2007-12-04

BYU Students' Beliefs About Language Learning and Communicative Language Teaching Activities

Sarah C. Bakker
Brigham Young University - Provo

BYU STUDENTS' BELIEFS ABOUT LANGUAGE LEARNING AND COMMUNICATIVE LANGUAGE TEACHING ACTIVITIES

by

Sarah Camille Bakker

A thesis submitted to the faculty of

Brigham Young University

in fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of

Master of Arts

Center for Language Studies

Brigham Young University

April 2008

BRIGHAM YOUNG UNIVERSITY

GRADUATE COMMITTEE APPROVAL

of a thesis submitted by

Sarah Camille Bakker

This thesis has been read by each member of the following graduate committee and by majority vote has been found to be satisfactory.

Date	Hans-Wilhelm Kelling, Chair
Date	Diane Strong-Krause
Date	Ray T. Clifford

BRIGHAM YOUNG UNIVERSITY

As chair of the candidate's graduate committee, I have read the thesis of Sarah Camille Bakker in its final form and have found that (1) its format, citations, and bibliographical style are consistent and acceptable and fulfill university and department style requirements; (2) its illustrative materials including figures, tables, and charts are in place; and (3) the final manuscript is satisfactory to the graduate committee and is ready for submission to the university library.

Date	Hans-Wilhelm Kelling Chair, Graduate Committee

Accepted for the Department

Date	Ray T. Clifford Director, Center for Language Studies

Accepted for the College

Date	Gregory D. Clark Associate Dean, College of Humanities

ABSTRACT

BYU STUDENTS' BELIEFS ABOUT LANGUAGE LEARNING AND COMMUNICATIVE LANGUAGE TEACHING ACTIVITIES

Sarah Camille Bakker

Center for Language Studies

Master of Art

Learner beliefs, which contribute to attitude and motivation, may affect language learning. It is therefore valuable to investigate the malleability of learner beliefs, and to determine whether potentially detrimental beliefs can be ameliorated. This study examines how instruction of the principles of Second Language Acquisition (SLA) affects students' beliefs about classroom activities and their beliefs about language learning in general. The 68 first-year German students at Brigham Young University who participated in this study were asked to rate the effectiveness of three activities typical of communicative language teaching: Dialogue activities, Peer Interview activities, and Information-gap activities. They were also asked to respond to 11 statements about language learning, seven of which were taken from the Beliefs About Language Learning Inventory (Horwitz, 1988).

Students responded to the survey three times: once during the first week of the

semester, again during the fourth week, and again during the eighth week. During the four weeks between the second and third surveys, students in the experimental group received seven treatment lessons based on some of the basic principles of SLA. A Repeated Measures ANCOVA and a Logistical Regression were used to determine the effects of the treatment, time, and a number of demographic variables.

Results of this study show that the treatment did not have a significant effect on any of the beliefs that were measured. However, one language learning belief was significantly affected by time. A majority of the students who participated in this study agreed with the statement, “The instructor should teach the class in German.” After three weeks of class instruction, however, they agreed with this statement significantly stronger. The results of this study also show that many of the demographic variables, such as gender and previous language learning experience, had a significant effect on a number of the students’ beliefs.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I first want to thank my family for all their love and support. I also want to thank my husband, specifically, for always believing in me. My deepest gratitude goes to Dr. Clifford, for helping me from the very beginning, and for Dr. Kelling and Dr. Strong-Krause for stepping in when I needed them most. I also want to express my gratitude for Dr. Decoo who was willing to help me with the early phases and revisions of this thesis, even when he was out of the country. Without the expertise, selflessness, and encouragement of these wonderful professors, I would not have been able to finish this. Thank you.

Table of contents

List of tables

Chapter 1 - Introduction

1.1 Rationale for This Study

Much of Second Language Acquisition (SLA) research has attempted to account for the varying success rates of individual language learners. Pimsleur, Mosber, and Morrison (1962) and Carroll (1981) have shown, for example, that intelligence and aptitude are successful predictors of language achievement. The seminal study by Gardner and Lambert (1972) and the many studies that have followed (for reviews see Dörnyei & Skehan, 2003; Gardner 1985) showed that motivation – second only to aptitude – is the most consistent predictor of language learning. They have also shown that motivation is largely determined by one's attitude. Gardner and Lambert's focus on the social and cultural components of attitude and motivation has been very influential in SLA research. Since their 1972 study, students' attitude toward the teacher, the class, the speakers of the language, and the cultures of the language have been shown to be a factor that influences motivation. Mantle-Bromley (1995), as an example, has found that students who participated in cultural-related lessons scored higher on the Attitudes and Motivation Test Battery (Gardner, Smythe, & Clément, 1974) than those who did not. Studies such as this are valuable because they explore the dynamic nature of factors that affect language learning as well as focus on ameliorating factors that could be detrimental, such as having a negative attitude.

However, not all affective factors that influence language learning fall in the realm of Gardner's social-psychological perspective. Students' beliefs about language learning, for example, are also believed to influence language learning. Some researchers believe that students enter the foreign language classroom with certain beliefs and

misconceptions about language learning which may cause anxiety or otherwise be detrimental (Green 1993; Horwitz, 1988; Mantle-Bromley, 1995; Phillips, 1991). If students' beliefs can in fact be an impediment to successful language learning, there is a need to combat potentially detrimental beliefs. According to Mori, Sato and Shimizu (2007), students' beliefs about language learning may be difficult to modify because they have been formed over long periods of time. They have suggested, therefore, that "future research must address the potential benefits of metacognitive instruction and the malleability of learner perceptions" (p. 80).

What about instruction on the basic principles of SLA – could this help ameliorate some of the potentially detrimental misconceptions that Horwitz (1988) and others have discovered? In addition, what about the principles of SLA that support the design of certain classroom activities – would this influence students' beliefs about the effectiveness of these activities? Perhaps if they knew why the activities are designed the way they are, students might have a more positive attitude toward them, and therefore have a more positive learning experience while participating in them.

As Mori, Sato and Shimizu's (2007) call for future research suggests, few studies have yet to address the potential benefits of metacognitive instruction. In particular, few studies have investigated the benefits of teaching students about the most basic principles of language learning. It is hoped that this study will shed light on how instruction of the principles of SLA influences students' beliefs about classroom activities and their beliefs about language learning in general.

1.2 Delimitations

Although there are many foreign language environments in which teachers and students may find themselves, this study addresses only beginning German classes at Brigham Young University (BYU).

One focus of this study is students' beliefs about the effectiveness of classroom activities. Whether or not students enjoy these activities will not be studied. A second focus of this study is whether students' beliefs about language learning change, and if so, what influences those changes. Although it would be interesting to define the beliefs that the particular students in this study enter the foreign language classroom with or compare them with other groups of students, that is not the focus of this study.

1.3 Definitions

1.3.1 Communicative

The term "communicative" has many meanings and uses. For the purposes of this study, all approaches, methods and activities that share the goal of communicative competence and the basic tenets of Communicative Language Teaching (CLT) (see section 2.2) will be classified as CLT or simply, "communicative." How these approaches, methods and activities are actually carried out in the classroom may vary according to the teachers using them.

The reason this study focuses on activities found in CLT is the first-year German program at BYU generally claims to teach in a "communicative" style. All student instructors in the program are required to attend an instructor training course which focuses on the principles of the "Communicative Approach" to teaching, including background on such things as Krashen's (1980) "input hypothesis" and the "affective

filter." The required textbook for all first-year German classes is *Kontakte: A Communicative Approach - 5th ed.* (Terrell, Tschirner, & Nikolai, 2004), which also claims to be "communicative." It is impossible to monitor student instructors to determine if they are in fact teaching in a communicative fashion. In addition, it may be debatable whether the textbook or the activities in it are in fact "communicative." However, in order to distinguish them from other activity types in programs that do not subscribe to the principles behind CLT, the activities in this study will be labeled "typical of CLT."

1.3.2 Foreign Language vs. Second Language

It is important to know that the students who participated in this study are learning a foreign language, meaning they are learning a language that is neither their native language nor the predominantly spoken language of the area. This is not to be confused with the second language environment in which students learn a language that is not their native language, but is the dominant language of the area. It is also important to note that the students in this study are learning German in a structured classroom environment, which generally falls under the construct of language "learning" as opposed to a more natural process of language "acquisition." For the purposes of this study, however, foreign and second language will be referred to as "second language" or "L2." Language learning and language acquisition will be referred to as language learning. In addition to language learning itself, research that involves language learning (both foreign and second language learning) will be referred to as SLA research.

1.3.3 Beliefs and Perceptions

When dealing with factors that affect language acquisition and learning, it can be difficult to distinguish between the constructs "belief" and "perception." Indeed, these constructs seem to be interchangeable in much of the literature (see for example Mori et al. 2007; Schulz 2001; Tse 2000). To illustrate, Mori et al. (2007) refer to the many studies that have focused on learner strategies and their correlations with learner beliefs as "belief studies" that "have contributed to our better understanding of learner perceptions…" (p. 58). They also speak of the "specificity of learner perceptions" which they define by way of giving an example: "task-specific beliefs" (p. 58).

For the purpose of this study it can be assumed that "beliefs" and "perceptions" are synonymous. If for example, a student "believes" that something is ineffective, he or she "perceives" that thing to be ineffective.

1.3.4 Attitude

The term "belief" is sometimes used interchangeably in the literature not only with "perception" but also with "attitude" (see O'Donnell, 2003, for example). This may be because of the strong influence and frequent use of Gardner, Smythe, and Clément's (1974) Attitudes and Motivation Test Battery (AMTB) in much of SLA research that examines students' attitudes and motivations. In a portion of the AMTB, students are asked to respond to a series of statements that are believed to measures one's attitude. For example, in order to determine a person's attitude toward French Canadians, he or she is asked to agree or disagree with the following statement: "French Canadians are a very sociable, warm-hearted and creative people." Whether or not the student believes this statement is true is considered to contribute to the overall measurement of his or her

attitude toward French Canadians. However, the items on the AMTB that are designed to measure one's attitude do not only involve beliefs, but other personal convictions as well. Personal desire, for example, is measured with statements beginning with words such as, "I want", "I prefer" and "I wish." In addition, statements such as "I enjoy meeting and listening to people who speak other languages" and "I love learning French" measure students' enjoyment as part of the overall construct of "attitude." Value placement is also measured as part of the "attitude" construct, by statements such as "Learning French is a waste of time" and "French is an important part of the school programme."

The term "attitude," therefore, seems to be an overall description of one's beliefs, values, and feelings toward someone or something. For the purposes of this study, beliefs will be considered to contribute to attitude, but attitude and beliefs will not be considered synonymous, as attitude comprises not only beliefs, but also wants, values, and other personal convictions.

1.3.5 LDS and MTC

This study was conducted at BYU which has a high concentration of members of the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints. The term "LDS" thus refers to people or other entities related to this church.

As a research sub-question, the effect of various settings in which students have learned another language will be examined. Because many BYU students serve missions for the LDS Church, it was necessary to include the Missionary Training Center (MTC) as one of these variables. The MTC is a unique language learning environment because missionaries live on the premises, it is extremely intensive, and classes are taught almost exclusively in the target language. With few exceptions, students serving a foreign-

speaking mission spend the first nine to twelve weeks in the MTC learning the language that is spoken in the community where they will serve.

1.4 Research Question

The main question this study addresses is: Does instruction about the principles of SLA that support CLT influence students' beliefs about the effectiveness of activities typical to CLT or their beliefs about language learning?

Chapter 2 - Literature Review

2.1 Introduction

The purpose of this chapter is to review the major research studies that focus on individual factors in language learning in order to provide the background necessary to further examine how instruction on SLA may influence individual beliefs. Specifically, it explores the individual differences that influence language learning, the various factors that affect students' attitude and beliefs, what these attitude and beliefs are, and whether or not they change. Because this study deals specifically with activities that are typical to CLT, a discussion of the term "communicative approach" will lead this review of the literature.

2.2 The "Communicative Approach"

The term "communicative approach" is often used to describe methods which focus on developing communicative competence. Because there is no one communicative method, teachers today have the privilege of looking to many methods for the best approach to conducting their classroom, yet they are not restricted to using only one "true" method, as all of them have something beneficial to offer. Larsen-Freeman's (1986) book, *Techniques and Principles in Language Teaching*, in which she examines eight methods of language teaching, is an example of the many options teachers have when using CLT. She suggests that teachers use their imaginations in trying to adapt the various techniques that she presents and reminds them that they are not expected to wholly adopt any one method. It is the common goal of communicative competence among so many methods that allows teachers to be creative in putting the principles of CLT into practice.

It is important to point out, however, that not all uses of the term "communicative" are synonymous. Savignon (1984) recognizes this in her introduction to the book, *Initiatives in Communicative Language Teaching*. She points out that many teachers remain unsure of what CLT in fact is. VanPatten (1998) analyzes differences in the term "communicative" as used by scholars and as realized in textbooks by teachers, textbook writers and curriculum planners. He labels the differences "a tremendous gap" (p. 931) and narrows these differences in a list of three perceptions commonly held by textbook writers and teachers and three perspectives commonly held by scholars. For teachers and textbook writers "communicative" refers to 1) speaking, 2) an end-point, a goal, and 3) the application of learned material (i.e., vocabulary and grammar). For scholars "communicative" refers to 1) all modes of language use and is not restricted to speaking or so-called productive abilities, 2) language acquisition (meaning language acquisition occurs because of communicative events), and 3) purposeful language use. He maintains that:

> The more that we interact with language instructors and the more we examine what is in the textbooks and how instructors use them, the more we realize that the term 'communicative' is not a mutually shared construct between scholars and practitioners. We share the same word but not the same meaning. (p. 931)

Despite these differences, methods with the common goal of communicative competence do share some basic tenets. VanPatten (2002) lists five common tenets of CLT:

1. Meaning should always be [*sic*] focus. . . .
2. Learners should be at the center of the curriculum. . . .
3. Communication is not only oral but written and gestural as well. . . .
4. Samples of authentic language used among native speakers should be available from the beginning of instruction. . . .
5. Communicative events in class should be purposeful. . . . (p. 106-107)

As mentioned in the previous chapter, all approaches, methods, and activities that share the goal of communicative competence and these basic tenets may be classified in this thesis as CLT or simply, “communicative.” How these approaches, methods, and activities are actually carried out in the classroom may vary according to the teachers using them.

2.3 Individual Differences in Language Learning

Much research has been devoted to identifying individual differences that influence language learning. Some of the differences that have received a significant amount of attention in SLA research are intelligence, aptitude, motivation, attitude, and language learning beliefs.

2.3.1 Intelligence and Aptitude

In the early 1960s, the United States Office of Education, Department of Health, Education and Welfare funded an investigation of under-achievement in second language learning, out of which came an excellent review of the research conducted prior to the 1960s pertaining to internal factors in language learning (Pimsleur et al., 1962). Pimsleur et al. grouped the factors under seven major headings: 1) intelligence, 2) verbal ability, 3) pitch discrimination, 4) order of language study and bilingualism, 5) study habits, 6) motivation and attitudes, and 7) personality factors. They concluded that, although all of these factors have been shown to correlate (even if weakly) to L2 achievement, the largest contributing factor is intelligence, and the second largest is motivation. Dörnyei and Skehan (2003) wrote a similarly exhaustive review of the literature that focuses on individual differences in language learning. Like Pimsleur et al., they also conclude that

aptitude and motivation are the highest consistently successful predictors of language learning.

It is noticeable that Pimsleur et al. (1962) used the construct “intelligence” in their review while Dörnyei and Skehan (2003) used the construct “aptitude” in theirs. Both of these constructs are difficult to define and although they are distinct in some aspects, they are sometimes used interchangeably. Carroll (1981), however, says that “foreign language aptitude is not exactly the same as what is commonly called ‘intelligence’” (p. 86). He defines aptitude as “the individual’s initial state of readiness and capacity for learning a foreign language” (p. 86). He proposed that aptitude has four components: phonetic coding ability, grammatical sensitivity, inductive language learning ability, and associative memory. Carroll and Sapon (1959) devised a practical and commercially available aptitude battery, the Modern Language Aptitude Test (MLAT), which has been widely used in research since. Their concise definition of aptitude and its testability influenced SLA researchers' focus toward aptitude and away from the vague and perhaps more difficult to define construct of “intelligence.”

Another important consideration when working with the constructs of aptitude and intelligence is classroom implications. Unfortunately, language teachers and applied linguists alike have little or no control over an individual’s aptitude or intelligence. This limits the classroom implications that research centered on these constructs may have. Moreover, aptitude and intelligence are sensitive constructs. To illustrate, teachers might not appreciate a researcher coming into their classroom to tell them which of their students are “smart” and which of them are “dumb” in regards to language learning. Or a parent might not appreciate a researcher discovering that his or her child doesn’t have

that special “knack” for language learning. And what if a student *could* legitimately be labeled “intelligent” or “apt”? Should those who do not qualify for these labels drop out of their first-year language classes? It is difficult for consumers of research to know exactly how to apply the findings. Intelligence and aptitude are not altogether ignored in SLA research; however, the concept of aptitude has fallen somewhat out of fashion.

As Ehrman and Oxford (1995) point out, many other individual differences may directly influence language learning. Of all the individual differences that have been examined, the study of motivation has generated by far the most research.

2.3.2 Motivation

Around the same time Carroll and Sapon (1959) were focusing on aptitude, Gardner and Lambert (1972) conducted a pioneering twelve-year study that also attempted to account for the varying success rates of individual language learners. A major difference in their research from that of Carroll’s is that Gardner and Lambert’s approach to motivation was firmly grounded in social psychology. In addition to cognitive aspects of language learning, the social psychologist’s perspective from which they approached the topic led them to focus on social and cultural aspects of language learning as well. In doing so, they determined that next to aptitude, motivation is a key factor in language learning success and that motivation is largely determined by one’s attitude. In their words

> . . . success in mastering a foreign language would not only depend on intellectual capacity and language aptitude but also on the learner's perceptions of the other ethnolinguistic group involved, his attitudes towards that group, and his willingness to identify enough to adopt distinctive aspects of behavior, linguistic and non-linguistic, that characterize that other group. (p. 132)

In their 1972 study, Gardner and Lambert define motivation in the now famous dichotomy: integrative vs. instrumental. Integrative motivation is influenced by a positive attitude toward the target culture. It reflects a personal desire and willingness to identify with the people and culture of the target language. Instrumental motivation, on the other hand, is more utilitarian and reflects the practical advantages of language learning, such as career advancement. The 1972 study showed that integrative motivation was a stronger predictor in L2 achievements than instrumental.

Williams, Burden and Lanvers' (2002) study supports the notion that students' view of the other culture affects their motivation to learn the language. They surveyed 228 middle school students in England and found a higher motivation to study German than French. When interviewed, the students gave clear reasons for their preferences which included the notion that French was considered too feminine and not "cool."

While continuing in the social-psychological realm, Gardner (1985) developed the integrative motivation construct with his Socio-Educational Model. The model consists of three main components: attitude toward the teacher and the course, desire to learn the language, and attitude toward learning the language. Referring to this model, some authors have felt that SLA research has been restricted by its narrow measures of motivation and have therefore suggested that researchers consider non-L2 approaches to motivation and expand the motivation construct to include a wider range of academic and social motives (Crookes & Schmidt, 1991; Dörnyei, 1994; Oxford & Shearin, 1994). In response to these suggestions, Tremblay and Gardner (1995) investigated a number of new measures of motivation. To guide their investigation they turned to Cronbach and Meehl's (1955) classic paper on construct validity, which suggests that one way of

improving a model, in this case the Socio-Educational Model, is by clarifying the relationships among its variables. In order to reach this objective, it is helpful to identify mediators, or variables that explain the relationship between two other variables. Using this strategy, Tremblay and Gardner (1995) identified three variables that mediate the relationship between attitudes and motivation: 1) specific and frequent goal setting, 2) valence, or perceived value of language study, and 3) self-efficacy, or an individual's belief that he or she has the ability to reach a certain level of achievement. Gardner, Tremblay and Masgoret (1997) expanded the Socio-Educational Model even further to include additional learner characteristics such as self-confidence and language learning strategies, which were also identified as mediators between attitude and motivation.

One component missing from Gardner's (1985) Socio-Educational Model, as well as the expanded models that followed, is time. Dörnyei and Skehan (2003) maintain:

> During the lengthy process of mastering certain subject matters, motivation does not remain constant, but is associated with a dynamically changing and evolving mental process, characterized by constant (re)appraisal and balancing of the various internal and external influences that the individual is exposed to. (p. 617)

Following the theoretical approach proposed by the German psychologists Heckhausen and Kuhl and their associates (for reviews see Heckhausen, 1991; Kuhl & Beckmann, 1994), Dörnyei and Skehan (2003) proposed a process model of learning motivation which separates the motivation construct into three temporal phases: Pre-actional, actional, and post-actional. He suggested that by adopting a temporal model, the various approaches to motivation and their attempts to clarify the complex construct of motivation, which previously have appeared to contradict each other, can be synthesized.

A complete and accurate definition of the complex structure of language learning motivation continues to be investigated and debated among scholars (Csizér & Dörnyei,

2005). Aside from trying to define the complex construct of motivation, all of the above-mentioned studies and their respective models confirm and then re-confirm that attitude influences motivation.

2.3.3 Attitude

An example of SLA research that shows that attitude influences L2 achievement is Kuhlemeir, Bergh and Melse's (1996) study. They examined the relationship between students' attitude, specifically about the subject (German), their course material and their teacher, and the students' achievement scores. The attitude and achievement levels of 53 first-year German classes from 28 schools in the Netherlands were measured at the beginning and end of the school year. They found that students who had a more positive attitude toward their subject, class material, and teacher had higher achievement scores than those with a more negative attitude, both at the beginning and at the end of the school year. This is strong evidence of the important and influential role that attitude plays in language learning.

Even Dörnyei and Skehan (2003) list attitude as one of the main motivational influences associated with the first phase in his model, indicating that attitude plays a key role in influencing one's initial motivation for studying a language. Attitude, then, is a primary influence on motivation, which in turn is a primary influence on language learning success. If this is the case, and research has shown that it is, it is important to understand what constitutes an attitude and what influences it.

In evaluating the importance of attitude in language learning, Smith (1971) offered this definition of the term attitude from Milton Rokeach: an attitude is an "organization of beliefs around an object or a situation, predisposing one to respond in

some preferential manner" (p. 82). The logic behind this definition is that if one believes, for example, that an activity is ineffective, and therefore a waste of time, he or she will have a negative attitude toward that activity and will prefer not to participate in it.

Perhaps the most widely used assessment of students' attitude is the Attitudes and Motivation Test Battery (AMTB). It asks students to respond to a series of statements that are believed to measures one's attitude. As discussed in Section 1.3.4, these statements assess not only one's beliefs, but also one's desires, value judgments, likes and dislikes, and overall feelings toward someone or something. The influence most pertinent to the focus of this study, however, is one's beliefs.

2.3.4 Language Learning Beliefs

The statements in the AMTB that attempt to assess attitude focus on beliefs about the people, culture, the teacher and the classroom. They do not, however, go outside the realm of the socio-psychological perspective. Horwitz (1988), on the other hand, attempted to describe students' beliefs not about the culture or the language, but about a number of issues related to language learning. In order to do this, she created an instrument called the Beliefs About Language Learning Inventory (BALLI).

In Horwitz's 1988 study, in which she used the BALLI, she surveyed 241 beginning university L2 students of intact Spanish, French and German classes at the University of Texas during the first three weeks of the semester. Her findings confirm that students arrive at the language classroom with "definite preconceived notions of how to go about it" (p. 293). She also argues that many of these preconceived notions may be detrimental to the students. For example, over 60% of the Spanish and German students felt that learning a foreign language is "mostly a matter of translating into English" (p.

291), which Horwitz claims probably results in negative outcomes for many language learners. Another example that she gives is the students' common concern for correctness of their utterances, which she argues is a contributing factor to anxiety in foreign language learning (p. 292). Phillips (1991) concurs with this.

Mantle-Bromley (1995) also used the BALLI to determine the beliefs about language learning among middle-school-aged children. She also found that many students entered the foreign language classroom with misconceptions about language learning which she argues, as do Horwitz and Phillips, may hinder progress and persistence in language learning.

If a positive attitude and accurate beliefs about language learning can be beneficial to language learning, while a negative attitude and misconceptions about language learning can be detrimental to language learning, it is essential to determine what is influencing students' attitude and beliefs.

2.4 Factors that Influence Students' Attitude and Beliefs

Many factors are believed to influence students' attitude and beliefs. Research has shown that two factors are particularly influential: cultural background and anxiety

2.4.1 Cultural Background

Many researchers have found cultural background to be a factor that affects attitude and beliefs. Yang (as cited in Kuntz, 1996) surveyed Taiwanese students using Horwitz's BALLI. Her results suggest that each sample may have an underlying structure of beliefs unique to its culture. This study became the model for both Park (1995) and Truitt (1995) who separately surveyed university students studying English in Korea and both found that students' attitude and beliefs vary according to background and culture.

Schulz (2001) also examined the cultural differences in students' and teachers' beliefs. Specifically, she examined the beliefs of 607 Columbian L2 students and 122 of their teachers, as well as 824 American L2 students and 92 of their teachers about the role of grammar instruction and corrective feedback. Although she found that an overall majority of those who participated in her study agreed that grammar instruction and error correction are important, she also found that Columbian students and their teachers had "stronger beliefs regarding the efficacy of explicit grammar instruction and error feedback" (p. 254). Her findings support the notion that cultural background influences students' and teachers' attitude and beliefs.

Another study that examined culture as a possible variable in students' attitude was conducted by O'Donnell (2003). He surveyed students entering the university in Japan and found that the majority of the students' attitude remained "traditional" and highly influenced by their secondary level experiences. He suggested that the students' attitude, which included "preferring teacher-dominated lectures" and not being willing to speak "for fear of making errors" (p. 53), may inhibit them from learning English. As students in Japan begin learning English at the university level, many of them are taught by a foreign instructor for the first time. O'Donnell concludes that teachers of English at the university level should become familiar with their students' language experiences and their resulting attitude and motivations. He says this will help "bridge possible cultural and pedagogical gaps" (p. 31).

2.4.2 Anxiety

In addition to cultural variables, there has also been a large focus on negative affective factors, particularly anxiety, in SLA research. Because of the perceived negative

effects of anxiety on language learning, many applied linguists have strived to create methods that lower anxiety and other affective factors; this is believed to increase chances for acquisition. Methods such as “The Natural Approach” (see Krashen & Terrell 1983; Terrell 1977), “The Silent Way” (see Gattegno, 1972), “Suggestopedia” (see Ostrander & Schroeder, 1970), and “Counseling Learning” (see Curran, 1976), among others, exemplify a heightened awareness of the negative effects anxiety can have on language learning.

In addition to the applied linguists who have created specific methods aimed to lower anxiety, other SLA researchers have tried to examine what factors cause anxiety and have found a number of contributing factors. After analyzing the research on language anxiety, Young (1991) identified six main sources of language anxiety.

> 1) personal and interpersonal anxieties; 2) learner beliefs about language learning; 3) instructor beliefs about language learning; 4) instructor-learner interactions; 5) classroom procedures; and 6) language testing. (p 427)

The factor most pertinent to the purpose of this study is students’ beliefs about language learning. Phillips (1991) contends that certain beliefs about language learning, which she considers misconceptions and unrealistic expectations that students bring to the classroom, are likely to heighten anxiety. It follows that students who have heightened anxiety will likely have a negative experience with language learning, and consequently a negative attitude toward language learning.

2.5 Students’ Attitude toward Classroom Activities

Some scholars have moved beyond the interest in students’ beliefs about language and language learning to their beliefs about the actual activities that are being used in language classrooms. In 1993, Green examined students’ perceptions and judgments of

the enjoyableness and effectiveness of both non-communicative and communicative activities. He surveyed 263 students enrolled in an intermediate ESL course at the University of Puerto Rico at Mayaguez and found a high correlation among students' ratings of effectiveness and enjoyment. Also, with only one exception, communicative activities were rated more enjoyable than non-communicative ones, but this distinction was not made for effectiveness. In other words, students clearly distinguished between communicative and non-communicative activities when rating for enjoyableness, but not when considering whether they believed the activities would help them learn English. He also examined the students' previous background experience with the various activities in question and found no significant correlation with the ratings. In his words, "they did not tend to automatically reject what was new to them in favor of what was familiar" (p. 8). The findings of this study differ somewhat from O'Donnell's (2003) in that the students were more receptive to new ideas and did not prefer activities that would fit into O'Donnell's characteristics of "traditional."

In Green's (1993) study the students did not evaluate activities that they experienced, but rather descriptions of possible future activities. Garrett and Shortall (2002) saw the need to not only have students evaluate certain classroom activities, but to rely on first-hand experiences with the activities to rate them. They collected data from 103 Brazilian students who were learning English on elementary and intermediate levels. These students completed and then evaluated four different types of activities: teacher fronted grammar, student-centered grammar, teacher-fronted fluency, and student-centered fluency. They found differences in students' preferences for certain types of

activities that correlated with the level they were in, but in general his findings support those of Green's study.

2.6 Do Attitudes and Beliefs Change?

The above studies provide valuable insight into student's beliefs and the possible factors that influence these beliefs. Less attention, though, has been paid to whether or not these beliefs change, and if they do change, what factors influence that change.

Montle-Bromley (1995), on the other hand, has recognized the importance of attitudinal change in SLA. She conducted a study that attempted to maintain and/or improve middle-school-aged students' attitude toward native French and Spanish speakers using attitude change theory. The treatment which the experiment group received was culture-related lessons aimed at creating and maintaining a positive attitude toward the target culture. To measure the students' attitude, she used a modified version of the AMTB. Her results show that the experiment group received a significantly greater score on the AMTB than the control group, indicating a more positive attitude after participating in the culture-related lessons.

This study suggests that attitudes can in fact be positively influenced. The focus, however, remains a social one; she addressed students' attitude toward the people of the other ethnolinguistic group. What about attitude toward language learning or classroom activities? Can these be influenced and if so, how?

2.7 Summary

Most scholars would agree that attitude plays an important role in learning a language. For many reasons, a positive attitude is a desirable goal for most language teachers and students. Even if research were to show little or no correlation between

positive attitude and language acquisition, it is of value to investigate what can be done to improve negative attitudes and maintain positive ones for the simple sake of enjoying the classroom experience.

The existing body of research attempts to determine how attitude and acquisition correlate, define students' attitude and beliefs and determine what factors influence them. This overview of the literature on student and teacher attitude and beliefs has revealed the following:

1. Aptitude and intelligence are the highest predictors of language acquisition.
2. Motivation is a key factor in language acquisition and is highly affected by attitude.
3. A positive attitude often correlates with high achievement.
4. Beliefs make up a part of the overall construct of attitude; they are therefore influential in language learning.
5. Many students' language learning beliefs might actually be detrimental misconceptions.
6. Many factors influence attitude and beliefs, including teacher, instruction, previous learning experience, and anxiety.
7. Students' attitude can be influenced.

Referring back to VanPatten's (1998) "gap" between scholars and teachers and textbook authors, it is also arguable that there exists a gap between these people and the students themselves. The research in second language acquisition that supports CLT is not often transmitted to the teachers and arguably never transmitted to the students. Is it possible that this could be a contributing factor to detrimental attitudes and beliefs about

language learning? If second language acquisition research is explained to students, will they be more likely to view CLT activities in a positive light? Will some of the potentially detrimental beliefs about language learning be ameliorated?

It seems that the effects of teaching students and teachers about SLA research that supports CLT have been largely unexamined. Although this study is limited to students' beliefs about CLT classroom activities and their beliefs about language learning in the beginning German context at BYU, it will hopefully give insight to the broader issues of attitude change and language learning.

2.8 Research Questions

The main purpose of this study is to answer the following question: Does instruction about the principles of SLA that support CLT affect students' beliefs about the effectiveness of communicative classroom activities and/or their beliefs about language learning in general?

In addition, this study also examines the following related sub-question: Do time, previous background experience with classroom activities, previous language learning experience, gender, native language, or attitude toward research affect beliefs about the effectiveness of communicative classroom activities and/or beliefs about language learning in general?

Chapter 3 - Research Design

3.1 Introduction

This chapter describes the setting in which this study took place, the subjects who participated in this study, the instruments used and how informed consent was obtained. The experimental treatment, data collection and data analysis are also described.

3.2 Setting

This study was conducted during the fall semester of 2005 at BYU. At the time, BYU offered six beginning German sections that were held Monday through Friday at 8:00, 9:00, and 10:00 a.m., and 12:00, 1:00, and 2:00 p.m. Each section met in the same classroom for a 50 minute period during their respective times. The surveys and treatments used in this study were administered in this classroom during the first or last 10 minutes of the class periods.

3.3 Description of Subjects

The subjects of this study consisted of students from all six sections of the intact beginning German classes at BYU. Because parental consent is required for students less than 18 years of age and this would cost a significant amount of time to obtain, those who were under 18 years of age when the experiment began were not included in this study. Of the 68 subjects who were included, 24 were males and 44 were females.

When asked about what formal settings students had previously learned a language in, only two students said they had learned a language in junior high, while 59 reported learning another language in high school, and 20 students had previously learned another language in college. Only six of the 68 had learned another language in the

Missionary Training Center (MTC). When asked how many languages they had learned in these formal settings, three students reported that they had never before learned a language, 48 said they had learned one other language (which may or may not have been German), and 14 said they had learned two.

Fewer students reported learning a language in an informal setting. Of the 68, only five students said they had learned another language at home, seven students had learned another language among friends and neighbors in the community, seven had learned another language abroad and only five had learned another language while serving an LDS mission. When asked how many languages they had learned in any of these informal settings, 43 students, a majority, reported that they had never learned a language in an informal setting, 24 reported learning one language in an informal setting, and only one student said he had learned two languages in an informal setting.

3.4 Instruments

The instruments used in this study were designed to measure students' beliefs about classroom activities typical to CLT as well as their beliefs about language learning. Three surveys were created: the Pre-course Survey, the Pre-treatment Survey, and the Post-treatment Survey.

3.4.1 The Pre-course Survey

The Pre-course Survey was administered during the first week of the semester (see Appendix A for the complete Pre-course Survey). It has three sections: Demographic Information, Activity Examples and Ratings, and Language Learning Beliefs.

3.4.1.1 Demographic Information

The first section of the Pre-course Survey asked students to provide demographic information regarding their age, gender and previous language learning experience. Table 1 displays the questions asked to gather this information.

Table 1

Demographic Information Gathered from the Pre-course Survey

Demographic Information	Question
Learned another language in Junior High School	yes/no?
Learned another language in High School	yes/no?
Learned another language in college	yes/no?
Learned another language in the LDS Missionary Training Center	yes/no?
Learned another language at home	yes/no?
Learned another language among friends and neighbors in the community	yes/no?
Learned another language while living abroad in a foreign country	yes/no?
Learned another language while serving an LDS foreign-speaking mission	yes/no?
Languages learned in a formal setting	how many?
Language learned in an informal setting	how many?
Native Speaker of English	yes/no?

3.4.1.2 Activity Examples and Ratings

The Pre-course Survey also described three activities found in *Kontakte* (Terrell et al., 2004), the textbook used by all first-year German classes at BYU, and then gave an English example of each. These activities were chosen to represent classroom activities that are typical to CLT. They were Dialog activities, Peer Interview activities and Information-gap activities.

Dialogue activities are individual listening activities. Students are given a written copy of a dialogue where two or three speakers are having a conversation. Most often the speakers in the dialogue are students participating in situations that are typical to student

life. One goal of Dialogue activities is to help students learn set phrases and sentence patterns that will help them in these situations. Another goal is to allow for focused listening comprehension. Throughout the written copy of the dialogue various words are left blank. As students listen to the dialogue being played, they are supposed to fill in the blanks with what they hear. The teacher usually plays the dialogue two or three times before checking answers. Below is the English example of a Dialogue activity found in the Pre-course Survey.

Example Dialogue Activity: "The First day of Class"

The underlined words in parenthesis would not appear in the students' written dialogue; they would be left blank. Students would hear the dialogue and fill in the blanks with what they hear.

On the first day of class, Melanie is speaking with another student.

Melanie: Hi! Are you (new) here?
James: (Yeah). You too?
Melanie: Yeah. So, (What's your name)?
James: James. And yours?
Melanie: (I'm) Melanie.
James: (Nice to meet you).
Melanie: Nice to meet you, too.

Unlike Dialogue activities which focus on listening, Peer Interview activities focus on speaking. They provide students with the opportunity to have a guided, yet open-ended conversation with a partner. Students are given a list of questions that follow a theme or topic that has previously been covered in class. Students ask and answer the questions and take notes of each other's responses so that they can be reported to the class when the activity is finished. The goal of Peer Interview activities is to allow students to practice "free speech" that is not memorized or scripted; the activity should feel like a conversation. For this reason, the answers to the list of questions are not

written down anywhere and students are encouraged to respond with personal, meaningful answers. The list of questions below is from the English example of the Peer Interview Activity found in the Pre-course Survey.

Example Peer Interview Activity: "Student Schedule"

1. What classes are you taking this semester? Which ones do you like? Which ones don't you like?
2. What time does your first class begin on Monday? Which class is it? What time do you go home on Mondays?
3. What time does your first class begin on Tuesday? Which class is it? What time do you go home on Tuesdays?

Like Peer Interview activities, Information-gap activities also involve speaking in pairs. Student A is given information that Student B does not have, and Student B is given information that student A does not have. Students must ask each other questions in order to find out the information needed to complete the task. The goal of Information-gap activities is to create a genuine exchange of information among students. Although there are many types of Information-gap activities, the most common type found in *Kontakte* involves filling out a chart, as in the example from the Pre-course Survey below.

Example of Information-gap activity: "What Do They Do When?"

model: *Student A: What does Rachel do when she is sad?*
Student B: She calls a friend.
Student B: What does Jason do when he is hungry?
Student A: He eats at McDonald's.

	Student A's Information		*Student B's Information*	
	Rachel	*Jason*	*Rachel*	*Jason*
is sad		*watches a movie*	*calls a friend*	
is tired	*takes a nap*			*drinks coffee*
is sick	*sees a doctor*			*stays home*
is hungry		*eats at McDonald's*	*cooks dinner*	

After each example, the Pre-course Survey asked students how often they had participated in the activity. The optional responses were never, seldom, and often.

Then the students were asked to rate the activities by responding to a series of 16 statements about the effectiveness of the activities. Students' were asked to determine on a Likert-scale if they strongly agree, agree, slightly agree, slightly disagree, disagree or strongly disagree with each statement. Eight of the sixteen statements were positively worded while the other eight were negatively worded. Table 2 lists the 16 statements used to obtain the rating for Dialogue activities. The same 16 statements were used for Peer Interview and Information-gap activities as well. The activity ratings are believed to represent the students' overall belief about the effectiveness of each activity.

Table 2

16 Statements Used to Obtain the Activity Ratings

	Dialogue activities taught in German 101 will. . .
1	. . . help me understand the structure of the language.
2	. . . NOT help me create correct sentences.
3	. . . NOT help me learn new words.
4	. . . help me learn culturally appropriate language.
5	. . . help me pronounce words correctly.
6	. . . NOT help me improve my listening skills.
7	. . . help me understand how sentences are formed.
8	. . . increase my vocabulary.
9	. . . NOT help me improve my speaking skills.
10	. . . NOT help me communicate appropriately.
11	. . . NOT improve my writing skills.
12	. . . help me understand when spoken to.
13	. . . NOT improve my pronunciation.
14	. . . help me write appropriately.
15	. . . help me speak appropriately in the foreign language.
16	. . . NOT help me learn grammar.

Although there were sixteen statements in the surveys, only 15 statements were actually used in the data analysis because a small, yet significant typographical error was found in one of these statements after the surveys had already been administered. The statement “NOT help me communicate appropriately” was missing the “NOT” in the Pre-treatment and Post-treatment Surveys. Because this error significantly changes the meaning of the sentence and the meaning was therefore not the same for each survey, it was discarded from the data set.

3.4.1.3 Language Learning Beliefs

After the three activity examples and ratings, students were asked to respond to 11 statements about language learning in general. The first question in this section was adapted from Elaine Horwitz' BALLI. It asked students to indicate how long they believe it will take a person to become fluent in German if he or she spent one hour a day studying it. The optional responses were 1-2 years, 3-5 years, 5-10 years, and Not Possible.

After students answered this question, they were asked to respond to ten statements about language learning. Table 3 lists the ten statements about language learning used in the surveys.

Table 3

Ten Statements about Language Learning

1. Learning German is mostly a matter of learning a lot of new vocabulary words.
2. It is important to speak with an excellent accent.
3. I feel self-conscious speaking German in front of other people.
4. Learning German is mostly a matter of learning grammar.
5. If you are uncertain about how to say something, it is OK to take risks and just try it.
6. Learning German is mostly a matter of translating from English.
7. You should not say anything in German until you can say it correctly.
8. Speaking with my peers does not improve my German as much as speaking with my teacher or a native speaker does.
9. The instructor should teach the entire class in German, including grammar explanations.
10. In order to become fluent in German it is necessary to practice speaking.

Students were asked to determine if they strongly agree, agree, slightly agree, slightly disagree, disagree or strongly disagree with each statement. The first seven

statements were also adapted from the BALLI; the last three were created specifically for this study.

3.4.2 The Pre-treatment Survey

The second survey that was administered, the Pre-treatment Survey, was administered after four weeks of regular instruction, but before any treatment began. It contained the same descriptions and examples of the three activities. The examples, however, were in German and came directly from *Kontakte*. Page numbers of the examples along with page numbers where other similar activities could be found in *Kontakte* were listed for the students' reference. Students were then asked to rate the activities again, this time based on their first-hand experiences with the activities. In addition to responding to the same eleven statements about language learning, students were also asked to state the grade that they anticipated earning for the course. See Appendix B for the complete Pre-treatment Survey.

3.4.3 The Post-treatment Survey

The last survey, the Post-treatment Survey, was administered after four additional weeks of instruction. During those four weeks, the control group continued their semester as they normally would have, while the experimental group received an average of two treatment lessons per week. The examples, activity ratings and statements about language learning found in the Post-treatment Survey were identical to those found in the Pre-treatment Survey.

During the treatments, the researcher noticed a particularly negative response from one of the teachers in the experimental group. This teacher would often disregard the researcher's attempts to remind him when various parts of the research were going to

take place. He would consequently not greet the researcher with a “Hello,” but rather with statements such as, “Oh, you’re coming again today? How long will this last again?” or “Do we have to do this today? I forgot you were coming.” The researcher also noticed some apparently negative attitudes from some of the students in the experimental group as well. Some students seemed to have a hard time paying attention to the treatment lessons and some students would make audible disapproval through moaning and muffled murmurings. Like many classroom discussions, often only a small handful of students participated in the treatment lessons.

In order to determine the students’ overall attitude toward classroom research and to enable the researcher to investigate any potential correlation between the students’ attitude and their responses to the surveys, three additional questions were added to the end of the Post-treatment Survey. The first question asked students to rate the value of classroom-based research projects in general. The second question asked them to rate the value of this study in particular. These two questions were answered on a scale of one to four, with one being “No Value” and four being “Great Value.” The third question asked students to rate how well the researcher conducted her study, also on a scale of one to four, with one being “Very Ineffectively” and four being “Very Effectively.” It was hoped and believed that the mean of these scores will represent an overall attitude about research that may influence students’ responses. See Appendix C for the complete Post-treatment Survey.

3.4.4 Confidentiality and Informed Consent

In order to maintain confidentiality, each survey was assigned a random, unique identification number and the names of the students were removed from the surveys. A

master list of names and their correlating numbers was kept in a locked filing cabinet in the Center for Language Studies at BYU. After the study is completed, the master list will be destroyed.

The cover page of each of the surveys explains the procedures used to maintain confidentiality, the minimum age requirement, and the researcher's personal contact information as well as that of the chair of the Institutional Review Board for Human Subjects at Brigham Young University in case students have any questions about their rights. Students were asked to sign and date the bottom of the cover page of each survey indicating their informed consent.

3.5 The Treatment

The treatment consisted of seven ten-minute lessons about some of the basic principle of SLA. The topic of each treatment lesson was presented to the students in the form of a question. The researcher spent an average of five to six minutes of instruction answering the question for that lesson. One of the goals of the instruction was to show that the design of the communicative classroom activities which the students were participating in (including the three they rated) is supported by SLA research. The instruction was followed by five to six minutes of open-ended discussion where students asked questions and gave comments.

The topics for each treatment lesson are given in Table 4. The seventh treatment lesson was an overview of the SLA principles that were taught during the first six treatment lessons. Students received a copy of the overview of SLA principles for future reference.

Table 4

Treatment Lesson Topics

Lesson	Topic
1	Why do we focus on communication?
2	Why do we teach the class in German?
3	Why don't we spend more time on grammar instruction? Isn't it helpful to learn explicit rules and memorize charts?
4	Why doesn't my teacher always correct me? Will the mistakes I make in the beginning ever go away?
5	Why do I have to do so much pair and group work? Wouldn't I learn better from my teacher or a native speaker who already knows how to speak well?
6	Why is it hard for me to speak in front of other people?
7	Second Language Acquisition Overview (also a handout)

Because the answers to these questions are complex, the researcher compiled a small, condensed list of information that she felt most appropriately and succinctly answered the questions (See Appendix D for an overview of the answers to the questions which comprised the treatment lessons). She used this list of information as a guide to her instruction. It is possible that a group of students discussed various points of information more thoroughly than another group, depending on the questions and comments from the students. However, the instructor covered every point on the list in every lesson and in every section.

3.6 Data Collection

Before the semester began, the six sections of beginning German were divided into experimental and control groups. Because the researcher taught the first section (the

8:00 a.m. class), that section was placed in the experimental group to control biased influences. Three of the remaining five sections were randomly selected by the flip of a quarter to be the control group.

At the end of the first week of the semester the researcher personally visited all six sections during ten minutes of class time (either at the beginning or at the end of the 50 minutes, depending on the teachers' preference). During this first visit students completed the Pre-course Survey. Each student received his or her own paper copy of the survey on which they hand wrote their answers.

After four weeks of normal class instruction, the students completed the Pre-treatment Survey in class. After the Pre-treatment Survey was administered, the control group continued the semester as they normally would have while the experimental group began receiving the treatment lessons. Over the following four weeks, each section in the experimental group received an average of two ten-minute treatment lessons per week for a total of seven treatments. The researcher conducted all seven treatments for all three sections in the experimental group, including her own.

The week after the treatment lessons were completed, which was the tenth week in the semester, all sections completed the Post-treatment Survey.

3.7 Data Analysis

This section describes the tests and procedures used to analyze the data. First it explains how the students' beliefs were measured, how the reliability of the instruments was determined and what independent variables possibly influenced the students' beliefs. Then it explains the process used to find a statistical model that best fits each belief variable, and what statistical analyses were used to answer the research questions.

3.7.1 How Students' Beliefs were Measured

Two set of beliefs were measured: beliefs about the effectiveness of communicative classroom activities and beliefs about language learning in general.

3.7.1.1 Classroom Activity Beliefs

The students' beliefs about the effectiveness of the activities were determined through the activity ratings. Each of the 15 statements that students responded to described a unique aspect of language that could represent a unique construct. Some examples are "grammar," "speaking," and "writing." However, each of these aspects was found in a single item rather than a set of items; it was therefore impossible to say with confidence that each statement represented a clear, definable construct. For this reason, the students' responses to the 15 statements were collapsed into a mean score. This mean was used to represent the students' overall belief about the effectiveness of that activity. The students rated the activities on a 6-point Likert scale with 1 being "Strongly Disagree" and 6 being "Strongly Agree." So, for example, if a student's average score was 5 for the Dialog activity, it is likely that that student believed Dialog activities to be overall "effective" for his or her learning. This holds true for all three activity types.

After the responses to the 15 statements were collapsed into a single mean for each student, the mean of all the students in the control group and then the mean of all the students in the experimental group were taken to represent each group's overall belief of the three activities, resulting in three dependent variables, one for each activity. Table 5 summarizes the three classroom activity beliefs that were measured.

Table 5

Three Classroom Activity Beliefs

Classroom Activity Belief	Explanation
Dialogue Rating	Overall belief about the effectiveness of Dialogue activities
Peer Interview Rating	Overall belief about the effectiveness of Peer Interview activities
Information-gap Rating	Overall belief about the effectiveness of Information-gap activities

3.7.1.2 Language Learning Beliefs

The difference between the activity rating scores and the language learning belief scores is that each of the ten statements about language learning represented a unique language learning belief (LLB) which could not be collapsed with the other language learning beliefs to represent a single construct. The scores from the ten statements about language learning were therefore considered ten individual dependent variables. As with the activity ratings, the mean of all the students in each group were taken to represent the group's overall belief about language learning, resulting in ten dependent variables, one for each LLB.

The one dependent variable that could not be measured as a mean score was the belief about how many years it takes a person to become fluent. Because the optional responses could not be considered equidistant points on an ordinal scale the way the responses on a Likert scale can, this particular variable was measured categorically. Table 6 summarizes each of the 11 LLBs that were measured.

Table 6

Eleven Language Learning Beliefs

LLB Label	LLB Statement
LLB1-Place of Vocabulary	Language Learning Belief 1: Learning German is mostly a matter of learning a lot of new vocabulary words.
LLB2-Importance of Accent	Language Learning Belief 2: It is important to speak with an excellent accent.
LLB3-Feeling Self-conscious	Language Learning Belief 3: I feel self-conscious speaking German in front of other people.
LLB4-Place of Grammar	Language Learning Belief 4: Learning German is mostly a matter of learning grammar.
LLB5-Risk Taking	Language Learning Belief 5: If you are uncertain about how to say something, it is OK to take risks and just try it.
LLB6-Place of Translating	Language Learning Belief 6: Learning German is mostly a matter from translating from English.
LLB7-Need for Exactness	Language Learning Belief 7: You should not say anything in German until you can say it correctly.
LLB8-Peer vs. Teacher Interaction	Language Learning Belief 8: Speaking with my peers does not improve my German as much as speaking with my teacher or native speaker does.
LLB9-Language of Instruction	Language Learning Belief 9: The instructor should teach the class in German, including grammar explanations.
LLB10-Necessity of Speaking	Language Learning Belief 10: In order to become fluent in German it is necessary to practice speaking.
LLB11-Year to Become Fluent	How long students believe it takes to become fluent if studying 1 hour a day: 1-2 years, 3-5 years, 5-10 years, Not Possible

Altogether the students' beliefs were divided into 14 dependent variables that could have been influenced by the treatment: three beliefs classroom activity beliefs (Dialogue Rating, Peer interview Rating and Information-gap Rating) and eleven LLBs.

3.7.2 Determining the Reliability of the Instruments

The reliability of the 15 items from the activity ratings was tested using a Cronbach's alpha. Although there is no standard cut-off point for alpha values (D. Eggett, personal communication, January, 2007), an alpha value of $\geq$ .80 was chosen as the bench mark for acceptable reliability. If a single statement consistently solicited abnormal and unpredictable responses from the students, or if a single student was consistently abnormal and unpredictable in his or her responses, these data were considered unreliable and would be eliminated from the data set.

Because the majority of the statements about language learning were adapted from the BALLI, which is considered to be a reliable instrument (Kuntz, 1996), those particular items were not analyzed for reliability.

3.7.3 Measuring the Independent Variables

The main purpose of this study was to determine if the treatment influenced students' beliefs. The treatment, albeit important, was not the only variable that could have influenced students' responses to the surveys. Time and five demographic variables could have influenced the students' responses to the surveys.

Time represented the difference between the students' responses on the three surveys. The demographic variable "previous activity experience" consists of three sub-parts that represented the amount of experience students had with the three classroom activities that were rated. The three categories of measurement for these variables were never, seldom and often. The explanations for the sub-parts of previous activity experience are summarized in Table 7.

Table 7

Previous Activity Experience

Label	Explanation
DIALOG EXPERIENCE	Previous Background Experience with Dialogue activities
PEER-INTERVIEW EXPERIENCE	Previous Background Experience with Peer-Interview activities
INFO-GAP EXPERIENCE	Previous Background Experience with Information-gap activities

The demographic variable “previous language learning experience” is a variable which represents the settings in which students have learned another language. The formal settings that students may have learned another language in are Junior High, High School, college and the MTC. The informal settings that students may have learned another language in are at home, among friends and neighbors in the community, while studying abroad, and while serving a foreign-speaking LDS mission. The number of languages that students have learned in any of these settings was also considered part of their previous language learning experience. The explanations for the sub-parts of previous language learning experience and the shortened labels that have been assigned to are summarized in Table 8.

Table 8

Previous Language Learning Experience

FORMAL SETTING- JR HIGH SCHOOL	Learned another language in Junior High
FORMAL SETTING- HIGH SCHOOL	Learned another language in High School
FORMAL SETTING-COLLEGE	Learned another language in college
FORMAL SETTING-MTC	Learned another language in the LDS
INFORMAL SETTING- HOME	Learned another language at home
INFORMAL SETTING-COMMUNITY	Learned another language in the community
INFORMAL SETTING-ABROAD	Learned another language while living
INFORMAL SETTING- MISSION	Learned another language while serving an
# OF LANGUAGES-FORMAL SETTING	Number of languages learned in a formal setting
INFORMAL SETTING- # OF LANGUAGES	Number of language learned in an informal setting

The additional demographic variables that were analyzed in this study were gender, native speaker of English and attitude toward research. Native speaker of English is the variable that identifies students as native speakers of English or non-native speakers of English; students who marked non-native were not asked to identify what their native language is. The variable attitude toward research is the mean score of students' responses to the three questions about classroom-based research that were added to the Post-treatment Survey and believed to represent the construct "overall attitude toward research."

3.7.4 Finding the Best-fit Statistical Model for each Belief

Because there were a high number of independent variables that may be interacting with one another, it was possible that the results of this study could be slightly skewed. It was necessary, therefore, to check which demographic variables were significant to the dependent variables (the students' beliefs) and then eliminate the ones that were not.

For each of the three activity ratings and the ten LLBs, a Repeated Measures ANCOVA with all the demographic variables was run. For the belief about how long it takes a person to become fluent, (where the data were categorical, not ordinal) a Logistical Regression was run.

The p values of the demographic variable were evaluated. The demographic variable with the highest p value (of those $\geq$ .2) was deleted from the model and the statistical analysis was run again. Each time the statistic was run, a new set of p values was given and reevaluated. The variable with the next highest p value that was $\geq$ .2 was again deleted from the model. This process of elimination was repeated until all demographic variables remaining had a p value $\leq$ .2.

This process of elimination was conducted for each belief until 14 unique statistical models that best fit each of the dependent variables were established, called "best-fit" models. Using statistical models that contain only the independent variables with a p value of $\leq$ .2 helped contribute to the validity of the results by protecting the data from being skewed by insignificant variables.

3.7.5 Answering the Research Questions

After each best-fit model was established, the variables Time, Treatment and the interaction of Time and Treatment were added and the statistic was run again. Because it was important to know the impact of the variable DIALOG EXPERIENCE in the final model for the Dialogue Rating, it was also added, even if it was taken out of the best-fit model. In addition, PEER-INTERVIEW EXPERIENCE was also added to the final model for Peer Interview Rating, as was INFO-GAP EXPERIENCE to the final model

for Information-gap Rating. Because multiple repeated ANCOVAs were run, the significance level was adjusted to $\leq$ .01 to help control for Type 1 errors.

Chapter 4 - Results

4.1 Introduction

The main purpose of this study was to determine if teaching students about the principles of Second Language Acquisition (SLA) that support Communicative Language Teaching (CLT) influences their beliefs about the effectiveness of activities typical to CLT and/or their beliefs about language learning in general.

In addition to Treatment and Time, a number of other variables that could potentially influence students' beliefs were also analyzed. This chapter will briefly review these variables. Following this review, the results of the item analysis used to determine the reliability of the instrument will be summarized. Next, the mean scores and standard deviations of each variable will be reported. Then the results of the final statistical analysis for each belief will be reported. Following these results, a summary of the influence of Treatment and Time will be given.

4.2 Review of Variables

This section briefly reviews the variables in this study.

4.2.1 Dependent Variables

The 14 dependent variables consist of three activity ratings and 11 language learning beliefs (LLBs). The three activity ratings (Dialogue Rating, Peer Interview Rating and Information-gap Rating) were calculated as a mean of each group's response to the 15 statements. Ten language learning beliefs (LLB1 - LLB10) were calculated as a mean score of each group's response. The variable LLB11: YEARS TO BECOME FLUENT is a language learning belief that was measured categorically.

4.2.2 Independent Variables

Seven variables that could have influenced students' beliefs were measured: Treatment, Time, and five demographic variables. The demographic variables include Previous Activity Experience, Previous Language Learning Experience, Gender, Native Speaker of English and Attitude Toward Research. For a complete list of the independent variables and their explanations, see Appendix E.

4.3 Reliability of the Instruments

Before any statistics were run on the data itself, an item analysis was conducted using a Cronbach's Alpha. The alpha values ranged from .86 to .95, all above the pre-determined .80 cut-off point (See Table 9). As stated in the previous chapter, the language learning beliefs section was not analyzed because the majority of the questions were adapted from Elaine Horwitz's BALLI, which has already been established as a reliable instrument (Kuntz, 1996).

Table 9

Alpha Values for Reliability of Instrument

	Pre-Course Survey	Pre-Treatment Survey	Post-Treatment Survey
Dialogue Rating	0.86	0.88	0.90
Peer Interview Rating	0.86	0.89	0.90
Information-gap Rating	0.91	0.93	0.95

4.4 Results of the Data Analysis for Each Belief

This section reports the results of the data analysis for each of the 14 beliefs. Table 10 provides the means and standard deviations for the three activities for each group (Control and Experimental) for each time (Pre-course, Pre-Treatment, and Post-Treatment). Table 11 provides the means and standard deviations for the ten LLBs. The

remaining sections present the results of the final statistical analyses for each belief. The final models include Treatment, Time, Time x Treatment and the variables left in the best-fit model. As stated in the previous chapter, it was important to know the impact of the variable DIALOG EXPERIENCE on the Dialogue Rating so it was left in the final model. PEER-INTERVIEW EXPERIENCE was also left in the final model for Peer Interview Rating, as was INFO-GAP EXPERIENCE in the best-fit model for Information-gap Rating. For a complete list of all the p values obtained through the process of elimination and the best-fit models for each belief see Appendix F.

Table 10

Pre-course, Pre-treatment and Post-treatment Means and Standard Deviations for each Activity Rating

	Mean (SD)		
Belief	Pre-Course	Pre-Treatment	Post-Treatment
Dialogue Activity			
Control	4.82 (1.03)	4.67 (1.08)	4.42 (1.09)
Experimental	4.68 (1.13)	4.63 (1.02)	4.53 (0.09)
Peer Interview Rating			
Control	4.57 (1.15)	4.53 (1.25)	4.40 (1.2)
Experimental	4.50 (1.06)	4.32 (1.17)	4.20 (1.1)
Information-gap Rating			
Control	4.43 (1.11)	4.57 (1.0)	4.47 (1.01)
Experimental	4.28 (1.08)	4.29 (1.03)	4.22 (1.01)

Table 11

Pre-course, Pre-treatment and Post-treatment Means and Standard Deviations for each Language Learning Belief

	Mean (SD)		
Belief	Pre-Course	Pre-Treatment	Post-Treatment
LLB1-Place of Vocabulary			
Control	3.63 (1.26)	3.53 (1.48)	3.50 (1.44)
Experimental	3.17 (1.23)	3.28 (1.11)	3.19 (1.28)
LLB2-Importance of Accent			
Control	3.97 (1.03)	4.03 (1.18)	4.06 (1.13)
Experimental	3.94 (1.06)	3.83 (1.18)	3.58 (1.08)
LLB3-Feeling Self-conscious			
Control	3.91 (1.63)	3.56 (1.61)	3.56 (1.61)
Experimental	3.72 (1.48)	3.22 (1.49)	3.42 (1.46)
LLB4-Place of Grammar			
Control	4.06 (1.07)	3.91 (1.15)	3.84 (0.92)
Experimental	3.25 (0.94)	3.61 (1.08)	3.42 (1.13)
LLB5-Risk Taking			
Control	5.25 (0.67)	4.94 (0.67)	4.91 (0.73)
Experimental	5.17 (0.75)	4.58 (0.97)	4.72 (1.06)
LLB6-Place of Translating			
Control	2.38 (1.01)	2.34 (1.04)	2.44 (1.16)
Experimental	1.92 (0.99)	2.19 (1.12)	2.14 (0.99)
LLB7-Need for Exactness			
Control	1.84 (1.08)	1.88 (0.75)	1.81 (0.82)
Experimental	1.89 (0.89)	1.97 (0.88)	1.69 (0.75)
LLB8-Peer vs. Teacher Interaction			
Control	3.56 (1.56)	3.22 (1.58)	3.38 (1.49)
Experimental	3.89 (1.28)	3.78 (1.44)	3.31 (1.31)
LLB9-Language of Instruction			
Control	2.97 (1.51)	4.56 (1.16)	4.56 (1.19)
Experimental	3.19 (1.28)	4.47 (1.23)	4.47 (1.28)
LLB10-Necessity of Speaking			
Control	5.78 (0.91)	5.94 (0.25)	5.69 (0.93)
Experimental	5.81 (0.47)	5.72 (0.57)	5.75 (0.44)

4.4.1 Dialogue Rating

When the variables Time and Treatment were added to the best-fit model for Dialogue Rating, only one variable, NATIVE SPEAKER OF ENGLISH, resulted in a significant p values. Table 12 summarizes the results for the final statistical analysis for Dialogue Rating.

Table 12

Analysis of Covariance for Dialogue Rating

Variable	DF	F Value	P Value
Treatment	1	0.02	0.89
Time	2	4.23	0.06
Treatment x Time	2	0.77	0.46
INFORMAL SETTING- # OF LANGUAGES	1	2.41	0.12
NATIVE SPEAKER OF ENGLISH	1	7.74	0.006
ATTITUDE TOWARD RESEARCH	1	5.01	0.03
FORMAL SETTING- JR HIGH SCHOOL	1	1.74	0.19
DIAGLOGUE EXPERIENCE	2	0.59	0.56

4.4.2 Peer Interview Rating

When the variables Time and Treatment were added to the best-fit model for Peer Interview Rating, only one variable, NATIVE SPEAKER OF ENGLISH, resulted in a significant p values. Table 13 summarizes the results for the final statistical analysis for Peer Interview Rating.

Table 13

Analysis of Covariance for Peer Interview Rating

Variable	DF	F Value	P Value
Treatment	1	0.77	0.43
Time	2	0.80	0.48
Treatment x Time	2	0.29	0.75
FORMAL SETTING- JR HIGH SCHOOL	1	2.11	0.15
FORMAL SETTING- HIGH SCHOOL	1	1.96	0.16
FORMAL SETTING- # OF LANGUAGES	1	5.49	0.02
INFORMAL SETTING- COMMUNITY	1	1.79	0.18
NATIVE SPEAKER OF ENGLISH	1	6.78	0.10
PEER INTERVIEW EXPERIENCE	2	0.40	0.67

4.4.3 Information-gap Rating

When the variables Time and Treatment were added to the best-fit model for Information-gap Rating, only one variable, NATIVE SPEAKER OF ENGLISH, resulted in a significant p values. Table 14 summarizes the results for the final statistical analysis for Information-gap Rating.

Table 14

Analysis of Covariance for Information-gap Rating

Variable	DF	F Value	P Value
Treatment	1	0.63	0.47
Time	2	0.43	0.66
Treatment x Time	2	0.12	0.88
INFORMAL SETTING- MISSION	1	2.99	0.086
NATIVE SPEAKER OF ENGLISH	1	7.17	0.008
ATTITUDE TOWARD RESEARCH	1	3.79	0.05
INFORMATION-GAP EXPERIENCE	2	3.23	0.04

4.4.4 LLB1-Place of Vocabulary

When the variables Time and Treatment were added to the best-fit model for LLB1, four variables resulted in significant p values. Three were connected with previous language learning experience: INFORMAL SETTING- ABROAD, INFORMAL SETTING- MISSION, and FORMAL SETTING- COLLEGE. NATIVE SPEAKER OF ENGLISH also resulted in a significant p value. Table 15 summarizes the results for the final statistical analysis for LLB1-Place of Vocabulary.

Table 15

Analysis of Covariance for LLB1-Place of Vocabulary

Variable	DF	F Value	P Value
Treatment	1	0.45	0.54
Time	2	0.80	0.48
Treatment x Time	2	0.05	0.95
FORMAL SETTING- JR HIGH SCHOOL	1	5.20	0.24
FORMAL SETTING- COLLEGE	1	9.15	0.003
FORMAL SETTING- MTC	1	1.64	0.20
INFORMAL SETTING- HOME	1	1.95	0.16
INFORMAL SETTING- COMMUNITY	1	2.44	0.12
INFORMAL SETTING- ABROAD	1	6.72	0.01
NATIVE SPEAKER OF ENGLISH	1	8.66	0.004

4.4.5 LLB2-Importance of Accent

When the variables Time and Treatment were added to the best-fit model for LLB2, six variables resulted in significant p values. One was connected with previous activity experience: INFORMATION-GAP EXPERIENCE. Four were connected with previous language learning experience: FORMAL SETTING- MTC, INFORMAL SETTING- HOME, INFORMAL SETITNG- COMMUNITY, and INFORMAL

SETTINGABROAD. GENDER also resulted in a significant p value. Table 16 summarizes the results for the final statistical analysis for LLB2-Importance of Accent.

Table 16

Analysis of Covariance for LLB2-Importance of Accent

Variable	DF	F Value	P Value
Treatment	1	0.00	0.99
Time	2	0.17	0.84
Treatment x Time	2	1.59	0.21
DIALOGUE EXPERIENCE	2	3.30	0.04
INFORMATION-GAP EXPERIENCE	2	12.31	<0.0001
FORMAL SETTING- JR HIGH SCHOOL	1	2.07	0.15
FORMAL SETTING- COLLEGE	1	2.36	0.13
FORMAL SETTING- MTC	1	10.03	0.0018
FORMAL SETTING- # OF LANGUAGES	1	1.67	0.20
INFORMAL SETTING- HOME	1	8.21	0.0047
INFORMAL SETTING- COMMUNITY	1	10.24	0.0016
INFORMAL SETTING- ABROAD	1	14.82	0.0002
NATIVE SPEAKER OF ENGLISH	1	2.81	0.96
GENDER	1	6.77	0.01

4.4.6 LLB3-Feeling Self-conscious

When the variables Time and Treatment were added to the best-fit model for LLB3, only one variable resulted in a significant p value. It was connected with Previous Activity Experience: PEER INTERVIEW EXPERIENCE. Table 17 summarizes the results for the final statistical analysis for LLB3.

Table 17

Analysis of Covariance for LLB3-Feeling Self-conscious

Variable	DF	F Value	P Value
Treatment	1	0.36	0.58
Time	2	1.24	0.34
Treatment x Time	2	0.23	0.79
PEER INTERVIEW EXPERIENCE	2	7.81	0.0006
INFORMATION-GAP EXPERIENCE	2	4.32	0.015
FORMAL SETTING- JR HIGH SCHOOL	1	3.40	0.067
FORMAL SETTING- # OF LANGUAGES	1	4.51	0.035
INFORMAL SETTING- HOME	1	2.98	0.087
INFORMAL SETTING- COMMUNITY	1	1.30	0.26
INFORMAL SETTING- ABROAD	1	3.80	0.053
INFORMAL SETTING- MISSION	1	4.92	0.028
INFORMAL SETTING- # OF LANGUAGES	1	3.30	0.071

4.4.7 LLB4-Place of Grammar

When the variables Time and Treatment were added to the best-fit model for LLB4, eight variables resulted in significant p values. One was connected with previous activity experience: PEER INTERVIEW EXPERIENCE. Six were connected with previous language learning experience: FORMAL SETTING- HIGH SCHOOL, FORMAL SETTING- COLLEGE, INFORMAL SETITNG- COMMUNITY, INFORMAL SETTING- MISSION, FORMAL SETTING- # OF LANGUAGES, and INFORMAL SETTING- # OF LANGUAGES. NATIVE SPEAKER OF ENGLISH also resulted in a significant p value. Table 18 summarizes these results.

Table 18

Analysis of Covariance for LLB4- Place of Grammar

Variable	DF	F Value	P Value
Treatment	1	4.11	0.11
Time	2	.39	0.70
Treatment x Time	2	1.52	0.22
DIALOGUE EXPERIENCE	2	1.50	0.23
PEER INTERVIEW EXPERIENCE	2	5.14	0.007
FORMAL SETTING- HIGH SCHOOL	1	7.12	0.0084
FORMAL SETTING- COLLEGE	1	24.64	<.0001
FORMAL SETTING- # OF LANGUAGES	1	8.13	0.0049
INFORMAL SETTING- COMMUNITY	1	7.57	0. 0066
INFORMAL SETTING-MISSION	1	44.23	<.0001
INFORMAL SETTING- # OF LANGUAGES	1	15.69	0.0022
NATIVE SPEAKER OF ENGLISH	1	16046	<0.0001
ATTITUDE TOWARD RESEARCH	1	1.80	0.18

4.4.8 LLB5-Risk Taking

When the variables Time and Treatment were added to the best-fit model for LLB5, only two variables resulted in significant p values. They were both connected with previous language learning experience: INFORMAL SETTING- ABROAD and INFORMAL SETTING- MISSION. Table 19 summarizes the results for this variable.

Table 19

Analysis of Covariance for LLB5-Risk Taking

Variable	DF	F Value	P Value
Treatment	1	0.67	0.46
Time	2	6.36	0.02
Treatment x Time	2	0.47	0.63
DIALOGUE EXPERIENCE	2	3.31	0.04
INFORMATION-GAP EXPERIENCE	2	0.59	0.56
FORMAL SETTING- MTC	1	6.40	0.012
INFORMAL SETTING- HOME	1	6.62	0.011
INFORMAL SETTING- ABROAD	1	12.64	0.0005
INFORMAL SETTING-MISSION	1	31.22	<.0001
NATIVE SPEAKER OF ENGLISH	1	4.75	0.03
GENDER	1	0.46	0.50

4.4.9 LLB6-Place of Translating

When the variables Time and Treatment were added to the best-fit model for LLB6, three variables resulted in significant p values. Two of them were connected with previous language learning experience: INFORMAL SETTING- COLLEGE and INFORMAL SETTING- MISSION. NATIVE SPEAKER OF ENGLISH also resulted in a significant p value. Table 20 summarizes these results.

Table 20

Analysis of Covariance for LLB6-Place of Translating

Variable	DF	F Value	P Value
Treatment	1	.50	.52
Time	2	.46	.65
Treatment x Time	2	.46	.64
DIALOGUE EXPERIENCE	2	1.55	0.22
FORMAL SETTING- COLLEGE	1	12.24	0.0006
INFORMAL SETTING- COMMUNITY	1	2.01	0.16
INFORMAL SETTING- MISSION	1	12.30	0.0006
NATIVE SPEAKER OF ENGLISH	1	7.93	0.0054
ATTITUDE TOWARD RESEARCH	1	.34	.56

4.4.10 LLB7-Need for Exactness

When the variables Time and Treatment were added to the best-fit model for LLB7, three variables resulted in significant p values. One of them was connected with previous activity experience: PEER INTERVIEW EXPERIENCE. One of them was connected with previous language learning experience: INFORMAL SETTING-MISSION and INFORMAL SETTING- MISSION. NATIVE SPEAKER OF ENGLISH also resulted in a significant p value. Table 21 summarizes these results.

Table 21

Analysis of Covariance for LLB7- Need for Exactness

Variable	DF	F Value	P Value
Treatment	1	0.01	0.92
Time	2	0.85	0.46
Treatment x Time	2	0.36	0.70
PEER INTERVIEW EXPERIENCE	2	7.68	0.0006
FORMAL SETTING- MTC	1	6.48	0.012
INFORMAL SETTING- HOME	1	6.63	0.011
INFORMAL SETTING-MISSION	1	24.96	<0.0001
NATIVE SPEAKER OF ENGLISH	1	13.11	0.0004

4.4.11 LLB8-Peer vs. Teacher Interaction

When the variables Time and Treatment were added to the best-fit model for LLB8, four variables resulted in significant p values. Two of them were connected with previous activity experience: DIALOGUE EXPERIENCE and PEER INTERVIEW EXPERIENCE. NATIVE SPEAKER OF ENGLISH and ATTITUDE TOWARD RESEARCH also resulted in significant p values. Table 22 summarizes these results.

Table 22

Analysis of Covariance for LLB8- Peer vs. Teacher Interaction

Variable	DF	F Value	P Value
Treatment	1	.87	0.40
Time	2	1.22	0.34
Treatment x Time	2	1.00	0.37
DIALOGUE EXPERIENCE	2	7.95	0.0005
PEER INTERVIEW EXPERIENCE	2	4.79	0.0094
INFORMATION-GAP EXPERIENCE	2	1.37	0.26
FORMAL SETTING- JR HIGH SCHOOL	1	5.01	0.026
INFORMAL SETTING- HOME	1	6.38	0.013
INFORMAL SETTING- COMMUNITY	1	1.32	0.25
INFORMAL SETTING- # OF LANGUAGES	1	3.02	0.084
GENDER	1	1.88	0.17
NATIVE SPEAKER OF ENGLISH	1	7.36	0.0073
ATTITUDE TOWARD RESEARCH	1	6.76	0.01

4.4.12 LLB9-Language of Instruction

When the variables Time and Treatment were added to the best-fit model for LLB9, two variables resulted in significant p values. Time resulted in a significant p value. The other variable that significantly affected LLB9 was connected with previous language learning experience: INFORMAL SETTING- MISSION. Table 23 summarizes these results.

Table 23

Analysis of Covariance for LLB9-Language of Instruction

Variable	DF	F Value	P Value
Treatment	1	0.16	0.71
Time	2	35.56	0.0001
Treatment x Time	2	0.43	0.65
FORMAL SETTING- MTC	1	4.96	0.027
INFORMAL SETTING- HOME	1	4.37	0.038
INFORMAL SETTING- MISSION	1	17.40	<.0001
NATIVE SPEAKER OF ENGLISH	1	2.13	0.15
GENDER	1	5.13	0.025
ATTITUDE TOWARD RESEARCH	1	4.0	0.047

4.4.13 LLB10-Necessity of Speaking

When the variables Time and Treatment were added to the best-fit model for LLB10, only one variable resulted in a significant p value. It was connected with Previous language learning experience: # OF LANGUAGE- INFORMAL SETTING. Table 24 shows the results for this variable.

Table 24

Analysis of Covariance for LLB10-Necessity of Speaking

Variable	DF	F Value	P Value
Treatment	1	0.02	0.88
Time	2	0.58	0.58
Treatment x Time	2	1.02	0.36
FORMAL SETTING- JR HIGH SCHOOL	1	3.56	0.06
INFORMAL SETTING- HOME	1	1.89	0.17
INFORMAL SETTING- # OF LANGUAGES	1	7.11	0.0084

4.4.14 LLB11-Years to Become Fluent

Table 25 provides the frequencies for LLB11-YEARS TO BECOME FLUENT for each group (Control and Experimental) for each time (Pre-course, Pre-Treatment, and Post-Treatment).

Table 25

Frequencies for LLB11-Years to Become Fluent

Group	Category	Pre-course	Pre-treatment	Post-treatment
Control	1-2 years	14	11	7
	3-5 years	16	19	21
	5-10 years	5	3	3
	Not Possible	1	3	4
Experimental	1-2 years	6	6	7
	3-5 years	18	18	17
	5-10 years	7	7	6
	Not Possible	1	1	1

When the variables Time and Treatment were added to the best-fit model for LLB11, two variables resulted in a significant p value. One was connected with previous activity experience: INFORMATION-GAP EXPERIENCE. NATIVE SPEAKER OF ENGLISH also resulted in a significant p value. Table 26 shows the results for LLB11.

Table 26

Logistical Regression for LLB11-Years to become Fluent

Variable	DF	Chi-Square	P Value
Treatment	1	4.26	0.39
Time	2	0.62	0.73
Treatment x Time	2	1.9	0.38
INFORMATION-GAP EXPERIENCE	2	15.36	0.0005
FORMAL SETTING- HIGH SCHOOL	1	1.65	0.19
FORMAL SETTING- MTC	1	1.71	0.19
FORMAL SETTING- # OF LANGUAGES	1	5.17	0.023
INFORMAL SETTING- ABROAD	1	4.99	0.026
INFORMAL SETTING- # OF LANGUAGES	1	2.53	0.11
GENDER	1	6.25	0.012
NATIVE SPEAKER OF ENGLISH	1	7.42	0.0064

4.5 Summary of the Influence of Treatment and Time

The most important variable that could have influenced students' beliefs was Treatment. The results of the statistical analyses showed that Treatment did not influence students' beliefs about the effectiveness of the activities or their beliefs about language learning. The p values for Treatment are summarized in Table 27. None of them were significant.

Table 27

Summary of P Values for Treatment

Variable	P-Value
DIALOG RATING	0.056
PEER-INTERVIEW RATING	0.43
INFO-GAP RATING	0.047
LLB1: PLACE OF VOCABULARY	0.54
LLB2: IMPORTANCE OF ACCENT	0.99
LLB3: FEELING SELF-CONSCIOUS	0.58
LLB4: PLACE OF GRAMMAR	0.11
LLB5: RISK TAKING	0.46
LLB6: PLACE OF TRANSLATING	0.52
LLB7: NEED FOR EXACTNESS	0.92
LLB8: PEER VS. TEACHER INTERACTION	0.40
LLB9: LANGUAGE OF INTRUCTION	0.71
LLB10: NECESSEITY OF SPEAKING	0.88
LLB11: YEARS TO BECOME FLUENT	0.039

The difference between the scores on the three surveys shows whether students' beliefs change significantly over time. The classroom activity beliefs that were rated did not change significantly over time. The only LLB that changed significantly over time was LLB9, which states, "The instructor should teach the class in German." The mean response for this question on the Pre-course Survey was 4.0 ("Slightly Agree"). For both the Pre-treatment and the Post-treatment, the mean response was 5.4 which falls just about half way between "Agree" and "Strongly Agree." This means that by the end of just the first four weeks of class and before any treatment began, students on average changed this particular belief about language learning in a significant way; they agreed more strongly that the instructor should teach the class in German at the end of four

weeks than at the beginning of the semester. After the initial four week period, the mean score for this belief did not continue change significantly.

4.6 Conclusion

The only variable that significantly affected the activity ratings was NATIVE SPEAKER OF ENGLISH. Many of the variables had a significant effect on many of the language learning beliefs. The overall effect of Treatment was insignificant. The effect of Time was not significant for any beliefs but LLB9-Language of Instruction. The following chapter will discuss some possible interpretations of the results for each of the dependent variables.

Chapter 5 - Discussion of Results

5.1 Introduction

The purpose of this chapter is to the answer the research questions by explaining the results of the statistical analyses, the limitations of these results as well as the limitations of the interpretations offered, and to give suggestions for future research.

When answering these questions, it is important to remember that two sets of beliefs were examined, namely:

A) Beliefs about the effectiveness of communicative classroom activities (called classroom activity ratings)

B) Beliefs about language learning in general (called LLBs).

The first set of beliefs consisted of three classroom activity ratings: Dialog Rating, Peer Interview Rating and Information-gap Rating. The second set of beliefs consisted of eleven LLBs.

5.2 Answers to the Research Questions

5.2.1 Main Research Question

The main purpose of this study is to answer the following question: Does instruction about the principles of SLA that support CLT affect students' beliefs about the effectiveness of communicative classroom activities and/or their beliefs about language learning in general?

The answer to this question is no, the experimental treatment did not have a significant effect on any of the beliefs. Possible reasons and explanations for why this is are discussed in section 5.5.

5.2.2 Research Sub-question

In addition to the main research question, this study also examined the following related sub-question: Do time, previous activity experience, previous language learning experience, gender, native speaker of English, or attitude toward research affect students' beliefs?

The first sets of beliefs, the beliefs about classroom activities, were not significantly affected by time, previous activity experience, previous language learning experience, gender, or attitude toward research. They were, however, affected by native speaker of English. The second set of beliefs, beliefs about language learning in general, were affected by different variables, depending on the belief. Section 5.3 discusses the effects of the variables that significantly affected each belief.

5.3 Explanation of Results for each Belief

This section will discuss the results by examining the 14 beliefs and the independent variables that have significantly affected them. Because this study did not ask students to explain any of their answers, the explanations offered here are hypotheses which will require further research for validation. The questions that arise from this discussion will be presented in section 5.5, "Suggestions for Future Research."

A number of the demographic variables that were measured had unequal distribution among the groups. For example, of the 68 subjects who participated in this study, 66 indicated that they learned another language while in Jr. High School while only two indicated that they had not. Two subjects do not constitute a valid representation of a group. In this section, the following variables cannot be interpreted reliably, even if they were significant: FORMAL SETTING- JR HIGH SCHOOL, FORMAL SETTING-

OF LANGUAGES, INFORMAL SETTING- HOME, INFORMAL SETTING- MISSION, INFORMAL SETTING- # OF LANGUAGES, and NATIVE SPEAKER OF ENGLISH.

5.3.1 The Three Classroom Activity Ratings

Only one variable, NATIVE SPEAKER OF ENGLISH, had a significant effect on the activity ratings. As stated above, this variable cannot be interpreted reliably.

5.3.2 LLB1-Place of Vocabulary

LLB1 states, “Learning German is mostly a matter of learning a lot of new vocabulary.” The students’ responses to this statement were significantly influenced by three variables: FORMAL SETTING- COLLEGE and INFORMAL SETTING- ABROAD, and INFORMAL SETTING- MISSION. All of these variables influenced students’ beliefs in the same direction: students who had learned a language abroad, while serving a mission, and in college all disagreed more strongly with LLB1 than those who had not. Each of these language settings is fairly demanding; students are all placed into the speaking environment as adults (or at least young adults) and the demand to communicate in the new environment is usually immediate. It is possible that because of this sudden demand to communicate in the target language, students may feel a strong sense of necessity to learn grammar rather than vocabulary words, so that they can at least come up with the bare necessities. On the other hand, without this sudden demand, students who have learned a language in the community or at home, for example, may have learned the grammar more gradually, perhaps as a bilingual child. This may be a reason why students who learn a language in a more natural environment tend to focus more on learning new vocabulary words, while those who have to immediately use the

language they are learning in a new and fairly demanding environment tend to focus less on the individual words.

5.3.3 LLB2-Importance of Accent

LLB2 states, “It is important to speak with an excellent accent.” The students’ responses to this statement were significantly influenced by six variables: INFORMATION-GAP EXPERIENCE, FORMAL SETTING- MTC, INFORMAL SETTING- HOME, INFORMAL SETTING- COMMUNITY, INFORMAL SETTING-ABROAD and GENDER. The direction of these influences is varied.

Experience with Information-gap activities had a very clear influence on LLB2: the more experience students had with this type of activity, the stronger they believe it is important to speak with an excellent accent. It is possible that the demand for understanding during communication that is created by these activities may be the reason for this influence. If a student’s partner cannot understand what he or she is saying, then the information needed to complete the task cannot be obtained and the task therefore, cannot be completed. Accent and pronunciation in general is an obvious aspect of language communication that may easily be “blamed” for the inability to understand one another. If a person’s accent is so bad that he or she cannot be understood, the accuracy of grammar or vocabulary usage, for example, becomes obsolete.

It is not necessarily a bad thing that experience with Information-gap activities is correlated with the belief that it is important to speak with an excellent accent. Although it is possible that a high score on LLB2-IMPORTANCE OF ACCENT could indicate a detrimental language learning belief, it is important to notice two things. First, very few students in any of the groups chose “strongly agree” for LLB2. A review of the means for

each group (see Table 28) shows that on average, the students in all three groups answered somewhere between “slightly disagree” and “slightly agree.” Few students answered in the extreme ends of “strongly disagree” or “strongly agree”, which may indicate an overall healthy, realistic understanding of the importance of accent.

Table 28

Means Responses for Information-gap Experience and LLB2

Information-gap Experience	Mean
Never	3.4
Seldom	4.1
Often	4.4

Second, the tendency to agree that it is important to speak with an excellent accent seems to be correlated with a low sense of self consciousness when speaking in front of other people. The results for LLB3, which states, “I feel self conscious when speaking in front of other people,” indicate that INFO-GAP EXPERIENCE had a strong impact on this belief, even if not statistically significant; the p value was .015. Of the students who had no previous background experience with Information-gap activities, 43% answered either a 5 or 6; they strongly agree or agree that they feel self conscious when speaking in front of other people. For those who had seldom experience, 19% answered with 5 or 6. Of those who had frequent experience, only 9% answered 5 or 6. It seems then, that although INFO-GAP EXPERIENCE is influencing the belief that it is important to speak with an excellent accent, this does not mean that this belief is causing students to feel more self conscious. In fact, the opposite seems to be true; students with more experience with Information-gap activities tend to feel less self conscious than those with little or no experience (see section 5.3.4).

The belief that it is important to speak with an excellent accent was also influenced by INFORMAL SETTING- COMMUNITY and INFORMAL SETTING-ABROAD. Students who had learned a language in the community or while abroad believed it is less important to speak with an excellent accent than those who had not. Most students have at least some apprehension toward speaking with natives. It is likely, however, that students who learned a language abroad or in the community participated in successful communication with native speakers and consequently feel less apprehensive about speaking with them. The more successful communication students experience with native speakers, the less apprehensive they are likely to be. Successful communication can give a valuable perspective on one's beliefs and expectations. Students who learned a language in any of the formal language settings, on the other hand, may not have had the opportunity to experience successful communication with native speakers. As a result, they may not have the perspective necessary to realistically evaluate the importance of an excellent accent, and consequently overrate it.

The students' belief about the importance of speaking with an excellent accent was also significantly influenced by GENDER. Over all, men feel it is more important to speak with an excellent accent than women do. This is very interesting; however, without further investigation into the reasons why the students responded they way they did, it is impossible to explain these results.

5.3.4 LLB3-Feeling Self-conscious

LLB3 states, "I feel self conscious when speaking German in front of other people." The students' responses to this statement were significantly influenced by their previous background experience with Peer Interview Activities. Overall, the more

experience students had with Peer Interview activities, the less self conscious they feel when speaking in front of other people. As with Information-gap activities, the more experience students had interacting with one another and practicing free speech with one another, the less self conscious they feel doing it. It seems safe to say from this that the more students practice speaking, the less intimidating it becomes.

5.3.5 LLB4-Place of Grammar

LLB4 states, “Learning German is mostly a matter of learning grammar” was significantly influenced by students’ previous background experience with Peer Interview activities. Students who had seldom experience with Peer Interview activities more strongly agreed that learning German was mostly a matter of learning grammar, while those with either no or frequent experience with Peer Interview activities disagreed more strongly. It may be that the complexity of the variables and other unnoticed (individual) factors make the differences in results insignificant; however, no plausible interpretation of these results can be given at this point.

FORMAL SETTING- HIGH SCHOOL, FORMAL SETTING-COLLEGE, and INFORMAL SETTING- COMMUNITY also had a significant influence on LLB4-PLACE OF GRAMMAR. Those students who learned a language in college and high school agreed more strongly that learning German is mostly a matter of learning grammar than those who had not. The opposite is true for students who learned a language in the community; they disagreed more strongly that learning German is mostly a matter of learning grammar than those who did not learn a language in the community. This may correlate with the focus on grammar that is common in formal settings such as

high school and college and the lack of focus on grammar that occurs in informal settings such as among friends and neighbors in a community.

5.3.6 LLB5-Risk Taking

LLB5 states, “It is OK to guess when speaking German if you do not know a word.” INFORMAL SETTING- ABROAD had a significant influence on this belief. Although those who had learned a language while abroad agreed more strongly with LLB5 than those who had not, overall, regardless of whether or not students had learned a language while abroad, students who participated in the experiment believe that it is OK to guess when speaking German if they do not know a word. For this reason, the practical significance of the influence of INFORMAL SETTING- ABROAD and INFORMAL SETTING- MISSION on LLB5 is minimal.

5.3.7 LLB6-Place of Translating

LLB6 states, “Learning German is mostly a matter of translating from English.” The students’ responses to this statement were significantly influenced by FORMAL SETTING- COLLEGE. Again, as with LLB5, students who had learned a language in college also disagree more strongly than those who did not. Because the overwhelming majority of all students who participated in the experiment disagree with this statement, the practical significance of the influence of FORMAL SETTING- COLLEGE on LLB6 is minimal.

5.3.8 LLB7-Need for Exactness

LLB7 states, “You should not say anything in German until you can say it correctly.” This belief was significantly affected by the previous experience with Peer

Interview Activities. Students with seldom experience with Peer Interview activities agreed more strongly with LLB7, while those with no or frequent experience more strongly disagreed. However, an overwhelming majority of students from all groups reported that they disagree with LLB7. For this reason, the practical influence of PEER-INTERVIEW EXPERIENCE is minimal.

5.3.9 LLB8-Peer vs. Teacher Interaction

LLB8 states, “Speaking with my peers does not improve my German as much as speaking with my teacher or a native speaker does.” The responses to this statement were significantly influenced by students’ previous background experiences with Dialog activities and Peer Interview activities. Overall, the more experience the students had with these activities, the more strongly they agreed that speaking with their peers is less helpful than speaking with their teacher or a native speaker. Dialog activities are a simple listening activity where students are given a written copy of a dialog between two native Germans that has a number of the words or phrases substituted with blank lines. Students listen to the dialog and fill in the blanks with what they hear. It is possible that students really enjoy these activities and they feel that they benefit from the authentic input. If so, they may be transferring this appreciation to the general belief that native speech is more beneficial than non-native speech. Another possibility is that students who hear native speech in the dialog activities are made acutely aware of the differences between their neighbor’s speech and what they are hearing on the recording. If they notice a large difference, which they probably will, it could be that they think this difference is reason to believe peer interaction is not helpful, or perhaps even detrimental. Another possibility is that students who have had frequent experience with Peer Interview activities, and

therefore frequent experience with peer interaction, do not feel that the interactions are helpful. As mentioned earlier, the inherent design of Peer Interview activities, unlike Information-gap activities, do not necessarily require students to understand one another. Perhaps this is causing students to interact with one another without fully understanding each other. If so, it might explain why students would not believe the interactions are helpful.

Another variable that influenced LLB8 was ATTITUDE TOWARD RESEARCH. Students with negative attitudes believe more strongly than students with positive attitudes that speaking with their peers does not improve their German as much as speaking with their teacher or a native speaker does. It stands to reason that students who do not value classroom based research, students who felt that this experiment was of little value, or students who felt that the researcher conducted her research ineffectively (which are the three basic aspects of the construct of "attitude" used in this research) would also agree that speaking with their peers is less effective than speaking with their teacher or a native. First, students who have a bad attitude as measured by the questions in the survey are likely to also have a bad attitude all around, which may cause them to dislike and/or devalue classroom participation. Second, if students saw little value in this project, they may also consider treatment lessons of little value. In addition, an entire lesson was devoted specifically to teaching students about the value of peer interaction and it is possible that students who devalued this research also disagreed with it. This is further support for the need to create research designs that are enjoyable for the students; a bad attitude toward the research or the researcher can influence students' responses to the research and possibly skew the data.

5.3.10 LLB9-Language of Instruction

LLB9 states, “The instructor should teach the class in German.” The students’ responses to this statement were significantly influenced by Time. Overall, the majority of all students who participated in the experiment agree that the instructor should teach the class in German. However, during the first week of the semester the average answer for this question was 4.0; after the first three weeks of instruction the students’ mean response jumped up to 5.5 and remained at 5.5 for the rest of the semester. Students therefore agreed more strongly that the instructor should teach the class in German at the end of three weeks than at the beginning of the semester. This could be due to a number of reasons. Perhaps if their previous language teachers did not teach the class in German and their teachers during this experiment did, the contrast may have helped them see the benefits. Some teachers in the first-year program at BYU are very strict about teaching the class in German and students may have recognized the benefits regardless of their background experience with language learning. A few of the teachers in the program, however, struggle to teach the class in German. It is possible that the students in their classes may have been disappointed with this. Another factor may also be that teachers in the program have some basic training in CLT through a prerequisite course on teaching methods, and as a result, may be explicitly telling their students what they have learned. Whatever the reason, students’ opinions about LLB9: LANGUAGE OF INSTRUCTION changed significantly after the first three weeks of the semester, and did not change again after that. A more thorough investigation that is beyond the scope of this thesis would provide more insight about why this might be.

5.3.11 LLB10-Necessity of Speaking

LLB10 states, “In order to become fluent in German it is necessary to practice speaking.” Only one variable, INFORMAL SETTING- # OF LANGUAGES, had a significant effect on the activity ratings. As stated in the introduction to this section, because of unequal distribution, this variable cannot be interpreted reliably.

5.3.12 LLB11-Years to Become Fluent

LLB11 asks students, “If someone spent 1 hour a day learning German, how long would it take him or her to become fluent?” The possible responses are 1-2 years, 3-5 years, 5-10 years, and “It is not possible to learn a language in 1 hour a day.” The responses to this question were significantly influenced by students’ previous background experience with Information-gap activities. In general, if a student had any experience (seldom or often) with Information-gap activities, he or she believed it would take longer to become fluent than those with no experience with these activities, who are generally more likely to believe a person can become fluent in a shorter amount of time. In order to better understand why this might be, a quick review of what the activity is like will be helpful.

Information-gap activities involve guided student-to-student interaction. A task is assigned to a pair of students, usually filling out some sort of chart. Each student is given a set of information that is missing from the other students’ set. In order to complete the task, students must ask each other questions to find the missing information. In contrast to the Peer Interview activities, which also involve student-to-student interaction, the exchange has a definite purpose: to complete the task. In Peer Interview activities the questions given to students provide a spring board for students to have an open-ended,

“free speech” conversation with one another. Although Peer Interview activities involve interaction, they do not necessarily require students to understand each other. One student may not understand what his or her partner has said, but nothing is depending on it; the task is simply to talk with one another, not necessarily to understand one another in the process. Information-gap activities, on the other hand, are driven by the need to complete a task which cannot be done without students asking for each other’s information, thus requiring students to understand each other. These activities are therefore designed not only to create an opportunity for genuine exchange of information among students, but a need for negotiation of meaning as well: understanding one another’s speech is paramount to the activities.

It is arguable that many classroom activities do not require students to truly understand the meaning of the language they are using. It is possible that this exchange of information and need for understanding one another’s speech that Information-gap activities provide helps students become aware and understand more realistically that communicating in German is a complicated process that involves much more than memorizing charts and grammar rules. Students who have no exposure to Information-gap activities, on the other hand, may not be exposed to situations where they truly have to communicate in the target language, and therefore may not have a realistic understanding of what it takes to be able to communicate.

5.4 Limitations

Because of various limitations to this study, many of the results were not significant or could not be interpreted reliably. This section explains these limitations.

5.4.1 No Pilot Study

The largest limitation of the research is the lack of a pilot study. Although a preliminary test was conducted with four graduate students, no official pilot study was conducted in an environment similar to the actual environment of the study, nor with subjects comparable to those who would be in the actual study. Consequently, many of the ineffective aspects of the research design and the instrument went undetected.

5.4.2 Broadly Defined Variables

The purpose of examining the influence of the demographic variables was to see, in fairly broad terms, what other possible background influences may play a role in students' responses to the surveys. Because these variables were not the main focus of this research, many of them were not defined narrowly enough to be able to interpret their exact meanings. For example, INFORMAL SETTING- ABROAD identifies students who learned a language while living abroad. It does not, however, clarify whether those students were foreign exchange students during high school, study abroad students during college, or perhaps living with their parents on a military base. The differences in the more narrow definitions of INFORMAL SETTING- ABROAD, or any of the other demographic variables, may have influenced the data in ways that is impossible to detect with the current research design.

5.4.3 Unequal Distribution

Because the demographic variables are not possible to control, it happened that many of them ended up with extremely unequal response distributions. INFORMAL SETTING- HOME, INFORMAL SETTING- COMMUNITY, INFORMAL SETTING- ABROAD, INFORMAL SETTING- MISSION, FORMAL SETTING- JR HIGH

SCHOOL, FORMAL SETTING- HIGH SCHOOL, MTC, NATIVE SPEAKER OF ENGLISH, INFORMAL SETTING- # OF LANGUAGES, FORMAL SETTING- # OF LANGUAGES, and ATTITUDE TOWARD RESEARCH all had groups with anywhere from one to nine subjects in them. Anytime there are too few subjects and unequal distribution among groups, the statistical significance of the variable is seriously questionable. Although many of the variables have been found to be significant with evidence of practical significance as well, in general, the significance of any of the above mentioned variables must be examined and interpreted with caution.

5.4.4 No Qualitative Data Collected

Because the main purpose of this study was not to examine the "why" behind students' beliefs, but rather to determine if the treatment influences those beliefs, the instrument did not ask students to explain their answers. This made it difficult to interpret many of them. For example, GENDER had a significant influence on how strongly students feel it is important to speak with an excellent accent. This is very interesting, but impossible to interpret. Without asking the students why they do or do not think it is important to speak with an excellent accent, it is impossible to determine this from the data collected. However interesting the effects of some of the demographic variables, it was often impossible to explain them because more data would be needed to do so.

5.4.5 Not all Final Exam Grades Obtained

At the end of the semester the researcher tried to gather the students' grades on the standardized final exam. She was unable to obtain all of these, and therefore could not correlate any of the variables with achievement scores.

5.5 Reasons for an Insignificant Treatment

This section explains the possible reasons why the treatment did not have a significant effect on any of the variables.

5.5.1 No Pilot Study

It has already been explained in 5.4.1 that no pilot study was conducted before the main research. It bears repeating, however, that this is the main cause Treatment results were not significant. Had a pilot study been conducted, the following ineffective aspects of the experiment might have been detected and changes would have been made accordingly.

5.5.2 Length of Surveys

One ineffective aspect of the experiment was the length of the surveys. During the preliminary testing, the Pre-treatment Survey was administered to four graduate students from four different disciplines. Three of them completed the survey within 10-15 minutes, while one of them required 25 minutes. In order to reduce the average length of time required to complete the survey, which originally had four activities to be rated by the students, the survey was reduced to three activities. In addition, some of the original background questions were eliminated and some of the wording of the instructions and the original 16 statements was simplified. Given the original length of time required by the four graduate students to complete the survey, it was expected that the reduction in length along with the simplifications in wording would be sufficient to assume that most students in the 101 classes would be able to complete the survey within ten minutes.

When the actual study was conducted, a number of students needed 20 minutes to complete the surveys; a few even needed 25 minutes to complete each survey. This may

be because the graduate students, although unfamiliar with the themes and questions of the survey, likely had exposure to and maybe even personal experience with primary research. Most of the students in the German 101 classes at BYU, on the other hand, are freshmen who have likely had very little exposure to primary research and probably never participated as a research subject before. Whatever the reason is that the students who participated in the experiment needed more time than the graduate students did, it was more time than they expected to have to give. This unanticipated length of time may have been the source of some frustration on the part of the students. Everyone involved was told that each survey should not take more than ten minutes, and when the experiment began taking more time than planned, students began to become frustrated. This frustration is understandable; students enroll in language courses and expect spend time learning that language during the 50 minute class periods. When a quarter or more of that class period is taken by a research project that the students are not personally invested in, one begins to feel “cheated”, so to speak. The length of the surveys may have also contributed to students’ frustrations because it used class time that would normally have been used for learning German, yet the students’ were still expected to learn the same amount of material that they would if there were no experiment. This increased the students’ requirements for outside learning, which also could have contributed to the students’ frustration.

Clear evidence of this frustration comes from a small section at the end of The Post-treatment Survey which allowed students to freely write any comments that they wished to express. Some example comments are: “I didn’t really see a point to the whole thing. It took away from time we could have used to study German. Surveys were long

and redundant"; and "I thought the discussions were interesting and I enjoyed listening to them, but I felt they distracted from the German lessons. In German class I want to learn German. I'm not completely sure of the purpose of the discussions of language learning exactly." These comments provide valuable insight to the negative effects of a lengthy survey that takes away from class time.

This frustration may have contributed to the non-significance impact of Treatment. This is because students who felt frustrated may have paid much less attention to the treatment lessons than they would had they not felt frustrated. It is natural that this frustration would breed apathy toward the treatment. Why would they care about or pay attention to something that they felt was not only not benefiting them, but hurting them. Had a pilot study been conducted, the feedback from the students might have given reason to re-structure the surveys as well as the research design in order to reduce the time required to participate.

5.5.3 Repetition of 16 Rating Statements

In addition to the length of the surveys, another ineffective aspect of the instrument was that students were often confused by it. The repetition of the 16 statements for the activity ratings along with the minor differences in wording and the eight positive forms and eight negative forms were both confusing and tedious for the students. Evidence of this again comes from the open-ended comments section at the end of The Post-treatment Survey. Some example comments that indicate this are: "The questions repeated themselves in different ways. There were too many of the same questions repeated in different ways. The questions were confusing with NOT in front of them. You should put all the NOTs in one section instead of mixing them up";

“Sometimes the questions were a little ambiguous or confusing”; and “The surveys involved a great deal of tedium.” These comments show another source of frustration from the students. Again, if confused by the surveys, it is likely that they were also frustrated by them. Naturally, frustrated and confused students are less likely to pay attention to the treatment. They are also likely to care less about the accuracy and honesty of their answers. All of this may have contributed to the non-significance impact of Treatment. Again, had a pilot study been conducted, this feedback would have provided the insight necessary to make the instrument less confusing and tedious.

5.5.4 Presentation of Treatment Lessons

In addition to the instrument, there were also aspects of the presentation of the treatment that may have been ineffective. First, the lessons were not conducted by the individual teachers. This may have caused a sort of disconnect between the students’ personal beliefs and the lessons that were intended to influence them. This is because the lessons were totally separate from what the classes’ normal, everyday activities and expectations were. Not only were they separate from the everyday activities and learning, some students felt it disrupted their class and took away from their time to learn German, as evidenced by the comments about the surveys being too long. This disconnect may have caused the students to take the surveys less seriously than their normal assignments. In addition, the unfamiliarity of the researcher (i.e. someone who they had never met before and will probably never see again) may have caused some of the students to take the treatment lessons less seriously and be apathetic to the experiment in general.

If the teachers had been trained to conduct the treatment lessons themselves, on the other hand, then the lessons could have been spaced out perhaps once a week instead

of two or three times a week, which might have made them feel less disruptive because the students would expect them as a weekly part of the regular curriculum. They might also have felt less disruptive because they would have come from someone the students were familiar with rather than an outsider. This regular integration of the lessons, along with the familiarity of the teacher may be a reason for some students to take the lessons and the surveys more seriously.

In addition to who conducted the lessons, how the lessons were conducted may, at least in part, have been ineffective. As one student commented, “Sometimes the long sections of information at the beginning of research were slightly boring and not everyone paid attention. Maybe find a better way to present info.” This comment is very insightful. Some students may have been simply unfamiliar with the topic and had had no previous exposure to discussing language acquisition and consequently felt alienated and bored. Those who actively participated in the discussions seemed to be able to navigate the conversation with such linguistic terms as “language input”, “phoneme”, and “inflection.” Terms like these are simple enough for those who are familiar with them, but for a student who has never before heard of anything like them, they may have been confusing. If students were confused by the language used to conduct the discussions, they may have decided early on to “shut off” their listening and not pay attention. Especially if they felt unable to participate in the conversation, even if initially interested, they may have stopped paying attention and therefore became bored with the lessons overall. If the students were bored with the lessons for any of these reasons, they probably did not listen carefully to the concepts that were taught, which would cause the treatment to be ineffective.

It may have been better to introduce the lessons with a hands-on activity which helps students become familiar with the terms used to discuss the lesson. Participating in such an activity would help students be capable of participating in the lessons, which in turn would given them a reason to invest their attention. If students are willing to invest their attention in the lessons, and they are comfortable and able to participate in the discussions, they will probably be less likely to notice that the activity or the lesson is taking away from their time learning German. Also, when students willingly invest their time and interest, they are more likely to take the concepts and principles taught through the activity or lesson seriously. They are more likely to seriously think about how the lessons may apply to them personally.

This lack of personal investment, which may have been caused by any number of the factors that have been discussed above, may have been a reason that students in this experiment who received the treatment did not take the lessons seriously or did not pay attention to them enough for them to be influential.

Lastly, without any teacher training or involvement, it is possible that the principles of acquisition that were discussed on one lesson may not have been mentioned again until the next treatment lesson. If there was no further discussion of the lessons, it may have been difficult for students to connect the principles of the lessons with their personal experience learning the language. It may be necessary for the teacher to revisit the lesson multiple times throughout the semester, perhaps whenever the class does one of the activities whose design is based on any of the principles taught. As part of the treatment, teachers could conduct short question-answer sessions that introduce the activities as a sort of verbal quiz that would remind students why the activities are

helpful, and what language acquisition principles support their design. It may be the lack of these kinds of reminders that caused students to be unable to make the proper connection between the treatment lessons and their personal experiences necessary for the treatment to have a significant influence on their beliefs.

5.5.5 Measurement of the Influence of Treatment

One reason the treatment was insignificant may have been that the statements used to measure the students' beliefs did not accurately measure the influence that could have been taking place. This is because there was a large disconnect between the principles taught in the treatment lessons and the topics of the statements used to rate the activities or the statements used to measure the language learning beliefs. For example, there were 16 statements that made up the activity ratings. The basic topics of these statements can be summarized as the following: understanding sentence structure, learning vocabulary, improving speaking skills, improving writing skills, learning grammar, improving pronunciation, and speaking. The basic topics of the language learning beliefs can be summarized as the following: length of time to become fluent, importance of vocabulary, feeling self-conscious, the importance of an excellent accent, the importance of grammar, risk taking, translating, exactness, peer vs. teacher interaction, language of instruction, and the importance of speaking. The seven treatments, however, address the following principles: the more we communicate the better we communicate; input is necessary; grammar is learned in many ways including through input and through peer interaction; there is an order of acquisition; errors can be signs of progress; feedback is most effective after mistakes naturally occur; anxiety interferes with language learning; and lowering the "affective filter" facilitates language

learning. When the topics of the statements used to measure the activity ratings and the language learning beliefs were listed and compared side by side with the principles taught in the treatment lessons, it became apparent that although there is overlap, many of topics of the statements are not addressed in the principles of the treatment lessons. From the activity ratings, for example, writing, learning culturally appropriate language, improving pronunciation, and learning vocabulary are not addressed in the treatment. From the language learning beliefs, length of time to become fluent, importance of vocabulary, importance of an excellent accent, and translating are not addressed in the treatment lessons.

Without a close correlation between the treatment and the instrument used to measure its influence, it is possible that the treatment influenced students' perceptions and beliefs, but in a way that was not measured. If more attention had been paid to choosing statements that better represent the principles taught in the treatment lessons, the results would have been a more accurate representation of whatever influence the treatments may have had.

5.6 Suggestions for Future Research

As discussed above, there were a number of limitations to this study, as well as reasons why the treatment was not significant. This section gives suggestions for future research that might enable researchers to shed more light on the important questions in this study that were unable to be answered.

5.6.1 Instrument and Treatment

As the above section explained, many aspects in the treatment and instruments were ineffectively designed. In order to answer the main research question, a new study

that implements changes to improve the instrument and treatment will have to be conducted. Using a smaller amount of statements for the activity ratings that are all written in a positive form, perhaps only eight to ten instead of 16, will shorten the amount of time needed to complete the survey and will reduce the amount of tedium involved. If possible, a design that does not confound treatment and teacher will be helpful so that the effect of teacher can more accurately be examined. It would also be more effective to train the teachers to administer the treatments themselves. This will allow teachers to conduct the treatments as part of the regular class curriculum which would be less disruptive and disconnected than it was in this study. It will also help students take the treatment lessons both more seriously and more personally because the treatment lessons will be coming from someone they know and frequently interact with as opposed to someone that they have almost no interaction or involvement with. As part of the treatment, it would be helpful to include student-centered activities that enable students to talk about the principles of language acquisition that may be new or confusing to them. Frequent reviews of the principles that precede the classroom activities would also help students remember what they learned and make the connection between the theoretical principle and the practical experience of their personal language learning. In addition to these changes, the principles taught in the treatment need to be closely correlated with the statements used to measure the students' perceptions of the activities and their language learning beliefs. After these changes have been made, a new pilot study would be helpful so that any additional unforeseen problems that may arise with the new design can be evaluated and changed, and the reliability of the new instrument can again be tested.

5.6.2 Demographic Variables

Aside from the suggestions for a new research design that would more accurately and effectively answer the research question, many other new questions have arisen from this study that could not be answered without future research. Many of these questions involve the demographic variables. In order to discover more information about the influences of these variables, they must be more narrowly defined. First, NATIVE SPEAKER OF ENGLISH only distinguished between native and nonnative speakers of English. It would be interesting to know if the specific native languages other than English have an influence. Second, FORMAL SETTING- # OF LANGUAGES and INFORMAL SETTING- # OF LANGUAGES only counted the amount of languages; they did not distinguish between which specific languages the students learned. Again, it would be interesting to examine the influence of learning specific languages, not just the number of languages learned. Third, as discussed in section 5.3.2, INFORMAL SETTING- ABROAD did not distinguish between what kind of environment or purpose the students who learned a language abroad may have been in. It would be interesting to know, for example, if learning a language during a college study abroad program has a different influence than learning a language while living abroad on a military base. Fourth, a clear distinction was not made between the variables INFORMAL SETTING-MISSION and MTC, yet these two variables were found significant at different times. In order to understand why, they would have to be more narrowly defined as those who only learned a language in the MTC, those who learned one in the MTC and while serving a mission, and those who never went to the MTC, yet learned a language while serving a mission. Without this distinction, these two variables were unintentionally confounded in

this study. It would be interesting, though, to examine more closely the difference between them.

5.6.3 Sample Size

As discussed earlier, many of the demographic variables had an insufficient number of responses in each group. In order to conduct a valid examination of the influences of these variables, a larger sample size would have to be used.

5.6.4 Qualitative Data

Why students believe the things they do is a very interesting research subject. In order to answer these questions, however, students would need to be given the opportunity to explain their responses. This qualitative aspect of the research would provide a more well rounded and balanced perspective of the quantitative results.

5.6.5 Specific Questions for Future Research to Examine

Why were the activity ratings not influenced by any of the demographic variables?

Why does experience with Information-gap activities correlate with believing that it takes longer to become fluent? Is this a positive or negative thing?

Why do men believe it is more important to speak with an excellent accent than woman do?

Why would a minimal amount of experience with Peer Interview activities correlate with a stronger belief that learning German is mostly a matter of learning grammar? Does this mean that teachers should avoid certain types of activities if they cannot be practiced frequently?

Experience with Dialog and Peer Interview activities had a negative influence on the value students placed on peer interaction. Can this be ameliorated without compromising the benefits of these activities?

Overall, the informal settings that students learned a language in had positive influences on many of the language learning beliefs. What aspects of these informal settings can be incorporated into the classroom setting in order to give students the same benefits?

Previous experience with Peer Interview and Information-gap activities was correlated with lower feelings of self consciousness. Do other activities help students feel more comfortable speaking in front of others? What specific aspects of these activities can be incorporated into other classroom activities?

5.7 Conclusion

Even though the treatment in this experiment was not significant, the research question is important and merits further examination. Many valuable insights were gained through this study, including ways to improve the instrument and the treatment in order to accurately and effectively answer the main research question. In addition to this insight, this experiment discovered a number of influential variables that also merit further examination.

References

Carroll, J. B. (1981). Twenty-five years of research on foreign language aptitude. In K. Diller, (Ed.), *Individual Differences and Universals in Language Learning Aptitude* (pp. 83-118). Massachusetts: Newbury House.

Carroll, J. B., & Sapon, M. (1959). Modem language aptitude test: MLAT. New York: Psychological Corporation.

Cronbach, L. J., & Meehl. P. E. (1955). Construct validity in psychological tests. *Psychological Bulletin,* 52, 281-302.

Csizér, K., & Dörnyei, Z. (2005). The internal structure of language learning motivation and its relationship with language choice and learning effort. *The Modern Language Journal, 89*, 19-36.

Crookes, G., & Schmidt, R. W. (1991). Motivation: Reopening the research. *Language Learning, 41*, 469-512.

Curran, C. A. (1976). *Counseling-learning in second language*. Illinois: Apple River Press.

Dörnyei, Z. (1994). Motivation and motivating in the foreign language classroom. *The Modern Language Journal, 78*, 273-284.

Dörnyei, Z., & Skehan, P. (2003). Individual differences in second language learning. In C. Doughty & M. Long (Eds.), *The Handbook of Second Language Acquisition* (pp. 589-630). Massachusetts: Blackwell Publishers.

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

Gardner, R. C. (1985) *Social psychology and second language learning: The role of*

attitudes and motivation. Baltimore, MD.: E. Arnold.

Gardner, R. C., & Lambert W. E. (1972). *Attitudes and motivation in second-language learning.* Massachusetts: Newbury House.

Gardner, R. C., Smythe, P. C., & Clement, R. (1974). Attitudes and motivation test battery (rev. ed.). London, Ontario: University of Western Ontario.

Gardner, R. C., Tremblay, P. F. & Masgoret, A. (1997). Towards a full model of second language learning: An empirical investigation. *The Modern Language Journal, 81*, 344-362.

Garrett, P., & Shortall, T. (2002). Learners' evaluations of teacher-fronted and student-centered classroom activities. *Language Teaching Research, 6*, 25-57.

Gattegno, C. (1972). *Teaching foreign languages in schools the silent way*. 2nd ed. New York: Educational Solutions, Inc.

Green, J. (1993). Students' attitudes toward communicative activities: Do enjoyment and effectiveness go together? *The Modern Language Journal, 77*, 1-10.

Heckhausen, H. (1991). *Motivation and action*. New York: Springer.

Horwitz, E. (1988). The beliefs about language learning of beginning university foreign language students. *The Modern Language Journal, 72*, 283-294.

Krashen, S. (1980). The input hypothesis. In J. E. Alatis, (Ed.) *Current issues in bilingual education: Georgetown University round table on languages and linguistics* (pp. 168-80). Washington: Georgretown University Press.

Krashen, S., & Terell, T. (1983). *The natural approach.* New York: Pergamon Press.

Kuhl, J., & Beckmann, J. (Eds.). (1994) *Volition and aersonality: Action versus state orientation*. Seattle, WA: Hogrefe and Huber.

Kuhlemeir, H., Bergh, H., & Melse, L. (1996). Attitudes and achievements in the first year German language instruction in Dutch secondary education. *The Modern Language Journal, 80*, 494-508.

Kuntz, P. S. (1996). *Beliefs about language learning: The Horwitz model*. Madison, WI: University of Wisconsin-Madison. (Eric Document Reproduction Service No. D397649).

Larsen-Freeman, D. (1986). *Techniques and Principles in Language Teaching.* New York: Oxford University Press.

Lozanov, G. (1988). *The foreign language teacher's suggestopedic manual*. New York: Gordon and Breach Science Publishers.

Mantle-Bromley, C. (1995). Positive attitudes and realistic beliefs: Links to proficiency. *The Modern Language Journal, 79*, 372-386.

Mori, Y., Sato, K., & Shimizu, H. (2007). Japanese language students' perceptions on kanji learning and their relationship to novel kanji word learning ability. *Language Learning 57*, 57–85.

O'Donell, K. (2003). Uncovering first year students' language learning experiences, attitudes, and motivations in a context of change at the tertiary level of education. *JALT Journal, 25*, 52-56.

Ostrander, S., & Schroeder, L. (1970). *Psychic discoveries behind the iron curtain*. New Jersy: Pretence-Hall, Inc.

Oxford, R. & Shearin, J. (1994). Language learning motivation: Expanding the theoretical framework. *The Modern Language Journal, 78*, 12-28.

Park, G. (1995). Language learning strategies and beliefs about language learning of

university students learning English in Korea (Doctoral dissertation, University of Texas at Austin, 1995).

Phillips, E. M. (1991). Anxiety and oral competence: Classroom dilemma. *The French Review, 65,* 1-14.

Pimsleur, P., Mosberg, L., & Morrison, A. L. (1962). Student factors in foreign language. *The Modern Language Journal, 46,* 160-170.

Savignon, S. (1984). Introduction. In S. Savignon & M. Berns (Eds.), *Initiatives in communicative language teaching: A book of readings.* Massachusetts: Addison-Wesley Publishing Company, Inc.

Schulz, R. A. (2001). Cultural differences in students and teacher perceptions concerning the role of grammar instruction and corrective feedback: USA-Columbia. *The Modern Language Journal, 85,* 244-285.

Smith, A. N. (1971). The importance of attitude in foreign language learning. *The Modern Language Journal, 55,* 82-88.

Terrell, T. (1977). A natural approach to second language acquisition and learning. *The Modern Language Journal, 61,* 325-337.

Terrell, T., Tschirner, T., & Nikolai, B. (2004). *Kontakte: A communicative approach (5th ed.).* New York: McGraw Hill Higher Education.

Truitt, S. (1995). Beliefs about language learning: a study of Korean university students learning English. *Texas Papers in Foreign Language Education, 2,* 1-16.

Tremblay, P. F. & Gardner, R. C. (1995). Expanding the motivation construct in language learning. *The Modern Language Journal, 79,* 505-518.

Tse, L. (2000). Student perceptions of foreign language study: A qualitative analysis of

foreign language autobiographies. *The Modern Language Journal*, *84*, 69-84.

VanPatten, B. (1998). Perceptions of and perspectives on the term "communicative". *Hispania*, *81*, 925-932.

VanPatten, B. (2002) Communicative classrooms, processing instruction, and pedagogical norms. In *Pedagogical norms for second and foreign language learning and teaching.* Philadelphia: John Benjamin Publishing Company.

Young, D. J. (1991). Creating a low-anxiety classroom Environment: What does language anxiety research suggest? *The Modern Language Journal*, *75*, 426-439.

Williams, M., Burden, R. & Lanvers, U. (2002). French is the language of love and stuff: Student perceptions of issues related to motivation in learning a foreign language. *British Educational Research Journal, 28*, 503-528.

Appendix A - Complete Pre-course Survey

BYU Students' Perceptions of
German 101 Classroom Activities: Survey A

Purpose:
The purpose of this study is to identify students' perceptions of typical classroom activities in the German 101 level courses at BYU. This is the first in a series of three surveys that will be administered throughout Fall Semester 2005. All German 101 section students will have the opportunity to participate.

- **Thoughtful and honest answers are important.**
- **No answers are "right" or "wrong".**
- **Your participation is voluntary.**
- **There will be no penalty for not participating in this survey.**

Time Required:
Thank you for your valuable time and insights! This survey describes three types of classroom activities and asks participants to respond to 16 statements for each activity. It is expected that participants will complete this survey within 10 minutes.

Informed Consent:
There are minimal risks to your participation in this study. After you complete this survey it will be assigned a unique identification number and your name will then be removed from the survey.

- **You must be 18 years of age or older to participate in this study.**
- **Your name will not be used during or after the research.**
- **Any personal information you provide will remain confidential and known only to the researcher.**
- **Your answers will be used only for the purposes of this study.**
- **If you have questions regarding this study you may contact Camille Bakker (801) 373-4755**
- **If you have questions regarding your rights as a participant in research projects, you may contact Dr. Renea Beckstrand, Chair of the Institutional Review Board for Human Subjects, 422 SWKT, Brigham Young University, Provo, UT 84602; phone, (801) 422-3873; email, renea_beckstrand@byu.edu.**

Name (please print) **Signature** **Date**

We appreciate your participation!
We value your opinions!
Your responses will help make a difference!

<u>Section 1</u>: Background Information.
Please answer the following questions by marking a check in all the appropriate boxes that best fit your answers. N/A stands for Not Applicable.

1a). Before taking this class, have you ever studied a foreign language in a formal setting?
☐ No ☐ Yes, in high school ☐ Yes, in college ☐ Yes, in the MTC

☐ Yes, Other (please specify) _____

1b). If yes, which languages?
☐ N/A ☐ Spanish/Portuguese ☐ German ☐ French ☐ Chinese/Japanese

☐ Other (please specify) _____

2) Have you ever learned another language in an informal setting?
☐ No ☐ Yes, at home ☐ Yes, among friends and neighbors in the community

☐ Yes, while I was abroad ☐ Yes, while I served an LDS mission

☐ Yes, Other (please specify) _____

3). Is English your native language?
☐ Yes ☐ No

4a). Do you speak any languages other than English?
☐ Yes ☐ No

4b). If yes, which languages?
☐ N/A ☐ Spanish/Portuguese ☐ German ☐ French ☐ Chinese/Japanese

☐ Other (please specify) _____

5). Are you 18 years of age or older?
☐ Yes ☐ No

6). What is your gender?
☐ Male ☐ Female

<u>Section 2:</u> The following paragraphs describe 4 activities commonly found in *Kontakte: A Communicative Approach,* the text book used for all sections of German 101 at BYU. An example of each type of activity is then given (in Italics) to show what this activity might look like. The examples are in English to ensure understanding. Please carefully read each example in order to accurately answer the questions that follow.

Example 1: "Dialogue"

In Dialogue activities, students are given a written dialogue where two or more speakers are having an "everyday" conversation. Most often the speakers in the dialogue are students participating in situations and activities that are typical to student life. One goal of Dialogue activities is to help students learn set phrases and sentence patterns that are useful in these situations and activities. Another goal is to allow for very focused listening comprehension. Throughout the dialogue, various words are left blank and students are supposed to fill in these blanks with the words they hear. Students work individually in Dialogue activities while the teacher plays the dialogue for the whole class to hear at the same time. Students usually listen to the dialogue 2-3 times before checking the answers.

Example 1: Dialogue activity *<u>The First Day of Class</u>*
The underlined words in parenthesis would not appear in the students' written dialogue; they would be left blank. Students would hear the entire dialogue and fill in the blanks.

On the first day of class, Melanie is speaking with another student.
Melanie: Hi! Are you <u>(new)</u> here?
James: <u>(Yeah)</u>. You too?
Melanie: Yeah. So, <u>(What's your name)</u>?
James: James. And yours?
Melanie: <u>(I'm)</u> Melanie.
James: <u>(Nice to meet you)</u>.
Melanie: Nice to meet you, too.

Rating 1: Dialogue Activities

1a) Please answer the following question by marking a check in the box next to the answer that most appropriately describes your experience.
Have you ever participated in an activity that fits this description in a foreign language course other than the one you are currently enrolled in?

- ☐ Does not apply. German 101, Fall 2005 at BYU is my first foreign language course.
- ☐ Seldom. The foreign language course I took used Dialogue activities once or twice.
- ☐ Often. The foreign language course I took used Dialogue activities.
- ☐ Never. The foreign language course I took did not use Dialogue activities.

1b) Below is a list of statements. Please place a check in the box that most appropriately describes your personal opinion about the value of Dialogue activities taught in German 101 courses.

Dialogue activities taught in German 101 will. . .	Strongly Agree	Agree	Slightly Agree	Slightly Disagree	Disagree
… help me understand the structure of the language.					
… NOT help me create correct sentences.					
… NOT help me learn new words.					
… help me learn culturally appropriate language.					
… help me pronounce words correctly.					
… NOT help me improve my listening skills.					
… help me understand how sentences are formed.					
... increase my vocabulary.					
… NOT help me improve my speaking skills.					
… NOT help me communicate appropriately.					
… NOT improve my writing skills.					
… help me understand when spoken to.					
… NOT improve my pronunciation.					
… help me write appropriately.					
… help me speak appropriately in the foreign language.					
… NOT help me learn grammar.					

Example 2: "Peer Interview"

Peer Interview activities are usually done in pairs. Students are given a list of questions that center on a theme or common topic that has already been covered in class. The answers to the questions are not written down anywhere, so they will vary from student to student. Each partner asks and answers all of the questions and takes notes of their partner's answers so that they can be reported to the class when the activity is finished. The goal of Peer Interviews is to allow students to practice "free speech", or speech that is not memorized or scripted. It should feel like a conversation.

Example 2: Peer Interview *School Schedule*

1. What classes are you taking this semester? Which ones do you like? Which ones don't you like?
2. What time does your first class begin on Monday? Which class is it? What time do you go home on Mondays?
3. What time does your first class begin on Tuesday? Which class is it? What time do you go home on Tuesdays?

Rating 2: Peer Interview Activities

1a) Please answer the following question by marking a check in the box next to the answer that most appropriately describes your experience.
Have you ever participated in an activity that fits this description in a foreign language course other than the one you are currently enrolled in?

- ☐ Does not apply. German 101, Fall 2005 at BYU is my first foreign language course.
- ☐ Seldom. The foreign language course I took used Dialogue activities once or twice.
- ☐ Often. The foreign language course I took used Dialogue activities.
- ☐ Never. The foreign language course I took did not use Dialogue activities.

1b) Below is a list of statements. Please place a check in the box that most appropriately describes your personal opinion about the value of Dialogue activities taught in German 101 courses.

Peer Interview activities taught in German 101 will. . .	Strongly Agree	Agree	Slightly Agree	Slightly Disagree	Disagree
… help me understand the structure of the language.					
… NOT help me learn grammar.					
… NOT help me learn new words.					
... increase my vocabulary.					
… help me pronounce words correctly.					
… NOT improve my pronunciation.					
… help me understand how sentences are formed.					
… NOT help me create correct sentences.					
… NOT help me improve my speaking skills.					
… NOT help me communicate appropriately.					
… NOT improve my writing skills.					
… help me write appropriately.					
… NOT help me improve my listening skills.					
… help me understand when spoken to.					
… help me speak appropriately in the foreign language.					
… help me learn culturally appropriate language.					

Example 3: "Information-Gap"

Information-Gap activities are usually done in pairs. Student A is given certain information that Student B does not have, and Student B is given information that Student A does not have. In order to complete the activity, both students must exchange whatever information that they have with their partner. Although there are many types of Information-Gap activities, the most common type found in *Kontakte* involves filling out a chart, as in the example below. The goal of Information-Gap activities is to create a genuine exchange of information among students. The entire task is supposed to be completed in the foreign language.

Example 3: Information-Gap activity *What Do They Do When…?*

model: Student A: What does Rachel do when she is sad?
Student B: She calls a friend.
Student B: What does Jason do when he is hungry?
Student A: He eats at McDonald's.

		Student A's Information		*Student B's Information*	
		Rachel	*Jason*	*Rachel*	*Jason*
1.	*is sad*		*watches a movie*	*calls a friend*	
2.	*is tired*	*takes a nap*			*drinks coffee*
3.	*is sick*	*sees a doctor*			*stays home*
4.	*is hungry*		*eats at McDonald's*	*cooks dinner*	

Rating 3: Information-gap Activities

1a) Please answer the following question by marking a check in the box next to the answer that most appropriately describes your experience.
Have you ever participated in an activity that fits this description in a foreign language course other than the one you are currently enrolled in?

☐ Does not apply. German 101, Fall 2005 at BYU is my first foreign language course.

☐ Seldom. The foreign language course I took used Dialogue activities once or twice.

☐ Often. The foreign language course I took used Dialogue activities.

☐ Never. The foreign language course I took did not use Dialogue activities.

1b) Below is a list of statements. Please place a check in the box that most appropriately describes your personal opinion about the value of Dialogue activities taught in German 101 courses.

Information-gap activities taught in German 101 will. . .	Strongly Agree	Agree	Slightly Agree	Slightly Disagree	Disagree
… help me understand the structure of the language.					
… NOT help me learn grammar.					
… NOT help me learn new words.					
... increase my vocabulary.					
… help me pronounce words correctly.					
… NOT improve my pronunciation.					
… help me understand how sentences are formed.					
… NOT help me create correct sentences.					
… NOT help me improve my speaking skills.					
… NOT help me communicate appropriately.					
… NOT improve my writing skills.					
… help me write appropriately.					
… NOT help me improve my listening skills.					
… help me understand when spoken to.					
… help me speak appropriately in the foreign language.					
… help me learn culturally appropriate language.					

<u>Section 3:</u> Language Learning.
Please answer the following question by marking a check in the box next to the answer that most appropriately describes your personal opinion about language learning.
If someone spent 1 hour a day learning German, how long would it take him or her to become fluent?

- ☐ 1-2 years
- ☐ 3-5 years
- ☐ 5-10 years
- ☐ It is not possible to learn a language in 1 hour a day.

Below is a list of statements. Please place a check in the box that most appropriately describes your personal opinion about language learning.

	Strongly Agree	Agree	Slightly Agree	Slightly Disagree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
1. Learning German is mostly a matter of learning a lot of new vocabulary words.						
2. It is important to speak with an excellent accent.						
3. I feel self-conscious speaking German in front of other people.						
4. Learning German is mostly a matter of learning grammar.						
5. If you are uncertain about how to say something, it is OK to take risks and just try it.						
6. Learning German is mostly a matter of translating from English.						
7. You should not say anything in German until you can say it correctly.						
8. Speaking with my peers does not improve my German as much as speaking with my teacher or a native speaker does.						
9. The instructor should teach the entire class in German, including grammar explanations.						
10. In order to become fluent in German it is necessary to practice speaking.						

Appendix B - Complete Pre-treatment Survey

BYU Students' Perceptions of German 101 Classroom Activities: Survey B

Purpose:
The purpose of this survey is to track possible change in students' perceptions of classroom activities.

- **Your honest and thoughtful opinions are important.**
- **The examples in this survey are in German and refer directly to the activities you have been participating in your German 101 class.**
- **Please answer the questions in this survey according to your personal experiences with these activities.**
- **It is OK if you feel differently about an activity now then when you took Survey A.**
- **Page numbers from your text book, *Kontakte*, are given for each example as a reference. Feel free to look at the activities in your textbook.**

Time Required:
Thank you for your valuable time and insights! It is expected that participants will complete this survey within 10 minutes.

Reminder:

- **You must be 18 years of age or older to participate in this study.**
- **Your name will not be used during or after the research.**
- **Any personal information you provide will remain confidential and known only to the researcher.**
- **Your answers will be used only for the purposes of this study**.
- **If you have any questions regarding this study you may contact Camille Bakker (801) 373-4755**

We appreciate your participation!

We value your opinions!

Your responses will help make a difference!

_____
Name

_____
Date

Section 1:
Please answer the following question by marking a check in the appropriate box that best fits your answer.

1. Please estimate the grade that you anticipate earning on the German 101 Final for this semester (Fall 2005).

☐ A ☐ A- ☐ B+ ☐ B- ☐ C+ ☐ C ☐ C- ☐ D or lower

Section 2: The following paragraphs describe 3 activities commonly found in *Kontakte: A Communicative Approach*, the text book used for all sections of German 101 at BYU. An example of each type of activity is then given, this time in German, with page numbers that correspond with your text book. Please carefully read each example in order to accurately answer the questions that follow.

Example 1: "Dialogue"

In Dialogue activities, students are given a written dialogue where two or more speakers are having an "everyday" conversation. Most often the speakers in the dialogue are students participating in situations and activities that are typical to student life. One goal of Dialogue activities is to help students learn set phrases and sentence patterns that are useful in these situations and activities. Another goal is to allow for very focused listening comprehension. Throughout the dialogue, various words are left blank and students are supposed to fill in these blanks with the words they hear. Students work individually in Dialogue activities while the teacher plays the dialogue for the whole class to hear at the same time. Students usually listen to the dialogue 2-3 times before checking the answers.

Example 1: Dialogue activity
Text book reference: page 12, Situation 9

Jürgen Baumann spricht mit einer Studentin.
Jürgen: Hallo, bist du (neu) hier?
Melanie: (Ja). Du auch?
Jürgen: Ja. Sag mal, (wie heisst) du?
Melanie: Melanie. Und (du)?
Jürgen: Jürgen.

Additional references: page 34, Situation 8; page 35, Situation 10; page 54, Situation 5

Rating 1: Dialogue Activities

1a) Please answer the following question by marking a check in the box next to the answer that most appropriately describes your experience.
Have you ever participated in an activity that fits this description in a foreign language course other than the one you are currently enrolled in?

- ☐ Does not apply. German 101, Fall 2005 at BYU is my first foreign language course.
- ☐ Seldom. The foreign language course I took used Dialogue activities once or twice.
- ☐ Often. The foreign language course I took used Dialogue activities.
- ☐ Never. The foreign language course I took did not use Dialogue activities.

1b) Below is a list of statements. Please place a check in the box that most appropriately describes your personal opinion about the value of Dialogue activities taught in German 101 courses.

Dialogue activities taught in German 101 will. . .	Strongly Agree	Agree	Slightly Agree	Slightly Disagree	Disagree
… help me understand the structure of the language.					
… NOT help me create correct sentences.					
… NOT help me learn new words.					
… help me learn culturally appropriate language.					
… help me pronounce words correctly.					
… NOT help me improve my listening skills.					
… help me understand how sentences are formed.					
... increase my vocabulary.					
… NOT help me improve my speaking skills.					
… NOT help me communicate appropriately.					
… NOT improve my writing skills.					
… help me understand when spoken to.					
… NOT improve my pronunciation.					
… help me write appropriately.					
… help me speak appropriately in the foreign language.					
… NOT help me learn grammar.					

Example 2: "Peer Interview"

Peer Interview activities are usually done in pairs. Students are given a list of questions that center on a theme or common topic that has already been covered in class. The answers to the questions are not written down anywhere, so they will vary from student to student. Each partner asks and answers all of the questions and takes notes of their partner's answers so that they can be reported to the class when the activity is finished. The goal of Peer Interviews is to allow students to practice "free speech", or speech that is not memorized or scripted. It should feel like a conversation.

Example 2: Peer Interview activity *Familie*
Text book reference: page 31, Situation 6

1. Wie heisst dein Vater/Stiefvater? Wie alt ist er? Wo wohnt er?
2. Wie heisst deine Mutter/Stiefmutter? Wie alt ist sie? Wo wohnt sie?
3. Hast du Geschwister? Wie viele? Wie heissen sie? Wie alt sind sie? Wo wohnen sie?

Additional References: page 7, Situation 4; page 52, Situation 3

Rating 2: Peer Interview Activities

1a) Please answer the following question by marking a check in the box next to the answer that most appropriately describes your experience.
Have you ever participated in an activity that fits this description in a foreign language course other than the one you are currently enrolled in?

- ☐ Does not apply. German 101, Fall 2005 at BYU is my first foreign language course.
- ☐ Seldom. The foreign language course I took used Dialogue activities once or twice.
- ☐ Often. The foreign language course I took used Dialogue activities.
- ☐ Never. The foreign language course I took did not use Dialogue activities.

1b) Below is a list of statements. Please place a check in the box that most appropriately describes your personal opinion about the value of Dialogue activities taught in German 101 courses.

Peer Interview activities taught in German 101 will. . .	Strongly Agree	Agree	Slightly Agree	Slightly Disagree	Disagree
… help me understand the structure of the language.					
… help me learn culturally appropriate language.					
… NOT help me learn new words.					
… NOT help me improve my listening skills.					
… help me pronounce words correctly.					
… NOT help me communicate appropriately.					
… NOT improve my writing skills.					
… NOT help me create correct sentences.					
… NOT help me improve my speaking skills.					
… NOT improve my pronunciation.					
... increase my vocabulary.					
… help me write appropriately.					
… help me understand how sentences are formed.					
… help me understand when spoken to.					
… help me speak appropriately in the foreign language.					
… NOT help me learn grammar.					

Example 3: "Information-Gap"

Information-Gap activities are usually done in pairs. Student A is given certain information that Student B does not have, and Student B is given information that Student A does not have. In order to complete the activity, both students must exchange whatever information that they have with their partner. Although there are many types of Information-Gap activities, the most common type found in *Kontakte* involves filling out a chart, as in the example below. The goal of Information-Gap activities is to create a genuine exchange of information among students. The entire task is supposed to be completed in the foreign language.

Example 3: Information-Gap activity Was machen sie, wenn…
Text book reference: page 124, Situation 13

model: Student A: Was macht Renate, wenn sie müde ist?
Student B: Sie trinkt Kaffee.
Student B: Was macht Ernst, wenn er trauig ist?
Student A: Er weint.

		Student A's Information		*Student B's Information*	
		Ranate	*Ernst*	*Ranate*	*Ernst*
1.	*trauig ist*	*ruft eine Freundin an*			*weint*
2.	*müde ist*		*schläft*	*trinkt Kaffee*	
3.	*krank ist*		*isst Suppe*	*geht zum Arzt*	
4.	*hunger hat*	*isst ein Apfel*			*schreit "Hunger!"*

Additional references: page 15, Situation 12; page 31, Situation 7; page 34, Situation 9

Rating 3: Information-gap Activities

1a) Please answer the following question by marking a check in the box next to the answer that most appropriately describes your experience.
Have you ever participated in an activity that fits this description in a foreign language course other than the one you are currently enrolled in?

- ☐ Does not apply. German 101, Fall 2005 at BYU is my first foreign language course.
- ☐ Seldom. The foreign language course I took used Dialogue activities once or twice.
- ☐ Often. The foreign language course I took used Dialogue activities.
- ☐ Never. The foreign language course I took did not use Dialogue activities.

1b) Below is a list of statements. Please place a check in the box that most appropriately describes your personal opinion about the value of Dialogue activities taught in German 101 courses.

Information-gap activities taught in German 101 will. . .	Strongly Agree	Agree	Slightly Agree	Slightly Disagree	Disagree
… NOT help me learn new words.					
… NOT help me learn grammar.					
… help me speak appropriately in the foreign language.					
... increase my vocabulary.					
… help me pronounce words correctly.					
… help me understand the structure of the language.					
… help me understand when spoken to.					
… NOT help me create correct sentences.					
… NOT help me improve my speaking skills.					
… help me understand how sentences are formed.					
… NOT improve my writing skills.					
… help me learn culturally appropriate language.					
… NOT help me improve my listening skills.					
… NOT improve my pronunciation.					
… NOT help me communicate appropriately.					
… help me write appropriately.					

<u>Section 3:</u> Language Learning.
Please answer the following question by marking a check in the box next to the answer that most appropriately describes your personal opinion about language learning.
If someone spent 1 hour a day learning German, how long would it take him or her to become fluent?

- ☐ 1-2 years
- ☐ 3-5 years
- ☐ 5-10 years
- ☐ It is not possible to learn a language in 1 hour a day.

Below is a list of statements. Please place a check in the box that most appropriately describes your personal opinion about language learning.

	Strongly Agree	Agree	Slightly Agree	Slightly Disagree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
1. Learning German is mostly a matter of learning a lot of new vocabulary words.						
2. It is important to speak with an excellent accent.						
3. I feel self-conscious speaking German in front of other people.						
4. Learning German is mostly a matter of learning grammar.						
5. If you are uncertain about how to say something, it is OK to take risks and just try it.						
6. Learning German is mostly a matter of translating from English.						
7. You should not say anything in German until you can say it correctly.						
8. Speaking with my peers does not improve my German as much as speaking with my teacher or a native speaker does.						
9. The instructor should teach the entire class in German, including grammar explanations.						
10. In order to become fluent in German it is necessary to practice speaking.						

Appendix C - Complete Post-treatment Survey

BYU Students' Perceptions of German 101 Classroom Activities: Survey C

Purpose:
The purpose of this survey is to track possible change in students' perceptions of classroom activities.

- **Your honest and thoughtful opinions are important.**
- **It is OK if you feel differently about an activity now than when you took Surveys A and B.**
- **Please answer the questions in this survey according to your personal opinion.**
- **The examples and questions in this survey are similar to those in Survey B, but they are ordered differently. Please read carefully!**

Time Required:
Thank you for your valuable time and insights! It is expected that participants will complete this survey within 10 minutes.

Reminder:

- **You must be 18 years of age or older to participate in this study.**
- **Your name will not be used during or after the research.**
- **Any personal information you provide will remain confidential and known only to the researcher.**
- **Your answers will be used only for the purposes of this study**.
- **If you have any questions regarding this study you may contact Camille Bakker (801) 373-4755**

We appreciate your participation!

We value your opinions!

Your responses will help make a difference!

_____
Name

_____
Date

<u>Section 1:</u> Language Learning.
Please answer the following question by marking a check in the box next to the answer that most appropriately describes your personal opinion about language learning.
If someone spent 1 hour a day learning German, how long would it take him or her to become fluent?

- ☐ 1-2 years
- ☐ 3-5 years
- ☐ 5-10 years
- ☐ It is not possible to learn a language in 1 hour a day.

Below is a list of statements. Please place a check in the box that most appropriately describes your personal opinion about language learning.

	Strongly Agree	Agree	Slightly Agree	Slightly Disagree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
1. Learning German is mostly a matter of learning a lot of new vocabulary words.						
2. It is important to speak with an excellent accent.						
3. I feel self-conscious speaking German in front of other people.						
4. Learning German is mostly a matter of learning grammar.						
5. If you are uncertain about how to say something, it is OK to take risks and just try it.						
6. Learning German is mostly a matter of translating from English.						
7. You should not say anything in German until you can say it correctly.						
8. Speaking with my peers does not improve my German as much as speaking with my teacher or a native speaker does.						
9. The instructor should teach the entire class in German, including grammar explanations.						
10. In order to become fluent in German it is necessary to practice speaking.						

<u>Section 2:</u> The following paragraphs describe 3 activities commonly found in *Kontakte: A Communicative Approach*, the text book used for all sections of German 101 at BYU. An example of each type of activity is then given, this time in German, with page numbers that correspond with your text book. Please carefully read each example in order to accurately answer the questions that follow.

Example 1: "Dialogue"

In Dialogue activities, students are given a written dialogue where two or more speakers are having an "everyday" conversation. Most often the speakers in the dialogue are students participating in situations and activities that are typical to student life. One goal of Dialogue activities is to help students learn set phrases and sentence patterns that are useful in these situations and activities. Another goal is to allow for very focused listening comprehension. Throughout the dialogue, various words are left blank and students are supposed to fill in these blanks with the words they hear. Students work individually in Dialogue activities while the teacher plays the dialogue for the whole class to hear at the same time. Students usually listen to the dialogue 2-3 times before checking the answers.

Example 1: Dialogue activity
Text book reference: page 12, Situation 9

Jürgen Baumann spricht mit einer Studentin.
Jürgen: Hallo, bist du (<u>neu</u>) hier?
Melanie: (<u>Ja</u>). Du auch?
Jürgen: Ja. Sag mal, (<u>wie heisst</u>) du?
Melanie: Melanie. Und (<u>du</u>)?
Jürgen: Jürgen.

Additional references: page 34, Situation 8; page 35, Situation 10; page 54, Situation 5

Rating 1: Dialogue Activities

1a) Please answer the following question by marking a check in the box next to the answer that most appropriately describes your experience.
Have you ever participated in an activity that fits this description in a foreign language course other than the one you are currently enrolled in?

- ☐ Does not apply. German 101, Fall 2005 at BYU is my first foreign language course.
- ☐ Seldom. The foreign language course I took used Dialogue activities once or twice.
- ☐ Often. The foreign language course I took used Dialogue activities.
- ☐ Never. The foreign language course I took did not use Dialogue activities.

1b) Below is a list of statements. Please place a check in the box that most appropriately describes your personal opinion about the value of Dialogue activities taught in German 101 courses.

Dialogue activities taught in German 101 will. . .	Strongly Agree	Agree	Slightly Agree	Slightly Disagree	Disagree
… help me understand the structure of the language.					
… NOT help me create correct sentences.					
… NOT help me learn new words.					
… help me learn culturally appropriate language.					
… help me pronounce words correctly.					
… NOT help me improve my listening skills.					
… help me understand how sentences are formed.					
... increase my vocabulary.					
… NOT help me improve my speaking skills.					
… NOT help me communicate appropriately.					
… NOT improve my writing skills.					
… help me understand when spoken to.					
… NOT improve my pronunciation.					
… help me write appropriately.					
… help me speak appropriately in the foreign language.					
… NOT help me learn grammar.					

Example 2: "Peer Interview"

Peer Interview activities are usually done in pairs. Students are given a list of questions that center on a theme or common topic that has already been covered in class. The answers to the questions are not written down anywhere, so they will vary from student to student. Each partner asks and answers all of the questions and takes notes of their partner's answers so that they can be reported to the class when the activity is finished. The goal of Peer Interviews is to allow students to practice "free speech", or speech that is not memorized or scripted. It should feel like a conversation.

Example 2: Peer Interview activity *Familie*
Text book reference: page 31, Situation 6

1. Wie heisst dein Vater/Stiefvater? Wie alt ist er? Wo wohnt er?
2. Wie heisst deine Mutter/Stiefmutter? Wie alt ist sie? Wo wohnt sie?
3. Hast du Geschwister? Wie viele? Wie heissen sie? Wie alt sind sie? Wo wohnen sie?

Additional References: page 7, Situation 4; page 52, Situation 3

1a) Please answer the following question by marking a check in the box next to the answer that most appropriately describes your experience.
Have you ever participated in an activity that fits this description in a foreign language course other than the one you are currently enrolled in?

- ☐ Does not apply. German 101, Fall 2005 at BYU is my first foreign language course.
- ☐ Seldom. The foreign language course I took used Dialogue activities once or twice.
- ☐ Often. The foreign language course I took used Dialogue activities.
- ☐ Never. The foreign language course I took did not use Dialogue activities.

1b) Below is a list of statements. Please place a check in the box that most appropriately describes your personal opinion about the value of Dialogue activities taught in German 101 courses.

Peer Interview activities taught in German 101 will. . .	Strongly Agree	Agree	Slightly Agree	Slightly Disagree	Disagree
… help me understand the structure of the language.					
… help me learn culturally appropriate language.					
… NOT help me learn new words.					
… NOT help me improve my listening skills.					
… help me pronounce words correctly.					
… NOT help me communicate appropriately.					
… NOT improve my writing skills.					
… NOT help me create correct sentences.					
… NOT help me improve my speaking skills.					
… NOT improve my pronunciation.					
... increase my vocabulary.					
… help me write appropriately.					
… help me understand how sentences are formed.					
… help me understand when spoken to.					
… help me speak appropriately in the foreign language.					
… NOT help me learn grammar.					

Example 3: "Information-Gap"

Information-Gap activities are usually done in pairs. Student A is given certain information that Student B does not have, and Student B is given information that Student A does not have. In order to complete the activity, both students must exchange whatever information that they have with their partner. Although there are many types of Information-Gap activities, the most common type found in *Kontakte* involves filling out a chart, as in the example below. The goal of Information-Gap activities is to create a genuine exchange of information among students. The entire task is supposed to be completed in the foreign language.

Example 3: Information-Gap activity Was machen sie, wenn…
Text book reference: page 124, Situation 13

model: Student A: Was macht Renate, wenn sie müde ist?
Student B: Sie trinkt Kaffee.
Student B: Was macht Ernst, wenn er trauig ist?
Student A: Er weint.

		Student A's Information		*Student B's Information*	
		Ranate	*Ernst*	*Ranate*	*Ernst*
1.	*trauig ist*	*ruft eine Freundin an*			*weint*
2.	*müde ist*		*schläft*	*trinkt Kaffee*	
3.	*krank ist*		*isst Suppe*	*geht zum Arzt*	
4.	*hunger hat*	*isst ein Apfel*			*schreit "Hunger!"*

Additional references: page 15, Situation 12; page 31, Situation 7; page 34, Situation 9

Rating 3: Information-gap Activities

1a) Please answer the following question by marking a check in the box next to the answer that most appropriately describes your experience.
Have you ever participated in an activity that fits this description in a foreign language course other than the one you are currently enrolled in?

- ☐ Does not apply. German 101, Fall 2005 at BYU is my first foreign language course.
- ☐ Seldom. The foreign language course I took used Dialogue activities once or twice.
- ☐ Often. The foreign language course I took used Dialogue activities.
- ☐ Never. The foreign language course I took did not use Dialogue activities.

1b) Below is a list of statements. Please place a check in the box that most appropriately describes your personal opinion about the value of Dialogue activities taught in German 101 courses.

Information-gap activities taught in German 101 will. . .	Strongly Agree	Agree	Slightly Agree	Slightly Disagree	Disagree
… NOT help me learn new words.					
… NOT help me learn grammar.					
… help me speak appropriately in the foreign language.					
... increase my vocabulary.					
… help me pronounce words correctly.					
… help me understand the structure of the language.					
… help me understand when spoken to.					
… NOT help me create correct sentences.					
… NOT help me improve my speaking skills.					
… help me understand how sentences are formed.					
… NOT improve my writing skills.					
… help me learn culturally appropriate language.					
… NOT help me improve my listening skills.					
… NOT improve my pronunciation.					
… NOT help me communicate appropriately.					
… help me write appropriately.					

Section 3:
Please answer the following questions by marking a check in the appropriate box that best fits your answer.

1. Please estimate the grade that you anticipate earning on the German 101 Final for this semester (Fall 2005).

☐ A ☐ A- ☐ B+ ☐ B- ☐ C+ ☐ C ☐ C- ☐ D or lower

2a. Do you plan on enrolling in German 102?

☐ Yes ☐ No

2b. Why or why not?

_____

Section 4: Feedback.
Please answer the following three questions by placing a check in the box that most appropriately describes your personal opinion.

	Great Value	Some Value	Little Value	No Value
1. In your opinion, what is the overall value of classroom-based research projects?				
2. In your opinion, what is the overall value of ***this*** research project?				

	Very Effectively	Effectively	Ineffectively	Very Ineffectively
3. From your experience as a participant in this study, how well did the researcher conduct her research?				

Please feel free to write any additional comments.

_____
_____
_____
_____
_____
_____
_____

Appendix D - Treatment Lessons

Treatment 1: Why do we focus on communication?

- Prior to the 70s the predominate method (ALM) focused on drills, accuracy and memorizing dialogues. Teachers and researchers wanted students who could actually talk and not just repeat like robots.
- Sandra Savingon's 1972 experiment showed that students who practiced "free speech" and unscripted conversations performed just as well as the ALM group on the linguistic tests, but performed better on the oral tests.
- Since the 1970s focus has been on communication, including *appropriate* communication in both speech and writing. Many methods came from this. Ex: TPR, Task-based and The Communicative Approach.
- Research shows a need to focus on both communication and grammar

Treatment 2: Why do we teach the class in German?

- It is generally accepted that input is necessary for SLA (both speech and writing)
- Krashen's Input Hypothesis - Input is the only necessary thing for SLA (ie: all you need is to hear the language, like child acquisition)
- Input alone may not be enough, but input is essential (necessary but not sufficient).
- The debate is not about whether input is necessary, but what kinds of input are most effective.
- Comprehensible Input - language that is modified to fit the level of the learner-helps learners focus their attention and gain meaning from context.
- Authentic input is very helpful Ex: Video Ecke, Video Blick
- Input can help learners acquire forms that are frequent and easily noticed.
- Dialogue activities provide students with "authentic input" (at least a native speaker) and bring students attention to forms that otherwise might go unnoticed.
- Peer interview and Info-gap activities provide students with input from each other.

Treatment 3: Why don't we spend more time on grammar instruction? Isn't it helpful to learn explicit rules and memorize charts?

- First of all, grammar can be learned in more than one way. For example, Sandra Savignon's 1972 experiment, and others that followed, showed that production (output) can be sometimes just as helpful as memorizing drills and charts.
- Williams (1999) and DeKeyser (1995) studied the roles of implicit (i.e. no mention of any grammar rule) and explicit (i.e. either deductive, where the rule is explained like in the purple pages of Kontakte, or inductive, where students are told that there is a rule and they have to figure it out on their own - this is often in reading where objects are highlighted to bring students' attention to the grammar, or in activities like the Denkblatt).
- Their findings support the conclusion that implicit instruction is best for concrete items that occur in the language frequently, and relatively predictably.

- Their findings also support the conclusion that items which do not occur frequently, are very abstract, hard to notice (Ex: they don't carry meaning, like 3rd person singular in English), and unpredictable are best learned explicitly.
- The textbook's philosophy is that input is the most crucial element in acquisition. Because some things are very difficult to learn without explicit instruction, the textbook provides the purple pages (an example of deductive instruction), and Dr. Lund provides the Denkblatt (an example of inductive instruction).
- Dialogue activities focus students' attention on forms that might otherwise go unnoticed. They also help students learn set phrases that they can later internalize and use in their own "free speech".
- Peer interview and Info-gap activities allow students to "practice" grammar and learn from each other.

Treatment 4: Why doesn't my teacher always correct me? Will the mistakes I make in the beginning ever go away?

- Brown conducted a longitudinal case study of his children by documenting their first language acquisition. After analyzing the data he found (to everyone's surprise) that children acquire certain forms before others regardless of corrections or instruction. Many studies have followed and pointed to the same conclusions.
- Later these studies were transferred into the field of SLA and the results showed the learners of a second language also acquire forms in a regular, systematic order.
- This means that learners will go through the same "steps" regardless of how they learn the language. Pienemann studied native speakers of Italian (of many ages) learning German as immigrants. All of his subjects passed through the same order of acquisition (of question formations). Some of them went through stages faster than others, but none of the stages were skipped by any of them.
- Studies that compared native languages with second languages to predict learners' error also found that students made some mistakes that could not be accounted for through influence from their first language. Ex: Japanese speaker, Spanish speaker and a German speaker all make the same mistake when learning English, even though the form that they use cannot be found in any of these languages.
- This led to the term "Interlanguage" and helped change the way errors are viewed. An interlanguage has its own grammar and is systematic, just like native languages.
- Errors are now seen as natural processes the learners must go through in order to form their own version of the target language.
- When learners are allowed to make errors through natural processes (trial and error) and are then interrupted and corrected after the error occurred has a greater likelihood of bringing the error to the learner's attention, making the feedback more meaningful.

Treatment 5: Why do I have to do so much pair and group work? Wouldn't I learn better from my teacher or a native speaker who already knows how to speak well?

- Interaction has been shown to be very helpful in acquisition.

- Susann Gass and Varonis (1994) and Mackey (1999) both studied the role of interaction in acquisition. They found that those who were allowed interaction (as opposed to reading something scripted) had a positive effect on learner production and learner comprehension.
- Interaction helps focus learners' attention on specific parts of the language
- Interaction provides opportunities for learners to negotiate for meaning. i.e. they are able to adjust their language so that they are understood by the person they are talking with.
- A cycle seems to take place when learners talk with each other: S1 hears the input from S2. S1 does not understand and asks for clarification. S2 repeats himself in a different way, testing new ways to express himself. S1 notices the change in the input and makes a mental note of the difference. S1 then reorganizes his previous representation of the language in her head and making it closer to the actual native form. She then tries to express herself to S2 and tests her new hypothesis about the language. S2 then gives her positive feedback that indicates he understood what she said.
- In this type of interaction both speakers are able to receive input, test hypotheses about the language, and receive feedback. These processes facilitate acquisition and help learners develop automatic language, where eventually they do not have to think about what they are saying, it becomes part of them.
- Peer interview and Info-gap activities provide for ample interaction and negotiation of meaning.

Treatment 6: Why is it hard for me to speak in front of other people?

- Krashen came up with something called the "affective filter". Students often have classroom anxiety (pressure to perform, pressure to speak with an excellent accent, pressure to speak accurately with no mistakes, fear of making mistakes, fear of being misunderstood, fear of sounding stupid, etc.). These are called affective factors (NOT effective factors) and they play a large role in one's ability to learn.
- The theory is that when these affective factors are high, learners subconsciously put up a wall or filter that does not allow for full comprehension or performance etc.
- Anxiety can be caused by many different things. It is very beneficial for a language learner to evaluate what may cause him or her anxiety, and what he or she can do to eliminate it.
- The goal of most communicative activities is to lower the affective filter and make students feel more comfortable. Ex: Most classroom activities in a "communicative setting" are done in pairs or groups. This helps students hear that others are on the same levels (i.e. they are also making mistakes) and gives them opportunities to learn from one another without having to perform in front of the whole class.

Treatment 7: Second Language Acquisition Overview (also a handout)

1- The more we communicate in speech and writing, the better we communicate.

2- Input is absolutely necessary for acquisition. The more "authentic" language students are exposed to, the better. Input is not, however, enough. Some things have to be taught explicitly.
    - Dialogue and Video activities provide students with authentic input.
    - Peer Interview and Information-gap activities provide students with input from each other.
3- Grammar can be learned in more than one way. For example, listening, speaking, writing, and interaction each play an important role in learning grammar.
4- Implicit instruction (no mention of the rule at all) is helpful for frequent, predictable items that are easy for learners to "pick up" on.
5- Explicit grammar (students are told that there is a rule and they either inductively figure it out on their own, or the rule is explicitly explained) is helpful for items that do not occur frequently, are hard to notice, or are very abstract.
    - Dialogue activities help students focus on forms that might otherwise go unnoticed.
    - Peer Interview activities give students the opportunity to focus on specific parts of language through interaction and negotiation.
6- There is a regular, systematic order of acquisition that learners will go through regardless of error correction. The language that learners speak, Interlanguage, is systematic and has its own grammar, just like native languages. The errors that occur in Interlanguages are often signs of progress.
7- Even though errors are inevitable, correction is important and necessary. Feedback is most meaningful when students are first allowed to naturally make mistakes and are then interrupted and corrected. Trying to prevent the mistakes before they are made is less helpful than correcting them after they are naturally made.
8- Interaction provides students with the opportunity to go through a valuable process. Both speakers in the interaction are able to 1) receive input, 2) make hypotheses about how to formulate the language correctly, 3) test these hypotheses by actually trying to say it (output), 4) receive feedback from their partner on whether they were understood. If the student was not understood, they have the opportunity to reorganize the grammar and form a new hypothesis to test. This process has been shown to help students learn grammar and develop "automatic" language.
    - Peer Interview and Information-gap activities provide students with ample interaction and negotiation.
9- Anxiety plays a large role in language acquisition. Fear of sounding "stupid", making mistakes, or speaking without a perfect accent, for example, can cause students to put up an "affective filter" that does not allow for full comprehension or production.
10- Lowering the "affective filter" facilitates language learning. Anxiety affects students in various ways, and students would benefit from evaluating their personal "affective factors" and trying to find ways to limit them.
    - Dialogues, Peer Interviews, and Information-gap activities, each contribute to a "communicative" setting where students work in pairs, groups, or as a class to help lower the "affective filter".

Appendix E - Independent Variables and Their Explanations

Table E 1

Independent Variables

Variable	Explanation
Treatment	Instruction about SLA that supports CLT
Time	Difference between three surveys
Previous Activity Experience	Amount of experience with the three classroom activities that students rated
DIALOG EXPERIENCE	Amount of experience with Dialogue activities
PEER-INTERVIEW EXPERIENCE	Amount of experience with Peer Interview activities
INFO-GAP EXPERIENCE	Amount of experience with Information-gap activities
Previous Language Learning Experience	Setting in which students learned another language and number of languages learned in those settings
FORMAL SETTING- JR HIGH SCHOOL	Learned another language in Junior High
FORMAL SETTING- HIGH SCHOOL	Learned another language in High School
FORMAL SETTING-COLLEGE	Learned another language in college
FORMAL SETTING-MTC	Learned another language in the LDS
FORMAL SETTING- # OF LANGUAGES	Number of languages learned in a formal Setting
INFORMAL SETTING- HOME	Learned another language at home
INFORMAL SETTING- COMMUNITY	Learned another language among friends and neighbors in the community
INFORMAL SETTING-ABROAD	Learned another language while studying abroad in a foreign country
INFORMAL SETTING- MISSION	Learned another language while serving a foreign-speaking LDS mission

Table E 2 (cont.)

Independent Variables

Variable	Explanation
INFORMAL SETTING- # OF LANGUAGES	Number of language learned in an informal setting
GENDER	Gender
NATIVE SPEAKER OF ENGLISH	Whether students were native speakers of English
ATTITUDE TOWARD RESEARCH	Overall attitude toward research

Appendix F - P Values for Process of Elimination

Table F 1

P Values for Variables Eliminated from the Dialogue Rating Model (in order of elimination)

Variable	P Value
INFORMAL SETTING- COMMUNITY	0.97
FORMAL SETTING- # OF LANGUAGES	0.89
FORMAL SETTING- COLLEGE	0.8
INFORMAL SETTING- HOME	0.84
FORMAL SETTING- MTC	0.59
FORMAL SETTING- HIGH SCHOOL	0.68
INFORMAL SETTING- MISSION	0.58
DIALOLGUE EXPERIENCE (left in)	0.41
GENDER	0.35
INFORMAL SETTING- ABROAD	0.29

Table F 2

P Values for Variables in the Best-fit Model for Dialogue Rating

Variable	P Value
FORMAL SETTING- JR HIGH SCHOOL	0.12
INFORMAL SETTING- # OF LANGUAGES	0.14
NATIVE SPEAKER OF ENGLISH	0.026
ATTITUDE TOWARD RESEARCH	0.042

Table F 3

P Values for All Variables in the Final Dialogue Rating Model

Variable	P Value
Treatment	0.056
Time	0.89
Time/Treatment	0.47
DIALOLGUE EXPERIENCE	0.56
FORMAL SETTING- JR HIGH SCHOOL	0.19
INFORMAL SETTING- # OF LANGUAGES	0.12
NATIVE SPEAKER OF ENGLISH	0.006
ATTITUDE TOWARD RESEARCH	0.026

Table F 4

P Values for Variables Eliminated from the Peer Interview Rating Model (in order of elimination)

Variable	P Value
ATTITUDE TOWARD RESEARCH	0.92
GENDER	0.86
FORMAL SETTING- MTC	0.80
INFORMAL SETTING- HOME	0.74
INFORMAL SETTING- ABROAD	0.57
PEER INTERVIEW EXPERIENCE (left in)	0.57
INFORMAL SETTING- # OF LANGUAGES	0.45
INFORMAL SETTING- MISSION	0.61
FORMAL SETTING- COLLEGE	0.36

Table F 5

P Values for Variables in the Best-fit Model for Peer Interview Rating

Variable	P Value
FORMAL SETTING- HIGH SCHOOL	0.11
FORMAL SETTING- JR HIGH SCHOOL	0.14
FORMAL SETTING- # OF LANGUAGES	0.028
INFORMAL SETTING- COMMUNITY	0.063
NATIVE SPEAKER OF ENGLISH	0.0091

Table F 6

Final P Values for All Variables in the Peer Interview Model

Variable	P Value
Treatment	0.43
Time	0.48
Time/Treatment	0.75
PEER INTERVIEW EXPERIENCE	0.67
FORMAL SETTING- HIGH SCHOOL	0.15
FORMAL SETTING- JR HIGH SCHOOL	0.16
FORMAL SETTING- # OF LANGUAGES	0.02
INFORMAL SETTING- COMMUNITY	0.18
NATIVE SPEAKER OF ENGLISH	0.01

Table F 7

P Values for Variables Eliminated from the Information-gap Rating Model (in order of elimination)

Variable	P Value
INFORMAL SETTING- HOME	0.97
FORMAL SETTING- MTC	0.96
FORMAL SETTING- JR HIGH SCHOOL	0.96
FORMAL SETTING- # OF LANGUAGES	0.94
FORMAL SETTING- HIGH SCHOOL	0.92
INFORMAL SETTING- COMMUNITY	0.64
FORMAL SETTING- COLLEGE	0.55
GENDER	0.52
INFORMAL SETTING- ABROAD	0.48
INFORMAL SETTING- # OF LANGUAGES	0.40

Table F 8

P Values for Variables in the Best-fit Model for Information-gap Rating

Variable	P Value
INFORMAL SETTING- MISSION	0.086
NATIVE SPEAKER OF ENGLISH	0.016
INFORMATION-GAP EXPERIENCE	0.039
ATTITUDE TOWARD RESEARCH	0.050

Table F 9

Final P Values for All Variables in the Information-gap Rating Model

Variable	P Value
Treatment	0.43
Time	0.66
Time/Treatment	0.88
INFORMATION-GAP EXPERIENCE	0.042
INFORMAL SETTING- MISSION	0.086
NATIVE SPEAKER OF ENGLISH	0.0081
ATTITUDE TOWARD RESEARCH	0.053

Table F 10

P Values for Variables Eliminated from the LLB1 Model (in order of elimination)

Variable	P Value
FORMAL SETTING- HIGH SCHOOL	0.98
FORMAL SETTING- # OF LANGUAGES	0.94
PEER INTERVIEW EXPERIENCE	0.83
GENDER	0.55
INFORMATION-GAP EXPERIENCE	0.51
INFORMAL SETTING- # OF LANGUAGES	0.52
DIALOLGUE EXPERIENCE	0.44
ATTITUDE TOWARD RESEARCH	0.23

Table F 11

P Values for Variables in the Best-fit Model for LLB1

Variable	P Value
FORMAL SETTING- JR HIGH SCHOOL	0.022
FORMAL SETTING- COLLEGE	0.0023
FORMAL SETTING- MTC	0.17
INFORMAL SETTING- HOME	0.16
INFORMAL SETTING- COMMUNITY	0.039
INFORMAL SETTING- ABROAD	0.01
INFORMAL SETTING- MISSION	0.0001
NATIVE SPEAKER OF ENGLISH	0.017

Table F 12

Final P Values for All Variables in the LLB1 Model

Variable	P Value
Treatment	0.89
Time	0.056
Time/Treatment	0.47
FORMAL SETTING- JR HIGH SCHOOL	0.024
FORMAL SETTING- COLLEGE	0.0029
FORMAL SETTING- MTC	0.2
INFORMAL SETTING- HOME	0.16
INFORMAL SETTING- COMMUNITY	0.12
INFORMAL SETTING- ABROAD	0.01
INFORMAL SETTING- MISSION	0.0003
NATIVE SPEAKER OF ENGLISH	0.0037

Table F 13

P Values for Variables Eliminated from the LLB2 Model (in order of elimination)

Variable	P Value
INFORMAL SETTING- MISSION	0.83
FORMAL SETTING- HIGH SCHOOL	0.73
PEER INTERVIEW EXPERIENCE	0.68
INFORMAL SETTING- # OF LANGUAGES	0.69
ATTITUDE TOWARD RESEARCH	0.24

Table F 14

P Values for Variables in the Best-fit Model for LLB2

Variable	P Value
DIALOLGUE EXPERIENCE	0.037
INFORMATION-GAP EXPERIENCE	0.0001
FORMAL SETTING- JR HIGH SCHOOL	0.086
FORMAL SETTING- COLLEGE	0.15
FORMAL SETTING- MTC	0.0012
FORMAL SETTING- # OF LANGUAGES	0.13
INFORMAL SETTING- HOME	0.012
INFORMAL SETTING- COMMUNITY	0.011
INFORMAL SETTING- ABROAD	0.0029
GENDER	0.022
NATIVE SPEAKER OF ENGLISH	0.12

Table F 15

Final P Values for All Variables in the LLB2 Model

Variable	P Value
Treatment	0.99
Time	0.84
Time/Treatment	0.21
DIALOLGUE EXPERIENCE	0.04
INFORMATION-GAP EXPERIENCE	< .0001
FORMAL SETTING- JR HIGH SCHOOL	0.15
FORMAL SETTING- COLLEGE	0.13
FORMAL SETTING- MTC	0.0018
FORMAL SETTING- # OF LANGUAGES	0.2
INFORMAL SETTING- HOME	0.0047
INFORMAL SETTING- COMMUNITY	0.0016
INFORMAL SETTING- ABROAD	0.0002
GENDER	0.01
NATIVE SPEAKER OF ENGLISH	0.096

Table F 16

P Values for Variables Eliminated from the LLB3 Model (in order of elimination)

Variable	P Value
FORMAL SETTING- COLLEGE	0.77
ATTITUDE TOWARD RESEARCH	0.73
FORMAL SETTING- HIGH SCHOOL	0.5
FORMAL SETTING- MTC	0.58
GENDER	0.52
NATIVE SPEAKER OF ENGLISH	0.37
DIALOLGUE EXPERIENCE	0.27

Table F 17

P Values for Variables in the Best-fit Model for LLB3

Variable	P Value
PEER INTERVIEW EXPERIENCE	0.01
INFORMATION-GAP EXPERIENCE	0.024
FORMAL SETTING- JR HIGH SCHOOL	0.16
FORMAL SETTING- # OF LANGUAGES	0.11
INFORMAL SETTING- HOME	0.09
INFORMAL SETTING- COMMUNITY	0.19
INFORMAL SETTING- ABROAD	0.17
INFORMAL SETTING- MISSION	0.18
INFORMAL SETTING- # OF LANGUAGES	0.0081

Table F 18

Final P Values for All Variables in the LLB3 Model

Variable	P Value
Treatment	0.58
Time	0.34
Time/Treatment	0.79
PEER INTERVIEW EXPERIENCE	0.0006
INFORMATION-GAP EXPERIENCE	0.015
FORMAL SETTING- JR HIGH SCHOOL	0.067
FORMAL SETTING- # OF LANGUAGES	0.035
INFORMAL SETTING- HOME	0.087
INFORMAL SETTING- COMMUNITY	0.26
INFORMAL SETTING- ABROAD	0.053
INFORMAL SETTING- MISSION	0.028
INFORMAL SETTING- # OF LANGUAGES	0.071

Table F 19

P Values for Variables Eliminated from the LLB4 Model (in order of elimination)

Variable	P Value
INFORMATION-GAP EXPERIENCE	0.55
INFORMAL SETTING- ABROAD	0.58
FORMAL SETTING- MTC	0.56
INFORMAL SETTING- HOME	0.44
FORMAL SETTING- JR HIGH SCHOOL	0.4
GENDER	0.24

Table F 20

P Values for Variables in the Best-fit LLB4 Model

Variable	P Value
DIALOLGUE EXPERIENCE	0.051
PEER INTERVIEW EXPERIENCE	0.061
FORMAL SETTING- HIGH SCHOOL	0.037
FORMAL SETTING- COLLEGE	< .0001
FORMAL SETTING- # OF LANGUAGES	0.023
INFORMAL SETTING- COMMUNITY	0.0005
INFORMAL SETTING- MISSION	< .0001
INFORMAL SETTING- # OF LANGUAGES	0.0022
NATIVE SPEAKER OF ENGLISH	0.0025
ATTITUDE TOWARD RESEARCH	0.045

Table F 21

Final P Values for All Variables in the LLB4 Model

Variable	P Value
Treatment	0.11
Time	0.69
Time/Treatment	0.22
DIALOLGUE EXPERIENCE	0.23
PEER INTERVIEW EXPERIENCE	0.0068
FORMAL SETTING- HIGH SCHOOL	0.0084
FORMAL SETTING- COLLEGE	< .0001
FORMAL SETTING- # OF LANGUAGES	0.0049
INFORMAL SETTING- COMMUNITY	0.0066
INFORMAL SETTING- MISSION	< .0001
INFORMAL SETTING- # OF LANGUAGES	0.0001
NATIVE SPEAKER OF ENGLISH	< .0001
ATTITUDE TOWARD RESEARCH	0.18

Table F 22

P Values for Variables Eliminated from the LLB5 Model (in order of elimination)

Variable	P Value
FORMAL SETTING- HIGH SCHOOL	0.92
FORMAL SETTING- # OF LANGUAGES	0.94
ATTITUDE TOWARD RESEARCH	0.88
INFORMAL SETTING- COMMUNITY	0.69
INFORMAL SETTING- # OF LANGUAGES	0.56
FORMAL SETTING- COLLEGE	0.5
PEER INTERVIEW EXPERIENCE	0.34
FORMAL SETTING- JR HIGH SCHOOL	0.3

Table F 23

P Values for Variables in the Best-fit Model for LLB5

Variable	P Value
DIALOLGUE EXPERIENCE	0.085
INFORMATION-GAP EXPERIENCE	0.15
FORMAL SETTING- MTC	0.077
INFORMAL SETTING- HOME	0.062
INFORMAL SETTING- ABROAD	0.0045
INFORMAL SETTING- MISSION	< .0001
GENDER	0.17
NATIVE SPEAKER OF ENGLISH	0.0068

Table F 24

Final P Values for All Variables in the LLB5 Model

Variable	P Value
Treatment	0.46
Time	0.022
Time/Treatment	0.63
DIALOLGUE EXPERIENCE	0.039
INFORMATION-GAP EXPERIENCE	0.56
FORMAL SETTING- MTC	0.012
INFORMAL SETTING- HOME	0.011
INFORMAL SETTING- ABROAD	0.005
INFORMAL SETTING- MISSION	< .0001
GENDER	0.5
NATIVE SPEAKER OF ENGLISH	0.031

Table F 25

P Values for Variables Eliminated from the LLB6 Model (in order of elimination)

Variable	P Value
FORMAL SETTING- # OF LANGUAGES	0.97
FORMAL SETTING- JR HIGH SCHOOL	0.9
FORMAL SETTING- MTC	0.88
FORMAL SETTING- HIGH SCHOOL	0.83
PEER INTERVIEW EXPERIENCE	0.62
INFORMAL SETTING- ABROAD	0.73
INFORMAL SETTING- # OF LANGUAGES	0.44
GENDER	0.45
INFORMATION-GAP EXPERIENCE	0.4
INFORMAL SETTING- HOME	0.27

Table F 26

P Values for Variables in the Best-fit Model for LLB6

Variable	P Value
DIALOLGUE EXPERIENCE	0.039
FORMAL SETTING- COLLEGE	0.0065
INFORMAL SETTING- COMMUNITY	0.091
INFORMAL SETTING- MISSION	0.0061
NATIVE SPEAKER OF ENGLISH	0.0095
ATTITUDE TOWARD RESEARCH	0.19

Table F 27

Final P Values for All Variables in the LLB6 Model

Variable	P Value
Treatment	0.52
Time	0.65
Time/Treatment	0.64
DIALOLGUE EXPERIENCE	0.22
FORMAL SETTING- COLLEGE	0.0006
INFORMAL SETTING- COMMUNITY	0.16
INFORMAL SETTING- MISSION	0.0006
NATIVE SPEAKER OF ENGLISH	0.0054
ATTITUDE TOWARD RESEARCH	0.56

Table F 28

P Values for Variables Eliminated from the LLB7 Model (in order of elimination)

Variable	P Value
INFORMATION-GAP EXPERIENCE	0.92
INFORMAL SETTING- ABROAD	0.8
ATTITUDE TOWARD RESEARCH	0.75
INFORMAL SETTING- # OF LANGUAGES	0.74
FORMAL SETTING- HIGH SCHOOL	0.55
FORMAL SETTING- JR HIGH SCHOOL	0.44
GENDER	0.37
DIALOLGUE EXPERIENCE	0.33
FORMAL SETTING- # OF LANGUAGES	0.27
INFORMAL SETTING- COMMUNITY	0.3
FORMAL SETTING- COLLEGE	0.31

Table F 29

P Values for Variables in the Best-fit Model for LLB7

Variable	P Value
PEER INTERVIEW EXPERIENCE	0.0042
FORMAL SETTING- MTC	0.038
INFORMAL SETTING- HOME	0.025
INFORMAL SETTING- MISSION	0.0001
NATIVE SPEAKER OF ENGLISH	0.0002

Table F 30

Final P Values for All Variables in the LLB7 Model

Variable	P Value
Treatment	0.92
Time	0.46
Time/Treatment	0.7
PEER INTERVIEW EXPERIENCE	0.0006
FORMAL SETTING- MTC	0.012
INFORMAL SETTING- HOME	0.011
INFORMAL SETTING- MISSION	< .0001
NATIVE SPEAKER OF ENGLISH	0.0004

Table F 31

P Values for Variables Eliminated from the LLB8 Model (in order of elimination)

Variable	P Value
INFORMAL SETTING- ABROAD	0.88
FORMAL SETTING- # OF LANGUAGES	0.81
FORMAL SETTING- MTC	0.42
INFORMAL SETTING- MISSION	0.56
FORMAL SETTING- COLLEGE	0.52
FORMAL SETTING- HIGH SCHOOL	0.27

Table F 32

P Values for Variables in the Best-fit Model for LLB8

Variable	P Value
DIALOLGUE EXPERIENCE	0.0047
PEER INTERVIEW EXPERIENCE	0.037
INFORMATION-GAP EXPERIENCE	0.079
FORMAL SETTING- JR HIGH SCHOOL	0.042
INFORMAL SETTING- HOME	0.066
INFORMAL SETTING- COMMUNITY	0.038
INFORMAL SETTING- # OF LANGUAGES	0.19
GENDER	0.18
NATIVE SPEAKER OF ENGLISH	0.029
ATTITUDE TOWARD RESEARCH	0.013

Table F 33

Final P Values for All Variables in the LLB8 Model

Variable	P Value
Treatment	0.4
Time	0.34
Time/Treatment	0.37
DIALOLGUE EXPERIENCE	0.0005
PEER INTERVIEW EXPERIENCE	0.0094
INFORMATION-GAP EXPERIENCE	0.26
FORMAL SETTING- JR HIGH SCHOOL	0.027
INFORMAL SETTING- HOME	0.013
INFORMAL SETTING- COMMUNITY	0.25
INFORMAL SETTING- # OF LANGUAGES	0.084
GENDER	0.17
NATIVE SPEAKER OF ENGLISH	0.0073
ATTITUDE TOWARD RESEARCH	0.01

Table F 34

P Values for Variables Eliminated from the LLB9 Model (in order of elimination)

Variable	P Value
INFORMAL SETTING- COMMUNITY	0.84
FORMAL SETTING- JR HIGH SCHOOL	0.67
INFORMATION-GAP EXPERIENCE	0.8
FORMAL SETTING- COLLEGE	0.69
PEER INTERVIEW EXPERIENCE	0.55
INFORMAL SETTING- # OF LANGUAGES	0.36
FORMAL SETTING- # OF LANGUAGES	0.21
DIALOLGUE EXPERIENCE	0.32
FORMAL SETTING- HIGH SCHOOL	0.3
INFORMAL SETTING- ABROAD	0.31

Table F 35

P Values for Variables in the Bess-fit Model for LLB9

Variable	P Value
FORMAL SETTING- MTC	0.12
INFORMAL SETTING- HOME	0.053
INFORMAL SETTING- MISSION	0.0052
GENDER	0.076
NATIVE SPEAKER OF ENGLISH	0.14
ATTITUDE TOWARD RESEARCH	0.047

Table F 36

Final P Values for All Variables in the LLB9 Model

Variable	P Value
Treatment	0.71
Time	0.0001
Time/Treatment	0.65
FORMAL SETTING- MTC	0.027
INFORMAL SETTING- HOME	0.038
INFORMAL SETTING- MISSION	< .0001
GENDER	0.025
NATIVE SPEAKER OF ENGLISH	0.15
ATTITUDE TOWARD RESEARCH	0.047

Table F 37

P Values for Variables Eliminated from the LLB10 Model (in order of elimination)

Variable	P Value
INFORMAL SETTING- ABROAD	0.92
INFORMAL SETTING- MISSION	0.9
ATTITUDE TOWARD RESEARCH	0.78
NATIVE SPEAKER OF ENGLISH	0.57
INFORMAL SETTING- COMMUNITY	0.51
FORMAL SETTING- COLLEGE	0.44
GENDER	0.35
PEER INTERVIEW EXPERIENCE	0.39
DIALOLGUE EXPERIENCE	0.41
FORMAL SETTING- MTC	0.3
FORMAL SETTING- # OF LANGUAGES	0.25
INFORMATION-GAP EXPERIENCE	0.24
FORMAL SETTING- HIGH SCHOOL	0.51

Table F 38

P Values for Variables in the Best-fit Model for LLB10

Variable	P Value
FORMAL SETTING- JR HIGH SCHOOL	0.73
INFORMAL SETTING- HOME	0.12
INFORMAL SETTING- # OF LANGUAGES	0.0011

Table F 39

Final P Values for All Variables in the LLB10 Model

Variable	P Value
Treatment	0.88
Time	0.58
Time/Treatment	0.36
FORMAL SETTING- JR HIGH SCHOOL	0.061
INFORMAL SETTING- HOME	0.17
INFORMAL SETTING- # OF LANGUAGES	0.0084

Table F 40

P Values for Variables Eliminated from the LLB11 Model (in order of elimination)

Variable	P Value
DIALOLGUE EXPERIENCE	0.99
FORMAL SETTING- JR HIGH SCHOOL	0.75
ATTITUDE TOWARD RESEARCH	0.69
INFORMAL SETTING- HOME	0.52
INFORMAL SETTING- MISSION	0.49
INFORMAL SETTING- COMMUNITY	0.41
PEER INTERVIEW EXPERIENCE	0.32
FORMAL SETTING- COLLEGE	0.22

Table F 41

P Values for Variables in the Best-fit Model for LLB11

Variable	P Value
INFORMATION-GAP EXPERIENCE	0.013
FORMAL SETTING- HIGH SCHOOL	0.10
FORMAL SETTING- MTC	0.11
FORMAL SETTING- # OF LANGUAGES	0.0071
INFORMAL SETTING- ABROAD	0.04
INFORMAL SETTING- # OF LANGUAGES	0.18
GENDER	0.052
NATIVE SPEAKER OF ENGLISH	0.0021

Table F 42

Final P Values for All Variables in the LLB11 Model

Variable	P Value
Treatment	0.039
Time	0.73
Time/Treatment	0.38
INFORMATION-GAP EXPERIENCE	0.0005
FORMAL SETTING- HIGH SCHOOL	0.2
FORMAL SETTING- MTC	0.19
FORMAL SETTING- # OF LANGUAGES	0.023
INFORMAL SETTING- ABROAD	0.026
INFORMAL SETTING- # OF LANGUAGES	0.11
GENDER	0.0124
NATIVE SPEAKER OF ENGLISH SPEAKER OF ENGLISH	0.0064