來文化與社會, 馬來人聚集的地區和國家的了解, 包括印尼、馬來西亞、新加坡、菲律賓南部和汶萊的認識。 3. 培養台灣學生馬來語(印尼語)日常會話和基本閱讀的基礎能力。
王麗蘭 馬/印 (二)	印尼語(馬來語)是東南亞群島最流通的語言, 馬來西亞、汶萊和新加坡的官方語言都是馬來語, 而印尼語來自馬來語, 更是印尼的國語。因此, 馬來語和印尼語相似, 這幾個國家的人民可以互通有無, 因此, 講馬來語和印尼語的人口, 總共約 2 億六千萬人, 是東南亞最多人講的語言。	1. 增加台灣學生對世界第五大語言, 有 2 億 5 千萬語言人口東南亞語言之一的馬來文的認識與了解。 2. 增進台灣學生對印尼和馬來文化與社會, 馬來人聚集的地區和國家的了解, 包括印尼、馬來西亞、新加坡、菲律賓南部和汶萊的認識。 3. 培養台灣學生馬來語(印尼語)日常會話和基本閱讀的基礎能力。

	<p>馬來西亞、汶萊、新加坡和印尼，加起來餘額超過 2.6 億人口，為東協最具發展性的國家，就業與投資市場越來越大，對馬來語、印尼語和中文雙語能力的需求，也越來越多。</p> <p>除了能講，還有懂得當地文化，因此，本課程主要為台灣學生奠定馬來語基礎與進階能力，培育馬來語言和文化的專才。因應台灣政府的南向政策的發展綱領，充實及培育南向人才是新南向政策成功的關鍵。因此，培育懂得東南亞語的語言人才，是當務之急，更應具備對當地文化、風俗等的瞭解，鼓勵學生積極參與與東南亞的國際合作。</p> <p>本課程將讓學生學習:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. 印尼語(馬來語)語法結構的學習 2. 印尼語(馬來語)聽說讀寫能力的養成 3. 印尼語(馬來語)文化及風土民情的瞭解 	
<p>王麗蘭 馬/印 (三)</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. 印尼語(馬來語)語法結構的學習 2. 印尼語(馬來語)聽說讀寫能力的養成 3. 印尼語(馬來語)文化及風土民情的瞭解 <p>本課程是分成兩個學期，即印尼文三、四。修課學生必須先修印尼文一、二，或曾經有修習過印尼語，時數約達 100~120 小時。印尼語在台灣的需求越來越高，除了在台灣約有 30 萬人的印尼移工、外配、外配第二代之外，印尼有 2.5 億人口，為東協最具發展性的國家，就業與投資市場越來越大，對印尼語和中文雙</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. 增加台灣學生對世界第五大語言，有 2 億 5 千萬語言人口東南亞語言之一的馬來文的認識與了解。 2. 增進台灣學生對印尼和馬來文化與社會，馬來人聚集的地區和國家的了解，包括印尼、馬來西亞、新加坡、菲律賓南部和汶萊的認識。 3. 培養台灣學生馬來語(印尼語)日常會話和基本閱讀的基礎能力。

	<p>語能力的需求，也越來越多。本課程跳脫傳統語言學習的方式，除了傳統課程講授之外，主力放在語言、文化與生活體驗的結合。讓學生在掌握了基礎印尼語字彙和句型之後，能夠更自在使用語言。此外，也讓學習語言變成一種主動式的學習活動，成為學生未來在語言上推進的動力。</p>	
<p>王麗蘭 馬/印 (四)</p>	<p>印尼語(馬來語)是東南亞群島最流通的語言，馬來西亞、汶萊和新加坡的官方語言都是馬來語，而印尼語來自馬來語，更是印尼的國語。因此，馬來語和印尼語相似，這幾個國家的人民可以互通有無，因此，講馬來語和印尼語的人口，總共約 2 億六千萬人，是東南亞最多人講的語言。</p> <p>馬來西亞、汶萊、新加坡和印尼，加起來餘額超過 2.6 億人口，為東協最具發展性的國家，就業與投資市場越來越大，對馬來語、印尼語和中文雙語能力的需求，也越來越多。</p> <p>除了能講，還有懂得當地文化，因此，本課程主要為台灣學生奠定馬來語基礎與進階能力，培育馬來語言和文化的專才。因應台灣政府的南向政策的發展綱領，充實及培育南向人才是新南向政策成功的關鍵。因此，培育懂得東南亞語的語言人才，是當務之急，更應具備對當地文化、風俗等的瞭解，鼓勵學生積極參與與東南亞的國際合作。</p> <p>本課程將讓學生學習:</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. 增加台灣學生對世界第五大語言，有 2 億 5 千萬語言人口東南亞語言之之一的馬來文的認識與了解。 2. 增進台灣學生對印尼和馬來文化與社會，馬來人聚集的地區和國家的了解，包括印尼、馬來西亞、新加坡、菲律賓南部和汶萊的認識。 3. 培養台灣學生馬來語(印尼語)日常會話和基本閱讀的基礎能力。

	<p>1. 印尼語(馬來語)語法結構的學習 2. 印尼語(馬來語)聽說讀寫能力的養成 3. 印尼語(馬來語)文化及風土民情的瞭解</p> <p>本課程是分成兩個學期，即印尼文三、四。修課學生必須先修印尼文一、二，或曾經有修習過印尼語，時數約達 100~120 小時。印尼語在台灣的需求越來越高，除了在台灣約有 30 萬人的印尼移工、外配、外配第二代之外，印尼有 2.5 億人口，為東協最具發展性的國家，就業與投資市場越來越大，對印尼語和中文雙語能力的需求，也越來越多。本課程跳脫傳統語言學習的方式，除了傳統課程講授之外，主力放在語言、文化與生活體驗的結合。讓學生在掌握了基礎印尼語字彙和句型之後，能夠更自在使用語言。此外，也讓學習語言變成一種主動式的學習活動，成為學生未來在語言上推進的動力。</p>	
張君松 泰(一)	<p>***注意*** 「第一堂課未到者視同放棄選課」</p> <p>教學目標 Target of Teaching： 在東南亞地區，泰國自古以來是個重要的營運中心之國。在觀光方面，目前泰國已經是東南亞最受歡迎的國家；在經濟方面，泰國已經是新興市場中值得投資的一個重要目標之一，每一年有不少的台灣人到泰國去旅遊與投資設工廠，甚至到泰國去工作、退休後定居。同時也有很多泰國人到台灣來工作與觀光，根據駐台北泰國經濟文化辦事處（勞工局）的統計，在台灣的泰國勞工曾經高達十二萬人。</p>	<p>***注意*** 「第一堂課未到者視同放棄選課」</p> <p>教學宗旨 Purpose： 1.在短期內能聽、說、讀、寫常用泰語、自我介紹、打招呼、問路、買東西等基本技能之觀光與生活會話。 2.泰國有很多方言，如：泰北方言、泰東北方言、泰南方言。藉此了解曼谷話，曼谷話是泰語的標準國語。 3.在文化方面，認識泰國的觀光勝地,泰國人的思想、文化、風俗習慣、泰國節日（如：波水節、水登節、守夏節、解夏節、禮佛節等）、泰國人的基本禮貌</p>

	<p>台商是泰國目前所投資最大的，位局第三，僅次於美國與日本。大部分都是製造業與工業為主，每一年他們需要大量的臺灣技術人員與機械人士，但是這些來自臺灣的專家都無法與當地的泰國員工溝通，因為臺灣的專家們都不會泰語，所以台商必須花很多時間在泰語的培訓上。</p> <p>總而言之，我們不能否認泰國與台灣往來的重要與衝擊，我們應該更進一步去了解泰國與東南亞國家之間的各方面，如：文化、思想、歷史、政治、經濟，以及最不可或缺的就是「語言」，因為「語言」是我們更了解其他文化的重要「鑰匙」，若我們沒有這把「鑰匙」，我們便談不上「文化」。</p> <p>透過這門課能讓學生學習到基本泰語和泰文。泰語學習包括文字、文法、句型結構、聽力、閱讀、發音以及常用語等項目。再者是泰國文化、歷史、風俗民情的基本常識。</p>	<p>(如：合掌、說話、送禮、禁忌)、泰國人的民族性(如：溫和好客、從來不排華或訪客、沒有種族歧視)。</p> <p>4.在歷史方面，認識泰國的近代史，如：素可泰王朝、阿域他雅王朝、吞武力王朝，以及現代的曼谷王朝之簡介。</p> <p>5.在文法方面，認識泰語的基礎語法，如：泰語的句子結構(SVO)、泰語的現在式、進形式、未來式、基本的詞彙、量詞、數字等。</p> <p>6.在語音方面，能習得泰語的語音學，如：44個子音、32個母音、5個聲調。</p> <p>7.在文字方面，能認識泰文的字母、韻母、調號，並能正確地熟悉與熟練泰文文字。</p>
張君松 泰(二)	<p>能夠使用基礎會話與泰國人溝通。</p> <p>自住旅遊專用語，認識問路，日月年，時間，祝福，辦簽證，訂機票以及泰語文法。</p>	<p>1.能了解曼谷話，曼谷話是泰語的標準語。</p> <p>2.在短期內能聽、說、讀、寫常用泰語、自我介紹、打招呼、問路、買東西。</p> <p>3.在此學期，若按照教師的學法，保證到泰國觀光必能以泰語跟泰國人溝通，買東西不受騙，不迷路。</p> <p>4. 認識泰國的觀光勝地,泰國人的思想、文化、泰國人的基本禮貌(合掌,說話,送禮、禁忌)。</p> <p>5.將來能進修，而到泰國發展，例如：推廣中華文化、作生意、傳道、作研究、</p>

工作、當中文教師、編中文課本等的重要基礎技能。

6.目前在泰國華語人才的需求量甚大，泰國正掀起了華文熱，很歡迎華文母語者到泰國任教中文，若懂泰文是將來的優勢。

7.為了提高學泰文的效率，教師建議錄音回家復習，有行線的筆記本。

8.泰國人個性溫和好客，從來不排華，沒有種族歧視，是個值得居住的地方，若懂泰文就沒有溝通障礙。

9.學泰文不是件很難的事，只要有信心與恆心，不早放棄，保證會成功。

附件（七）

學生訪談

學生群像，問卷，搭在量表上問：

年級 年紀 性別 科系 英文程度 修課原因（取得學分，時間剛好，英文跳免修，聽說老師好，聽說好過，聽說好學，好玩，家庭背景，爸媽或家人鼓勵，朋友，未來求職加分，與專業搭配，對外語有興趣，對文化有興趣…多選題）

- 1 這門課你最喜歡的部分是甚麼？
- 2 這門課你覺得最難的是甚麼？
- 3 從這門課你主要學到甚麼？
- 4 從以下面向，在修這門課以前，你對使用這個語言的人了解多少？

歷史

自然及地理環境

文化風俗

教育體制

經濟發展

家庭社會結構

- 5 從以下面向，在修這門課以後，你對使用這個語言的人了解多少？

歷史

自然及地理環境

文化風俗

教育體制

經濟發展

家庭社會結構

- 6 關於這個語言或其使用者、使用地區，未來你希望進一步知道甚麼？

- 7 你認為台灣大學生是否需要學第二外語？為什麼？

或

你認為台灣大學生學第二外語最大的好處是甚麼？

(二) 訪談問題

修課前問學生 (focus group, 2~4? 不同語的分開問)

1. 學英文的經驗? (很可能有影響)
2. 過去在英文以外的語言文化經驗
3. 修這門課的原因和期待
4. 對這個語言和文化的既有知識及看法

修課後問學生 (focus group, 2~4?)

1. 敘述這學期修課經驗 (上課情形 課後研讀 學會些甚麼 甚麼沒學好)
2. 說說修課帶來的想法或行為的改變 或沒有改變
3. 回顧修課前的修課原因和期待 comment and evaluate
4. 對這個語言和文化的知識和看法 有何增加或改變

只修半年的有可能改變不大, 已修進入第二年或修完兩年的人可能可以提供不同的訊息.

授課老師資料

(一) 師資群像, 整理這些二外老師的 demographic information: age, gender, native/non-native, education, teaching experience, years in target culture,

(二) 訪談老師

1. 請問老師過去與這個語言有關的生活文化經驗 (cultural background)
2. 請問老師過去教這個語言的經驗? 多久 課程性質 在哪裡 甚麼樣的學生...
3. 請問老師教學安排的想法考量 (再從中引出或去找文化的部分)
 - a. 你認為文化在語言課程的功能是甚麼?
 - b. 請老師舉例說明: 教材, 教法, 教學成效, 評量等
4. 請問老師對目前學生學習的觀察 (學生學得好的 學不好的 改變了的; 可從語言和文化分別談)
 - a. 在你的課裡, 學生最想學(喜歡)的是甚麼?
 - b. 你覺得學生對該語言的文化有興趣嗎?他們有興趣的主題有哪些?
 - c. 文化介紹或學習在你的課堂裡所佔份量有多少?
 - d. 你在甚麼情境下(何時, 如何)引入文化內容? 教材來源?
5. 請問老師對學生修課後的觀察 (已修完的學生的出路 改變 後續學習等)

(Note: Questions 4 and 5 are closely related to RQs 2 and 3)