華文圈的外語與外國文學教學

Fremdsprachen- und Literaturunterricht in einer chinesisch geprägten Gesellschaft

Chris Merkelbach (Hg.)

Fremdsprachen- und Literaturunterricht in einer chinesisch geprägten Gesellschaft

herausgegeben von

Chris Merkelbach

mit Beiträgen von

Monika Leipelt-Tsai, Jörg - A. Parchwitz, Chris Merkelbach, Nigel Daly, Suzan Babcock, Angelika Loo, Hsien-yun Pi, Tristan Lay, Janet C. Yuvienco, Stefan Rummel, Monika Schwabbauer, Lanni Tsai, Antje Dohrn, Hsui-Chuan Chang

Adult language learning strategies in a continuing education context in Taiwan

畢先芸 (Hsien-yun Pi)

This study, conducted at a private language institute in Taiwan, examines the relationship between the strategy use of adult EFL learners and a variety of variables. Investigation with the SILL, an instrument that measures the frequency of strategy use, revealed that the participants frequently used strategies in their language learning process. Their use of strategies varied according to English proficiency and gender, but not by age; psychological variables and interaction variables seemed to influence their choice of strategies more greatly. The results provide valuable information to language instructors who are interested in increasing adult learners' strategy use across gender, age, and proficiency levels.

本研究以台北某一成人外語教育機構的英語班學員為對象，利用語言學習策略量表 (SILL)，以非隨機方式抽樣調查成人學習者常使用的語言學習策略，並探討人口學變項與學習者變項在其中所扮演的角色。研究結果指出，成人學習者的語言學習策略使用頻率偏高。此外，在三個人口學變項當中，相較於年齡變項，英語程度和性別變項對學習策略的影響較大。然而，學習者變項對於學習策略的使用似乎有更大的影響力；也就是說，動機強弱、用功程度、和母語人士的互動頻率以及學習者對自己英語能力的評價更明顯地造成學習者在策略使用上差異。本研究結果亦與先前之相關研究對照，並提出未來可能的研究方向。

Background

In Taiwan, English as a foreign language is a very important educational requirement. Students from elementary school to high school have to study English, and it is a subject test for all students who want to enter college. Many college freshmen are obliged to take a one-year English course or, before graduation, to pass an English proficiency test, such as the TOEFL, TOEIC or GEPT[2], on which they must demonstrate a certain proficiency level or exceed a particular score. Since English is a subject that plays a crucial role in a student's academic success, many scholars are desperately seeking ways to improve the quality of English learning and teaching, and some studies have focused especially on the learning strategies employed by school students (Hsieh, 2005; Liu, 2004; Yang, 1992), which is an issue connected with the process of language acquisition and is believed to have an impact on learning result.

---

[2] GEPT (General English Proficiency Test) is a proficiency test in Taiwan administered in five proficiency levels - Elementary, Intermediate, High-intermediate, Advanced, and Superior.

English is also an important language for people in various industries, such as commerce and technology, and studying English has become a popular activity among professionals, since proficiency in English is regarded as beneficial to a career. Usually, these professionals attend English classes in the continuing education system to further their learning progress. In Taiwan, many language institutes in metropolitan areas provide English courses for adults, and they attract great numbers of learners. However, due to the difficulty of sampling, adult learners in this context have long been neglected by researchers, and to date, few related studies on the strategy use of adult learners have been published.

The purposes of this study are to provide a preliminary description of the use of learning strategies among adult learners in Taiwan with help from the SILL (Strategy Inventory of Language Learning), a popular, reliable tool developed by Oxford (1990), and to see what strategies they apply to their language learning, how frequently these strategies are used, and how their strategy use varies according to gender, age, proficiency level, and five other self-reported learner variables – daily length of study, effort spent, motivation, contact with English native speakers, and self-rated proficiency among peer learners.

Literature review
Language learning strategies
It has been a widespread belief among scholars that there is a connection between the success of language learning and the strategies learners use. Long before the development of the SILL in the late 1980s, some scholars had already noticed the differences between successful and unsuccessful language learners and tried to illustrate the qualities that successful language learners have in common. Rubin (1975), a pioneering researcher in this field, found that more successful language learners tended to use guess making and monitoring skills, and they were more willing to communicate in the target language with native speakers. She claimed that some variables might influence learners' strategy use, such as age, language proficiency, and the context in which the target language is used. Wesche (1975), after qualitatively and quantitatively examining adult learners' learning strategies, described good language learners as those who were comparatively younger, more knowledgeable about the target language before receiving instruction, more active in having conversations in the target language, and more likely to associate words with graphic images.

Beyond simply illustrating the qualities that a good language learner might have, researchers also tried to define what learning strategies are and why learners use them. Rubin defined the term "strategies" as the techniques adopted by a learner in the

process of retaining knowledge (1975, p. 43), and the term "learning" as the process of information storage and retrieval (1981, p. 118). Later, she stated that language learners use learning strategies to improve their language development, and that such techniques have a direct impact on their learning process (1987). Similarly, O'Malley et al. (1985) regarded learning strategies as "operations or steps" used by learners to assist in information processing, and the strategies were "thoughts or behaviors" that facilitated such a process (O'Malley & Chamot, 1990, p. 1). Oxford (1990), in her well-known book *Language Learning Strategies: What Every Teacher Should Know*, indicated that the purpose of applying language learning strategies is to enhance learning (p. 1), and her viewpoint was echoed by Griffiths (2003), who at the same time emphasized the importance of consciousness of strategy use since, in her opinion, learning strategies are specific actions consciously taken by language learners. Actually, Griffiths' emphasis originally comes from Cohen (1998), a scholar who asserted that the use of language learning strategies always entails consciousness. These definitions and purposes clearly indicate that learning strategies play a significant role in the process of language acquisition, and that such strategy use can reflect how much autonomy a language learner possesses when dealing with the acquisition process.

The following paragraphs focus on the variables that have been found to affect language learners' strategy use.

Gender and age
Many studies on language learning strategies that address gender have found that women tend to use strategies more frequently than men (Ehrman & Oxford, 1988; Oxford, 1993; Green & Oxford, 1995; Sheorey, 1999), although some studies have showed a similar but weak tendency (Oxford & Ehrman, 1995; Hong-Nam & Leavell, 2006). Generally speaking, women are better at cognitive, social, and affective strategies such as skimming, seeking native speakers to talk with, and self-encouraging.

As for the impact of age on learning strategy use, Oxford (1990) found that the strategies used by older language learners were different from those used by younger learners (p. 13). Younger learners were found to be significantly better at speaking than older learners (Ehrman & Oxford, 1995); nevertheless, older learners were found to have an advantage when learning a new language, since their greater cognitive maturity aided them in processing higher-level linguistic information, especially in the areas of grammar and vocabulary (Schleppegrell, 1987; Homstad, 1987). As a result, a variation in strategy use by age might occur. A recent SILL study conducted by Magogwe & Oliver (2007) found a dynamic relationship between strategy use and age; that is, learners at a different levels of schooling (i.e. primary, secondary, and

tertiary) had different orders of preference for strategies.

Language proficiency

Learners at a higher proficiency level in the target language have been more often regarded as frequent users of language learning strategies (Ehrman & Oxford, 1988; Green & Oxford, 1995; Wharton, 2000). Green & Oxford (1995), examining how language strategy use was related to proficiency by course level, indicated significant differences in overall strategy use between prebasic level and basic level learners as well as between prebasic and intermediate level learners. The post-hoc test results showed that four strategy categories – cognitive, compensation, metacognitive, and social – had significant variations by level. Further, Griffiths (2003) conducted a study on "plus strategies"; i.e., the strategies used by higher proficiency level learners as well as strategies self-reported to be used more often by learners across all levels. Her study revealed a large number of "plus" strategies employed with high frequency by higher-level learners. However, the results of some studies pointed in a different direction. Oxford & Ehrman (1995) found a positive correlation with cognitive strategies only, but the correlation was significant and weak. Hong-Nam & Leavell (2006), who grouped their learners into beginning, intermediate, and advanced levels, found a significant difference but with a negative correlation; compensation strategies were applied more frequently by intermediate level learners than by advanced level learners.

Other variables: length of study, motivation, effort, functional practice, and self-rated proficiency

Length of study, motivation, effort, functional practice (e.g. seeking native speakers for conversation), and self-rated proficiency have been found to be important variables affecting choice of language learning strategies. Oxford & Nyikos (1989) found that the correlation between each of these variables and strategy use was significant at $p < 0.05$ or even lower. Actually, any of these variables can be both cause and effect to the rest, since the connections among them are similar to those of a food chain. These five variables were first included in Oxford's background questionnaire (1990) that is used with the SILL to elicit personal data. Later, the variables were incorporated in the individual background questionnaire of Yang's study (1992) to obtain information related to strategy use.

Research questions

1. How often do adults use language learning strategies? What groups of strategies are more frequently used?
2. How appropriate is the SILL, the measuring instrument, for assessing adult learners? How are these language learning strategies related to each other?

3. Does the use of certain language learning strategies relate to proficiency, gender, and age? Which variable(s) has (have) a greater influence on adult learners' strategy use?
4. Is the use of language learning strategies related to other learner variables, namely daily length of study, effort spent, motivation, contact with English native speakers, and self-rated proficiency among peers?

Methodology

Participants

Between 2007 and 2008, data was collected over three three-month cycles from 418 adult EFL learners at an adult language institute in Taipei. For more than fifty years, this institute has been regularly offering foreign language training for four terms a year. Usually, learners who enroll in intensive English courses at the institute, either half-day or full-day courses, are not school students, but adults sponsored by their employers or completely financed by themselves to attend the classes.

An institute-prepared placement test was given before the term began in order to identify the English proficiency level of each participant. Based on the test scores, the participants were placed in one of the seven proficiency levels, from 1 (Beginning) to 7 (Higher-Intermediate). Table 1 illustrates the institute's curriculum design; the full-day class levels and the half-day class levels can be classified as below in terms of English proficiency:

Table 1: Proficiency levels and their corresponding course levels

Proficiency Level	Placement Level	Courses	Equivalent TOEFL iBT Score
Beginning	Level 1-2	Full-day Level 1	42-53
		Half-day Level 1	
Intermediate	Level 3-5	Full-day Level 2	54-75
		Half-day Level 2 & 3	
Higher-Intermediate	Level 6-7	Full-day Level 3	76-95
		Half-day Level 4 & 5	

The sample was composed of 114 learners at the Beginning level, 180 at the Intermediate level, and 124 at the Higher-Intermediate level. Women outnumbered men nearly 2:1, and learners between the ages of 18 and 30 formed the largest age group, comprising 71% of the total participants (See Table 2 for demographic information).

Table 2: Demographic information

		N	%
Proficiency Level	Beginning	114	27
	Intermediate	180	43
	Higher-Intermediate	124	30
Gender	Male	146	35
	Female	272	65
Age	18-30	298	71
	31-40	93	22
	41 and up	27	7

Instrument

1. The Strategy Inventory for Language Learning (SILL) version 7.0 for ESL/EFL learners (Oxford, 1990), with a total of 50 items, was used to collect self-report data on strategy use.
2. A background questionnaire was used to collect demographic information, including gender, age, educational background, major, hours of daily self-study, and self-rated English proficiency among peer learners (see Appendix I for the complete questionnaire).

This study adopted the Chinese version of SILL translated by Yang (1992), except for Item 100, which was excerpted from the Chinese version of Oxford's book *Language Learning Strategies: What Every Teacher Should Know*, translated by Su (2006). According to Yang and Su, all of the translated items have been carefully double-checked or proofread. The background questionnaire of the present study was actually a modified combination of the SILL Background Questionnaire and the individual background questionnaire created by Yang (ibid).

Data collection and analysis

With instructions on administration procedures fully provided beforehand, the SILL was administered to participants either by their classroom teacher during a regular class period or by the institute's administrative staff during a class break. All of the participants filled out the survey form voluntarily and anonymously.

The SPSS package was used to compute descriptive statistics, including mean, maximum/minimum value, and standard deviation, which was helpful in interpreting the basic facts about participants' demographic characteristics and overall strategy use. Pearson's correlations were calculated to reveal the relationships among learning

strategies. To identify if the variance among the dependent variables reached a statistically significant level, an analysis of variance (ANOVA) or a Chi-square test was conducted. Following Green & Oxford (1995), three categories were formed in order to obtain valid cell sizes when Chi-square tests were performed: (1) the low strategy use category, which was composed of responses of 1 and 2, (2) the medium strategy use category, which consisted of responses of 3, and (3) the high strategy use category, which was composed of responses of 4 and 5.

A Scheffé post-hoc test was conducted after ANOVA to specifically identify where the statistically significant differences existed.

Results and Interpretation

Question 1: How often do adults use language learning strategies? What groups of strategies are more frequently used?

The overall strategy use of the adult EFL learners was moderate to high (mean 3.321, SD 0.444). According to the frequency categorization proposed by Oxford (1990), a total of 17 strategies were regarded as "high usage" (mean 3.50 or above), a total of 32 strategies as "medium usage" (mean 2.5 ~ 3.4), and only one strategy as "low usage" (mean 2.4 or below).

Among the six strategy subscales, four were used above the average level, including compensation (mean 3.574), cognitive strategies (mean 3.515), metacognitive strategies (mean 3.485), and social strategies (mean 3.471), while the use of memory (mean 2.998) and affective strategies (mean 3.232) were comparably less frequently used. These findings corresponded to the results of a one-way ANOVA and a Scheffé post-hoc test, which indicated that the participants did have preferences for strategy use ($F = 67.591, p < .0001$) and a significant difference existed in the use of cognitive, compensation, metacognitive, and social strategies compared to the use of affective and memory strategies. In addition, there was a significant difference in the use of affective strategies compared to the use of memory strategies (See Table 3 next page).

Some previous SILL studies on EFL learners in Taiwan at the secondary or tertiary levels yielded different results in terms of the frequency of strategy use. The study conducted by Yang (1992) concerning the language learning strategy use of Taiwan's university students demonstrated a low to moderate frequency, since more than half of the 50 SILL items had a mean below 3 (p. 81). Liu (2004), who investigated the strategy use of senior high school students in Taiwan also with the 50-item SILL, found that almost half of the strategies (48%) were used in a low to moderate fashion. However, in the present study, only a total of 11 strategies (22%) employed by adult learners had an average below 3, which means that strategy use is comparatively more frequent in adult EFL learners.

The comparatively greater level of strategy use by adult EFL learners might be

explainable by two factors: First, adults who voluntarily participate in intensive English training usually have a stronger desire to succeed in English language learning and therefore are more active in adopting strategies to facilitate their learning progress; and second, their previous learning history at school or at work has made them more experienced and skillful learners, which directly or indirectly benefits their use of language learning strategies in the stage of continuing education.

Table 3: Descriptive statistics and F-test value of overall strategy use

Category[3]	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	SD	Rank	F	Significance
Mem	1.33	4.78	2.998	.552	6	67.591	< .0001
Cog	2.36	4.29	3.515	.276	2		
Comp	1.67	5.00	3.574	.619	1		
Metacog	1.78	5.00	3.485	.564	3		
Aff	1.17	4.83	3.232	.597	5		
Soc	1.33	5.00	3.471	.606	4		
Total	1.17	5.00	3.321	.444			

Note: Difference in strategy use shown by the Scheffé post-hoc test result was Memory < Affective < Cognitive, Compensation, Metacognitive, and Social ($p < 0.05$)

Question 2: How good is the appropriateness of the SILL, the measuring instrument? How are these language learning strategies related to each other?

The first question, the internal validity of the SILL, can be answered along with the second question of correlations between strategies by exploring: (1) the correlation among subscales, and (2) the correlation between each subscale and the overall average of the SILL. There were 14 significantly correlated pairs at $p < 0.01$, with Pearson's correlations ranging from 0.641 (relationship of metacognitive and affective strategies) to 0.183 (relationship of memory and cognitive strategies); among these pairs, nine of them correlated in a moderate (around 0.4) to strong (around 0.6) fashion. The only non-significantly correlated pair was the pair of compensation and cognitive strategies. Examining the relationship from another angle, the overall mean of the SILL was significantly correlated with each SILL strategy category ($p < 0.01$), with Pearson's correlations of 0.823 (metacognitive), 0.787 (affective), 0.784 (social), 0.750 (memory), 0.703 (compensation), and 0.219 (cognitive). Except for cognitive strategies, the other five subscales significantly and strongly correlated with the entire SILL scale. The above-mentioned result demonstrates that the relationships between learning strategies were mostly

---

[3] Six strategy categories are represented by Mem (memory strategies), Cog (cognitive strategies), Comp (compensating strategies), Metacog (metacognitive strategies), Aff (affective strategies), and Soc (social strategies).

significant and strong; it also shows that the SILL is an instrument with high internal validity for measuring the strategy use of adult EFL learners.

The high internal validity and consistency of the SILL has also been empirically proved by Yang (1992) and Oxford & Ehrman (1995) by checking the correlations among strategies. Yang (1992), who examined the relationship between SILL strategies with Pearson's r, found significant intra-correlations among most of the strategy items ($p < 0.005$ or 0.0005), and the Cronbach's alpha coefficient was 0.94 (N = 487), which means that the responses elicited by the SILL were consistent. Oxford & Ehrman (1995) also found significant rho correlations at $p < 0.0005$, ranging from 0.66 to 0.81, between the SILL mean and each SILL subscale; in addition, significant intercorrelations at $p < 0.0005$ were found among the subscales, ranging from 0.35 to 0.61. A more comprehensive review of the SILL's reliability done by Oxford & Burry-stock (1995) also revealed the fact that the SILL is an instrument with high internal consistency.

Question 3: Does the use of certain language learning strategies relate to proficiency, gender, and age? Which variable(s) has (have) a greater influence on adult learners' strategy use?

This question can be answered by performing one-way ANOVA and Chi-square tests. The one-way ANOVA results showed that adult learners with basic English proficiency used learning strategies significantly less frequently than intermediate and higher-intermediate learners (F = 4.993, $p < 0.01$), but the difference was found only in the use of compensation strategies (F = 10.451, $p < 0.01$). However, one-way ANOVA revealed no significant difference ($p < 0.05$) in the overall strategy use between sexes or among the three age groups (F = 3.818 and 1.272 respectively). As for the comparison of the means of the subscales, men were found to use memory and metacognitive strategies significantly more often than women at $p < 0.05$ (F = 4.584 and 6.021 respectively), but, again, no significant difference was found between the three age groups in the comparison of the means of the six subscales. The Chi-square test result, which examined the relationship between these three variables and individual SILL items, exhibited a similar pattern. Thirteen SILL items varied significantly with learner's course level (Items 1, 7, 14, 15, 16, 17, 21, 24, 25, 27, 28, 29, and 49), six with gender (Items 1, 25, 30, 36, 40, and 44), and only two with age (Items 35 and 43). Combining the results of one-way ANOVA and Chi-square test, proficiency and gender had a greater influence on adult learners' strategy use than age. These results partially corresponded to the results of a study conducted by Green & Oxford (1995). Exploring how two variables – proficiency level and gender – varied in university students' strategy use, they found that the use of cognitive, compensation, metacognitive and social strategies varied by proficiency level; however, as for gender difference, they suggested that women used memory,

metacognitive, affective and social strategies significantly more often than men. Their variation by proficiency level actually shares a similar pattern with the present study; i.e., more successful learners used strategies more frequently. Nevertheless, although their finding of variation by gender is the exact opposite of the present study, their viewpoint is shared by other SILL researchers in Taiwan and mainland China (Hsieh, 2006; Yang 1992; Zhang, 2003).

Question 4: Is the use of language learning strategies related to other learner variables: daily length of study, effort spent, motivation, contact with English native-speakers, and self-rated proficiency among peers?

A background questionnaire was used to collect some important data that might have a meaningful connection with adult learners' learning strategy use (See Appendix I for the complete questionnaire). Each adult learner was asked to self-report the individual's length of studying English after class every day, the effort spent on English learning, the motivation for English learning, the frequency of contacting English native-speakers outside the class, and the self-evaluation of overall proficiency compared with the proficiency of other students in the class. Again, a one-way ANOVA and a Scheffé post-hoc test were performed to examine how significant a role these variables play in adult learners' overall strategy use. The results showed that their strategy use significantly varied according to these five dependent variables at $p < 0.001$. In addition, there was a pattern of positive variation shared by these five variables, i.e., that learners who used strategies significantly more often were those who spent more time/effort learning English, had higher motivation to learn English, were in contact with English native speakers more often, and self-evaluated their English proficiency more positively (See Table 4 **next page**).

Similar results have been obtained by other researchers. Echoing the conclusion made by Oxford & Nyikos (1989), Oxford & Ehrman (1995), who used the Affective Survey (Ehrman & Oxford, 1991) to measure total motivation, intrinsic motivation, and desire to use the language outside class, indicated that there was apparently a connection between motivation and learning strategy use. Moreover, effort variables, including effort in class and out of class, were found to be positively correlated with language learning success, and the correlation between in-class effort and SILL cognitive strategies was significantly high (Ehrman & Oxford, 1995, pp. 81-82). Self-efficacy, a concept closely connected with self-rated proficiency among peer learners, was found to be significantly correlated with overall strategy use of learners at the tertiary level, with Pearson's $r = 0.297$ at $p < 0.0001$ (Magogwe & Oliver, 2007, p. 348). Moreover, Huang & Van Naerssen (1987) claimed that the frequent use of social strategies, such as interacting with English native speakers, was one of the variables contributing to success in English speaking. Taking the significant correlation between proficiency level and strategy use into account, the above-mentioned conclusion reached by Huang & Van Naerssen may serve as indirect supporting evidence of the finding of the present study that there could be a meaningful connection between the amount of exposure to English native speakers and learners' strategy use.

Table 4: Summary of variation in overall strategy use by five learner variables

Independent variables	F value and significant level	Comments
Daily length of study after class	9.452 ($p < 0.001$)	More than 4 hrs, 3-4 hours > 1-2 hours, Less than 1 hour
Effort spent	26.418 ($p < 0.001$)	Very much, Much > Medium > Not much
Motivation	18.140 ($p < 0.001$)	Very much > Much > Medium, Not much
Contact with NS	21.957 ($p < 0.001$)	Much, Medium > Not much > Not at all
Self-rated proficiency among peers	11.356 ($p < 0.001$)	Good > Medium > Not good; Good > Poor

Summary and extensions of this study

The adult learners in the present study used language learning strategies with moderate to high frequency. Based on the results of descriptive statistics and one-way ANOVA, the strategies they use can be grouped into (1) more preferred strategies, including cognitive, compensation, metacognitive, and social strategies, and (2) less preferred strategies: memory and affective strategies. Echoing the results of some related studies addressing the issue of the relationship between proficiency level and strategy use, the present study showed that the adult learners' use of language learning strategies varied according to course level, though the significant differences were only found in the use of compensation strategies. Gender also had an influence, but only on the use of memory and metacognitive strategies, rather than on overall strategy use. Age played a comparatively insignificant role in adult learners' strategy use. Surprisingly, five self-reported learners' variables greatly affected adult learners' choice of strategies, and the results of one-way ANOVA indicated that these five variables share a very consistent pattern of positive variation. Therefore, compared to the demographic characteristics, the psychological features and the frequency of interacting in the target language/with native speakers of the target language seem to be more influential in the process of language learning. Such results provide language instructors with very valuable information that can be used in increasing adult learners' strategy use across gender, age, and proficiency levels.

The present study was limited by the limited sample size of older learners. Although the data collection period lasted for nine months, the numbers of learners in each age group still could not be equalized. If high statistical power cannot be expected due to the limited sample size, qualitative research methods might be more powerful in disclosing the strategy use of older adult learners. In addition, due to the finding of a great impact of psychological characteristics as well as interaction with the target language/native speakers on adult learners' strategy use, in-depth studies focusing on these variables may also be an area worthy of further exploration.

References

Cohen, A. D. (1998). *Strategies in learning and using a second language.* London and New York, Longman.

Ehrman, M., & Oxford, R. (1988). Effects on sex differences, career choice, and psychological type on adult language learning strategies. *The Modern Language Journal, 72*(3), 253-265.

Ehrman, M., & Oxford, R. (1991). *Affective Survey.* Arlington, VA: Foreign Service Institute.

Ehrman, M., & Oxford, R. (1995). Cognition plus: Correlates of language learning success. *The Modern Language Journal, 79*(1), 67-89.

Green, J., & Oxford, R. (1995). A closer look at learning strategies, L2 proficiency, and gender. *TESOL Quarterly, 29*(2), 261-297.

Griffiths, C. (2003). Patterns of language learning strategy use. *System, 31*(3), 367-383.

Homstad, A. (1987). Neurolinguistic and psycholinguistic research on learning modes of older language learners: Classroom implications. *Hispania, 70*(2), 374-380.

Hong-Nam, K., & Leavell, A. G. (2006). Language learning strategy use of ESL students in an intensive English learning context. *System, 34*(3), 399-415.

Hsieh, P. C. (2005). *Junior high school students' English learning strategy use and its relationships with their English learning achievements.* Unpublished master's thesis, Tunghai University.

Huang, X. H., & Van Naerssen, M. V. (1987). Learning strategies for oral communication. *Applied Linguistics, 8*(3), 287-307.

Liu, M. L. (2004). *A study of beliefs about language learning and learning strategies of senior high school students.* Unpublished master's thesis, National Kaohsiung Normal University.

Magogwe, J. M., & Oliver, R. (2007). The relationship between language learning strategies, proficiency, age and self-efficacy beliefs: A study of language learners in Botswana. *System, 35*(3), 338-358.

O'Malley, J. M., Chamot, A. U., Stewner-Manzanares, G., Russo, R. P., & Küpper, L. (1985). Learning strategy applications with students of English as a second language. *TESOL Quarterly, 19*(3), 557-584.

O'Malley, J. M., & Chamot, A. U. (1990). *Learning Strategies in Second Language Acquisition.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Oxford, R. (1990). *Language learning strategies: What every teacher should know.* Boston, MA: Heinle and Heinle.

Oxford, R. (1993). Instructional implications of gender differences in language learning styles and strategies. *Applied Language Learning, 4*(1-2), 65-94.

Oxford, R. (2006). *Language learning strategies: What every teacher should know* (M. H. Su, Trans.). Taipei: Thomson.

Oxford, R., & Burry-stock, J. (1995). Assessing the use of language learning strategies worldwide with the ESL/EFL version of the Strategy Inventory for Language Learning (SILL). *System, 23*(1), 1-23.

Oxford, R., & Ehrman, M. (1995). Adults' language learning strategies in an intensive foreign language program in the United States. *System, 23*(3), 359-386.

Oxford, R., & Nyikos, M. (1989). Variables affecting choice of language learning strategies by university students. *The Modern Language Journal, 73*(3), 291-300.

Rubin, J. (1975). What the "good language learner" can teach us. *TESOL Quarterly, 9*(1), 41-51.

Rubin, J. (1981). Study of cognitive processes in second language learning. *Applied Linguistics, 11*(2), 117-131.

Rubin, J. (1987). Learner strategies: Theoretical assumptions, research history and typology. In A. L. Wenden & J. Rubin (Eds.), *Learner strategies in language learning* (pp. 15-30). Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.

Schleppegrell, M. (1987). The older language learner. Washington, DC: ERIC Clearinghouse on Languages and Linguistics. ED287313.

Sheorey, R. (1999). An examination of language learning strategy use in the setting of an indigenized variety of English. *System, 27*(2), 173-190.

Wesche, M. B. (1975). *The good adult language learner: A study of learning strategies and personality factors in an intensive course.* Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Toronto.

Wharton, G. (2000). Language learning strategy use of bilingual foreign language learners in Singapore. *Language Learning, 50*(2), 203-243.

Yang, N. D. (1992). *Second language learners' beliefs about language learning and their use of learning strategies: A study of college students of English in Taiwan.* Unpublished doctoral dissertation, the University of Texas at Austin.

Zhang, L. B. (2003). *Gender difference and Chinese university students' EFL learning strategy use.* Unpublished master's thesis, Southwest Jiaotong University.

Appendix I: Background Questionnaire

1. Sex: ☐ Male ☐ Female
2. Age: ☐ 18-30 ☐ 31-40 ☐ 41 and up
3. Class level: ☐ 1 ☐ 2 ☐ 3 ☐ 4 ☐ 5 ☐ 6 ☐ 7
4. Outside the English class, on the average how many hours do you spend every week studying English? ☐ Less than 1 hour ☐ 1-2 hours ☐ 3-4 hours ☐ More than 4 hrs
5. How much effort do you spend in learning English? ☐ Not much ☐ Medium ☐ Much ☐ Very much

6. How much do you want to learn English? ☐ Not much ☐ Medium ☐ Much ☐ Very much
7. How often do you have contact with English native-speakers outside the English class? ☐ Not at all ☐ Not much ☐ Medium ☐ Much
8. How do you rate your overall proficiency in English as compared with the proficiency of other students in your class? ☐ Poor ☐ Not good   ☐ Medium ☐ Good

畢先芸 (Pi Hsien-yun), who holds an MA degree in language education from the National Taipei University of Education, is currently an editor at the Language Training and Testing Center (LTTC) in Taipei, Taiwan. Her academic interests include children's language development, literacy development, and computer assisted language learning. hsienyup@gmail.com

„Ich glaube, dass Mehrsprachigkeit in der Zukunft immer wichtiger wird." Analyse eines personenzentrierten Interviewgesprächs zu den Themen Mehrsprachigkeit, Spracheinstellungen und Fremdsprachenlernen in Taiwan

Tristan Lay (賴漢龍)

Der vorliegende Beitrag möchte einerseits Impulse für eine verstärkte Implementierung qualitativer Forschungsverfahren bei der Erforschung fremder Sprachen in Taiwan geben. Andererseits wird dafür plädiert, Fremdsprachenlerner im ostasiatischen Raum stärker ins Zentrum des Geschehens zu stellen und authentische Perspektiven bei der Untersuchung des Forschungsgegenstandes mit einzubeziehen. Anhand eines personenzentrierten, semistrukturiert-leitfadenorientierten Interviewgesprächs mit einer taiwanischen DaF-Studentin wird das Thema Spracheinstellungen und Fremdsprachenlernen in Taiwan, sowie weitere relevante Themenkomplexe wie Mehrsprachigkeit, multiples Sprachenlernen und universitärer Fremdsprachenunterricht in Taiwan eingehend aus der Lernerperspektive beleuchtet.

本研究期望提供與建議台灣的外語研究採行更多深度研究方法；同時主張將東亞地區的外語學習者置於中心位置加以了解，於探討研究對象時，將其真實的觀點納入考量。本文主要根據研究者所設計的半結構式、主題引導的個人訪談進行分析，對象為一名主修德語的台灣女性大學生，將其深入描述之語言觀念、台灣外語學習狀況及其他相關題目，如多語能力、多種語言學習、台灣的大學外語課程等，予以分析闡述。

Forschungsmethoden
Qualitative Forschung in der Fremdsprachenerwerbsforschung
Qualitative Forschungsmethoden im Bereich Lehren und Lernen fremder Sprachen finden in internationalen empirischen Untersuchungen vermehrt Verwendung. Während seit geraumer Zeit ausschließlich die Quantitative Forschung die Forschungsmethodologie in der empirischen Fremdsprachenerwerbsforschung maßgeblich bestimmte, hat sich nach anfänglichen Legitimationsproblemen in den letzten Jahren die Qualitative Forschung als eigenständige Forschungsmethodologie mit spezifischen Validitätskriterien in der Forschungsmethodenlandschaft emanzipieren können.

Die empirische Fremdsprachenerwerbsforschung in Taiwan ist im Allgemeinen immer noch sehr stark quantitativ ausgerichtet; die meisten Studien zum Thema Fremdsprachenlernen sind analytisch-nomologisch geprägt. In der internationalen Fremdsprachenerwerbsforschung und -didaktik wird hingegen seit längerer Zeit dafür plädiert, Lernende stärker ins Zentrum des Geschehens zu stellen und authentische