Learning to Learn: the Training of Missionaries in Language Learning Strategies at the Missionary Training Center

D. Brian Kohler
Brigham Young University - Provo

Follow this and additional works at: https://scholarsarchive.byu.edu/etd
Part of the First and Second Language Acquisition Commons, Missions and World Christianity Commons, and the Mormon Studies Commons

BYU ScholarsArchive Citation
https://scholarsarchive.byu.edu/etd/4855

This Thesis is brought to you for free and open access by BYU ScholarsArchive. It has been accepted for inclusion in All Theses and Dissertations by an authorized administrator of BYU ScholarsArchive. For more information, please contact scholarsarchive@byu.edu, ellen_amatangelo@byu.edu.
LEARNING TO LEARN—THE TRAINING OF MISSIONARIES 
IN LANGUAGE LEARNING STRATEGIES AT 
THE MISSIONARY TRAINING CENTER 

by 

D. Brian Kohler 

A thesis submitted to the faculty of 
Brigham Young University 
in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of 

Master of Arts 

Department of Language Acquisition 
Brigham Young University 
April 1998
Copyright © 1998 D. Brian Kohler

All Rights Reserved
BRIGHAM YOUNG UNIVERSITY

GRADUATE COMMITTEE APPROVAL

of a thesis submitted by

D. Brian Kohler

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

March 20, 1998
Date

Randall J. Lund, Chair

23 March 1998
Date

Neil J. Anderson

March 20, 1998
Date

Hans-Wilhelm Kelling
I have read the thesis of D. Brian Kohler 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.

March 20, 1998

Date

Randall J. Lund
Chair, Graduate Committee

Approved for the Department

Masakazu Watabe
Chair, Department of Language Acquisition

Accepted for the College

Van C. Gessel
Dean, College of Humanities
ABSTRACT

LEARNING TO LEARN—THE TRAINING OF MISSIONARIES IN LANGUAGE LEARNING STRATEGIES AT THE MISSIONARY TRAINING CENTER

D. Brian Kohler
Department of Language Acquisition
Master of Arts

Language learning strategies (LLS) are specific actions, behaviors, steps, or techniques that learners use to improve their rate and level of L2 development. This thesis details the development and validation of a LLS training program designed to measure if training in LLS increases LDS missionaries’ awareness of LLS as potential language learning tools. Specifically, it explores the question as to whether missionaries trained in LLS use and intend to use LLS more frequently, more appropriately, and with a greater range than those not trained in LLS.

The development of the LLS training program involved selecting a set of 48 specific strategies in 10 categories, developing 17 strategy training lessons, and designing a nine-week training schedule. Five different instruments were used to investigate strategy
use with German and Portuguese learning missionaries: (a) a Missionary Background Questionnaire, (b) a Situational Strategy Evaluation Worksheet, (c) a Learning the Language in the Mission Field Worksheet, (d) a Missionary Language Learning Questionnaire, and (e) a Missionary Task Performance and Retrospective Interview. The effects of training on the variables of training, language, and gender were analyzed.

Results showed that for intended strategy use, those missionaries having received the LLS training showed significantly higher scores for frequency, appropriate usage, and range, over those with no training. Results also showed evidence that different languages may react to training differently for intended strategy use. Although in both German and Portuguese those trained scored higher, the difference between trained and untrained Portuguese-learning missionaries was greater than for German-learning missionaries in measures of frequency and appropriate usage. Influence of gender indicated that German-learning males intended to use more strategies than German-learning females, while the opposite was found for Portuguese learners.

Results for actual strategy use for missionaries in the Missionary Training Center showed that LLS training had no significant impact on frequency, appropriate usage, or range. Results also showed that Portuguese learners reported using more total strategies and in particular more speaking strategies. For grammar strategies, untrained learners reported using more strategies than those trained. Gender showed no effect on the actual use of strategies.
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CHAPTER ONE

Introduction

Context of Problem

The age-old adage that “If you give a man a fish, he will have food for a day, but if you teach a man to fish he will have food for life,” is well applied to the study of language learning strategies. Just like the fisherman’s need is to obtain food, the language learner’s need is to obtain language. Fishermen and language learners alike benefit from being “served” something that temporarily satisfies their needs, but the only real lasting satisfaction is when they are able to adapt to their environment and situation and provide for themselves in a manner that they find effective and personal.

The notion of how to teach individuals to provide for themselves in an effective manner has been the cause of many frustrations in the history of teaching, particularly in language teaching. Why is it that student A quickly learns task X but fails to master task Y, while student B easily relates to task Y but becomes exasperated when attempting task X; or why student C seems not to be able to learn anything while student D breezes through everything. If learners could be trained how to use appropriate language learning strategies that complement their individual learning styles, a huge step forward would be taken in eliminating the wasted efforts students spend on learning tasks and some of the frustration that teachers feel in language instruction. Instead of merely telling their students to “work harder,” “go over it again,” or “just focus,” specific proven strategies
could be recommended according the students’ needs and abilities. Harnessing the power of language learning strategies could make measurable differences in the student’s achievement level, ultimate language learning satisfaction, and ability to continue learning beyond the formal classroom environment.

In the process of acquiring language, somewhere between individual learner differences, various situational factors, and learning outcomes, lies the mediating role of *language learning strategies*. These language learning strategies are:

- specific actions, behaviors, steps, or techniques that students (often intentionally) use to improve their progress in developing L2 skills. These strategies can facilitate the internalization, storage, retrieval, or use of the new language. Strategies are tools for the self-directed involvement necessary for developing communicative ability. (Oxford, 1993a, p. 18)

Every individual language learner approaches the task of acquiring a language with a set of pre-existing beliefs, and previous learning experiences. Additional variables include the target language being studied, whether the setting is formal or informal, the nature of the instruction, and the specific tasks learners are asked to perform. How the individual learner learns, and under what conditions, determines to a large part the approach the learner uses, or which learning strategies are incorporated in the learning process. These choices of strategies then influence the ultimate level of achievement. The success that the learner experiences in these areas then rebounds to have an effect on future strategy choice. If the learner acquires a high level of language, then the practiced strategy will probably be considered to be “effective” or “good” and will be used again.
Through the various stages of the language learning process every learner inevitably employs one strategy or another. The question then is, which strategies are the "best" and how should they be implemented into the teaching curriculum? Without proper training and knowledge of these strategies, the learner may experience a problem in choosing a strategy compatible with a particular learning style or for a particular situation. Although the study of learning strategies has seen an increase in activity in recent years, it is probably true to say that it is still in its infancy. Through further research in the training of learners in language learning strategies, it is anticipated that learners will be made more aware of the many possible language learning strategies and how better to use them as tools in effective language learning for increased levels of performance and learner autonomy.

Statement of Problem

The study of learning strategies holds considerable promise for both language pedagogy and for explaining individual learning preferences. However, since the relatively new interest in language learning strategies, several questions regarding the training of learners in language strategies remain unanswered. Which strategies, and in particular, which combinations of strategies, should be taught? How are individuals’ preferred learning styles to be taken into account? Do some learners need convincing that strategy training is worthwhile? Does learning strategy training work best when it exists as a separate element in a language program or when incorporated into the curriculum? Are the learners who most need the training likely to welcome or reject it? When should training be implemented? Should learners be made conscious of the strategies they are
being taught? Although these are the questions that are pushing the edge of research in the field of language learning strategies, this study will focus on the effectiveness of training in language learning strategies, specifically to determine if learners actually use and intend to use language learning strategies more frequently, more appropriately and with a greater range as a result of training, and if that training gives them a greater intent to use strategies in future language learning situations.

The Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-Day Saints trains thousands of missionaries each year in over 45 foreign languages. The basic design of this training program is to expose the missionaries to an intensive two-month language learning program where they study the language up to twelve hours a day and are then sent into the country of the target language. This training utilizes a specific teaching curriculum for teaching language, and this curriculum is the same for all missionaries. Because of the structure of this training system, relatively little freedom is given to the missionaries to choose how they should best approach the complex task of learning another language. The missionaries are exposed to large amounts of language in a formal classroom setting with relatively few authentically structured opportunities for actually using the language. Many missionaries express frustration at not being able to relate to the teaching method, or that after the formal training has ended, they feel unguided and unsure of how to continue learning the target language. For many of these missionaries, this is their first experience in learning a language and they are unsure of the best way to approach it.

After the formal Missionary Training Center (MTC) training, these missionaries are expected to be functional speakers of the language and to improve steadily in the time
that they reside in the target country. The term “functional” means in this case that missionaries are not just able to survive or “get by” in the target language as tourists and visitors might, but rather to communicate effectively at a high level of performance with a vast variety of individuals from varying backgrounds on gospel-related topics. Infield studies (MTC, 1994 & 1996a) have shown, however, that missionaries departing the MTC and many in the mission field are not functional and are relatively confused as to what they should do in order to learn the language. Many missionaries study the language very little or not at all once they leave the MTC. The above considerations regarding training are very important in the teaching curriculum and it might be through training in language learning strategies that missionaries could be aided in becoming more productive sooner as autonomous language learners.

It seems that the trend in much of formal instruction, and in particular language instruction, is to make sure that students get the intended information, without real regard as to how they get it. Considering the relatively brief period that students are actually in a formal instruction setting, this can be a dangerous concept that encourages learners that are dependent on instructors and lacking in self-initiated learning skills. Perhaps a significant part of an education should not only be in the obtaining of specific information, but also in learning the process of how to obtain information. Can missionaries learning a foreign language be trained how to learn a language rather than just trying to teach them a language? This question merits further research and investigation in an attempt to make the language learning process easier, more efficient and more self-directed.
Research Questions to be Addressed

Does language-learning strategy training increase missionaries’ awareness of their potential use in foreign language learning? More precisely, when trained in language-learning strategies, do missionaries when compared to non-trained missionaries:

1. Demonstrate use of targeted and other language learning strategies while in the Missionary Training Center (a) more frequently? (b) more appropriately? and (c) with a greater range?

2. Evidence a greater intent to employ language learning strategies (a) more frequently, (b) more appropriately and (c) with a greater range, in their foreign language learning when in the mission field?

Justification of the Problem

One justification for the study of training in language learning strategies is that there have been very few empirical studies that have attempted to evaluate how successful training in strategy use is in the success of second language learners. It seems that in learning a language, the process of learning how to learn is every bit as valuable as the actual information being learned. The justification for research in the training of learners in language learning strategies is to help them identify and use the particular strategies that best work with their personal learning style, in order to help them improve their rate of language acquisition as well as their level of performance.

An additional justification for research in the training of learners in language learning strategy use is to help promote learner autonomy. This self-directed learning is especially applicable for those that study a language intensively in preparation for
surviving in an environment where the language is spoken exclusively. This language learning strategy training shifts the responsibility to the learner in classroom work as well as increasing autonomy once they are on their own. It would be of great benefit to the Church, and to the field of language acquisition, if strategy training methods could be discovered and developed that would help learners become more autonomous in their learning, speed up their rate of acquisition and increase their ultimate level of achievement through strategy training.

It is anticipated that the results of a study in the training of language learning strategies will indicate which benefits are gained by learners who go through language learning strategy training and see if they are able to apply the strategies learned in new situations and effectively create a plan for future autonomous language learning. By helping the learners better identify useful strategies and which learning strategies best help them in a particular situation, it is hoped that the learners will take on more personal responsibility and be able to make adjustments after formal instruction for increased learning autonomy.
CHAPTER TWO

Review of Literature

Introduction

In order to find out if it is possible to develop a language learning strategy training program that will train missionaries to use strategies more frequently, more appropriately, and with a greater range, as well as become more autonomous learners, it is important to look at previous research. This review will look at previous research conducted with LDS missionaries regarding language learning strategies as well as general research that has been conducted, specifically in the area of training. When considering how a training program might be developed and what the learners should be trained in, it is crucial to look at how strategies are defined and why strategies are important. Consideration must also be given to the different classifications of strategies, methods of investigating strategy use and the factors that affect strategy use.

Why Learning Strategies are Important

In a review of current research themes on language learning strategies Rebecca Oxford (1986) has claimed that there are four key reasons why second language learning strategies are important: (a) appropriate language learning strategies are related to successful language performance, (b) using appropriate learning strategies enables students to take responsibility for their own learning, (c) learning strategies are teachable, and (d) addressing learning strategies in their programs gives teachers an expanded role.
Whether or not successful learners are aware of what they are doing, research has shown that they typically use appropriate strategies that can help explain their exceptional performance (Naiman, Frohlich, and Todesco, 1975; Rubin, 1975, 1981). It has been shown that good language learners use strategies more appropriate for their stage of learning, personality, age, purpose of learning, and the particular language being learned (Politzer and McGroarty, 1985), while poor language learners typically use fewer strategies or use strategies inappropriately for a given context. This relationship of performance and strategy use helps explain the failings of poor language learners as well as weaknesses that good language learners show (Reiss, 1983).

If students learn to use strategies appropriately, they will soon begin to be more self-directed learners who are able to continue learning even after formal instruction has ceased or when much of the language learning process takes place outside of the classroom, as is typical for missionaries learning a language. These strategies must, however, be taught in the classroom setting in order for them to be carried outside of the classroom, particularly for learners who have not had a great deal of language learning experience.

Oxford’s claim that strategies are teachable is important because of the fact many other variables are not. Unlike personality, aptitude, and general learning style, strategies can be adapted to improve the skills of language learners and fill in the cracks for many frustrating difficulties that language learners face.

Although Oxford claims that an advantage to fostering appropriate use of strategies encourages learner autonomy, it by no means lessens the role of the teacher.
On the contrary, the teacher’s role is expanded from simply imparting information, providing practice, and teaching strategies, to assessing which strategies the learner is actually using and how appropriate those strategies are being employed (Oxford, 1986).

**Defining Language Learning Strategies**

The concept of exactly what a *strategy* is seems to be rather elusive and is a term that is difficult to define completely. The field of language instruction has created a plethora of terms in the area of language strategies. It is often unclear as to exactly what the terms actually mean and what they refer to. Rebecca Oxford defines language learning strategies as “behaviors or actions which learners use to make language learning more successful, self-directed and enjoyable (Oxford, 1989c). This definition is rather broad, indicating that almost anything that a learner does to improve progression in the target language can be considered a language learning strategy.

Oxford (1989d) expands on the above definition by adding that strategies are not only techniques, behaviors, or actions taken by learners, but the development of learning-to-learn, problem-solving, or study skills. She adds that although the term *strategies* may be misleading, no matter what they are called, “strategies can make learning more efficient and effective” (p. 404).

Because of the difficulty in pinning down a clear definition of what strategies are, a distinction is often made between different types of strategies. Tarone (1980) divides strategies used in language learning into production, communication, and learning strategies. The first two categories she defines as *language use* strategies with *production* strategies being defined as “an attempt to use one’s linguistic system efficiently and clearly
with a minimum of effort” (p. 419) and communication strategies as those consisting of attempts to deal with problems of communication that have arisen in interaction” (p. 419). Tarone defines learning strategies as those that “attempt to develop linguistic and sociolinguistic competence in the target language” (p. 420). She further breaks this category down into language learning strategies and skill learning strategies. The former defined by an attempt to master new linguistic and sociolinguistic information and the later as having the goal of becoming a skilled listener, speaker, reader or writer in the target language. Although these distinctions may make it easier to talk about different types of strategies, Tarone (1993) argues that it is virtually impossible to separate communication and learning strategies because:

1) it is difficult to gauge the individual’s purpose (communication or learning); 2) the purpose might be both; and 3) even if the person just wants to communicate and not learn, learning often occurs anyway. (p. 62)

In his definition, Cohen (1995) defines second language learning and use strategies as “the steps or actions selected by learners either to improve the learning of a second language, the use of it, or both” (p. 3). He indicates that one reason that the definition of language learning and use strategies is so difficult to pin down, is that they encompass all actions that are clearly aimed at language learning, as well as those that may lead to learning but which do not necessarily have learning as their primary goal. Cohen defines the term language learning strategies as those that have “an explicit goal of assisting learner in improving their knowledge of a target language” (p. 4) and similar to Tarone, breaks language use strategies into performance and communication strategies.
Performance strategies are those that involve cognitive processing such as efforts at simplification or complexification (e.g. circumlocution). Communication strategies are used as a means to get a message across. Cohen indicates that although there are slight differences in these differently termed strategies, all may or may not have any impact on learning.

Oxford (1990a) stresses the point that “all appropriate language learning strategies are oriented toward the broad goal of communicative competence” (p. 8). These goals could be based on either what the learner wants to be able to do, or what the instructor has in mind with specific curriculum learning outcomes. She further points out that the “development of communicative competence requires realistic interaction among learners using meaningful contextualized language learning strategies that help learners participate actively in such authentic communication” (p. 8). This point poses the question as to whether there is a clear distinction between learning strategies and use strategies. Clearly this is once again dependent on the intent of the learner, but regardless, learning does indeed take place when communication is the goal and one of the best ways to learn or acquire a language is to use it in a communicative way. For ease of expression, the term language learning strategies is used to refer to all learning and use strategies which enhance any part of the language learning acquisition continuum and make the target language easier to master.

A good look at the above terms and definitions helps one to understand the concept of what a strategy is, but at the same time shows that not all researchers group learning strategy terms together or agree as to what language learning strategies are.
Several researchers (Ellis, 1994; Cohen, 1995; Schmidt, 1994) identify several problems that arise as to what constitutes a strategy when samples of recent literature are explored. One problem is the question of whether strategies are seen as behavioral (those that can be observed) or as mental, (those that cannot be observed), or possibly both. Oxford (1989c) indicates that strategies are more behavioral while Weinstein and Mayer (1986) claim that strategies have both behavioral and mental characteristics.

A second problem of definition comes in the understanding of the precise nature of the behaviors viewed as language learning behaviors. The terms strategy, sub-strategy, technique, tactic, move, and macro/micro- strategies, among others, have been used to describe these behaviors. The term strategy has been used to refer to both general approaches as well as to more specific actions or techniques used to learn a language. Stern (1983) uses two terms, strategy and technique. The former is a more general approach to learning and the later is a more specific term evident in a particular area of language learning such as vocabulary. Cohen (1995) suggests that a solution to the terminology problem would be to simply use the term strategy for all of the above terms keeping in mind that there is a continuum from the broadest categories to the most specific.

A third problem is a lack of agreement as to whether strategies demand conscious awareness in order to be classified as strategies. Weinstein and Mayer (1986) emphasize that the main goal of employing learning strategies is to facilitate learning and thus strategies need to be intentionally selected and conscious. Cohen (1990) supports this belief defining learning strategies as conscious behaviors that are intentionally selected by
the learner for a particular learning task. On the other side, however, there are other views that indicate that strategies employed by learners are “potentially conscious” which seems to indicate that learning strategies involve both conscious and subconscious aspects (Wenden and Rubin, 1987). Perhaps the most appropriate way of looking at this issue is drawn from Schmidt (1994) who stipulates that language learning strategies are those behaviors that are in either the focal or the peripheral attention of the student in that “they can identify them if asked about what they have just done or thought.” If a learner is unaware of, or unable to identify the behavior, then the behavior would simply be classified as a process. It is often the case where a learner consistently displays a behavior, but is unaware that they are doing it, such as repeated words, phrases or mannerisms. The issue of consciousness makes it difficult to evaluate which strategies a student is utilizing and if at some point, “automatic processes” were once “conscious strategies.” It might very well be the goal of strategy training program to move students through a conscious use of strategies to a sub-conscious state where strategies become automatically applied skills.

Whether conscious of what they do or don’t do, learners do things physically and mentally that can be considered behavioral. The problem, as pointed out by the many definitions, is in making the distinction between what is considered a strategy. The consciously applied behaviors or the sub-conscious actualization of the behavior?

Although there are many approaches to defining strategies, there seems to be a general consensus on several points of language learning strategies. Ellis (1994) has
compiled the following list which compiles many of the common characteristics of language learning strategies:

1. Strategies refer to both general approaches and specific actions or techniques used to learn a L2.

2. Strategies are problem-oriented—the learner deploys a strategy to overcome some particular learning problem.

3. Learners are generally aware of the strategies they use and can identify what they consist of if they are asked to pay attention to what they are doing and/or thinking.

4. Strategies involve linguistic behavior (such as requesting the name of an object) and non-linguistic (such as pointing at an object so as to be told its name).

5. Linguistic strategies can be performed in the L1 and in the L2.

6. Some strategies are behavioral while others are mental. Thus some strategies are directly observable, while others are not.

7. In the main, strategies contribute indirectly to learning by providing learners with data about the L2 which they can then process. However, some strategies may also contribute directly (for example, memorization strategies directed at specific lexical items or grammatical rules).

8. Strategy use varies considerably as a result of both the kind of task the learner is engaged in and individual learner preferences (pp. 532-533).
Overall it appears that strategies are “actions that are taken by the learner to make learning easier, faster, more enjoyable more self-directed and more transferable to new situations” (Oxford, 1990a). These basic elements are what the focus of this study is about, to help missionaries become more self-directed learners who become more proficient in the language sooner.

Classification and Taxonomies of Language Learning Strategies

Initial investigation of language learning strategies resulted primarily into a compilation of “good learner” lists of what strategies learners were observed to use or which strategies they reported using (Rubin, 1975; Stern, 1975; Naiman et al, 1975; Bialystok, 1978). These early lists made little attempt at classifying the types of strategies used by the learners, and have been criticized in recent years as lacking a sound base in theories from the fields of linguistics and cognitive psychology.

O’Malley and Chamot (1990) discuss the fact that although early categorized lists identify a high number of useful deliberate approaches used by learners in learning a second language, they “do not have any grounding in theories of second language acquisition or cognition” (p. 7). Oxford also discusses these early attempts at classifying strategies calling them “invalidated strategy lists based on folklore, common sense, and the unstructured, personal observation of the list makers” (p. 8). Although these early taxonomies may be rudimentary, it should be noted that they have been responsible for a huge surge in the field of language strategy research and are still the foundation upon which much of today’s theories are built.
More recent strategy studies have strived to identify and classify broad categories of language learning strategies, under which large numbers of more specific and refined strategies can be grouped. Current research in the field of language learning strategies is also endeavoring to integrate theories of linguistics and cognitive psychology in order pull the strengths of each in regard to developing taxonomies and training programs that make the best use of strategies in language learning. The recent work of O’Malley and Chamot (O’Malley et al. 1985a and 1985b; O’Malley and Chamot 1990), Wenden (1991), and Oxford (1990) is the most current in the field of language learning strategies and has made important contributions to the knowledge, classification, and application of language learning strategies.

The taxonomy that O’Malley and Chamot have developed distinguishes three major types of strategies, in accordance with the information-processing model on which their research is based. These strategy categories are as follows: (a) metacognitive strategies, (b) cognitive strategies, and (c) affective/social strategies.

*Metacognitive* strategies are indirect strategies or “higher order executive skills that may entail planning for, monitoring, or evaluating the success of a learning activity” (p. 44). Examples of this type of strategy are planning the organization of written or spoken material, monitoring speech as it occurs, or evaluating speech after it has been spoken. Chamot gives examples from interviews with ESL learners of the kinds of behaviors that represent the strategy of self-management:

- “I sit in the front of the class so I can see the teacher’s face clearly.”
> “It’s a good idea to mix with on-Hispanics because you’re forced to practise your English. If you talk with a Chinese who is also studying English you have to practise the language because it is the only way to communicate” (Chamot in Ellis, 1994, p. 638)

The *cognitive* class defines strategies that “operate directly on incoming information, manipulating it in ways to enhance learning” (p. 44). These cognitive strategies appear to be directly linked to the performance or more specific learning tasks than the other classifications. These consist of rehearsing, repeating what was heard, organizing, grouping, classifying words according to syntax or meaning, inferencing for meaning, summarizing and synthesizing information, deducting from what is known, imagery, transferring, and elaborating.

*Affective/social* strategies deal with those strategies involving interaction with other people be it fellow learners, instructors, or native speakers. This category also includes elements that are used in order to control affective influences on the learner. These strategies include working in cooperation with others, questioning for clarification, and talking to one’s self to reduce anxiety and reassure one’s self. O’Malley and Chamot put the least amount of emphasis on this last class as it does not fit as well as the previous two in their cognitive approach to language learning (Chamot, 1987).

In her research of which strategies adult language learners use when directing their own language learning, those strategies similar to O’Malley and Chamot’s metacognitive class, Wenden (1991) identified three general categories of self-directed language learning strategies: (a) knowing about language (relating to what language and language learning
involves), (b) planning (relating to the what and how of language learning), (c) self-evaluation (relating to progress in learning and the learner's response to the learning experience). These categories were based on the idea that language learners consistently pose questions to themselves and then make decisions on how to proceed based upon the answers they come up with.

Probably the most thorough and up-to-date taxonomy of language learning strategies is that developed by Rebecca Oxford (1990a). Oxford includes the strategy classes contained in the O'Malley and Chamot taxonomy, but goes into more depth and definition by focusing on a larger number of strategies with a wider range of features. Oxford follows up on the point that O'Malley and Chamot focused more heavily on the cognitive and metacognitive aspects of strategies giving only brief attention to the affective/social aspects. Oxford (1993b) explains that the language learner is a whole person "not just a cognitive and metacognitive machine" (p. 183) and that affective and social strategies should play as great a role, if not a greater role in the language learning process.

In the formation of Oxford's taxonomy, she made an extensive review of previously cited research in the theories of both cognition theory and language acquisition, determining which strategies were based on scientific research and which were based on speculation and intuition. Each strategy list, categorization and taxonomy was analyzed for redundancy, inconsistencies and scientific validity. From this search, Oxford developed a preliminary comprehensive taxonomy of language learning strategies (Oxford, 1985). From this first taxonomy, a self-report survey was developed in order to test the
accuracy and effectiveness of the list. This survey, known as the Strategy Inventory for Language Learning (SILL), was given to thousands of language learners in many different languages.

Oxford’s most recent taxonomy (Oxford, 1990a), shows how a given strategy may apply to each of the four major language modalities: speaking, writing, reading, listening, an aspect that no other previous taxonomy has accomplished. Oxford herself claims that her taxonomy system “is probably the most comprehensive, practical, and theoretically grounded one so far available” (p. 20). This taxonomy divides language learning strategies into two main classes: Direct and Indirect. Direct strategies are “language learning strategies that directly involve the target language” (p. 137). These direct strategies consist of three sub-classes: (a) memory strategies, (b) cognitive strategies, and (c) compensation strategies. Indirect strategies “support and manage language learning without directly involving the target language” (p. 135) and are subdivided as (a) metacognitive, (b) affective, and (c) social strategies. Although each category is further broken down in Oxford’s taxonomy, only each of the main strategies will be briefly discussed in this review. For a complete outline of her taxonomy see Appendix J.

Direct Strategies

Memory strategies. Memory strategies are based on the notion that, although the brain is capable of storing vast amounts of information, the information is only useful when it is available for access. This is where memory strategies come into play. Specifically, memory strategies aid the learner in the daunting task of learning sizeable amounts of new vocabulary. The principles that this type of strategy are built on are
arranging things in order, making associations, and reviewing information in a meaningful way so that it can be stored in the long-term memory for effective access when needed. From Oxford’s SILL, students rarely report using memory strategies. This could be due to the fact that they are largely unaware that they are using memory as a strategy or that they are not aware of its use as a strategy for language learning.

Oxford divides memory strategies into four sub-sets: (a) creating mental images, (b) applying images and sounds, (c) reviewing well, and (d) employing action. Each of these sub-sets is further broken down into individual tasks. Oxford feels that these strategies can be a powerful tool in enhancing language learning, especially when used in conjunction with other indirect strategies.

Oxford does not comment on the use of context as an aid in using memory as a strategy, but does indicate that memory strategies reflect principles of meaning such as arranging things in order, making associations, and reviewing. She indicates that these arrangements and associations must be “personally meaningful to the learner, and the material to be reviewed must have significance” (Oxford, 1990a, p. 39).

**Cognitive strategies.** Cognitive strategies are a vital component of language learning, and according to Oxford (1990a), they are the most used among language learners. She refers to these strategies as those that use all your mental process and have the common characteristics of manipulation or transformation of the target language. The sub-sets of cognitive strategies include: (a) practicing, (b) receiving and sending messages, (c) analyzing and reasoning, (d) creating structure for input and output.
Compensation strategies. Compensations strategies are those strategies that are used in order to “enable learners to use the new language for either comprehension or production despite limitations in knowledge” (p. 47). These strategies are employed primarily to take up the slack for what the learner is unsure of, giving the learner more opportunities for practice despite the inadequacies that may exist. The two main sub-sets of this category of strategies are (a) guessing intelligently and (b) overcoming limitations in speaking and writing. These strategies may be particularly effective once the learners have been introduced to them and then they start to initialize them on their own instead of continually having to bring the learner to them.

Indirect Strategies

Metacognitive strategies. Metacognitive strategies are “strategies or actions which go beyond purely cognitive devices, and which provide a way for learners to coordinate their own learning process” (p. 136). These types of strategies consist of focusing and planning learning, looking for opportunities to practice newly acquired knowledge, evaluating, monitoring, and reviewing products of language.

In past studies it has been recognized that students, particularly those in a more formal classroom setting use far more cognitive than metacognitive strategies (O’Malley et al., 1985, 1985b). Of the metacognitive strategies that students do report using, over 82.3 percent of them are focused on planning, self-management and preparation aspects with only 9 percent being used for self-monitoring and self-evaluation. These facts suggest that learners are largely unaware of or not being trained in metacognitive strategies. Oxford (1990a) suggests that this is a result of the school setting rewards for rule learning rather
than for communication competence. Students avoid using monitoring and evaluation skills that could help them identify errors, the first step in being able to correct themselves and evaluate language progression.

The sub-sets of these apparently “elusive” metacognitive strategies in Oxford’s taxonomy are: (a) centering your learning, (b) arranging and planning your learning, and (c) evaluating your learning.

**Affective strategies.** Affective strategies are those referring to emotions, attitudes, motivations, and values. In contrast to others in the field, Oxford places a great emphasis on the importance of affective language learning strategies. She even goes as far as to state that “the affective side of the learner is probably one of the very biggest influences on language learning success or failure” (p. 140). H. Douglas Brown (1987) comments on the difficulty of pinning down the exact definition of affective strategies, but suggests that they spread throughout all aspects of the learning process encompassing such concepts as self-esteem, attitudes, motivation, anxiety, culture shock, inhibition, risk taking, and tolerance for ambiguity (p. 99). Negative feelings can stunt the progression in learning a language while positive influences can make the language learning process much more effective and enjoyable. Although it might be noted that a certain amount of anxiety can be an aid in learning, too much seems to block progression.

Bialystok’s 1981 study found that attitude had a more pervasive influence on the learner’s choice of language learning strategies than aptitude did. Oxford and Nyikos (1989), sampled over 1200 undergraduate language learning students and found that in
four out of five learners measured, motivation had the most influence on the use of specific kinds of strategies, as well as overall frequency use.

The sub-sets that Oxford includes in the affective group of strategies are: (a) lowering your anxiety, (b) encouraging yourself, and (c) taking your emotional temperature.

**Social strategies.** Social strategies are the final main category in Oxford’s taxonomy and deal with those that involve working with others. This category is divided into three sub-sets: (a) asking questions, (b) cooperating with others, and (c) empathizing with others. Ehrman and Oxford (1989) indicate that:

social learning strategies have been found to be particularly important for exposing the learner to the target language, increasing the amount of interaction with native speakers, and enhancing motivation and verbal learning. (p. 3)

Language in and of itself is a very social behavior intended to provide communication between parties.

Also in support of the effectiveness of social strategies, Wenden (1986) discovered that when good language learners learned how to control their emotions and attitudes and were trained to focus on effective social strategies, they felt more comfortable, their language learning improved, and learning become more enjoyable.

**Methods Used to Investigate Learning Strategies**

Research on the uses of language learning strategies has evolved from making simple lists to more sophisticated methods of analyzing how various students of language utilize various approaches. These approaches of investigating strategy use include list
making, interviews, group discussions, language learning diaries, teacher-student
dialogues, open-ended surveys, structured surveys, think-aloud procedures, and
observation techniques. Oxford (1993b) claims that each of these methods has its
strengths and weaknesses depending on what is being looked at and for what reason.
These techniques of investigation can be divided into two basic categories, those that are
self-reported by the learner in either an after-the-fact retrospective style or as the task is
being performed, and the technique of recording what strategies are being employed by
researcher observation. The literature (Rubin, 1981; Naiman, Frohlich, Stern, and
Todesco, 1978; Cohen and Aphek, 1981) indicates that most second language learners are
capable of identifying and reporting their learning strategies accurately and that
observation methods are “not very productive” (Rubin, 1981), since they reveal very little
about the mental operations and behaviors that learners use.

This section of the review will briefly describe the major methods of investigation
for language learning strategies in order to determine which methods are the most
productive and useful for the study under consideration in this paper.

*Strategy Lists*

In the early studies and investigations of language learning strategies, general lists
were compiled of what was generally observed, typically in the formal classroom setting.
These lists often had no empirical research backing, but were based on common sense and
the intuitions of the time in regard to language learning strategies. These lists were widely
published and have become the basis for more modern study and classification of learning
strategies today. Good examples of these strategy lists include Stern’s list (1975) of nine
items of what a good language learner does when faced with problems, Rubin’s list (1975) of seven strategies that the “good learner” uses, Rubin and Thompson’s (1994) list of 14 practical strategies to become a better language learner, the observations of Tyacke and Mendelsohn (1986) on the differences in good and poor students in utilizing available resources, and the list of Tarone’s communication strategies (1983) that she claims can be used in the learning of language, such as paraphrasing, borrowing, and avoidance.

Observations

The attempts to identify strategies through observation are generally made in classroom settings by observing the performance of various tasks and employing the use of an observation scale. These kind of observations are difficult in that they reveal very little, if any, mental activity of the learner, but rather only the observable end product. Rubin (1981) indicated that they were “not very productive” because the teacher was continually after the correct answer and not the process or strategy behind the deriving of the answer. Likewise Naiman et al. (1978) and Cohen Aphek (1981) indicate that simple observations do not produce reliable evidence of strategy use. Chesterfield and Chesterfield (1985) did find some success with observation with younger children, whose behavior may serve as a better indicator of mental activity than in adults.

Interviews and Questionnaires

Instead of merely relying on observable behavior, many researchers have turned to more structured interviewing and the questioning of learners. Almost all interview-question techniques call for retrospective focus on general strategy use, or the application of a strategy in a particular task. These more structured kinds of reporting are thought to
be more statistically reliable and produce more correlationaly comparable information. Although there is a question as to how well students can remember and describe their personal strategy use, it is generally felt that this type of investigation produces much more reliable results than strict observational methods (Rubin, 1981; Naiman, Frohlich, Stern, and Todesco, 1978; Cohen and Aphek, 1981).

One drawback to this collection method is that it is retrospective and requires the learner to recall and reflect. This feature may cater to those learners who are more skilled in cognitive thought processes and can effectively talk about what they did and what they were thinking at the time. Studies that have employed this investigative method include: Naiman et al.'s (1978) general questions about techniques used on sound systems, vocabulary and the four modalities; Wenden's (1987) grid descriptions of activities and strategies employed; and Rubin's (1981) study on learners' ability to report on activities with and without training. There are many other studies involving this technique of investigation (Cohen, 1983; Cohen & Aphek, 1981; Papalia & Zamponga, 1977; Naiman et al., 1978; Rubin, 1981; Politzer & McGroarty, 1985; Oxford, 1985; Wenden, 1986; Chamot, 1987).

**Note-taking and Diaries**

Another means of retrospective and self-disclosure reporting is that of diary studies and note taking. This type of investigative activity allows learners to record their thoughts, feelings, achievements, problems, questions, frustrations, and impressions throughout their language learning experience. Through this means, learners become “participant observers” and can better prepare for strategy-assessment interviews.
Rubin (1981) experimented with both direct diary entries where the students were instructed on which strategies to report on and with less-structured entries where students were freer to express themselves. Cohen & Aphek (1981) used a more introspective approach as they had students make notes as they learned vocabulary items.

The use of diaries and note-taking has been used to demonstrate the effects of anxiety and competitiveness on language learners and has been shown to be of great help in analyzing the affects of affective and social language learning strategies (Bailey, 1983; Tyacke & Mendelsohn, 1986; Brown, 1985).

**Think-Aloud Tasks**

This technique is a process requiring the learner to describe what strategies are being employed at the same time that the task is being completed. Although this method of investigation may shed light on strategy use, it is felt that students may be subtly influenced by the investigation and indeed even perform a task differently on account of the investigative procedure involved (Færch & Kaspar, 1987; Abraham & Vann, 1987). Hosenfeld (1976), comments that learners can give accurate accounts in think-aloud information on tasks as they are performing them, and that it was more accurate than the retrospective approaches where the learner recalls what took place after the fact. In one particular study, Hosenfeld (1976) investigated the language learning strategies of young students and college-age learners to find that they could identify and verbalize their strategies and that often the teachers’ assumptions about their students’ strategies were incorrect. Omaggio (1981) suggests that think-aloud tasks similar to the one that Hosenfeld has attempted can be of great aid to the unsuccessful learners and their
instructors by helping them discover the source of learning difficulties or successes at the moment that they surface, something that is often difficult to glean in an after-the-fact interview.

It may well be that this method of investigation is better for some learners than others or for learners at different stages. Beginners can generally only report in their L1 and some learners are more skilled in articulating what they are thinking at the moment of inquiry.

In summary of investigative methods of language learning strategies, research seems to indicate that the retrospective data is more complete and detailed in the information given and that using a variety of methods is preferable as results may vary and contradict. Early methods of strategy investigation were almost exclusively exploratory and based on hunches and general impressions for a basic understanding of strategy use, but more recent investigative methods have emphasized using several methods of investigation. The current trends in the investigation and collection of related data seem to be moving research in a direction for further insights into the field of language learning strategies.

**Factors Affecting Strategy Choice**

Every learner trying to learn a language varies from other learners in how he employs language learning strategies. Not all learners in a similar situation learn in the same manner and each learner may learn in a different manner in each unique situation. The frequency of strategy use as well as which specific strategies are employed are dependent on many variables. The following discussion is a review of many different
factors that have been noted to affect strategy use and that should be taken into
consideration in the investigation of strategy use, the development of a language learning
strategy training program, and the application of a strategy training curriculum.

Several differing categories of factors affecting strategy choice can be identified. Some factors are of the individual type specific to every learner such as beliefs about
language, age, aptitude, learning style, motivation and attitude, goals and personality. Others factors have to do with the background of the learner, including cultural factors. A
third category are the situational and social factors surrounding a learning situation such as
teaching methods, training programs, expectations, language being learned, task, gender
of the learner, and place of learning.

*Individual Learning Differences*

Individual learning differences start with a learner’s basic belief about language
learning. Wenden (1987) indicates that learners who emphasize *learning* a language tend
to use more cognitive strategies to remember specifics of the language, while students
who are more interested in *using* the language use fewer cognitive learning strategies and
more communicative strategies. This choice in strategy emphasis is perhaps a strategy in
and of itself, but reveals that not all learners have the same beliefs or learn for the same
reasons.

*Age* is a factor that clearly affects the way that learners learn. Younger learners
tend to learn in a more task-specific manner while older learners use more general
strategies in a flexible way (Brown, 1985). Ehrman and Oxford (1989) indicate that
children use more basic strategies and adults favor strategies that are more sophisticated
and chose to think *about* language where children do not. This may be help explain why
adults seem to learn faster initially, particularly in the areas of grammar and vocabulary
where there are many possible cognitive strategies, as opposed to pronunciation where
there are fewer strategies and the activity becomes more rehearsed.

Aptitude is a rather elusive factor that has been found by some (Bialystok, 1981;
Oxford, 1990c) not to have as great an influence as other variables. It may be, however,
that a person’s general intelligence will play a role in their use of strategies and thus affect
overall language learning.

Like a fingerprint, every learner has an individual learning style that affects how he
employs strategies (Reid, 1995, 1998). To date there has been little research done on the
connection between style and strategy use, but Oxford claims “it is likely that a strong
relationship exists between the individual’s use of learning strategies and the individual’s
learning style.” (Oxford, 1989b)

Closely related to learning style is personality (Carrell & Monroe, 1995). Ehrman
(1990a) used the Myers-Briggs Type Indicator to assess a relationship between personality
and strategy use. She found that introverts reported significantly greater uses of strategies
involving searching for and communicating meaning than did extroverts. She also
reported that “feelers” report using general study strategies more than “thinkers.” She
indicates, however, that these findings are in the preliminary stages and that, if there is a
real link between personality and strategy use, it needs further investigation.

The factors of motivation and goals are powerful in strategy choice and usage.
Oxford and Nyikos (1989) claim that “the degree of expressed motivation was the single
most powerful influence on the choice of language learning strategies” (p. 294). They also found that the type of motivation and goals play an important role as to what kind of strategies are employed. Those learners in a formal education setting may choose strategies that are more generally oriented to helping them pass a test or meet requirements, while learners in a socially demanding setting may choose more functional strategies to help them learn through communicative means where no formal instruction is present.

**The Learner’s Personal Background**

There is considerable evidence to suggest that the background of the learner should be taken into consideration in the development and application of strategy training. Factors of background that should be taken into consideration are the learner’s cultural upbringing, how much experience they have had with language learning, support systems, and what their native language is.

Ehrman (1990b) found that in a survey of professional linguists, the professionals reported using more strategies with greater frequency than did untrained instructors or students. Similarly, Chamot, O’Malley, Kupper, and Impink-Hernandez (1987) reported that students with at least five years of language learning experience used more functional practical strategies than their fellow students who had four years or less of formal language learning experience. In a further study, Chamot, Kupper, and Impink-Hernandez (1988) found that novice learners were more likely to panic when faced with a new language learning task, whereas the more experienced learners approached the tasks more calmly with a clear plan of action.
Cultural background is also a factor that has been shown to have some affect on strategy usage and choice and should be taken into consideration in the planning of strategy training programs (Oxford & Anderson, 1995). O'Malley, Chamot, Stwener-Manzanares, Russo, and Kupper, (1985) conducted a study with groups of Hispanic and Asian students being trained in imagery and grouping strategies. Although there was no difference in the training procedures, the Hispanic treatment groups out performed the Hispanic control groups, while the reverse was true for the Asian students. Their conclusion, based on interview and observational investigative methods, was that the Asian treatment group resisted this particular type of strategy training because they preferred to rely on the rote memorization technique that they were accustomed to in their native culture.

Situational and Social Factors

Situational and social factors are a third area that can affect the way strategies are used and taught. Factors such as the specific language being taught, the setting of the learning and the tasks to be performed can all have an impact on the way the strategies are used and instructed. Chamot et al. (1987) and Politzer (1983) found that strategy use is different depending on the specific language being learned. Native English speaking students learning Russian reported using more strategies than students learning Spanish, and that students learning French and German employed strategies somewhere in between Russian and Spanish. It is not clear, however, whether the students that are enrolled in the less frequently taught languages in a typical school setting are better students, or if the specific language actually does influence the employment of strategies.
Another situational factor to consider is the *setting* of the learning and the particular language being learned. Chamot et al. (1988) found that students who were learning a language in a more formal classroom setting were far less likely to use social strategies and were mainly concerned with those strategies that would help them fulfill the requirements of the class. Learners who were learning in a social setting such as on the job or the playground used many more social and affective strategies in order to learn from communicative activities rather than from textbooks or formal instruction.

The effect of social factors on strategy use is just becoming an area of interest. The factors of economic and social group have the potential of affecting the way strategies are employed by learners and taught by instructional programs. Ethnicity and sex are also areas where social background factors of the native language are carried over to the learning of a second language. Oxford and Nyikos (1989) indicate that gender has "a profound effect on strategy use" (p. 196) and how language is learned and strategies employed. Women reportedly use strategies more overall than males, including their approach to general study strategies and formal rule-related practice strategies (Oxford, Nyikos, Ehrman, 1988). These findings may indicate that a training program in strategies should have a set of strategies specifically designed specifically for females or that males and females should be instructed separately.

As a result of the evidence that indicates that there are many factors that can influence how learners learn language and employ strategies, it seems that it is essential to take these factors into consideration in order to develop and apply language instruction programs that will obtain the greatest possible benefit for the learners. These
considerations might include grouping like learners, providing a variety of different types of activities, or being flexible in approach to adapt to different learner backgrounds. This consideration in the development of strategy training programs should not give students an excuse as to why they cannot learn, but rather provide them with a great variety of possible strategies that they can choose from according to their individual background and situational needs.

“Good Language Learner” Studies

The differing success of language learners leads one to believe that there is something that the more successful language learner is doing that the less successful learner is not. Investigating what those “things” are, could be of great benefit to all who attempt to learn a language, and in particular, the poor language learner. Although there may be many variables at work, by looking into what the successful language learner is doing, procedures might be established in order to better train students learning another language.

The studies that have been conducted to investigate what strategies the “good language learner” uses started seriously in the 1970's and have taken two basic approaches. One approach is to identify and interview those students who seem to be successful, and the other is to compare what successful learners do with what poorer learners do. This review will focus on several hallmark studies and try to draw some conclusions as to which strategies “good language learners” use.

Rubin (1975) identified strategies that successful language learners use through extensive classroom observations and by analyzing journals that students used to record
their use of strategies. She found that effective language learners exhibit the following characteristics:

1. Are prepared to make good guesses and know how to infer and look for clues.
2. Show motivation to communicate and do so using many techniques such as circumlocution, paraphrasing, use of gestures and other knowledge in order to communicate the message.
3. Are uninhibited and are willing to risk looking foolish in order to communicate.
4. Attend to form in language and are able to find patterns in the language.
5. Practice often and seek out opportunities to use the language as much as possible.
6. Monitor their own speech as well as the speech of others.
7. Focus on meaning more than form in order to understand.

Modifying Rubin’s list, Stern (1975) developed a list of what he felt were the strategies used by effective language learners. Stern felt strongly that it was characteristic of the good language learner to have an intuitive command of the language and be able to think in the target language. His list includes the following:

1. Take an active approach to learning.
2. Take a tolerant outgoing approach to learning in general.
3. Possess the technical know-how of how to “tackle” a language.
4. Experiment with planning and ordering in strategy use and revision.
5. Look for meaning in the language.
6. Be willing to practice the target language.
7. Use the target language for real communication.

8. Monitor own speech and pay attention to how language is used.

9. Think in the language and develop it as a separate reference from the native language.

Naiman et al. (1975) did research into strategies used by good learners by interviewing students. The learners were given hypothetical situations and in an open-ended fashion indicated what strategies they would be most likely to use in those situations. The following is a list of the six strategies Naiman et al. identified as being “good.”

1. Select large situations that match their particular learning styles.

2. Be an active learner in the language learning process.

3. Be conscious of the language as a rule system and a communication tool.

4. Continually monitor, infer, and revise the L2 learning system.

5. Think in the target language.

6. Address the affective demands of language learning.

These lists as well as those developed by others (Rubin, 1981; Naiman et al., 1978; Reiss, 1983 & 1985; Huang and Van Naersson, 1987; Lennon, 1989) have developed a foundation for the idea that there is indeed a group of specific strategies that successful language learners seem to exhibit. Additional empirical studies have built upon this foundation further by testing their validity. Bialystok (1978 & 1981) found that functional practice was most responsible for successful learner achievement. Politzer and McGroarty (1985) found that when students employed the strategies compiled by Rubin (1975) and
Naiman et al. (1975), performance on language tests improved. Reiss (1985) validated Rubin's list with the exception of the idea that to be successful, language learners need to be uninhibited.

Many other studies have further supported the notion that the mentioned lists can significantly improve the success that learners experience in learning a second language (Tarone, 1983; Tyacke & Mendelsohn, 1986; Papalia & Zampongna, 1977; Oxford & Crookall, 1989).

When these studies are reviewed, it is tempting to want to overstate the common traits that good language learners exhibit and claim that there is a “magic set” of strategies that can make any individual successful. In his research, Stevick (1989) has indicated that learners “differ markedly with regard to what they prefer to do and not to do” (p. 128). He does believe, however, that there can be some general patterns of good language learners established. In summarizing the many studies that have been mentioned about what “good” language learners do, Ellis (1994, p. 546) has compiled a list of five major strategy traits to show where the many lists show agreement as to what traits successful language learners show:

1. A concern for language form.
3. An active task approach.
4. An awareness of the learning process.
5. A capacity to use strategies flexibly in accordance with task requirements.
Caution should be taken, however, in putting too much promise in the above lists. These lists were compiled almost exclusively from formal learning settings through a self-report method that might give an advantage to the student who is able to talk about language in a skillful manner. Perhaps the most important evidence to emerge out of the investigation of what successful language learners do, is that more effective learners use a greater range of strategies and are better aware of how to choose appropriate strategies for a given situation (Ellis, 1994, p. 547). These findings are providing the investigation of strategies with some very beneficial information as to what behaviors successful language learners typically portray.

**Development of Training Programs in Language Learning Strategies**

Although research seems to indicate that indeed training in language learning strategies can significantly make the language learning process easier, more efficient, more self-directed, and more enjoyable (Wenden and Rubin, 1987; Oxford, 1990a; O’Malley and Chamot, 1990), there have been surprisingly few empirical studies done to evaluate the success that training can have in making learners more aware of using strategies as potential language learning tools. This section will discuss a wide variety of research and anecdotal data in training programs that have proven successful from around the world, targeting various speakers, languages, ages, educational backgrounds, and motives for learning. This information represents the most current efforts in the field and several important general implications about the training in language learning strategies.

Studies that have been conducted on how best to develop a training program in language learning strategies, indicated that L2 strategy training is frequently successful,
but not in every circumstance (O’Malley & Chamot, 1990; Cohen, 1990; Chamot & Kupper, 1989; Chamot et al., 1987; O’Malley et al., 1985a; Russo & Stwener-Manzanares, 1985). Problems in training methodology that have been identified include: (a) training for too short a period of time, (b) disproportionate ease or difficulty with the specific training task, (c) lack of integration of the training into the normal class work, (d) perceived irrelevance of the training by both student and/or instructor, and (e) inadequate assessment of the learners’ strategy needs and uses (Oxford, 1993).

Another finding is that there is often an imbalance in the type of strategies that are incorporated into training programs. Many of the affective and social strategies such as positive self-talk, reward, and group cooperation, have been overlooked in favor of the more cognitive and metacognitive strategies—the more intellectual aspects of learning a language (Horwitz, 1990; Lavine & Oxford, 1994).

Research in the training of strategies seems to indicate that the effects are strengthened when the training activates knowledge already existing in the learner. The training may not be so much a process of introducing many new strategies to learners, as making them aware of strategies that they already successfully use in their native language, or in other learning circles. It may also be the case that the training gives the learners more alternatives to choose from and helps them better adapt their own personal learning style to the task of learning a new language.

As far as the approach to the training, studies indicate that the most effective strategy training programs are explicit in their instruction (Oxford et al., 1990; Carrell, Pharis, & Liberto, 1989). Learners are informed specifically about many different
strategies and that some of the strategies will be helpful in their language learning efforts. Not only are the students informed directly of the strategies, but they are taught how to use them and how to transfer them to new situations that they will encounter. Blind training where students are coaxed into using a specific strategy without realizing it, is less successful, particularly when the student tries to transfer the strategy use to a new situation. Oxford and her colleagues (Oxford et al., 1990) claim that the training should also be integrated into the regular class activities as much as possible and not strictly taught as an “extra class” or lecture.

Although there is debate about how exactly to go about the training in strategies, the consensus seems to be that it is not effective to just tell the learners about strategies during infrequent training sessions (MTC, 1996). This method seems to temporarily overload the learner with a flood of learning strategy ideas that are quickly forgotten in the face of actual learning. The optimal strategy training is currently thought to be the explicit explanation of strategies to the learners and then having them practice using those strategies with actual class work, over and over for some period of time, and in frequent training sessions (Oxford et al., 1990; Ehrman & Oxford, 1989). This approach encourages several important processes to take effect. One process that develops, is that learner becomes more aware of the existence of personal habits and language learning needs. Also important is that initially learners may not understand the importance of strategies in learning or may not be aware of how to appropriately use them, a skill that only comes with time and practice.
Rebecca Oxford (1990a) suggests that there are three different ways that strategy training can take place: awareness training, one-time strategy training, and long-term strategy training.

In awareness training, also frequently referred to as consciousness-raising or familiarization training, is when learners become familiar with the idea of language learning strategies and ways in which these strategies might help them learn more effectively. In this type of training, however, learners are not required to use strategies in on-the-spot language learning tasks. This type of training is important in any program in that it encourages learners to be open to the idea of strategies and prepare them for incorporating them in future situations. This training should be fun and encouraging for the students.

One-time strategy training is more in-depth than awareness training in that it requires the learner to use one or more strategies in actual language learning tasks. To be most effective this training should make use of regular classroom material being used in the course. This training aids the learner in assessing different strategies as to when they are used, how to use them, and how to evaluate the success of a strategy for them personally. This particular type of training is useful for those with specific learning needs that can be addressed in just a few short sessions.

Long-term strategy training is similar to one-time training in that it requires learners to not only become aware of strategies, but to practice using them in real tasks. If differs from one-time training in that it is continued for a longer length of time.
throughout the course, employing a greater number of strategies and more in-depth practice sessions.

As a model for the development of a strategy training program, Oxford (1990a, p. 204) suggests an eight-step procedure as outlined below:

1. Determine the learners’ needs and the time available.
2. Select strategies well.
3. Consider integration of strategy training.
4. Consider motivational issues.
5. Prepare materials and activities.
6. Conduct “completely informed training.”
7. Evaluate the strategy training.
8. Revise the strategy training.

Little research has been done in the explicit training of students in 20 or more strategies within an integrated environment for any significant length of time. Oxford (1986; 1993b) has conducted training sessions where many strategies are discussed, but there is an absence of integrated practice using the actual strategies. To date no one has done any follow-up on training programs after a year or two to see long term effects of training. More typical is the ad hoc training of students in just one or two strategies which is unlikely to have any permanent effects (Politzer, Pressley, Levin, & Delaney, 1982; Henner-Stanchina, 1988). Because learning a language requires strong self-direction and high motivation, strategies which can aid the student in sustaining good learning skills after the end of formal language education have great value. Strategy training does not
have to be the brief instruction of a few strategies for a short period, rather, research is showing that prolonged training in many strategies as well as development of positive attitudes, motivations, and beliefs show great promise for helping to create more autonomous learners who can become more effective sooner.

Probably the one area that has been most investigated in regard to strategy training is that of the use of strategies to aid in comprehension. Bialystok (1983) conducted two experiments with secondary level L2 French learners to see if their ability to infer the meaning of words in a continuous text could be improved through training in inferencing strategies. In each experiment, a fifteen-minute training seminar was given to one group. A second group received no training but was given picture cues and permission to use a dictionary, and a third group only permission to use a dictionary. In the first experiment, the trained group showed more effective overall comprehension than the picture-dictionary group, but the dictionary-only groups performed the best. The second experiment showed a poorer performance from the group trained in inferencing strategies than either of the two other groups.

Andrew Cohen (1990) has been experimenting with language learning strategies in Israel with learners of Hebrew as a second language. His goal with strategy training to help language learners of all ages take greater responsibility for their own progress. Cohen’s training involved students of all ages and backgrounds who were enrolled in an intensive language learning program at Ulpan Akiva in Natanya, Israel. These students were in formal instruction for six hours a day with informal language use in the dining and living quarters of the school. Cohen goes to the school for three days once a month and
gives language learning strategy seminars which consist of two formal, hour-long talks emphasizing various aspects of strategy use and self-directed learning, and two informal one-hour rap sessions which are open-ended discussions with the students asking anything they want to know about language learning. Because of the infrequency of the training sessions, the program is not integrated with the normal classroom work, but he strongly encourages students to practice with the strategies in hopes that it will stimulate them to become more autonomous in their language learning efforts.

Although little empirical data has been collected in regard to Cohen’s training efforts, he reports receiving many positive and encouraging comments from the students. They report that they are learning more systematically and that their concept of the traditional role of student and teacher has been altered. Both students and teachers are learning the value of the self-directed learner and are recognizing the value that the training has in helping them become part of a more purposeful and more unified educational team.

Another program that has made use of training in strategies has been developed by Will Sutter (1987). Sutter has been working with adult refugees in Denmark who are receiving Danish second-language instruction through the Language Schools of the Danish Refugee Council. The strategy training is conducted in three different modes: integrated and overt training; non-integrated training; and integrated and covert training.

The integrated and overt training is the most common mode and is woven into the regular class work, but with explicit discussion of language learning strategies. The actual strategy training part of the curriculum makes up 15-20 percent of the course and is aimed
at making students conscious of their existing strategies and emphasizes the advantage of those techniques, giving praise to students who purposefully use them. A great deal of stress is put on presenting and practicing new techniques, mostly in conjunction with cognitive and metacognitive strategies, and then evaluating the progress that students make.

The second mode of training is the *separate or non-integrated training courses*. This training consists of academically-focused lectures in conjunction with group work and entails 20-30 hours of training outside the regular classroom instruction.

The third mode of training established by Sutter is the *integrated and covert strategy training*. This type of training, often referred to as “camouflaged training” is designed for use with students who feel threatened by new concepts or that all study time should be focused on strictly formal language learning practice. Sutter has discovered that especially some Asians and Eastern European learners hold tightly to the traditional methods of learning that they were introduced to in their native cultures. This type of training seems to be particularly ideal for these type of learners and has the aim of helping students enlarge their strategy repertoire without actually knowing it or feeling threatened.

Reactions to these styles of strategy training are generally very good. Students view the overt and separate training as effective in providing highly relevant skills to help them “make it” in the real world. The covert style of training shows great promise for those students who have negative reactions to the overt system and for some reason, have a difficult time dealing with new methods.
A very successful strategy training scenario is reported by Roberta Lavine (Oxford et. al, 1990) in conjunction with the training of undergraduate university students in Spanish. Originally she began using strategy training as part of a field test for some of Oxford's research, but found it to be so successful that she has continued training ever since.

Faced with many undergraduate Spanish learners who were typically taking a language to fulfill mandatory requirements and who showed little or no motivation for learning a language, Lavine developed a language learning strategy training program focusing on vocabulary acquisition and listening comprehension. The training covered Oxford's six strategy categories: memory, cognitive, compensation, metacognitive, affective, and social (Oxford, 1990a). The training initially took a formal approach, but became more informal as her students reported they preferred the integration of the strategies into the regular class activities. The students participated in training on a daily basis and were constantly faced with language tasks that they needed to work out by practicing a particular strategy that had been presented in a non-threatening way.

The students were encouraged to keep language learning diaries, and as the training progressed students were anxious to share their techniques and increasingly sought out other students who preferred the same strategies. The strategies that were the most popular were metacognitive techniques, compensation behaviors, affective actions, and memory devices. Lavine reports that giving labels to these strategies helped the students remember and use them.
Results of the training were that students developed an awareness of their own personal responsibilities and choices in language learning and that by "integrating strategy training with regular language activities and explicitly demonstrating the concrete benefits (e.g., higher grades and greater proficiency) of appropriate strategies motivated the students to improve their conscious behaviors" (p. 204).

Oxford (Oxford et al., 1990) experimented with the technique of integrated training with beginning level learners of Russian at the university. Although the existing curriculum required a grammar-based textbook, Oxford incorporated communicative learning activities into the classroom around which she wanted to build her training. The training was built into the course syllabus, and although identifiable, was thoroughly integrated in the regular class work.

Many strategies were demonstrated and practiced on a regular basis, including strategies from all six strategy categories as outlined in Oxford's taxonomy (1990a), see Appendix J. Students kept language learning journals and periodically would bring them to class to share with the teacher, who used them to evaluate the training and adapt for future lessons.

The strategy training and even the idea of strategies at all, was new to most of the students involved, but they immediately accepted the value of training as an idea that would help them learn Russian more effectively. They seemed to be most interested in memory strategies and as time went on they became very adept at analyzing their individual learning needs. Some students even began asking for additional, independent homework, or extra out-of-class practice with other students.
The strategy training that was used in beginning and intermediate German level university classes by Martha Nyikos (Oxford et al., 1990) at Purdue University, came to be known as the "motivational" part of the class. Students enrolled in these classes indicated that they were there primarily to fulfill required course work and that although they felt communication was important, they had the general attitude that real language learning only takes place through rigorous grammar practice.

Working with the situation mentioned above, Nyikos designed a course where all materials were introduced through language learning strategies. Students learned "how to learn" by visualizing (e.g. Nyikos stood on one side of the class for Du-Sprache and the other for Sie-Sprache), performing social tasks, and emulating native speakers in specific ways. Each day five minutes of class time was devoted to generating personally meaningful learning strategies that the students could use in their study.

Responses to this type of training were very positive. Within the class community comradery developed as well as friendly competition and an effort to understand one another’s thought patterns and learning styles. One class was so taken with the training, that they compiled the strategies they used in class into a booklet to share with the entire class. Nyikos reports that:

learning strategy generation quickly made the German class a unique, enjoyable, and therefore truly motivating experience. The initial states of ‘goofy’ ideas soon gave way to fascination with fellow students’ patterns and genuine desire to share helpful hints. (p. 207)
A more carefully followed experiment in strategy training was conducted by David Crookall (Oxford et al., 1990). It was Crookall’s focus to take second year university students at the Université de Toulon in France who were required to take English classes, and instill in them a motivation to take responsibility for their own learning as well as to give them learning-to-learn tools or strategies to bring the language alive for them. All of the strategy training was integrated into concrete language-learning activities.

Crookall collected quantitative and qualitative data on 198 students’ reactions to the strategy training and reports a significantly more positive attitude toward active language instruction techniques by those receiving training than students that did not participate in the strategy training program. Students also evidenced more self-direction in learning as they reported being involved in more student talk and significantly less teacher talk as a result of the training. Crookall relates one experience where he suggested that the class be conducted by the students in his absence. Initially the students were surprised, but then putting the training to use took responsibility into their own hands and conducted a class where they reported having never worked so hard or spoken so much English in class.

**Instructional Implications from the LLS Training Examples**

It is worth noting several elements that the above situational case studies display and that should be taken into consideration by developers of LLS training programs:

1. Both students and teachers indicate the positive value and contribution of LLS training programs.
2. Students prefer strategy training that caters to the skills relevant to their future intentions (such as speaking, reading, or listening) and that have personal meaning for them individually.

3. As students develop a more self-directed approach to learning, their abilities to learn independently and attitudes toward language learning improve.

4. Students prefer explicit strategy training in a non-threatening atmosphere that is modeled by the instructor and that is course integrated.

5. Students prefer to have a choice of a variety of strategies from which they can select according to their particular needs and styles.

Although there is not a lot of empirical data on training to date, these studies indicate that qualitative and case study approaches can be effective in providing information. It seems evident that training in strategies within the language learning classroom can help students learn more effectively and enjoy the language learning process.

Previous LLS Studies at the Missionary Training Center

Because of the promise that language learning strategies hold in helping learners become more effective sooner as independent language learners, several studies have been conducted at the Missionary Training Center in order to determine which strategies missionaries use, how long it generally takes them to become effective in the mission field, whether different types of missionaries use different strategies, whether strategies can be incorporated into an established program, and how possible it is to make missionaries aware of strategies. There have been no real studies done in regard to training in
strategies, but these studies provide important information around which a training program should be built. This section will review these past studies and what implications they have on language learning strategy training.

*Second Language Skills Study*

In 1994 (MTC, 1994), a study was conducted to determine: (a) how well missionaries spoke their mission language and how long it took them to become functional in the language, (b) what role second-language skills play in missionaries’ overall effectiveness was, and (c) what factors affected language learning and how missionary language learning can be improved. These questions were investigated in order to understand how training could be adjusted to better help missionaries accomplish their purpose as missionaries and to help them become more effective sooner in their respective target languages.

The sample of missionaries in the study consisted of 303 missionaries who had been serving for various amounts of time in the mission field, ranging from new arrivals to those preparing to return home. Three different languages were represented: Portuguese, Russian and Japanese. These three were selected to represent different levels of learning difficulty for native English speakers. In order to gather data, several instruments were used in this study:

- Missionary Language Performance Test (measure task performance)
- Listening Comprehension Test
- Demographic Questionnaire
- Confidence Rating
Self-rating of Ability

Language Learning Questionnaire (to determine which strategies were used)

Effectiveness Rating by Mission President (ranked the missionaries into three groups: most effective, next-most effective, and least effective according to overall effectiveness in doing missionary work.

The findings of this study showed that indeed different languages do show differences with regard to the effectiveness of missionary training and how long it takes for missionaries to become functional in their respective languages. In test scores for performance, listening, and confidence, those that were learning Portuguese ranked highest, followed by Russian and then Japanese. The same basic pattern was also found in the self-rating of language ability.

Also interesting in the findings of this study was the time that is required for missionaries to become functional in the mission language. Figure 1 shows the trend of various languages in proficiency according to amount of time in the mission field.

The values in the above graph are based on the composite score of the MLPT and show that in Portuguese (and presumably in other similar languages for native English speakers), missionaries typically become functional in the mission language during the first six months of their mission. In Russian, missionaries become functional during the second six months and in Japanese it requires a year or longer to become functional and an estimated 25 percent of the Japanese missionaries are still non-functional during the last six months.
The language learning questionnaire had missionaries rate themselves on a Likert scale for frequency on one hundred different strategies. A Pearson correlation coefficient was used to compare the frequency of strategy use (determined by the language learning questionnaire) with the performance tests (MLPT, Listening Comprehension Test, and the Self Rating). For the majority of strategies, the frequency of use gave nonsignificant correlations, indicating that most of the strategies do not discriminate between missionaries who speak the language well and those who don’t. Table 1 shows those strategies with correlation values of $r = .15$ or higher with the MLPT and significant correlation with either the Listening Comprehension Test or the missionary’s self-rating of language ability.

The language learning strategies listed in the table are used more frequently by missionaries who are more proficient in the language. It is interesting to note that the highest correlations are for strategies that involve reading and writing, caution should be
Table 1
Language learning strategy correlations with MLPT, Listening Comprehension, and Self-Rating Ability tests (MTC, 1994).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Language Learning Strategy</th>
<th>MLPT</th>
<th>Listening Comprehension</th>
<th>Self-Rating of Ability</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Read materials in the language</td>
<td>0.44*</td>
<td>0.31*</td>
<td>0.49*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Write personal notes and messages in the language</td>
<td>0.38*</td>
<td>0.25*</td>
<td>0.37*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Take notes in meetings in the language</td>
<td>0.3*</td>
<td>0.14</td>
<td>0.29*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use the language on the street</td>
<td>0.29*</td>
<td>0.26*</td>
<td>0.36*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Try to think in the language</td>
<td>0.29*</td>
<td>0.09</td>
<td>0.35*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Initiate conversations in the language</td>
<td>0.28*</td>
<td>0.23*</td>
<td>0.41*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apply general rules to new situations</td>
<td>0.26*</td>
<td>0.26*</td>
<td>0.24*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Make short summaries of long passages</td>
<td>0.23*</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>0.2*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ask questions to be involved in the conversation</td>
<td>0.22*</td>
<td>0.11</td>
<td>0.28*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I revise what I write in the language</td>
<td>0.21*</td>
<td>0.14</td>
<td>0.27*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Imitate the way native speakers talk</td>
<td>0.21*</td>
<td>0.15*</td>
<td>0.28*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Listen to native speakers and practice what they do</td>
<td>0.21*</td>
<td>0.16*</td>
<td>0.19*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Put a new word in a sentence to remember it</td>
<td>0.21*</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>0.25*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Read from the Book of Mormon or other scriptures</td>
<td>0.19*</td>
<td>0.22*</td>
<td>0.23*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Try to notice language errors and find out why</td>
<td>0.28*</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>0.17*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Try to understand w/out word for word translation</td>
<td>0.16*</td>
<td>0.15*</td>
<td>0.21*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use familiar words in new sentences</td>
<td>0.15*</td>
<td>0.16*</td>
<td>0.21*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

N = 303
* = those with an r value of r ≥ .15

emphasized in the application, as it is not clear if this reflects the fact that reading and writing actually help missionaries to learn language faster, if those who are more proficient in the language tend to read and write more, or if these areas are simply easier
to evaluate for effectiveness. The fact that there is high correlation should not be overlooked however.

In addition to the empirical evidence shown in the above table, missionaries also gave interesting information when asked the open-ended question: *What is the single most helpful thing you have done to help you learn your mission language?* Table 2 shows the strategies mentioned by missionaries displayed by categories with the total number of missionaries who answered with a response in that category.

The overwhelming majority of the missionaries responded foremost with activities corresponding to speaking the language. This suggests that missionaries *learn* the language when they are using it for communicative activities.

Also of interest are the categories of reading and writing in the language. All 31 responses to “reading scriptures in the language” were from Portuguese and Russian missionaries, no Japanese. This is a result of the difficult writing system of Japanese and similar languages that missionaries typically never master. In fact, missionaries are never formally taught to read the Japanese characters that *The Book of Mormon* is written in.

Although the category of “spirit” is not a typical language learning strategy mentioned in the literature, spiritual learning strategies such as prayer, faith, hard work, desire, and help from the spirit are seen as very important by the missionaries in general. This is perhaps a strategy that does not fit easily in many of the prescribed taxonomies, but one that cannot be overlooked as to its contribution to language learning and strategy training.
Table 2
*Frequency measures by category of the language learning strategies used by missionaries (MTC, 1994).*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strategy</th>
<th># of missionaries</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Speaking in the mission language</td>
<td>116</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Praying for help / praying for the Spirit</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Learning from native speakers</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Learning the missionary discussions</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Having faith that the Lord will help me</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Studying regularly and diligently</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reading scriptures in the language</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Listening when others speak</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Having native companions</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Studying grammar</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asking questions / asking for help</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Looking up new words in the dictionary</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asking to be corrected</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Desiring to learn / desiring to speak as a native</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not getting discouraged / being patient / relaxing</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Spirit</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

N = 303

The authors of this study concluded: (a) missionaries should be actively involved in a training program of how to approach the task of learning a language; (b) that missionary second language training should include an appropriate balance of studying the language and using the language for real communication; (c) missionaries should be taught basic reading and writing skill in every language, including those not currently doing so.
such as Japanese; and (d) there should be additional support, including more substantive
post-MTC language training, for missionaries learning more difficult languages.

**Language Learning Strategies used by Missionaries at the MTC**

A study conducted at the MTC in 1995 (MTC, 1995) was designed to analyze
what strategies were used by missionaries while residing in the MTC during formal
language training. Data was gathered from 156 missionaries—90 learning Spanish and 66
learning Japanese. The missionaries were evaluated on the use of 75 different language
learning strategies which were grouped into seven categories: Memory, cognitive,
compensation, metacognitive, affective, social, and spiritual. The first six of these
categories were based on Oxford’s (1990) most recent taxonomy and the seventh was
added because of previous research findings and because of the specific needs of
missionaries.

Four kinds of instruments were used to obtain information for the study: (a) a
background information form, (b) a use-of-language-learning-strategy questionnaire
administered at 1, 3, 5, and 8 weeks into training, (c) a listening comprehension test, and
(d) a language proficiency rating. The data collected by these means was used to evaluate
what strategies missionaries at the MTC use and which strategies tended to be used by
more proficient learners.

Findings of this study indicate that missionaries rely heavily on language learning
strategies at the MTC. Figure 2 breaks down the seven categories of strategies used in the
study into levels of usage on a five-point scale, "1" representing never used, and "5"
representing consistent use.
A complete listing of all 75 strategies in a frequency of use listing showed that the difference between the most frequently used language learning strategy (4.76) and the least used strategy (1.47) is very large, indicating that there are some strategies that almost all missionaries use and others that very few use.

Also interesting is a breakdown of how learners of the two different languages involved in the study use strategies. Those missionaries learning Japanese (a more difficult language for native English speakers), relied more on learning strategies than those learning Spanish. Table 3 shows that the missionaries learning Japanese showed significantly higher usage levels in a majority of the areas measured.

Other interesting findings were results of the factor of gender on which strategies were used. The literature (Oxford and Nyikos, 1989) indicates that females are more
Table 3
Use of Language Learning Strategy Categories by Language at the MTC (MTC, 1995).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Spanish</th>
<th>Japanese</th>
<th>Significance (T-Test)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Memory</td>
<td>2.79</td>
<td>2.98</td>
<td>0.02*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cognitive</td>
<td>3.12</td>
<td>3.29</td>
<td>0.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Compensation</td>
<td>3.52</td>
<td>3.56</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meta-Cognitive</td>
<td>3.16</td>
<td>3.33</td>
<td>0.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Affective</td>
<td>3.12</td>
<td>3.13</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>3.92</td>
<td>0.0001*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spiritual</td>
<td>3.65</td>
<td>3.85</td>
<td>0.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall</td>
<td>3.22</td>
<td>3.39</td>
<td>0.01*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

N = 156
* = Significance at the alpha level of p < .05

likely than males to report using strategies, and the findings of this study support the
literature and suggest that sisters report a higher overall use of language learning
strategies as well as a higher means on several of the different strategy categories, as can
be seen in Table 4. The only category with statistical difference at the .05 level, however,
was the memory category. Although it would be difficult in the current program to train
sisters and elders separately, the fact that they do display some significant differences in
strategy approach should be taken into consideration in the development and training.

The missionaries were tested at different intervals throughout the training program
to see if strategy use differed with time. Results indicate that except for memory
strategies used in Japanese, which dropped from 3.17 in week one to 2.75 in week eight,
there were no significantly consistent trends in increase or decrease.
Table 4
Use of Language Learning Strategy Categories by Gender at the MTC (MTC, 1995).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Elders</th>
<th>Sisters</th>
<th>Significance (T-Test)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Memory</td>
<td>2.83</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>0.004*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cognitive</td>
<td>3.17</td>
<td>3.23</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Compensation</td>
<td>3.48</td>
<td>3.64</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meta-Cognitive</td>
<td>3.22</td>
<td>3.29</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Affective</td>
<td>3.12</td>
<td>3.15</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social</td>
<td>3.64</td>
<td>3.86</td>
<td>0.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spiritual</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Overall</strong></td>
<td><strong>3.27</strong></td>
<td><strong>3.41</strong></td>
<td><strong>0.1</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

N = 156 (130 elder, 26 sister)
* = Significance at the alpha level of $p < .05$

 Probably the most significant realization from this study is that individual learners learn differently and have different approaches to strategy use, and the frequency of their use as seen from the varied responses to the 75 listed strategies. This high degree of individual variability in learner profiles suggests that not every learner takes the same road to success and that there is a need for flexibility in training missionaries to use language learning strategies. It is unlikely that a few strategies can be isolated that will boost performance in every learner. Recommendations include using a large subset of learning strategies that are most often used by the missionaries, particularly those preferred by more successful learners. These strategies should be systematically presented to the missionaries and the missionaries encouraged to try them and discover, through practice, the specific strategies that are most useful for them individually.
**Evaluation of the TALL program at the MTC**

The Technology-Assisted Language Learning (TALL) Program has as one of its objectives teaching missionaries to use language learning strategies. In the first two try-outs (MTC, 1996) of the TALL program in Spanish, strategies were taught to the students in the classroom presentations. Additionally, many strategies were built into the computer program. It was determined that *integrating* the strategies into the computer lessons proved helpful--strategy use increased. However, the strategies that were simply *discussed* in the classroom or handouts and not practiced did not show any increase in usage. This supports the notion that it is vital for learners to get hands-on practice with the strategies.

**Language Learning Strategies Awareness Study**

The goal of another study at the MTC in 1996 (MTC, 1996) was to try to make missionaries more aware of potential strategies that they could use in order to help them become better language learners. As part of the third try-out of the Spanish TALL program, a one-page summary document of selected key language learning strategies was given to the missionaries, and they were encouraged to use those strategies in connection with their TALL training. The training sessions were two one-hour training sessions at the beginning and in the middle of their training. This strategy awareness training showed significant measures indicating that those trained in language learning strategies had more positive attitudes about using strategies than missionaries not trained, but did not result in higher use of the strategies, improved language learning, or proficiency. Evidently just talking briefly about strategies at infrequent intervals is not enough to motivate
missionaries to use them more appropriately or more frequently in order to encourage them to be better language learners.

**Summary of Literature Review**

The research presented in this review of literature supports the view that language learning strategies are an important element of language learning. It also supports the notion that learners can and possibly should be trained in strategies in order to help them become more effective language learners faster.

The research presented here has demonstrated and implied the following points that should be taken into consideration in the development and application of a strategy training program, particularly in a formal instruction setting such as at the Missionary Training Center:

1. Language learning strategies are important in that they are related to successful performance in language learning and use, enable students to take individual responsibility for language learning, are teachable, and can give the teacher an expanded role of coach instead of simply provider.

2. The learner is an active and involved participant in the language learning process. Individuals with different learning styles, personalities, backgrounds, or learning situations use different kinds of strategies.

3. Although there are many definitions as to what language learning strategies are, there is basic agreement that almost anything the learner does in order to learn the language or progress in language ability can be considered a language learning strategy.
4. Many different classification taxonomies exist in attempts to organize different strategies, however, most classifications agree that there are direct strategies that directly involve the target language being learned, and indirect strategies that do not involve the target language directly.

5. There are many methods of strategy investigation. It is currently thought that a combination of many methods is preferable in order to accommodate for different types of learners and inherent weaknesses of some methods for certain types of investigation. It is also been shown that self-report methods are reliable and successful.

6. Language learners at all levels use strategies to some extent; however, many of the "poorer" learners are unaware of the strategies they use and do not take advantage of the range of strategies available to them as "good" learners do.

7. More proficient learners use a greater range of appropriate strategies in a greater number of situations with good learners typically having a concern for language form and meaning, a concern for communication, an active task approach, a cognitive awareness of the learning process, and a capacity to use strategies in a flexible manner.

8. It is advisable to conduct training in a completely informed manner with good course integration and ample practice time where learners are taught how and why to use, transfer, and evaluate strategies.

9. It is possible that different kinds of strategy combinations often work together for optimal effectiveness.
10. While there are many that feel that training in language learning strategies is worthwhile, there have been relatively few empirical studies to validate if learners actually benefit from strategy training. The studies that have been conducted do show considerable promise for further investigation of strategy training.

Although there have been many factors that can affect the use of language learning strategies, some of the most significant are the motivation for learning a language, whether training methods are integrated and informed, and the individual learning styles of the learners in relation to the strategies presented in training. Each of these points, as well as others should be taken into consideration in the planning of a training course, according to the particular group involved in the training program.

The actual training methods have not been studied extensively, mostly anecdotal in nature, but overall characteristics that are thought to be effective in LLS training programs are that they are communicative in approach (although not all necessarily so), presenting the strategies in an integrated method. They train learners in a large range of strategies and encourage learners to choose what works best for them and to experiment with new strategies. One of the largest factors involves the issue of practice. Those programs that limit training to lecture or discussion show lower results than those programs which give the learner specific practice in using the strategies. The most effective trainers also recommend overt training where the learner is aware that strategies are being presented and is expected to consciously apply strategies to the task of language learning.
**Synthesis of Literature**

In synthesizing the material that has been looked at in this literature review, there seem to be many factors that need to be further investigated in the development and application of a language learning strategy training program. The hypotheses, founded in the existing literature, are that training learners in language learning strategies will increase learners' use and intended use of language learning strategies as potential language learning tools, specifically in the areas of frequency, appropriateness, and range.

This study will continue with the established research, investigating the above hypotheses through the training of missionaries at the MTC in language learning strategies. The indications of this study are that training missionaries in language learning strategies will help them become more proficient sooner as they increase their awareness of using strategies as language learning tools.
CHAPTER THREE
Methodology and Design

Introduction

As indicated earlier, the main purpose of this study is to examine if training learners in language learning strategies helps make the learners more aware of using language learning strategies as potential language learning tools. This examination of strategy training is an evaluation of a program specifically designed by the researchers of this study in order to make decisions about the effectiveness and implications of training missionaries in language learning strategies. This evaluation will in turn provide much needed research for the field of strategy training, broadening the current knowledge base of what is currently known about language learning strategy training.

To accomplish this purpose, a research team from the MTC Research and Evaluation Department created and developed a Language Learning Strategy (LLS) training program based on the existing literature and past LLS projects. This strategy awareness program included an overt integrated training emphasis with a heavy practice component. The research team consisted of C. Eric Ott, Research and Evaluation Director at the MTC, and two graduate students from BYU, Brian Kohler and Necia Stanford. This program was designed to be flexible and to use technology available in any language taught at the MTC in order to be adaptable to any of the MTC language training programs.
In order to investigate these issues, the program based it’s training on a strategy list entitled *How to be a Better Language Learner* (Appendix A) that was founded on research done by Rebecca Oxford, Rubin and Thompson, Mary Lee Scott (now Mary Lee Call) and research at the MTC. Additional suggestions for training were taken from the MTC/BYU Language Advisory Committee, a group of professors from BYU and language training directors from the MTC. This specific study involved younger missionaries who were learning either German or Portuguese in an intensive eight-week language learning program and the use of four different instruments of measurement.

**Subjects**

The subjects for this study were 40 missionaries from the Missionary Training Center of The Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints in Provo, Utah learning either German or Portuguese. The Missionary Training Center has an intensive training program where missionaries learning a foreign language are instructed in language, LDS doctrine, and teaching skills. The curriculum consists of the missionaries attending training classes for approximately nine hours a day, five days a week for a period of eight weeks. During their training at the MTC, the missionaries are expected to learn enough of the new language to be functional upon arrival in the target culture. The Missionary Training Center was chosen as the location of the data collection because the MTC is interested in the training of language learning strategies and because the current training program could be adapted to accommodate the regular training in language learning strategies.

The 40 missionaries who participated in this study were 19-22 year old men and women consisting of 20 German-learning and 20 Portuguese-learning missionaries. These
languages were chosen because of the background knowledge of the researchers involved. These 40 missionaries made up two experimental test groups, called districts, in which the training was conducted, and two control groups who received the traditional MTC training and no strategy training. Each individual district received only one treatment, training or no training. The German experimental groups consisted of seven elders (young men) and four sisters (young women) and the Portuguese experimental group of six elders and four sisters. The German control group of seven elders and two sisters and the Portuguese group of six elders and four sisters. Table 5 summarizes the grouping categories for the subjects involved.

Table 5
Subjects involved in the study.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Treatments</th>
<th>Missionaries Learning German</th>
<th>Missionaries Learning Portuguese</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Language Learning</strong></td>
<td>7 Elders</td>
<td>6 Elders</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Strategy Treatment Group</strong></td>
<td>4 Sisters</td>
<td>4 Sisters</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>11 Total</td>
<td>10 Total</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Traditionally Trained Control Group</strong></td>
<td>7 Elders</td>
<td>6 Elders</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2 Sisters</td>
<td>4 Sisters</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>9 Total</td>
<td>10 Total</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A human subjects approval was sought and granted through means of the MTC/BYU Language Advisory Committee in order to assure that no adverse effects would result from the design of the program or treatments administered to the missionaries.
All subjects who participated in this study were as randomly selected as possible. Initially each missionary individually received a call from LDS church headquarters to serve in a specific mission of the world. Disregarding any influence that those making the calls had, each missionary had an equal opportunity to serve in any of the hundreds of missions throughout the world. Upon arrival at the MTC, the missionaries were randomly assigned to a district in the area responsible for training missionaries in the language they are to learn. The four districts involved in this study were then randomly picked from those available in the time frame needed for the study. None of the subjects declined to participate in the study. This was perhaps due to the fact that the study was a blind study so the involved missionaries were unaware that they were receiving training different from any other missionaries, until the conclusion of the study. This blind approach was approved by the Missionary Committee at the Missionary Training Center and was viewed as not favoring or withholding from any group or individual in the training received.

All subjects who participated in this study were involved in the eight-week training program at the MTC and none of the four groups was being instructed by a native speaker of the target language. All forty of the participants were native English speakers with varying amounts of educational background, experience with foreign languages, learning aptitude, confidence, motivation and language learning abilities. The objective of both methods of training was the same—to prepare missionaries to be functional in the target language and to conduct language involved tasks in an effective and confident manner.
Training Materials

The specific training materials that were created by the research team for this particular study include: the How to Be a Better Language Learner handout, two 60-minute training presentations (introduction and conclusion), fifteen 30-minute individual training lessons, tapes and letters produced by native speakers, and a weekly training schedule for strategy training. This section will briefly describe each type of training material and how it was used in training.

"How to Be a Better Language Learner"— Strategy Training Document

This document (Appendix A) is a one-page, two-sided listing of the strategies that were used in the strategy training. This handout consisted of 48 different strategies organized into the following categories: Maximizing your language study, learning language tasks, speaking, listening, reading, writing, learning grammar, learning vocabulary, learning missionary discussions, and spiritual and mental preparation. Although there are many more possible strategies that could have been listed, the emphasis was to provide several "good" strategies accompanied with training to each missionary from which they could choose according to their personal learning styles, needs, and interests.

The origin of this document came from three principle sources. First, the work of Rebecca Oxford, Rubin and Thompson, and Mary Lee Scott (now Mary Lee Call), all leading professionals in the field of language learning strategies. Second was the previous research that has been conducted with missionaries at the MTC and in the mission field. Third were insights and suggestions from the MTC/BYU Language Advisory Committee.
Lesson Plans

Seventeen total lessons were created for the training program (Appendix C). These lessons included an introductory lesson, a conclusion lesson, and 15 bi-weekly training lessons. Each of these lesson types will be briefly discussed in this section.

Introduction Session. The Introduction Session was the first contact that the missionaries had with the language learning strategy training. This lesson was taught in “week 0” (missionaries arrive on a Wednesday and “week 1” of training begins the following Monday). There are five main objectives covered in the lesson: helping missionaries understand what it means to learn a second language, dispelling misconceptions about language learning, helping missionaries take personal responsibility for language learning, helping them realize that different people have different learning styles, and providing missionaries with useful language learning strategies (*How to be a Better Language Learner* handout).

The first objective begins with a discussion as to the importance of learning a language as a missionary. A proficiency scale is presented and each level of the scale explained. An audio cassette of ESL speakers at various levels is played for the missionaries to help them understand the language capabilities for each level.

A discussion of common misconceptions about learning the language is then presented and the missionaries informed that learning a language takes consistent effort and work.
The third objective introduces the missionaries to the Speak Your Language (SYL) program at the MTC and helps missionaries realize that they must take personal responsibility for learning the language.

Objective four is a discussion of how different individuals learn differently. The missionaries are encouraged to find out how they learn best and to select strategies that help them be most effective.

The final objective introduces the missionaries to the strategy training sheet, *How to Be a Better Language Learner*. Each strategy is read aloud and briefly discussed for meaning.

**Conclusion Session.** The conclusion session is also a 60-minute lesson that is taught in “week 8.” The main objectives of this lesson are to review the strategy training handout, discuss their reactions to the training, discuss the danger of fossilization, discuss ways of building daily language study into the missionary schedule, and have the missionaries create a personalized plan for learning the language in the mission field.

The missionaries are first divided into small groups where they discuss which strategies they found most helpful for them individually and what they plan on doing with them. The missionaries then reassemble as a groups and the instructor leads a discussion about the purpose of the training, strategies that the missionaries brought up in the small groups, and any reactions to the training in general.

An in-field worksheet is handed out to the missionaries (Appendix F) and the ESL tape of the different proficiency levels used in the introduction lesson is played again. The concept of language fossilization is presented and the missionaries indicate on their
worksheets where they feel their current proficiency is and what level of proficiency they wish to obtain while on a mission.

A discussion is then lead as to how to build daily language study into the missionary schedule and several examples are given (getting up early, splitting up companion study, etc.).

The final activity has the missionaries write down the strategies they plan on using is the mission field to continue to learn the language. These strategies are written on the backside of the in-field worksheet and the missionaries are encouraged to take the worksheet with them into the mission field and refer to it often.

Thirty-minute Individual Training Sessions. These training sessions were taught twice a week for 30 minutes to each group of missionaries during the last half hour of their regular afternoon class. These sessions include a brief review of the previous strategies introduced, introduction of the new strategies, and practice exercises for the new strategies being learned. Each of these practice sessions revolved around materials that the missionaries were involved with during regular class activities at that particular time in their MTC training.

Weekly Training Schedule

A weekly training schedule was made in order to coordinate which strategies would be taught when and to incorporate specific strategies with the missionaries' level of language ability and what was occurring in the regular classroom training (Appendix B).
Instruments of Measurement

In order to collect data to address the research questions, five instruments were administered to both the experimental treatment groups and the control groups:

- Missionary Language Background Questionnaire (Appendix D)
- Missionary Language Learning Questionnaire (Appendix H)
- Situational Strategy Evaluation Worksheet (Appendix E)
- Learning the Language in the Mission Field Worksheet (Appendix F)
- Missionary Language Task Performance & Feedback Interview (Appendix G)

The first two of these instruments were administered in either the sixth or seventh week of the missionaries’ training at the MTC respectively, with the remaining three being used in the eighth week of training, just prior to the missionaries’ departure. This section will briefly discuss each instrument and how it was used. How each instrument was scored will be handled in a separate section called “Scoring.”

Missionary Language Background Questionnaire (MLBQ)

This instrument (Appendix H) was designed by the Research and Evaluation Department at the Missionary Training Center specifically for this study and was intended to elicit personal background information for each subject prior to entrance into the MTC. This questionnaire was administered in the sixth week of the missionaries’ training in the MTC.

Information gained from this questionnaire includes prior language experience in both the specific target language the missionaries are learning as well as experience in any other foreign language. Additionally information was collected as to the subjects’
perceptions of their confidence in learning the language, the importance they placed on learning a language, how challenging they feel learning a language is for them, and how much education they had prior to entering the MTC.

*Missionary Language Learning Questionnaire (MLLQ)*

The Missionary Language Learning Questionnaire (Appendix H) was administered in the seventh week of training at the MTC and based on the document *How to Be a Better Language Learner*. The form of this questionnaire used in this study was adapted from a previous version used in previous MTC strategy studies (MTC, 1995, 1996). This original form of this document was based on the Strategy Inventory for Language Learning (SILL) originally developed by Rebecca Oxford (Oxford, 1985). Her original document was a 121-item self-report instrument that asked second language learners to report the frequency with which they used a variety of different language learning strategies. This SILL was designed to assess how language learners go about learning a second language with respect to the four major language modalities of reading, writing, listening and speaking. Oxford’s SILL has learners rate themselves on a five-point frequency scale for each strategy mentioned. Responses are: 1. Never, 2. Almost never, 3. Sometimes, 4. Almost always, and 5. Always.

The questionnaire requires the subjects to rate themselves on how often they use each strategy on a five-point scale (1. Never, 2. Rarely, 3. Sometimes, 4. Often, 5. Always or Almost always.) There are 80 rating questions on the questionnaire as well as two open-ended questions inquiring as to the single activity or strategy that has been most helpful in learning the mission language and what their long term proficiency goals are.
Situational Strategy Evaluation Worksheet (SSEW)

This instrument (Appendix E) was created specifically for this study and was designed to assess which strategies missionaries would employ in a given language learning situation. This instrument was administered in the eighth week of training.

The instrument was a two-page worksheet which consisted of eight situational questions, roughly one question representing each major strategy grouping on the How to Be a Better Language Learner sheet used in the training program. Each question presented a different situation that might be encountered by missionaries in the process of learning the mission language. For example, “You have a list of new vocabulary words to learn. What will you do to learn these words?”

For each question the missionaries could list up to five different strategies they would employ to best accomplish the task or deal with the situation. These strategies were generated from memory and experience and not from any “on-hand” list.

The design of this instrument is different from the Missionary Language Learning Questionnaire in that it is open ended, requiring the subject to come up with the strategies on their own instead of having the strategy given to him. These responses could then be used to analyze which strategies the missionaries were likely to use, if they are effective strategies according to the situation given, and to evaluate the differences between the strategies that the experimental and control groups listed.

Learning the Language in the Mission Field Worksheet (LLMF)

This instrument (Appendix F) was also designed specifically for this study and was designed to elicit the strategies that missionaries intended to use in the mission field as
they continued to study the language. This test was administered in the eighth week of the MTC training. It was designed not only as a measurement tool, but also as a worksheet for the missionaries to take with them into the mission field, in order to remind them of their language learning goals and which strategies they planed on continuing to use throughout their missions.

The first half of this worksheet presented a proficiency scale and had the missionaries indicate what level of proficiency they felt they were currently at and what level of proficiency they wished to obtain while on their missions.

The second half of the worksheet was open-ended in design, having the missionaries list however many strategies they could think of that they intended using in the mission field. Once again this instrument was designed to see which strategies were likely to be used, how appropriate the strategies were, and how the two treatment groups differed in intended strategy use.

This instrument differed from the situational strategy evaluation worksheet in that there were no contextual situations provided to the missionaries. They were free to indicate any and as many strategies as they felt.

Missionary Language Task Performance and Retrospective Interview (TPRI)

This instrument (Appendix G) was a performance-type instrument designed for this study to measure actual strategy use. This activity was given in the “week 8” of the MTC training schedule in the time-slot of the last regular strategy training session. Both the experimental and control groups was merely informed that they would be
participating in an activity as part of the culmination of their MTC training experience, unaware that it was different from what any other group might experience.

The purpose of this instrument was to see which strategies missionaries employed when put into a given situation where they needed to use the target language, and to assess the extent to which missionaries selected appropriate strategies.

The missionaries were instructed that they would be working in partners and that they would have time to prepare for a teaching situation in the target language. They would then be expected to teach what they had prepared. They were taken by companionships to individual rooms where they found a tape recorder with a taped message as well as a letter. The missionaries were to assume that they were in the target country and that the recorded message was an answering machine message from an ecclesiastical leader (the message had been recorded by a native speaker). The letter was mentioned in the recorded message (also created by a native speaker) and contained information from the mother of the boy that the missionaries would be preparing to teach. Each companionship was given 30 minutes to prepare for the specific task, in this case to teach a nine-year-old boy who was preparing for baptism. They could use any materials or methods that they needed.

The missionaries were also informed that there would have access to two native speakers (teachers) and that they could ask them for help if they wished. This service was provided the missionaries in order to give them the opportunity of using strategies that involved using a native speaker.
After the 30 minute preparation time, the missionaries were excused to go back to their classroom where the teacher continued with the planned lesson of the day, giving the missionaries no opportunity to talk with each other or further prepare. Each companionship was then taken out separately, and asked to perform the given situation as they had prepared it. A researcher with experience in the language played the native part and the role play was taped on audio cassette, typically lasting 15-20 minutes.

Immediately following the performance task discussed above, the missionaries were taken to another room and were interviewed in English by a second researcher. During this interview, the missionaries were asked to recall and self-report what they did in the preparation and performance stages of the task in order to assess which strategies they employed (Appendix G). Additional questions were asked in regard to how the subjects felt they had performed. The experimental groups also responded to questions about the whole strategy training program that they had participated in. Such questions asked what they liked best about the LLS training program, what recommendations they had, which strategies they liked best, and if they would recommend continuing with the program for future missionaries. These interviews were audio-taped as well and were later analyzed to assess which strategies were used.

Procedural Overview

The following procedures were used in the creation, administration, and evaluation of the LLS training program designed specifically for this study at the Provo MTC.
Creation and Development of the LLS Program

The research team began by reviewing the literature and previous MTC studies in order to determine which strategies should be involved in the LLS training. It was concluded that there should be a wide variety of strategies from which missionaries could choose from, but that the list should be contained on the two sides of one piece of paper to facilitate use and reduce anxiety overload. Previous lists were revised and the How to Be a Better Language Learner was created.

After the specific strategies were selected for the training, the learning outcome objectives were reviewed and measurement instruments created to gather data on the objectives for the study: The Missionary Language Background Questionnaire was created to examine the equality of both treatment groups and acted as covariates in the data analysis; The Missionary Language Learning Questionnaire and Missionary Language Task Performance and Retrospective Interview were created to measure the actual use of strategies by missionaries in the MTC; and the Situational Strategy Evaluation Worksheet and Learning the Language in the Mission Field Worksheet created to measure intended strategy use in the mission field.

The format for the training was then established by consulting previous studies and by conforming to the administrative restrictions placed on the researchers by the MTC training committee. The resulting training format was the two-a-week 30-minute training schedule that included a heavy practice component for each lesson.

After the strategies had been selected and the training format established, the strategies were reviewed and ranked for their usefulness in the MTC training atmosphere
and target language community. Individual lesson plans were then created that reviewed all of the strategies on the training list and provided practice activities for those strategies ranking the highest.

Several of the preliminary training lessons were pilot tested with German and Portuguese groups of missionaries. These pilots were evaluated for effectiveness in training and learner reaction, after which modifications were made in the lessons, materials, training methods, and training schedule.

*Administration of Training*

Upon entering the MTC the subjects that participated in this study were assigned to one of four groups: an experimental German group (trained), a control German group (untrained), a Portuguese experimental group (trained), or a Portuguese control group (untrained). All four groups had a different set of “traditional curriculum” teachers and all four groups met independently for day-to-day training.

The control groups had no strategy training and only had contact with the researchers in order to complete instruments during normal classroom hours. The experimental groups, German and Portuguese, met together for the introduction and conclusion strategy training lessons, but otherwise were instructed separately by the same set of strategy training instructors for the bi-weekly training.

During the sixth week of training, all the missionaries completed the *Language Background Questionnaire*. During the seventh week of training they completed the *Language Learning Questionnaire*. Both of these instruments were completed during
normal classroom hours and did not interfere with the strategy training time for the experimental groups.

In the eighth week of MTC training, all the subjects participated in the performance task activity and retrospective interview. For the experimental groups this activity took place during their final bi-weekly training session, and for the control group, it took place during normal classroom hours that had been previously scheduled. Neither the experimental or the control groups were aware that their participation was different from a traditionally trained group. The final training session was the conclusion session and combined the German and Portuguese groups again.

Also in the eighth week of training, the *Situational Strategy Evaluation Worksheet* and the *Infield Worksheet* were completed by all missionaries. The experimental groups completed these during the concluding strategy training session, and the control groups during normal classroom time.

Although the procedure for both the experimental and control groups was different than traditionally trained groups of missionaries, neither group was made aware that they were participating in anything different than any other group trained at the MTC. It may have been the case that there was some discussion between groups about their training experiences that occurred outside of class, particularly between the two German groups or two Portuguese groups. This was not noted by anyone, however, and there were no complaints from the missionaries about receiving treatment different than anyone else. It is felt that any bias of this nature was eliminated by the blind nature of the instruction and
the minimal time that the missionaries converse outside of the classroom. A graphical summary of the major treatment procedures of this study can be seen in Figure 3.

Figure 3. Summary of Treatment Procedures.
Scoring

This section will discuss how the information for each measurement instrument used in collecting data was scored to produce the data involved in the data analysis. Each instrument of measurement will be looked at individually.

Missionary Language Learning Questionnaire (MLLQ)

This questionnaire contained eighty questions and was divided into ten major sections: language study, learning language tasks, speaking, listening, reading, writing, learning grammar, learning vocabulary, learning missionary discussions, spiritual and mental preparation. For each question, the missionaries ranked themselves according to the following scale.

A. I never use it
B. I rarely use it (less than 10% of the time)
C. I sometimes use it (10% - 50% of the time))
D. I often use it (50% - 90% of the time)
E. I always or almost always use it (over 90% of the time)

The missionaries indicated their choice on a “bubble” sheet and their answers were later scanned into a computer and assigned an appropriate numerical score for each response: A=1, B=2, C=3, D=4, and E=5. An average score for each missionary was then calculated for each of the ten major categories and these averages were considered in the analysis for this instrument.
Situational Strategy Evaluation Worksheet (SSEW)

For the eight questions on this instrument, the research team created a master list of all strategies that were mentioned by the missionaries. Each different strategy appearing on the instrument receiving a specific code number. In addition, each strategy on the master list was also given a weighted effectiveness score, a context score, and a list score, as explained below. Each missionary response was given an appropriate code from the master list and all the information was entered into an Excel spreadsheet format. Total strategy counts, weighted effectiveness scores, context scores, and LLS program scores were then calculated in the following manner:

**Total score.** The total score was derived simply from the total number of strategies that were mentioned by each missionary. Repeatedly listed strategies were counted only once as it was possible on this instrument to use the same strategy for more than one of the given situations. This score was used to determine how frequently missionaries used strategies, or the total count of how many strategies missionaries on average used. Range of strategy use was also determined by this score as the number of different strategies was analyzed.

**Weighted effectiveness scores.** Each strategy listed by the missionaries received a rating by the research team of “0”, “1”, or “2”. Strategies were assigned a “2” if they were on the document How to be a Better Language Learner used in the strategy training, or if the research group felt that it was an equally effective strategy according to literature and previous studies. Strategies received a “1” if they were indeed language learning strategies but were not on the training list of judged to be “minimally” effective.
Strategies were assigned a "0" if they were not actual strategies or they were considered totally ineffective as a language learning strategy (e.g. "hit my companion" or "learn by osmosis"). For each strategy reported, the subject received the appropriate weighted points assigned to that item. The cumulative weighted points represented the data for each missionary. The possible range for the cumulative weighted score was from 0, meaning that no strategies were reported, or that all of the reported strategies were assigned an "inappropriate," to 80 indicating that all five blanks per question (8 total questions) were filled in with a "very appropriate" strategy. This score was used in analyzing appropriate strategy use.

**Context Scores.** Each of the eight situations given on this instrument targeted a specific language context (e.g. writing, speaking, or learning grammar). If a strategy was considered by the research team to be "applicable" in the given context it was assigned a score of "1." If the listed strategies were judged to be "non-effective" in the given context they were assigned a score of "0." For each response given, the appropriate context score was assigned. The individual contexts scores were totals to obtain a cumulative context score. The possible range for the cumulative context score was between 0 and 40. This score helped in determining the level of analyzing appropriate strategy use for a specific context situation.

**List score.** Each strategy listed by the missionaries received a list score of either a "1" or a "0." A score of "1" was given only for those strategies that were found printed on the *How to be a Better Language Learner* handout, all other strategies regardless of effectiveness received a "0." After the individual list scores for each response was given,
they were totaled to gain a cumulative list score. The range for the cumulative list score was between zero and 40. This score was used to determine how much the actual training influenced strategy choice and if some strategies were used by all learners, regardless of training.

*Learning the Language in the Mission Field Worksheet (LLMF)*

The strategies that the missionaries listed on the back side of this instrument were used to create a master list of strategies that missionaries intended to use in the mission field and were individually coded. The information for the strategies and missionary responses was entered into an Excel spreadsheet format and a total score, weighted effectiveness score, and a list score were given for each missionary as was done for the previous instrument. No context score was assigned as there were not context-specific items on the instrument.

*Missionary Language Task Performance and Retrospective Interview (TPRI)*

After the missionaries prepared for and performed the assigned performance task, they were interviewed in English to determine strategy choice and usage. The interviews were tape recorded and conducted in a retrospective open-ended style in which the missionaries recalled what strategies they used according to pre-prepared questions.

The tapes were later reviewed by the research team and a master list of strategies made and coded. As this activity was conducted by companionship, scores were given by companionship for strategies that both individuals in the companionship agreed were used. Each companionship was given a total score, weighted effectiveness score, and list score as was done in previous instruments. The ranges of scores for each of these scoring
systems was not limited in that the companionships could list as many strategies as they used, so possible ranges could be from 0, meaning no strategies were used, to an undetermined upper limit. These scores helped to determine actual strategy use.

**Data Analysis**

To determine if training missionaries in language learning strategies helped to increase their awareness of using strategies in foreign language learning, an Analysis of Covariance (ANCOVA) statistical procedure was used. The procedure was chosen in order to take into consideration possible moderating variables due to the missionaries’ backgrounds.

**Covariates**

The covariates that were used for this analysis were the following four questions from the *Missionary Language Background Questionnaire* that were felt to best represent influential moderating background information:

**Question 4**  Please check the box representing the highest level of school you have attended.

1 = high school

2 = less then 1 year of college

3 = 1-2 years of college

4 = 3 or more years of college

5 = college graduate
Question 5  How much experience with foreign language(s) did you have before your mission?— 5.1  In your mission language & 5.2  In other languages?

1 = none

2 = 1-2 years in jr/sr high school

3 = over 2 years in jr/sr high school

4 = one or more college classes

5 = lived in foreign country

6 = spoke the language in my home

Question 8  Compared with other areas of missionary training such as learning the discussions or acquiring good teaching skills, how important is learning your mission language to you?

1 = much less important than other areas of training

2 = less important than other areas of training

3 = about the same as other areas of training

4 = more important than other areas of training

5 = much more important than other areas of training

These items were included as covariates in this study as they were factors that were uncontrollable but that might have had an effect on the analysis of the dependent variable measurements. In using the ANCOVA procedure, the measurement of the dependent variables was adjusted, taking into account these initial difference among the involved subjects.
Independent Variables

Three independent variables were chosen for analysis: *Training* (trained in strategies or not), *language* (German or Portuguese), and *gender* (male and female). Interactions of these three variables was also analyzed.

Dependent Variables

There were a total of 21 different dependent variables that were measured in this study, coming from four different instruments of measurement. The following is a list of the major instruments and the various scores that were from each:

*Situational Strategy Evaluation Worksheet*

- Total score
- Weighted effectiveness score
- LLS program score
- Context score

*Missionary Language Learning Questionnaire*

- Language study score
- Learning language task score
- Speaking score
- Listening score
- Reading score
- Writing score
- Learning grammar score
- Learning vocabulary score
• Learning missionary discussions score
• Spiritual and mental preparation score
• Overall average score

Missionary Language Task Performance and Retrospective Interview

• Total score
• Weighted effectiveness score
• LLS program score

Learning the Language in the Mission Field Worksheet

• Total score
• Weighted effectiveness score
• LLS program score

Analysis Method

The ANCOVA procedure was run by the BYU Department of Statistical Consultation using Statistical Analysis System (SAS) version 6.12. For each measure, a full model including all of the independent variables and covariates was run to test for initial effects. When one or more variables produced a significant effect, a reduced model was tested, discarding the non-significant variables to provide a better analysis of the independent variables. All measures of significance were considered at the alpha level \( p < .05 \) level of probability.
CHAPTER FOUR

Results

Introduction

The results of the data analysis are presented in this section by instrument of measurement. The instruments that were used to compare the involved variables were designed and selected to elicit information on the missionaries’ use and intended use of language learning strategies. These instruments included:

- Situational Strategy Evaluation Worksheet (SSEW)
- Learning the Language in the Mission Field Worksheet (LLMF)
- Missionary Language Learning Questionnaire (MLLQ)
- Missionary Task Performance and Retrospective Interview (TPRI)

Data from each of these instruments will be looked at individually in this section broken down by dependent variable in regard to the stated research question found in chapter one of this study.

The abbreviations found in Table 6 will be used in this analysis to refer to various measurement instruments and variables.

For each dependent variable in question, a full statistical ANCOVA model was run considering all independent variables and covariates in order to determine which variables showed statistical significance at an alpha level of $p < .05$. For those full models that showed areas of significance, a reduced model was run, including only those
Table 6
Abbreviations for instruments of measure, variables, and covariates

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Abbreviation</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Abbreviations for Instruments of Measurement</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MLBQ</td>
<td>Missionary Language Background Questionnaire (Appendix D)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SSEW</td>
<td>Situational Strategy Evaluation Worksheet (Appendix E)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LLMF</td>
<td>Learning the Language in the Mission Field Worksheet (Appendix F)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MLLQ</td>
<td>Missionary Language Learning Questionnaire (Appendix H)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TPRI</td>
<td>Missionary Task Performance and Retrospective Interview (Appendix G)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Abbreviations for Covariates</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BKG #04</td>
<td>MLBQ #4 - Education level reached before MTC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BKG #5.1</td>
<td>MLBQ #5.1 - Experience in mission language</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BKG #5.2</td>
<td>MLBQ #5.2 - Experience in other foreign languages</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BKG #08</td>
<td>MLBQ #8 - Importance of language as tool</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Abbreviations for Independent Variables</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lang</td>
<td>Language of training (German or Portuguese)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Train</td>
<td>LLS Training vs. No LLS Training</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gend</td>
<td>Male or Female</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Lang x Train</td>
<td>German / Portuguese x LLS Training / No LLS Training</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Lang x Gend</td>
<td>German / Portuguese x Male / Female</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Train x Gend</td>
<td>LLS Training / No LLS Training X Male / Female</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Lang x Train x Gend</td>
<td>German / Portuguese x LLS Training / No LLS Training x Male / Female</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(variables showing significance, to further define which areas were indeed significant. The complete ANCOVA models that were run are found in Appendix I, and figures and tables showing levels of significance are included in this analysis.)
Table 6 continued

*Abbreviations for instruments of measure, variables, and covariates*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Abbreviation</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Abbreviations for Dependent Variables</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weight Score</td>
<td>Weighted score for appropriate strategy usage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>List Score</td>
<td>LLS Program score for strategies used in LLS training program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Context Score</td>
<td>Context score for strategies used correctly in a given context</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Score</td>
<td>Total score for total number of strategies mentioned</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Study</td>
<td>Language study score on MLLQ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tasks</td>
<td>Learning language task score on MLLQ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speaking</td>
<td>Speaking score on MLLQ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Listening</td>
<td>Listening score on MLLQ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reading</td>
<td>Reading score on MLLQ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Writing</td>
<td>Writing score on MLLQ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grammar</td>
<td>Learning grammar score on MLLQ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vocabulary</td>
<td>Learning vocabulary score on MLLQ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discussion</td>
<td>Learning missionary discussions score on MLLQ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preparation</td>
<td>Spiritual and mental preparation score on MLLQ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall Average</td>
<td>Overall average score on MLLQ</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* = Interaction of Independent Variables

**Instrument Analysis**

**Situational Strategy Evaluation Worksheet (SSEW)**

This instrument consisted of eight questions, each designed to elicit which strategies the learners would use in a specific situation (e.g. learning new vocabulary, reading a passage, dealing with stress, etc.). Each question requested that the learner
provide up to five different strategies per question, and these answers were then analyzed for total score, weighted score, list score, and context score using the independent variables and covariates mentioned above. For the SSEW (situational) none of the covariates from the background questionnaire tested significant at the alpha level of \( p < .05 \), which suggests that the backgrounds of the missionaries involved in this study were more or less equal. Of the independent variables tested, significance was found only for the measures of \textit{training} and the \textit{language x training} interaction.

\textbf{Total score on SSEW.} The total score consists of the total number of strategies listed by the learner for all eight questions on the instrument combined. In the analysis of the total score, \( \textit{training} F (3, 36) = 7.37, p = .0101 \), and the \textit{language x training} interaction \( F (3, 36) = 5.01, p = 0.0315 \), were significant. The trained group (\( M = 24.55 \)) listed 4.54 more total strategies than did the group receiving no LLS training (\( M = 20.01 \)). Figure 4 depicts the total scores for the training variable according to treatment.

\begin{figure}[h]
\centering
\includegraphics[width=0.5\textwidth]{figure4.png}
\caption{Total score means per missionary for the \textit{training} variable on the \textit{Situational Evaluation Strategy Worksheet (SSEW)}.}
\end{figure}
However, this difference in total strategies listed between the trained and untrained groups is due largely to the Portuguese learners, where the trained students ($M = 26.2$) reported an average of 8.30 more strategies than the untrained students ($M = 17.9$).

Among German students, the mean difference was less than one strategy, see Figure 5.

These results show that in all cases the trained groups listed more total strategies, but that difference in the number of total strategies between the trained and untrained groups was much greater for Portuguese than for German, 8.30 as compared to .80.

**Weighted score on SSEW.** The weighted score was the score given indicating how effective the strategies listed by the learners on the eight questions were according to the specific situations given in the questions. In the analysis of the weighted score on the SSEW, a similar pattern to that of the total score resulted, showing significance in *training* $F (3, 36) = 7.16, p = 0.0112$, and the *language x training* interaction $F (3, 36) = 6.60, p = 0.0145$. The trained group's weighted score ($M = 41.70$) was 7.96 points higher than that
of the untrained group as seen in Figure 6. but in a similar fashion to the total score, the significance was again driven by the Portuguese learners, where the trained Portuguese

![Bar chart showing comparison between trained and untrained Portuguese learners.](image)

**Figure 6.** Weighted score means per missionary for the *training* variable on the *Situational Strategy Evaluation Worksheet (SSEW).*

students scored an average of 15.6 points higher than the untrained Portuguese learners.

The German students means between trained and untrained differed by .31 points as presented in Figure 7.

![Line chart showing comparison between German and Portuguese learners.](image)

**Figure 7.** Weighted score means per missionary for the *language x training* interaction on the *Situational Strategy Evaluation Worksheet (SSEW).*
**List score on SSEW.** The list score is the number of strategies that each learner listed that came directly off the *How to be a Better Language Learner* training sheet was used with the missionaries in the LLS training program. Unlike the total and weighted scores on the SSEW that showed significance for *training* and the *language x training* interaction, the list score showed significance for only the *training* variable $F(1, 38) = 14.22, p = 0.0006$. For the training variable the trained group ($M = 13.3$) indicated that they would use on average 4.22 more strategies appearing the training list than the untrained group ($M = 9.11$) as exhibited in Figure 8.

![Figure 8](image)

Figure 8. List score means per missionary for the *training* variable on the *Situational Strategy Evaluation Worksheet (SSEW)*.

Although it would be expected that the trained groups would list more strategies from the training list, this is evidence that the trained missionaries were indeed acquiring information from the LLS training they received at the MTC.

**Context score on SSEW.** The context score is similar to the weighted score in that it deals with the appropriateness of strategies for a given situation. It differs slightly,
however, in that the weighted score accounted for all effective strategies without regard to the context in which they were used. The context score took into consideration what the situation is and how appropriate the strategy was for that particular situation. In other words, a strategy might have been scored high in the weighted scoring because it was generally considered a good strategy, but in context was scored low as it was not appropriate for the given context.

In the context scoring, both training and the language x training interaction showed significant results. Similar to previous patterns with this instrument the training variable $F(10, 29) = 8.63, p = 0.0058$, showed that the trained groups ($M = 42.02$) scored 8.61 points higher on average than the untrained groups ($M = 33.41$), see Figure 9.

![Figure 9](image-url)  

*Figure 9. Context score means per missionary for the training variable on the Situational Strategy Evaluation Worksheet (SSEW).*

The language x training interaction $F(10, 29) = 7.97, p = 0.0078$, also showed significance, however, the pattern evidenced in the total and weighted scores was not seen on the context score. The German students were consistent with the previous pattern
showing that the trained group showed a slightly higher scores ($M = 39.26$) than the untrained group ($M = 38.92$). The Portuguese trained group did not show the dramatic increase as shown in the total and weighted scores, in fact the trained group ($M = 26.2$) scored 1.74 points below the untrained group ($M = 27.9$) for context score as seen in Figure 10.

Figure 10. Context score means per missionary for the language x training interaction on the Situational Strategy Evaluation Worksheet (SSEW).

These results show that the trained groups and the untrained groups in both languages were fairly close in score, but that the Portuguese trained group did not show the dramatic increase in score as seen with other scores, and in fact did not score as high as the untrained Portuguese group.

In summary of the results for the SSEW, it is evident that indeed training did have an effect on the use of language learning strategies. The missionaries' backgrounds were essentially equal with no significance being shown in an analysis of the covariates. However, training significantly affected training and the language x training interaction.
The trained group was significantly higher in all four areas of measurement, total score, weighted score, list score, and context score, indicating that the training did indeed help the missionaries use the strategies more often, more appropriately and with a greater range. In all areas except for listed score, there was a significant interaction between language and training as well. This was primarily driven by the Portuguese learners who showed dramatic differences between trained and non-trained groups with the trained group being higher for each measure with the exception of the context score. The Germans also showed increases for each measure, but to an insignificant level. There were no measurements that were significant to any degree in favor of the untrained group.

*Learning the Language in the Mission Field Worksheet (LLMF)*

This instrument was designed to gather data on the strategies that the missionaries intended to use after they left the MTC and entered the mission field. This instrument differs from the one previously discussed in that there were no specific contexts that were given for the missionaries to respond to. The missionaries were requested to list the strategies that they planned on using in the mission field and their answers were measured for total score, weighted score, and list score. Each of these will be discussed in turn and the areas of significance shown.

The covariates for the background questionnaire were again taken into consideration, and this instrument showed some significance for total and weighted scores as will be discussed.

Of the independent variables tested, only three indicated significance. *Training* showed significance for all three variables, *language* was significant for the total and
weighted scores, and the language x gender interaction was significant for the totals score.

**Total score on the LLMF.** The total score was the total number of strategies listed by each learner on the backside of the worksheet that they intended to employ in the mission field. For the total score, three of the four covariates for background proved significant: BKG #04, $F(7, 32) = 7.40, p = 0.0105$; BKG #5.1, $F(7, 32) = 5.33, p = 0.0276$; and BKG #08, $F(7, 32) = 8.10, p = 0.0077$. Because these are covariates, no further statistical breakdown was made, but there does appear to be an influence of previous education, previous experience with the target language and how important language is as a missionary tool. For the total score on the LLMF, the independent variables of, language, training and the language x training interaction tested significant.

With regard to language $F(7, 32) = 11.82, p = 0.0016$, those students learning German ($M = 13.09$) tested significantly higher by 7.26 strategies than those learning Portuguese ($M = 5.83$) as shown in Figure 11.

![Figure 11](image)

Figure 11. Total score means per missionary for the language variable on the Learning the Language in the Mission Field Worksheet (LLMF).
These results show that the students learning German intended to use more strategies and strategies more frequently in the mission field than those missionaries learning Portuguese.

With regard to training $F(7, 32) = 46.90, p = 0.0001$, the trained group ($M = 13.85$) listed significantly more strategies (8.78) that they intended to use in the mission field than the untrained group ($M = 5.07$) as depicted in Figure 12.

![Figure 12](image)

Figure 12. Total score means per missionary for the training variable on the *Learning the Language in the Mission Field Worksheet (LLMF)*.

The significant difference between the trained and untrained groups indicate that those that receive strategy training intend to use more strategies and strategies more frequently than those that do not receive strategy training.

The *language x gender* interaction $F(7, 32) = 7.00, p = 0.0125$, for the total score was the only time that a variable involving gender showed significance in the study. These results show that the German males ($M = 16.21$) averaged much higher totals than the German females ($M = 9.98$), while the Portuguese females ($M = 6.39$) averaged higher than the Portuguese males ($M = 5.26$). Overall the German males and females produced
higher totals than the female and males in the Portuguese groups as displayed below in Figure 13.

![Figure 13. Total score means per missionary for the language x gender interaction on the Learning the Language in the Mission Field Worksheet (LLMF).](image)

These results show that German males intend to use more strategies than German females, while the opposite is true for the learners of Portuguese. They also show that generally the German learners intend to use more strategies than the Portuguese learners.

**Weighted score on the LLMF.** The weighted score was used to measure the appropriate use of strategies. For this measure one covariate background question showed significance. $BKG \#08 F (6, 33) = 4.31, p = 0.046$ inquired as to the importance of learning the mission language as compared to other missionary skills. The variables of language and training showed significant results as will be discussed.

The variable of language $F (6, 33) = 6.10, p = 0.0125$, indicated that the German missionaries ($M = 22.31$) showed higher weighted scores ($10.36$) than the Portuguese missionaries ($M = 11.95$) as seen in Figure 14.
These results show that those missionaries learning German intend to use more appropriate language learning strategies in the field than those learning Portuguese.

With regard to training $F (6, 33) = 44.40$, $p = 0.001$, the trained missionaries ($M = 25.74$) were much more likely to use language learning strategies appropriately than the untrained group of missionaries ($M = 8.52$) by 8.78 points as displayed in Figure 15.

This measure shows that trained learners intend to use more appropriate strategies than those that are not trained.
**List score on the LLMF.** The list score is a count of how many strategies the missionaries listed on the *LLMF* that appear on the *How to be a Better Language Learner* training sheet. The only area that showed significance was again training $F (4, 35) = 48.32, p = 0.0001$. Training indicated that the trained group ($M = 9.73$) identified 7.99 more strategies from the training list on average than the untrained group ($M = 1.74$) as depicted in Figure 16.

![Figure 16. List score means per missionary for the training variable on the Learning the Language in the Mission Field Worksheet (LLMF).](image)

Although it seems obvious that the trained group would identify more strategies from the training list, this measure is important in that it indicates that the trained missionaries were gaining something from the strategy training, as well as validating the belief that many of the strategies on the training list were strategies that many untrained learners use.

**Missionary Task Performance and Retrospective Interview (TPRI)**

The performance task required the missionaries to use printed and audio material in the target language to prepare for and present an authentic simulation activity.

Concluding the performance, the missionaries participated in an interview with one of the
research team members in English, and were asked to answer some specific questions in regard to the strategies that they used both in the preparation time and in performance of the task. The information obtained in the retrospective interview was used to gather data for total scores, weighted scores and list scores.

As this activity was conducted in companionships and was scored by companionship, the covariates for individual backgrounds did not play a role with this instrument. The only dependent variable that showed significant results was the total score, neither the weighted nor the list score showed any significant data.

*Total score on TPRI.* The only independent variable that showed significance for the total score on the TPRI was the *language* variable $F(1, 17) = 5.91, \ p = 0.0264$. With regard to language, the Portuguese ($M = 14.7$) used 2.48 more strategies on average than the Germans ($M = 12.22$), as shown in Figure 17.

![Figure 17](image.png)

Figure 17. Total score means per companionship for the *language* variable on the *Missionary Task Performance and Retrospective Interview (TPRI).*

These results showed that the Portuguese learners tended to use more strategies in a performance scenario than did the German learners. This was opposite of what was
observed with the previous instrument that measured for intended strategy use in the mission field as compared to actual performance evaluation of strategy use.

Although no variable involving training showed levels of significance, it is interesting to note that when the individual strategies under the task category of the training list is examined, there seemed to be important differences emerging. This is particularly noteworthy in that this instrument measured a task based activity. Figure 18 shows that the missionaries with LLS training indicated that they were almost twice as likely to use the task based strategies that were taught in the LLS training program.

![Figure 18](image)

**Figure 18.** Breakdown of the use of the task based strategies found on the LLS training list as mentioned by companionships in the retrospective interview.

Most striking within those that were mentioned was that of predicting, a strategy that was practiced in the LLS training. Not one missionary companionship that was in the non-trained group indicated that they had used this strategy.

These results indicate that the learners having received training used almost twice as many task based strategies overall than untrained learners. Trained learners also
employed the task strategy of prediction that was practiced in LLS training session, where the untrained learners did not. This implies that the LLS strategy training had a direct effect on the types of strategies that the learners actually used. Neither group employed the strategy of identifying and studying grammar principles.

**Missionary Language Learning Questionnaire (MLLQ)**

This instrument asked the missionaries to rate themselves on how often they employed certain language learning strategies while at the MTC and was used to address the question of how frequently strategies are used. Of the ten categories on the questionnaire, only three showed measures of significance at the alpha level of $p < .05$: Task learning, speaking, and grammar. Each of these will be discussed in turn.

**Task learning strategies on the MLLQ.** This category asked the learners “When I need to prepare to perform a specific language task (such as giving a talk or making an appointment): I . . .” The only area that showed significance was the language $X$ training interaction $F (3, 36) = 15.78$, $p = 0.0003$. This interaction showed interesting results with the pattern of the German learners different than that of the Portuguese learners. The trained German group ($M = 3.64$) showed an increase over the untrained German group ($M = 3.11$), whereas the untrained Portuguese group ($M = 3.9$) showed higher scores than the trained Portuguese group ($M = 2.87$) as portrayed in Figure 19.

These results are particularly interesting when compared to the measures of the previous instrument that indicated that the Portuguese learners actually used more strategies than did the German learners in a task performance evaluation.
Figure 19. Task score means per missionary for the language x training interaction on the Missionary Language Learning Questionnaire (MLLQ).

Speaking strategies on the MLLQ. The speaking category asked the learners to rate themselves on how often they would use strategies that involved speaking activities. For this category, the covariate BKG #5.1 $F(2, 37) = 5.29$, $p = 0.0272$, showed significance. This question had to do with the amount of experience the learners had with the target language prior to entering the MTC. Although no formal analysis on the covariates was run, this indicates that missionaries that have previously studied the mission language prior to coming on a mission, were more likely to use strategies in order to improve speaking skills.

The only other area that showed significance was the language variable $F(1, 38) = 8.11$, $p = 0.0071$, that indicated that the Portuguese learners ($M = 4.25$) tended to use strategies for the speaking category more often than the German learners ($M = 3.43$), as shown in Figure 20. This information concludes that Portuguese learners use strategies from the speaking category more frequently than do learners of German.
Grammar learning strategies on the MLLQ. The Grammar category of this questionnaire inquired as to how often missionaries used strategies when involved in the learning and use of grammar-related activities. The only area that showed significance for this area was the training variable $F(1, 38) = 6.19$, $p = 0.0173$, which showed that the non-trained learners ($M = 3.98$) actually were more likely to use strategies for the grammar category, than the trained learners ($M = 3.46$) as depicted in Figure 21.
This indicates that the untrained learners use grammar strategies more often than the missionaries that received strategy training.

**Anecdotal Findings**

Although the major emphasis of this study was to analyze if training missionaries in language learning strategies helped to increase missionaries use and intended use of strategies as language learning tools, several findings of interest were made pertaining to how the missionaries felt about the LLS training program, which strategies they found most helpful, and which strategies they remembered and liked best.

When interviewed, all missionaries involved in the LLS training felt that the training was beneficial and recommended that missionaries continue with the LLS training in the future. Although different missionaries felt differently about the training, no missionary felt that the training should be discontinued or that it was a waste of time. It was generally felt that the lack of actual strategy usage while at the MTC was due to the fact that the missionaries were still learning the strategies, had little time and opportunity to use many of them, and the fact that they were still under formal instruction. Some of the comments missionaries made regarding the LLS training are as follows:

- "Some of the strategies will be more useful in the mission field than in the Missionary Training Center."
- "I will definitely take and use the strategy sheet in the field."
- "The training might help some, but for me, I felt that it took time away from other things that I should be working on."
> "Strategy training gives us a different perspective."

> "Strategy training gives us choices and options of how to learn."

> "Training makes us aware of the strategies so even if we don’t use them now, we will think of the later."

> "I would not of thought of these strategies on my own."

> "The strategies are good, but I already use them."

> "The training covered all possible ways to learn."

> "We can choose to use the strategies that work for us."

Also, in a retrospective interviews, missionaries indicated which specific strategies used in the LLS training program they found most helpful and which strategies they remembered and liked best. Figure 22 shows the average number of strategies per training category that the missionaries indicated were most helpful.

![Strategy count by category that the missionaries found most helpful as mentioned in the retrospective interview.](image-url)
Figure 23 shows a list of individual strategies within the categories that were taught in the LLS training that missionaries mentioned as being the strategies that they remembered and liked most.

Other findings from this study indicated that all language learners use strategies of some kind, but that many learners are relatively unaware of the strategies they use and do not take advantage of the full range of available strategies. Training learners helps them to discover strategies that have been shown to be effective for good language learners and aids them in developing a strategy approach that is best suited for them individually.

Figure 23. *Individual strategies that missionaries remembered and liked best as mentioned in the retrospective interview.*

**Summary of Findings**

A summary of the results found in this study indicate that training missionaries in language learning strategies does increase their overall awareness of strategies as potential language learning tools. The results, however, indicate that LLS training has a greater
impact in the area of intended strategy use for the mission field than in the area of actual strategy use while at the MTC. Those missionaries learning German tended to score higher in the areas of intended use, whereas the Portuguese learners showed strengths on the actual use measures. The areas of training, language and the training x language showed the most significant findings for the dependent variables measured. The covariates of the background questionnaire were relatively insignificant and all of the independent variables and interactions involving gender proved to be insignificant. Table 7 summarizes the statistically significant areas.

**SSEW Summary**

The SSEW, measuring intended strategy use, showed that when missionaries were presented with potential specific language learning situations, the training variable and the language x training interaction showed significance.

The training variable showed that the trained missionaries scored significantly higher in all measures taken; total, weight, list, and context scores.

The language x training interaction showed significance for the total, weight, and context score, but not the list score. Although the trained groups outperformed the untrained groups for the total and weight scores, the significance in these areas was driven by the Portuguese missionaries who showed a much more dramatic difference between trained and untrained groups than did those missionaries learning German.

The significance with the context score was due to the major differences between languages and different from previous patterns for this instrument, the trained Portuguese scored lower than the untrained missionaries.
Table 7
Summary of areas of significant findings

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dependent Variables</th>
<th>Covariates</th>
<th>Independent Variables</th>
<th>Interactions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>BKG # 04</td>
<td>BKG # 5.1</td>
<td>BKG # 5.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Situational Strategy Evaluation Worksheet (SSEW)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Score</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weight Score</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>List Score</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Context Score</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Learning the Language in the Mission Field Worksheet (LLMF)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Score</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weight Score</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>List Score</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missionary Task Performance Task and Retrospective Interview (TPRI)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Score</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weight Score</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>List Score</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missionary Language Learning Questionnaire (MLLQ)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Study</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Task</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speak</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Listen</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Read</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Write</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grammar</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vocabulary</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discussion</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preparation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall Ave.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

X = Alpha level of significance at p < .05
**LLMF Summary**

The LLMF, also designed to measure intended strategy use, showed significance for three of the four covariates in question as well as for the areas of *language, training,* and *language x training*.

The *covariates* that showed significance were BKG #04, BKG #5.1, and #08. These significant measures indicate the missionaries who enter the MTC with more education having studied the target mission language, or any other foreign language, intended to use more strategies more appropriately.

The *language* variable showed significance for total and weight score in favor of the German speaking missionaries, indicating that the German groups intend to use more strategies more appropriately.

The training variable measured significant in favor of the trained groups for all three measure taken; total, weight, and list scores.

The *language x gender interaction* showed significance for the total score. This was the only time in this study that any variable or interaction involving gender showed significance. This interaction was perplexing, however, in that it showed that the German males intended to use more strategies that German females, but that Portuguese females intended to use more strategies than their male counterparts.

**TPRI Summary**

This instrument, designed to measure actual strategy use, proved to show significance in only one area. The area that showed significance was for the *language* variable on the measure of total score. This measurement indicated that the Portuguese
learners used more strategies when preparing for and participating in a role-play situation at the MTC.

**MLLQ Summary**

This instrument measured the frequency of actual strategy use by missionaries at the MTC, and similarly to the TPRI found relatively few significant measurements. Three out of ten dependent variable categories found significance; *task, speaking*, and *grammar*.

*Task* strategies measured significant for the language x training interaction. This is one of the most interesting measures as the trained German learners scored higher than the untrained learners, but the untrained Portuguese learners scored higher than their trained counterparts. This is different than the findings for the TPRI where the Portuguese demonstrated that they typically use more strategies.

*Speaking* showed significance for BKG #5.1 and for the language variable. This background questionnaire indicates that missionaries that have studied the target mission language prior to entering the MTC are more apt to use speaking strategies more frequently than those missionaries that have never before studied the mission language. The language variable showed that missionaries learning Portuguese indicated that they used speaking strategies more frequently than the German learners.

The area of *grammar* was the only area where the untrained missionaries showed significance over the trained learners. The untrained missionaries indicated that they use grammar learning strategies more often than trained missionaries.

The findings presented in this chapter show indicate that the hypotheses set forth in the study have been supported:
1. The training of missionaries in language learning strategies does influence their awareness of using language learning strategies as potential language learning tools.

2. Those missionaries trained in language learning strategies show a greater intent to use strategies more frequently, more appropriately in a given context, and with a greater range than those not trained.
CHAPTER FIVE

Discussion and Recommendations

*Delimitations of the Study*

The delimitations of this study included age, time, sample size, and follow up. First, this research only involved LDS missionaries ages 19-22 who were being trained at the MTC in Provo, Utah. For this reason, the results in this study are indicators of the particular group involved and may not be comparable to the general population of language learners, although many characteristics and conclusions could be compared to similar groupings and language learners in general.

Second, because of administrative restrictions, the total amount of language learning strategy training time and integration was limited, although it is significantly more than other similar studies. Training was conducted only two times a week in 30 minute sessions.

Third, and perhaps most limiting, the sample size was relatively small. Because of administrative restrictions, teacher language capabilities, and the fact that this study was designed to be a pilot for future LLS training investigation, numbers were limited. It was generally felt, however, that the sample that was used was a good representation of the targeted population, missionaries learning foreign languages.

Fourth, follow-up for strategy use was limited to the missionaries’ stay at the MTC. No in-field follow up was made for logistical reasons.
Finally, training was only applied in two languages, German and Portuguese. Because of this limitation, the results from this study can only accurately be applied to those missionaries learning German and Portuguese, but there is much that could be compared to the experience of most missionaries.

Although efforts were made to control for some variables, it should be noted that there are many various variables contributing the missionaries' language learning process, including motivation, education, cultural background, and natural abilities that are difficult to control for but that should be considered in making important training decisions and in future research projects.

**Discussion of Findings**

The discussion of the findings that this study produced will be discussed as to how they answer and can be applied to the research questions presented in chapter one:

Does language-learning strategy training increase missionaries’ awareness of their potential use in foreign language learning? More precisely, when trained in language-learning strategies, do missionaries when compared to non-trained missionaries:

1. Demonstrate *use* of targeted and other language learning strategies while in the Missionary Training Center (a) more frequently, (b) more appropriately, and (c) with a greater range?

2. Evidence a greater *intent* to employ language learning strategies (a) more frequently, (b) more appropriately and (c) with a greater range, in their foreign language learning when in the mission field?
The discussion of each question will be broken down into a discussion of the findings that each instrument designed to measure for that particular question produced.

**Question One — The effects of LLS training on strategy use**

Question one inquires how the training in language learning strategies affects actual use of language learning strategies by missionaries while at the MTC. Two of the four instruments for which data was analyzed measured use: (a) the Missionary Task Performance and Retrospective Interview (TPRI) and (b) the Missionary Language Learning Questionnaire (MLLQ).

**Missionary Task Performance and Retrospective Interview (TPRI).** Results of the data analyzed for this instrument suggested that the training of missionaries in language learning strategies at the MTC has little effect as to how they actually use the strategies with regard to frequency, appropriateness, or range while still at the MTC. The non-existing difference between the trained and the untrained groups may be due to the fact that the missionaries were still in a “training mode” and were not yet accustomed to applying the strategies to a “real life” scenario. The type of task used to measure strategy usage may have had an affect as well, leaving relatively little time for missionaries to consciously think about which strategies to apply. As the strategies were not yet habitually practiced, the trained missionaries may have defaulted to previous approaches or those that are typical of untrained missionaries.

There have been few longitudinal studies of strategy use to date, but Oxford (1993b) suggests that efficient strategy use to increase performance takes time and that only through realistic experience can the potential of strategies be fully understood.
The one area that did show significance was that of language, where Portuguese learning missionaries showed a greater use of total strategies than those missionaries learning German. Although language was not the primary emphasis of this study, the difference in language occurring in this study prompts questions as to how specific languages utilize strategies, and in particular how certain native languages affect learning specific second languages. Some research (Oxford et al., 1988; Bialystok, 1983) has put forth the idea that some languages are more difficult for native English speakers and that learning these “difficult” languages prompt more strategy use out of necessity. This is an interlanguage issue that deserves further exploration.

One might interpret this finding that the increased number of strategies used by the Portuguese missionaries could be due to the nature of the language itself. Either the missionaries that learn Portuguese become more proficient while at the MTC and are therefore capable of using more strategies, or the Portuguese language lends itself easier to the incorporation of the language learning strategies used in the training program.

An interesting area of observation is as to why the area of total strategies for language showed significance, where the areas of weighted score and list score did not. As there was little difference between trained and untrained missionaries, training does not seem to play a role in this issue. This phenomenon may be due the fact that when missionaries get “stuck” they “throw” strategies at the problem in random desperation hoping that something will work, without regard to how appropriate they may be for the situation.
Missionary Language Learning Questionnaire (MLLQ). Of the ten categories of strategies on the questionnaire, only three showed measures of significance and will be discussed in this section.

The first category showing significance was that of tasks. Tasks showed significance for the language x training interaction. The reason for this significance, however, is perplexing in that each language showed a different trend. The trained German speakers tended to use strategies more often than the untrained Germans, but the untrained Portuguese used strategies more frequently than those receiving training. Reasons for this pattern emergence could be due to the differing caliber of the missionaries involved, by this is meant that the untrained Portuguese group contained missionaries who were naturally more gifted with language learning, or had more motivation to use task based strategies. Investigation into this type of factor is very difficult and involved, more sophisticated background testing than was conducted in this study would be useful to further investigate this theory. Because each test group had a different set of daily instructors, it could have been that some teachers pushed or taught task strategies where others did not. It may also have been that each group interpreted the rating scale used on the instrument differently and that there was a difference in perception rather than on actual strategy usage.

The second category showing significance was speaking. As the independent variables of language and previous experience with the mission language showed significance, it might be reasoned that those missionaries learning German would use more speaking strategies, as German is a far more common pre-language experience than
Portuguese for most missionaries. This was not the case, however, with the Portuguese missionaries indicating that they used more speaking strategies, therefore another explanation is plausible. Because of a lack of formal pre-mission training, the Portuguese missionaries felt a greater need to employ speaking strategies in learning the language in order to compensate for previous experience. This suggests that perhaps previous language learning experience has more impact that on the specific language being learned, a more cognitive approach applied to any language (Oxford, 1990a). On the other hand, this might be a deviation from what much of the research indicates, suggesting that “easier” languages can make better use of strategies.

It may also be the case that those missionaries involved in the Portuguese program had a higher expectation placed on them by teachers and others to participate in the “Speak Your Language” program at the MTC, thus yielding a higher measure of speaking strategies.

Grammar was the only area in the entire study that showed significance in favor of the untrained missionaries. A feasible explanation to this occurrence is to note that the time that the trained missionaries spent in training was taken from their grammar study time, meaning that the untrained missionaries did more in class grammar study and consequently focused more heavily on grammar oriented strategies. It may also be the case that because the untrained missionaries were not exposed to the strategy training and practice, they were not made aware of other possible strategies and thus had a heavier weight on grammar strategies.
**Question two — The effects of LLS training on intended strategy use**

Question two handles the issue of the *intent* that missionaries have in using language learning strategies, and was measured by two instruments: (a) the Situational Strategy Evaluation Worksheet (SSEW) and (b) the Learning the Language in the Mission Field Worksheet (LLMF).

*Situational Strategy Evaluation Worksheet (SSEW).* Where training had little effect on actual strategy usage, it has the single greatest affect on intended strategy use. The fact that *training* showed significance in all areas of measurement, is most likely due to the fact that missionaries had never before encountered language learning situations as are typical of missionaries and unless otherwise trained, had little idea of how to approach the situation. The probable reason that the trained missionaries showed such an advantage over the untrained missionaries, is that the strategy training introduced them to many possible strategies and gave practice in how to appropriately use them in different learning situations. The untrained missionaries seemed only to be aware of a few basic strategies, and these were not appropriate for every learning situation or context.

The significance for the *language x training interaction* is due to the dramatic differences between the trained and untrained Portuguese groups. Although the trained German missionaries consistently outperformed the untrained, the difference is marginal when compared with the Portuguese trained vs. untrained. Reasons for this difference could feasibly be due to the fact that many of the German-learning missionaries had experienced German language instruction prior to entering the MTC and were aware of strategies as learning tools, whereas none of the Portuguese had previous experience with
Portuguese. Although the German learners did show an increase in their intent to use strategies it may not have been as dramatic as the Portuguese as they were not starting from scratch as were the Portuguese learners.

This observed trend between the German and Portuguese learners prompts further investigation of language in order to see if the nature of language itself plays a role in the learning and usage of strategies, or whether it is previous experience that determines how strategies are learned and used.

With the context score, that also showed significance for the language x training variable, the above mentioned pattern was broken with the trained Portuguese missionaries scoring lower than the untrained. This break in the pattern by the Portuguese trained group may be coincidental, or that the training that the trained Portuguese received misguided them in using a few typically good strategies in all contexts and not being selective for the particular situation.

*Learning the Language in the Mission Field Worksheet (LLMF).* Although training showed significance again in all areas measured, language also showed significance in favor of the German missionaries, where it previously did not. This is perhaps do to the fact that the German missionaries had not made as much progress in the mission language while at the MTC and foresaw a greater need to use strategies in the mission field than those missionaries learning Portuguese. It may also have been the case that those missionaries learning German considered German a more “useful” language that could be used after a mission, whereas those learning Portuguese viewed it as a language they would rarely use after completing a mission, discouraging more concentrated efforts
to learn it well. Another plausible explanation might be that the instructors of the German missionaries instilled a greater sense of awareness for the continued need of strategy use in the mission field.

For the total score, three background covariates showed significance: BKG #4, BKG #5.1, and BKG #08. Respectively, these questions show that missionaries that obtain a high level of pre-mission education, study the mission language previous to entrance to the MTC, and feel that language is an important missionary tool, intend to use more language learning strategies than who missionaries that do not.

Also significant for the total score as the interaction of language x gender. The results in this study showed that German male missionaries intended to use more strategies that German females, and that Portuguese females intended to use more strategies that their male counterparts. This occurrence is most likely due to the fact that there were few sisters involved in the study and the pervasive attitude of one or two sisters could have significantly skewed the data. Another explanation is that the majority of missionaries in the German groups were male, corresponding with the trend for German missionaries to use more strategies. The majority of missionaries in the Portuguese groups were also male and the Portuguese showed less intent to use strategies. In other words, the gender majority seems agree with the language tendencies indicated in the literature (Oxford et al., 1988).

Some general discussion points that are not necessarily tied to any one instrument deal with the type of missionaries who are called to learn one language or the other. It might well be the case that missionaries possessing different types of skills are called to
serve in areas with languages that are compatible with those skills. Perhaps the intent to use strategies is a more cognitive type exercise than that of performance and that the German groups were more cognitively oriented because of the demands of that particular language.

Reasons for the success of this study over prior MTC LLS training programs (MTC, 1995 & 1996) is probably a result of a completely informed training approach. No effort as made to camouflage or disguise strategy instruction and the missionaries responded well. This study also concluded that successful LLS training is due largely to an integrated classroom approach that contains a heavy element of practice. The results from this study showed much greater involvement over previous MTC strategy studies, that only infrequently lectured about strategies with no practice involved, or tried to covertly include them in the curriculum.

In summary of the discussion, it seems evident that the variable of training shows strong indications of having a positive correlation for an increase in missionaries’ awareness of strategies, in particular with what they intend to do once in the mission field. Strong conclusions about language and gender should be guarded at this point, however. Because of the size of the groups involved it may have been that one group was more motivated or possessed higher pre-mission skills that skewed that data. Missionaries may also have had preconceived notions of what they would learn and how difficult it would be according to the languages they were learning.
Comparison of this Study with Existing Research

This section will report on how the data gathered in this study compares to the existing literature and to which arguments it gives weight.

Oxford's (1986) claim that language learning strategies are teachable is strongly supported by the data collected in this study. Although there are few, if any, existing lesson formats in the literature for actually teaching strategies, the lessons designed for this study worked very well and were well received by both teachers and missionaries involved. Teachers generally felt that the teaching of strategies in no way limited their role as providers, but rather expanded their role by having them teach the strategies and then consistently provide assistance in helping the missionaries use strategies often and in an appropriate manner.

Some research (O'Malley & Chamot, 1990; Cohen, 1990; Chamot & Kupper, 1989; Chamot et al., 1987; O'Malley et al., 1985a; Russo & Stwener-Manzanares, 1985) argues that although LLS training can be successful in some situations, it may not be in every circumstance. The data from this study indicates that in no situation did the LLS training show a disadvantage when compared to the program with no LLS training. This is most likely due to the fact that several of the problems in training methodology were addressed as mentioned by Oxford (1993).

Although no attempt was made in this study to separate the “good” learners from the “poorer” learners, emphasis was placed on using strategies that had been developed from the studies on “good learners.” All of the strategies used in this training came from lists that provided information as to what “good learners” typically do (Rubin, 1975, 1981;
Stern, 1975; Naiman et al., 1975, 1978; Reiss, 1983, 1985; MTC 1994, 1995). However, there were still strategies that the missionaries seemed to prefer using over others and some additional strategies several of the missionaries mentioned that were not on the training list. This seems to agree with the research in that it is very difficult to provide a "magic set" of strategies that "good learners" use, but that it is important to provide a list of typically good strategies that the learner can select from and add to.

With regard to classification and taxonomy of strategies, this study did not seek to re-define, but rather use those existing that are thought to be the most extensive. Rebecca Oxford’s list (1990a) was most closely followed and a good mix of all of the strategies represented in this taxonomy were used. One interesting problem that this study raises is the need for a category of strategies that deals with more "spiritual" strategies such as prayer and faith that are common strategies used by LDS missionaries and not well represented on any existing taxonomy.

After consulting the existing literature (Rubin, 1981; Naiman, Frohlich, Stern, and Todesco, 1978; Cohen and Aphek, 1981), it was determined to use list making, retrospective reporting, interviews, and questionnaires as investigative methods of strategy use as they produce the most reliable information. Some in the field (Rubin, 1981; Wenden, 1986; Chamot, 1987) indicate that retrospective reporting is somewhat controversial in that some learners are better able to report their actions and intentions that others. This study found that some learners do express themselves better than others, but that overall all learners in the population of this study were very willing and able to articulate what they did in both oral and written forms. Very little formal observation was
done in this study for evaluation purposes, although informal observation revealed a great deal about how the training took place and how those involved reacted. An area that the literature discussed that was not incorporated was a type of "think-aloud" activity. In retrospect, however, this is one type of investigation that is felt to have great potential, not only as an investigative tool, but as a training component as well to have learners consistently monitor what they are doing, how they are doing it, and what alterations can be made to improve learning.

Although factors affecting strategy choice and usage are felt to have a great impact on learners, the efforts in this study showed that background played, for the most part, a rather insignificant role in the questions addressed. The one area that did show significance indicated that those missionaries who had previously studied a foreign language, either their mission language or another, were more likely to use strategies during training as well as in the mission field. The lack of further findings may be due to the fact that the missionaries involved in this study had a rather homogeneous background, motivation, and training schedule.

The development of strategy training programs is one area that is relatively new to the field and an area that this study strongly contributes to the literature. Researchers (O’Malley & Chamot, 1990; Cohen, 1990; Chamot & Kupper, 1989) do not agree whether to make training a covert or overt activity. This study strongly supports the notion that training should be very overt and that the learners should be completely informed of the training and what strategies are being used (Oxford et al., 1990; Carrell, Pharis, & Liberto, 1989; Ehrman & Oxford, 1989). This study also strongly suggests that
training involve a very heavy practice component and that training consist mostly of activities to practice strategies instead of merely talking about them. Past research (MTC, 1994) indicates that simply explaining the strategies without using them in a controlled practice environment does little to increase a learner’s awareness of language learning strategies as potential language learning tools.

Regular practice is another area that this study supports. Other studies (Oxford et al., 1990; Ehrman & Oxford, 1989) have done sporadic training at the beginning and the end of a training period yielding very modest results. This study conducted two 30-minute sessions per week and it is felt that increasing these sessions would only yield better results.

The ideas that learners attempting to learn different languages use strategies differently is beginning to be explored in the general research and this study further points to more efforts in this area. Learners of German and Portuguese were used in this study and there was strong enough evidence shown to warrant further exploration in to how different languages utilize different strategies and how this affects strategy training.

Overall it seems that the literature is targeting some important areas, but is as of yet inconclusive. This study supports most of the theoretical positions in the field at the present, but more than anything shows that there are more unanswered questions than there are answers. Without question, however, this study supports the claim of the existing research, that the training of learners in language learning strategies does make them more aware of using strategies as potential language learning tools, and that with
training learners use and intend to use strategies more frequently, more appropriately, and with a greater range than those who do not receive training.

**Implications of Study**

The implications of this study are exciting and rather new in the area of strategy training. Very few training programs of the type conducted in this study have been conducted, but results show that training learners in language learning strategies does indeed help them to develop strategies as additional language learning tools.

Direct implications would be for further development of the training program and continued use with missionaries learning foreign languages. Evidence indicates that this will enable missionaries to become autonomous learners and to become more effective sooner as they develop effective ways to learn language.

Although this study was conducted with a highly specific group of learners, LDS missionaries, it is reasonable to assume that similar strategy training could be useful and advisable in other more traditional classroom settings. If learners, particularly those in the beginning level classes, could be taught to use effective strategies more frequently, more appropriately, and with a greater range, they could become more effective sooner as autonomous learners. If training in the typical classroom was not found to be effective for all students, implications suggest that those learners who are having difficulty might benefit from some strategy training. It might also be the case that some languages are more suited for strategy training and could adopt a more rigorous program as needs required.

This study suggests that specific languages also play a role in how strategies are approached and implemented. Implications of this notion may mean that learners
attempting to learn a language very different from their native language could greatly
benefit from strategies found to be particularly useful for those learners in that language.
These implications are particularly of interest to native English speaking missionaries who
are learning Asian languages and rarely become “proficient” in those languages.

Other implications of strategies aiding the learner in becoming more autonomous
may become very useful with the advances in technology. Computer training and
simulations with language are currently under heavy investigation, but it has been shown
that technology is often very “self-learner” driven. It is even conceivable that strategies in
many areas could themselves be taught and practiced on the computer.

Recommendations for Future LLS Training Studies

In future replications of this study or in the conducting of studies that are similar,
several recommendations can be made to enhance and further the research in the area of
training learners in language learning strategies.

It is recommended that a larger sample size of learners be used in order to get a
more accurate view of how the variables of training, language, and gender are really
affected by the strategy training. The sample size used in this study was large enough to
start giving evidence of the effects of training and that LLS training is beneficial, but not
large enough to show conclusive evidence in many areas. An ideal sample would include
many more learners as well as a representation of more languages than the two analyzed in
this study. Part of the conclusions of this study indicate that different languages use and
are affected differently by strategies and this representation would further explore this
issue.
Another recommendation would be to involve the actual classroom teachers more in the training process. This study had outside LLS trainers for the strategy lessons and the teachers would encouraged to follow up on the training. With the classroom teachers conducting the training, the teachers would become more familiar with the strategies and be able to better incorporate their use in learning activities throughout the course and not exclusively during the strategy training. This builds confidence in both the teachers and the learners, thus supporting the idea of using strategies as actual language learning tools instead of just something to learn about.

Also along the lines of teacher involvement is the recommendation of having the same teachers teach both the experimental and control groups. Teachers have a powerful affect on what is learned in the classroom and how it is presented. Because of language capabilities, this is not always possible in setting such as the MTC, but in other situations this is recommended and encouraged.

As far as recommendations to training procedures is was felt that the practices of informed training and practice of strategies which were used in this study should be continued. It was also felt that the list of strategies used contained good strategies and was the right length in content. Recommended changes is training procedures include increasing the training sessions from two to three times a week and providing even more opportunities for practice with the strategies. In interviews with missionaries involved in the strategy training, the following comments were made as suggestions to improve training by missionaries participating in the strategy training:
▶ "Incorporate the strategies into the class more."

▶ "Have the teachers focus on and teach the strategies."

▶ "Some lessons seemed repetitive and basic; some of the strategies were already being used."

▶ "Use the time more effectively—more practice."

▶ "In the first couple of weeks, do the [training] sessions more often and for a longer period of time."

▶ "Make the lessons more exciting—more activities and less talk."

To more exhaustively explore the implications that training has on language learning, it is recommended that future research include a more in-depth look at exactly what the learners can actually do with the language after receiving strategy training. Such investigation would involve more performance-type activities such as giving diagnostic grammar tests, listening and speaking comprehension tests, and more in-depth simulation activities. Ideally some longitudinal studies would be designed to follow and track learners after training in order to assess how much they really use the strategies that they intended to and if indeed they are becoming more effective sooner.

As mentioned earlier, the general area of strategy involvement in language learning is a relatively new area of study that deserves further investigation. Still up for debate are the issues of exactly which strategies should be covered, how they should be instructed, for how long, and by whom. Further investigation is needed to even determine if LLS training is always appropriate, and if not, when is it most and least valuable.
Future LLS research should take into account past accomplishments and failures. Researchers should, whenever possible, use multiple methods (qualitative and quantitative) for gathering and validating LLS data. If manipulation is involved, as in training studies, comparison groups should be chosen with care, and extraneous variables should be either controlled for or eliminated. It is important to expand LLS studies to include all the relevant variables such as, age, sex, motivation, attitudes, teaching and testing methods, and so on.

One area that was not focused on in this study is the investigation of how individual learning style affects LLS training and use. The examination of the extent that individuals can be successfully trained to use strategies which are outside of their current "comfort zone," as defined by their overall learning style, could lead to advances in strategy training.

Another area of investigation are those of linguistic issues. The effects that different writing and sound systems have on LLS use is at the present not well understood. Also relatively un-researched are the interactions between the native language and a new language it terms of strategy use. This study investigated, to some degree, the effects of different languages on LLS learning and use by native English speakers, prompting the further investigation of strategy language interactions.

The field of strategy research would also be helped considerably if researchers could come to some consensus on definitions and categorization of various strategies. Greater agreement and more standardized procedures will increase comparability across studies, allowing results to have greater explanatory power.
LLS strategies should examine the less formal situations in which people gain skills in a new language, such as through travel and living abroad in the target culture. To understand more about how language strategies are developed and used, researchers should compare the strategies used in informal situations with those used in more conventional environments. Informal situations, such as those facing LDS missionaries in the mission field, might provide helpful information about strategies that could be adapted for use within more formal environments.

New computer-assisted language learning technologies should also be examined to determine their effects on the strategies students use to learn a new language. Such technologies could be designed in such a way as to monitor and record certain types of strategy use (providing both instant feedback to the learner and easily analyzed data for the researcher).

Still other areas of language learning strategies are need of future research, including how training should deal with variables like gender, ethnicity, and the motivation to learn. Not every learning situation is similar and further investigation is needed in order to determine the best methods of tailoring LLS training for individuals, small groups, and the typical classroom situation. Because of the rather new interest in this area, the lasting effects of LLS training is relatively unexplored and more longitudinal studies are in need. All of these issues are important in getting a handle on the power that strategy training has to offer and that are to date relatively unexplored.

The results of LLS research is much like a double-edged sword. It has provided many intriguing insights into how learners struggle with learning or help themselves learn.
But it has also revealed how much still remains to be discovered. It is recommended that researchers build upon the available knowledge through future research in order to help students improve strategy learning and use. The most constructive research is by those who really care about learners, who wish to understand and enhance the learning-to-learn skills. Improvements in strategy training and use in turn can enable learners to become more autonomous learners and to participate in language learning activities with increased positive attitudes, enthusiasm, and enjoyment.
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APPENDIX A

Language Learning Strategy Training Sheet:

How to Be a Better Language Learner
How to Be a Better Language Learner

MAXIMIZING YOUR LANGUAGE STUDY

- Study the language daily throughout your entire mission.
- Make goals for language learning (both long-term and short-term goals).
- Plan out your study time, focusing on those activities that are most helpful.
- Review previously learned material regularly.
- Beware of fossilizing when you begin to feel comfortable in the language; strive continually to improve and to achieve a high level of proficiency.

LEARNING LANGUAGE TASKS

- Identify a language task that you may need to do in the future (e.g. making an appointment or giving a talk); go through the task in your mind and split it into subtasks.
- Identify and learn vocabulary and phrases that can be used to accomplish the task.
- Identify and study sentence patterns and grammar rules that are used in accomplishing the task.
- Have a native speaker model the task or show you how to do it.
- Predict the other person’s possible responses and decide how you would respond to them.
- Practice doing the task in several different contexts—with investigators, members, other missionaries.

SPEAKING

- Take advantage of every opportunity to speak; do as many of your daily activities as possible in the language.
- Initiate conversations with native speakers or others that speak the language well and actively participate in the conversation.
- Practice using grammar rules and new vocabulary you have learned in your everyday speech.
- When you are speaking, keep track of the things you don’t know how to say, and find out how to say them later.
- If you don’t know how to say something in the language, try to say it another way rather than resorting to English.
- Imitate the pronunciation and intonation of native speakers of the language.
- Be willing to take risks; don’t let fear of making mistakes keep you from speaking.

LISTENING

- Listen for things that native speakers say and write them down; incorporate them in your own speech.
- Use your knowledge of the context and situation to understand what the other person is saying.
- If you don’t understand what someone says, ask them to repeat it or to slow down.
- Listen for the main ideas; don’t worry if you don’t understand every word that you hear.

READING

- Read daily from the Book of Mormon or other materials in the language.
- Look for cognates (words that are similar to English words you know) to help you understand what you are reading.
- If you don’t understand a word, try to figure out the meaning from the context of the sentence or paragraph before looking it up.
- Pay attention to grammatical markers such as particles or word endings that might give clues about the meaning.
WRITING
◆ Write everyday things in the language (e.g. letters, talks, notes from meetings, journal entries).
◆ Have your teacher or others help you revise what you write in the language.

LEARNING GRAMMAR
◆ Look for patterns in the language.
◆ Look for examples of particular grammar points in authentic native speech or writing.
◆ Break sentences down into their grammatical parts; for example, identify the subject, verb, word endings, etc.
◆ When you encounter a new situation, try to apply rules you have already learned.
◆ Practice using grammar rules in drills and exercises until you can apply the rules accurately and consistently.

LEARNING VOCABULARY
◆ When possible, learn vocabulary in context rather than as isolated words.
◆ Remember new words by associating them with similar-sounding words, or with mental images or pictures.
◆ Learn new vocabulary by paying attention to words and expressions you read in books, messages, and street signs, and to those you hear used by fluent speakers.
◆ When studying vocabulary, put the words in meaningful sentences, phrases, or groups to help you remember them.

LEARNING MISSIONARY DISCUSSIONS
◆ Learn an outline of the discussions in sequence (discussion titles, principle titles, and paragraph headings).
◆ Learn the meaning of each paragraph; for example, read the paragraph to find the main ideas, look up unfamiliar words, or translate the passage into English.
◆ Practice saying each paragraph aloud many times until you can present it with only occasional glances at the written text.
◆ Write key words in the mission language alongside each paragraph and say the paragraph in your own words using the key words as prompts.
◆ Practice the discussion over and over in a variety of contexts—to different types of investigators, to different age levels, to people with different types of concerns, etc.
◆ Teach the content of a discussion principle in your own words in a different format (e.g. sacrament meeting talk, street contact, answer to an investigator’s question).

SPIRITUAL AND MENTAL PREPARATION
◆ Pray for help in learning the language and remember to give thanks for every little improvement that you make.
◆ Try to think in the language.
◆ Try to learn all you can about the culture of the place where the language is spoken.
◆ When you are feeling stressed about learning the language, try to relax, use humor, and/or make encouraging statements to yourself.
◆ Exercise faith that the Lord will help you learn your mission language.
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Language Learning Strategy Training Schedule
**Language Learning Strategy Training Schedule**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Week 0</th>
<th>Session One</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>01 - Introduction</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>➔ What it means to learn a second language</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>➔ Misconceptions about language learning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>➔ Personal responsibility and SYL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>➔ Differences in learning style</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>➔ Read and discuss strategy training worksheet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Week 1</td>
<td><strong>02 - Maximizing Study</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>➔ Short and long term goals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>➔ Planning your study time</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>➔ Review previously learned material</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Week 2</td>
<td><strong>04 - Spiritual and Mental Preparation</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>➔ Pray for help in learning the language</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>➔ Exercise faith to learn the language</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>➔ Think in the target language</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>➔ Learn about the culture of the target country</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>➔ Relax</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>➔ Make encouraging statements to self</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>➔ Humor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Week 3</td>
<td><strong>06 - Task 1</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>➔ Learn vocabulary for the specific task</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>➔ Study grammar and patterns for the task</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>➔ Obtain a model of a native speaker</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>➔ Practice doing the task in different contexts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Week 4</td>
<td><strong>08 - Speaking 2</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>➔ Initiate conversations in the target language</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>➔ Circumlocution</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>➔ Imitate native speakers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Session Two</td>
<td><strong>03 - Vocabulary 1</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>➔ Learn new vocabulary in context</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>➔ Put vocabulary into meaningful sentences</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>05 - Speaking 1</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>➔ Do everything you can in the language: SYL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>➔ Risk taking</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>➔ Practice using new vocabulary and grammar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>➔ Keep track of things you don’t know how to say</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>07 - Grammar</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>➔ Practice rules with 100% mastery</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>➔ Break sentences into grammatical parts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>➔ Practice patterns in the target language</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>➔ Look for rules in authentic native speech</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>➔ Use previously learned rules in new situations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>09 - Listening</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>➔ Ask to repeat or slow down</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>➔ Listen for the main ideas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>➔ Listen for things native speakers say</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>➔ Use context to understand</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Week 5</td>
<td>Session One</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>10 - Discussion Learning 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>* Outline the discussions and learn main ideas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>* Learn the meaning of each paragraph</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>* Practice saying the discussion over and over many times</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Week 6</td>
<td>12 - Reading</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>* Read daily from the Book of Mormon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>* Look for cognates in the target language</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>* Understand meaning from the context</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>* Gain clues form grammatical markers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Week 7</td>
<td>14 - Writing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>* Write everyday things in the target language</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>* Obtain revision of things you write by teacher</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Week 8</td>
<td>16 - Simulation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>* Missionaries use strategies in 30 minute preparation time based on the information extracted from a taped message and a written letter.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>* Missionaries perform the task and are interviewed to find out what they did</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Strategies to practice in structured activities
* Strategies to explain and discuss only
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Language Learning Strategy Training Lessons
LESSON 01
INTRODUCTION OF LANGUAGE LEARNING STRATEGY TRAINING
(1 hour)

OBJECTIVES

1. Help missionaries understand what it means to learn a language.
2. Dispel misconceptions about language learning.
3. Help missionaries to take personal responsibility for language learning and commit to follow the SYL program.
4. Help missionaries realize that different people have different learning styles.
5. Provide missionaries with useful language learning strategies.

MATERIALS AND EQUIPMENT

1. Overhead projector
2. Cassette recorder
3. Transparencies
   a. Image of the hand saw
   b. Image of the power saw
   c. Quote from Marion G. Romney
   d. Language as a tool and a barrier
      ▶ When Missionaries Speak a Second Language
      ▶ Low Missionary Effectiveness
      ▶ High Missionary Effectiveness
   e. Missionary Language Proficiency Scale
   f. Misconceptions about language learning
   g. SYL Overhead
   h. Personal responsibility items
   i. Quote from D&C 90:11
4. Audio Cassette of various proficiency levels in English.
5. How to be a Better Language Learner Handout

PROCEDURE

OBJECTIVE #1 - (15 minutes)
Help missionaries understand what it means to learn a second language

Step 01  Using the right tool makes a big difference. Show the “saw” transparencies and explain:

   ▶ Using a hand saw is fine, but if you have a big project (like building a house) it can take a long time. Having a power saw makes the job a lot easier.
   ▶ Learning a second language is like building a house--it takes a lot of time and effort. Having the right tools can save you a lot of time in the long run. Today we’re going to help you acquire some better tools for the job.

Step 02  How did you feel about your mission call? Ask the missionaries to think for a moment about how they felt when they received a mission call that entailed learning a second language.
Step 03 Ask what the goal of language learning is for a missionary? For missionaries the goal is not just to learn the grammar or vocabulary of a language, but to be able to speak and understand the language well enough to do their work effectively in that language.

Step 04 The importance of second language ability in missionary work. Put up the transparency and read the following quote by Marion G. Romney.

"The chief difficulty to good missionary work is the inability of the missionaries to speak [foreign languages]." — Marion G. Romney, October 1961

Step 05 Explain why second language ability is a critical factor in missionary work. Show the three transparencies that show the language barrier and discuss them.

1. *When Missionaries Speak a Second Language.* A foreign language can be a barrier between missionaries and the people they want to share the gospel with.

2. *Low Missionary Effectiveness.* When language skills are weak, it is difficult to make effective use of other assets such as testimony, spirit, teaching skills, love, etc.

3. *High Missionary Effectiveness.* Once the language barrier is penetrated, missionaries can make effective use of other tools, skill, and attributes.

Step 06 Show Transparency: Missionary Language Proficiency. Read through the descriptions on the proficiency scale with the missionaries, emphasizing what makes the rating good or bad.

Step 07 Listen to the language proficiency audio tape. Tell the missionaries that they are going to hear a series of ESL missionaries at different proficiency levels.

• Leave the proficiency scale transparency on the screen.
• Play example levels 2-7 one at a time and discuss how effective the missionaries are at each level.

Step 08 Ask the missionaries what level of proficiency they would like to achieve on their mission.

Step 09 It takes effort to speak the language well. Only a small percentage of missionaries reach the level of a 7, but they can do it if they keep working on their second language skills throughout their missions.

---

**OBJECTIVE #2 - (10 minutes)**
Dispel misconceptions about language learning

Step 10 Ask: What have you heard about how missionaries learn language? Get a few ideas but don’t spend too much time on this step.

Step 11 Show transparency: Misconceptions About Language Learning. Show and briefly explain each point:

1. **You will “learn” your mission language while at the Missionary Training Center.** Learning a language is a long process, one that will continue throughout your mission. At the MTC you will get a foundation in the language, but it will take additional months in the field to get proficient.
2. **The Spirit will automatically give you the ability to speak your language.**
The Spirit can and will help you with the language, but only as you do your part and work
diligently to learn it.

3. **Learning a second language is simply finding equivalent words in that language.**
Simply memorizing vocabulary lists and directly translating native phrases is not learning a
language. It is a process of finding out how the language functions in its own context.

4. **You will learn a language just by being exposed to it.**
Many people are around a new language for years and never learn it. Effort and work are
necessary to learn a language.

5. **Not everyone can learn a language.**
Everyone has the ability to learn a foreign language, just as everyone learns their native
language. However, some people take longer than others and they don’t all learn the language
in the same way.

---

**OBJECTIVE #3 - (15 minutes)**

*Help missionaries to take personal responsibility for language learning
and commit themselves to the SYL program*

**Step 12** *Ask the missionaries who is responsible for their language learning.* Show the personal
responsibility overhead. The *missionary* is responsible for learning the language. Not the teacher,
and not the companion.

**Step 13** *Introduce the SYL program.* Show the SYL transparency and make the following points:

- One of the ways you can take personal responsibility for learning your mission language is
through the “SYL” or “Speak Your Language” program.
- Over the years, the SYL program has been one of the most effective methods we have at the
MTC.
- The best way to learn a language is to use it to communicate.

**Step 14** *Learning a language is fulfillment of prophecy—* **show overhead**

- In D&C 90:11, the Lord tells Joseph Smith the following:

  “For it shall come to pass in that day, that every man shall hear the fulness of the gospel in his
own tongue, and in his own language, through those who are ordained unto this power, by the
administration of the Comforter.”

- Through this and other revelations, we know that the Lord has promised his children the
opportunity of hearing the gospel in their native language, through representatives called and
set apart for that purpose
- You are the literal fulfillment of that prophecy. You have been called by the prophet of God
and have both the right and responsibility to become proficient in your mission language.
Step 15  What it means to Speak Your Language.

- SYL means that you use everything you learn, speaking the language as much as you can in and out of the classroom.
- Your teachers will teach you new vocabulary and grammar principles, but they will become useful only as you apply them.
- In your daily language class, you will record an SYL score ranging from 1 to 4, with “4” representing your best effort, and “1” representing no effort. A “4” doesn’t mean you spoke the language perfectly, and it doesn’t mean you spoke no English. It means you gave your best effort to use the things you had learned.

Step 16  Invitation to participate in the SYL program.

- I invite all of you to make a commitment right now to speak your language here at the MTC. It will make a big difference.

OBJECTIVE #4 - (5 minutes)
Help missionaries realize that different people have different learning styles

Step 17  Different people learn differently.

- Some people like to work with people, other like to work alone
- Some individuals like to get involved physically with their whole body
- Some people write things down, other prefer to just listen
- Some people like checklists, others prefer more freedom

Step 18  Help the missionaries understand that they don’t have to learn exactly the same way that other missionaries learn.

- Use what works best for you.
- Be willing to step outside your comfort zone and try something different.

Step 19  Learn how you learn.  Remind the missionaries about how important it is that they learn how they learn best and that they don’t have to learn just like everyone else.

Step 20  New is good. Encourage them to develop new styles and experiment instead of relying on old styles.

Step 21  Learn to recognize what works well for you. Tell the missionaries that part of the strategy training program is to help them recognize strategies that will work best for their own personal learning styles.

OBJECTIVE #5 - (15 minutes)
Provide missionaries with useful language learning strategies

Step 22  Distribute the “How to be a better language learner” handout. Give a copy of the strategy sheet to each missionary.
Step 23  Explain that these are some of the most effective strategies proven to learn a language. There are hundreds of ways to learn a language. Some are more effective than others. These are some of the most effective ways for missionaries and others to learn languages.

Step 24  Read through the strategies with the missionaries. Comment on specific strategies as you feel appropriate.

Step 25  Bear Testimony of the results that will come from working hard and working smart in learning the mission language.
"The chief difficulty to good missionary work is the inability of the missionaries to speak [foreign languages]."

Elder Marion G. Romney
Low Missionary Effectiveness

- Doctrine
- Testimony
- Language Skills
- Missionaries
- Investigators

Language Barrier

High Missionary Effectiveness

- Doctrine
- Teaching Skills
- Language Skills
- Testimony
- Love
- Missionaries
- Investigators

Language Barrier
Missionary Language Proficiency

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Less Proficient</th>
<th>More Proficient</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Missionary cannot communicate well enough to accomplish the basic purpose of the discussion; no control of grammar; many pronunciation errors; knows few words and expressions in the language; does not comprehend enough to respond appropriately</td>
<td>Missionary can be understood by someone accustomed to dealing with nonnative speakers; frequent grammar and pronunciation errors; vocabulary is limited; comprehends enough to respond some of the time</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missionary can be understood, with some effort, by someone not accustomed to dealing with nonnative speakers; some grammar and pronunciation errors; vocabulary adequate for task; comprehends to respond appropriately all of the time with help</td>
<td>Missionary can easily be understood by someone not accustomed to dealing with nonnative speakers; handles spontaneous elements smoothly; few if any errors in grammar or pronunciation; appropriate and precise vocabulary; comprehends enough to respond appropriately all of the time without help</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Misconceptions About Language Learning

1. You will "learn" your mission language at the MTC.
2. The Spirit will automatically give you the language.
3. Learning a new language is simply finding equivalent words.
4. You will learn the language just by being in the country.
5. Not everyone can learn a new language.
Speak Your Language
SYL

Personal Responsibility

1. Set your own goals for language learning
2. Develop your own specific language learning strategies
3. Evaluate your own learning
4. Use the language at every opportunity inside and outside class
5. Work effectively with teachers and other missionaries
“For it shall come to pass in that day, that every man shall hear the fulness of the gospel in his own tongue, and in his own language, through those who are ordained unto this power...”

Doctrine and Covenants 90:11
LESSON 02
MAXIMIZING LANGUAGE STUDY
(30 minutes)

OBJECTIVES

1. Help missionaries understand the importance of making language learning goals.
2. Teach them how to plan study time and practice with them.
3. Emphasize the importance of consistently reviewing previously learned material.

MATERIALS AND EQUIPMENT

1. *How to be a Better Language Learner*.
2. Chalkboard, Chalk and Eraser.
3. Paper and pencils for all of the missionaries.

PROCEDURE

Step 01  Read aloud the bulleted items under *Maximizing your language study* on the strategy sheet.

Step 02  Explain that planning is an essential part of God's way of doing things:

- The Word *plan* is mentioned 56 different times in the scriptures.
- Examples: *plan of salvation, plan of God, plan of redemption, plan of restoration, plan of happiness, plan of mercy, eternal plan, plan of creation*.

Step 03  Provide examples of short and long term language goals to the missionaries:

- *Daily goals* (speak the language today, study specific pages or exercises in the grammar book, learn specific vocabulary words).
- *MTC goals* (learn the first two discussions, finish the grammar book).
- *Mission goals* (Achieve a proficiency level of 7, read through the Book of Mormon in my mission language).

Step 04  Discuss possible study times:

- Scheduled personal study time.
- On a break or as you take walk.
- At night before bed.
- Waiting in meal lines.

Step 05  Discuss the consequences of not planning out study time:

- Wasted time (sleeping, chatting, day dreaming, etc.)
- Less effective learning.
Step 06  Write the following main points of planning on the board and discuss each:

- Keep track of things that you have learned.
- Identify specific times to study.
- At the beginning of each study session, plan out what you are going to do:
  - Most important things to study.
  - Things you need most work on.
  - Review previously learned material so you will not forget it.

Step 07  Have each companionship plan their next study session using the outline in step six.

Step 08  Invite the missionaries to follow their new study plans in their next scheduled personal study time.
LESSON 03
VOCABULARY 1
(30 minutes)

OBJECTIVES

1. How to learn vocabulary by putting it into meaningful sentences, phrases, or groups.
2. How to learn vocabulary in context rather than as isolated words.

MATERIALS AND EQUIPMENT

1. How to be a Better Language Learner handout.
2. Chalkboard, Chalk and Eraser.
3. One current vocabulary list from the grammar book.
4. Hymnals in the mission language.

PROCEDURE

Step 01 Review the strategies that were discussed in lesson 02, Maximizing your language study, on the strategy sheet.

Step 02 Read through the bulleted items under Learning Vocabulary on the strategy sheet.

Step 03 Stress the effectiveness of those strategies on the strategy list.

- These strategies have been proven effective through the literature, in-field studies, and studies at the Missionary Training Center.

Step 04 Discuss use of flash cards for vocabulary learning.

- Point out that the use of flash cards is not on the strategy list.
- Spending a lot of time making flash cards detracts from other more productive study methods.
- Language learning studies show nothing favorable about the extensive use of flash cards (if flash cards are used, words should be placed in sentences or phrases).

Step 05 Memorizing long lists of words is not the most effective way of learning and remembering vocabulary words.

- Just getting through lists of vocabulary doesn’t mean you have learned them.

Step 06 Learning words by putting them into meaningful sentences, phrases, or groups.

1. Demonstrate putting words into meaningful sentences, phrases, or groups.

- List some of their current vocabulary on the board
- Put the words into phrases or sentences on the board.
2. **Practice** putting words into meaningful sentences, phrases, or groups.
   - Missionaries make groupings from the words on the board.
   - Missionaries form phrases and sentences from the words on the board.

**Learning vocabulary in context rather than as isolated words.**

1. Chose a hymn that has a good mixture of words the missionaries already know and some they don’t know.
2. Sing the hymn together as a group.
3. Assign each companionship a verse and have them infer the meaning of new words from the context.
4. After a few minutes, have each companionship share the information with the group.

**Step 08** Challenge the missionaries to use these strategies with the next vocabulary lists they learn and with the hymns that they sing.
LESSON 04
SPIRITUAL AND MENTAL PREPARATION
(30 minutes)

OBJECTIVES

1. Help missionaries learn how to handle stress, anxiety and tension while learning a new language.

MATERIALS AND EQUIPMENT

1. *How to be a Better Language Learner* handout.
2. Pencil and paper for all of the missionaries.

PROCEDURE

Step 01  Review the strategies that were discussed in lesson 03, *Learning Vocabulary*, on the strategy sheet.

Step 02  Read aloud the bulleted items under *Spiritual and Mental Preparation* on the strategy sheet.

Step 03  Read aloud the following quote about the Gift of Tongues.

“One of the gifts [of the Spirit] is the gift of tongues. Now the gift of tongues primarily is learning languages. Incidentally, and in a very lesser sense, it’s a miraculous instance in which someone speaks for a moment in a tongue that he doesn’t understand; but the great operation of the gift of tongues is the gift to learn a language.

The Lord doesn’t just pour things out upon us without us deserving them . . . or seeking them. Part of seeking the gift of tongues is to labor and struggle and do all we can to learn a language.” (Bruce R. McConkie)

Step 04  Explain that learning a foreign language in an intensive situation like the MTC is a stressful activity.

- *Everyone* who participates in this kind of intensive language learning experiences some tension and anxiety. However, high levels of tension and anxiety can significantly reduce your effectiveness in learning the language. Learning to relax and reduce anxiety can be very helpful in your efforts to learn your mission language.

Step 05  Ask the following questions and discuss briefly as a group:

- Have you felt stress since you’ve been in the MTC? How does it make you feel?
- What are the physical signs of stress? (tense, can’t eat, can’t sleep, eat too much, etc...)
Step 06  **Explain that thoughts can affect anxiety levels and how learning takes place.**

1. **Anxiety producing thoughts.** Ask the missionaries if they have ever had an anxiety producing thoughts similar to the following while at the MTC. For example:
   - What’s happening to me?
   - I’m getting farther and farther behind in learning this language.
   - I just can’t remember this stuff!
   - Everyone in the class is faster than I am. I don’t think I can do this!

2. **Replacing anxious thoughts.** Replace negative thoughts with something more positive and reassuring such as the following.
   - Learning this language is challenging, but everyone struggles with this.
   - We’ve covered a lot of material, so what if I can’t remember it all?
   - I’ll just take the most important things and work on them. In time, it will come.
   - The Lord called me and will help me learn this language.

3. **The danger of thoughts that are too idealistic.** Replacing negative thoughts with thoughts that are too idealistic does not work because you won’t realize them.
   - I don’t have any problems at all learning the language.
   - I feel like I’ve understood everything so far.

Step 07  **Practice replacing negative thoughts.** Have the missionaries write down several negative thoughts they have had while at the MTC. Then have them write a positive replacement thought for each negative thought.

   - Emphasize that they need to repeat those positive thoughts over and over (100 times if necessary) whenever a negative thought troubles them.
   - Invite some of the missionaries to share their thoughts with the group.

Step 08  **Practice techniques for helping the body and mind to relax.** Have the missionaries practice each of the following techniques as you read the comments.

   - **Stand up and stretch.**
     1. “Stand up, hold your hands high over your head and stretch with the hands. Now stretch the shoulders, upper body, and down the legs to the ankles.”

   - **Deep breathing.**
     1. “Sit down and close your eyes. Take a slow deep breath and hold it while you slowly count to five. Now breathe out completely.”
     2. Repeat the above procedure two more times and wait a minute before continuing to work.
> **Muscle relaxation.**

1. "Lean back in your chair and hold you legs out straight with the toes pointed out. Tighten the leg muscles and hold for five seconds. Now relax."
2. "Breathe in and pull in your stomach as tight as possible. Hold the stomach muscles for five seconds, now relax."
3. "Tighten the muscles in your arms and hold for five seconds. Relax your arms."
4. "Tighten the muscles in your neck and face. Hold for five seconds, then relax."
5. "Open your mouth as wide as you can and hold it for five seconds. Now relax."

**Step 09**  **Discuss the importance of having a sense of humor.**  Trying to always smile. Keeping a sense of humor, and appropriate laughter are good way to reduce stress. Keep things in perspective and don’t take yourself too seriously.

**Step 10**  **Comment briefly on the following strategies giving your testimony about the importance of prayer and faith in learning a language.**

> - **Praying** for help and giving thanks for every improvement.
> - **Thinking** in the language (when and how)
> - Learning about the **culture** (how does this help?)
> - Exercising **faith** in the Lord.
OBJECTIVES

1. Encourage missionaries to actively participate in the SYL program at the MTC.
2. Encourage missionaries to take risks and not be afraid of making mistakes.
3. Help them learn how to keep track of things they don’t know how to say and incorporate new grammar and vocabulary into their speech.

MATERIALS AND EQUIPMENT

1. How to be a Better Language Learner handout.
2. Pencil and paper for all of the missionaries.

PROCEDURE

Step 01  Review the strategies that were discussed in lesson 04, Spiritual and Mental preparation, on the strategy sheet.

Step 02  Read aloud the bulleted items under Speaking on the strategy sheet.

Step 03  SYL program at the MTC.

1. What program is being described in the first two strategies read? Explain that real SYL involves both strategies.

2. Why don’t many missionaries SYL? (they forget, they’re lazy, they don’t care, they don’t know how—they think that they must say everything in the mission language and they get too overwhelmed with the task).

3. SYL means that they say all they can in the language and then fill in the gaps with English. Explain that the purpose of SYL is to create real communication situations and that meaningful practice is most helpful in learning the language (you could relate it to sports/music and practice vs. performance).

Step 04  Practice keeping track of things you don’t know how to say.

Situation #1  You need to buy a new pair of shoes. One missionary will be the clerk and the other will be the buyer.

1. Divide the missionaries into companionships and have them act out situation #1. Have them write down the words they need to use in the situation but do not know how to say (don’t have them look up the words during the practice).
2. Give the missionaries about 5 minutes to practice. Then, ask the group what things they wrote down. Pick a couple of the things mentioned and have them find out how to say them (ask if anyone knows how, ask the teacher, look it up in a dictionary, etc...)  

3. If there is time, you may have the missionaries repractice the role-play using the new words.

**Practice using new vocabulary and grammar.**

**Situation #2** You are introducing yourself to the bishop/branch president. One missionary will be the bishop and the other will introduce himself.

1. Chose a grammar principle and 2-3 vocabulary words recently learned to use in the situation.

2. Have each missionary do the situation once. Give them each about 5 minutes (you may want to give the second missionary a different grammar principle and different vocabulary words to use).

3. Ask them how it went and if they were able to incorporate the grammar and vocabulary.

**Step 06  Risk taking.**

1. Ask the missionaries how they feel when they make a mistake? Why?  
   - Don’t like constant correction.  
   - Makes you feel like you don’t know anything.

2. Ask how they can feel more willing to experiment with the language?  
   - Everyone makes mistakes--learn to use them to help you improve.  
   - Most natives will be tolerant of your mistakes--they’ll be pleased that you’re trying to speak their language.

**Step 07  Encourage missionaries to use these strategies and emphasize that missionaries that use these strategies throughout their missions will greatly improve their language skills.**
LESSON 06
LEARNING LANGUAGE TASKS 1
(30 minutes)

OBJECTIVES

1. Learn the process of learning a language task: vocabulary, phrases, grammar, and native model.

MATERIALS AND EQUIPMENT

1. How to be a Better Language Learner.
2. Chalkboard, Chalk and Eraser.
3. Vocabulary list in the mission language.

PROCEDURE

Step 01 Review the strategies that were discussed in lesson 05, Speaking 1, on the strategy sheet.

Step 02 Read aloud the bulleted items under Learning Language Tasks on the strategy sheet.

Step 03 What is a language task?

- A task is an activity that a missionary does (i.e. introducing themselves, giving a prayer, teaching a discussion principle, buying shoes).
- Preparing for a language task helps to become more functional sooner. It helps to focus on important and useful vocabulary and grammar concepts for a specific situation.
- You can study the grammar book all day, but that doesn’t make you fluent in the language. You need to try it out in real situations. (Similar to sports/music)

Step 04 The process of learning a language task.

- Identify and learn vocabulary and phrases used to accomplish the task.
- Identify and study sentence patterns and grammar rules that are used in accomplishing the task.
- Have a native speaker model the task or show you how to do it.
- Practice doing the task in several different contexts—with investigators, members, other missionaries.

Step 05 Language task example: Conduct a meeting

1. Have the missionaries think about how a person typically conducts a meeting.
2. Write the following subtasks on the board as the missionaries come up with them.
   - Opening-- Extend a welcome
     Make announcements
     Announce the opening hymn and prayer
   - Agenda-- Outline the meeting (who will give the talks/lesson)
   - Closing-- Thank those who have participated
     Announce the closing hymn and prayer
Step 06  **Vocabulary.** Write necessary words in the language on the chalkboard.

- hymn, welcome, lesson, talk, meeting, opening prayer, closing prayer, Sacrament, Relief Society, etc...

Step 07  **Phrases.** Write necessary phrases in the language on the chalkboard.

- Welcome to our ________ meeting.
- There will be a party at the church on Friday evening.
- We will sing hymn number 120.
- Brother/Sister Smith will give the ________.
- Thanks to all (who have participated in this meeting).

Step 08  **Grammar.** Are there any grammatical concepts that are an integral part of the phrases.

Step 09  **Model the task.** Slowly and clearly model the entire task.

Step 10  **Individual Practice.** Give the missionaries a few minutes to practice doing the to themselves using the vocabulary, phrases, and grammar concepts.

Step 11  **Companion Practice.** Have each missionary do the task while his/her companion acts as the congregation. (Make sure they keep the task in a very simple form). Let them look at the board as they practice.

Step 12  **Demonstration.** Have one missionary do the task for the group.

Step 13  **Review.** Review the steps to learning a task. Remind the missionaries that in the field they will often be asked to do things that they have never done before in the language, and possibly never in English either (i.e. arranging for new lodgings, getting a phone line hooked up to their house, arranging paperwork for a wedding). Following these steps will make doing the task easier.
LEsson 07
GRAMMAR
(30 minutes)

OBJECTIVES

1. Learn grammar by breaking sentences down into grammatical parts.
2. Learn to apply rules that you have previously learned.
3. Practice using a grammar rule until it is automatic.

MATERIALS AND EQUIPMENT

1. *How to be a Better Language Learner.*
2. Chalkboard, Chalk and Eraser.
3. Copy of the missionary discussions in the mission language for each missionary.

PROCEDURE

Step 01  Review the strategies that were discussed in lesson 04, *Learning Vocabulary,* on the strategy sheet.

Step 02  Read aloud the bulleted items under *Learning Grammar* on the strategy sheet.

Step 03  **Explain that sentences are made of many small grammatical parts.** All sentences, even complex ones, are really just a combination of many smaller understandable parts.

**Example**

- Write a sentence from the standard missionary discussions on the board.
- Pick out the grammatical concepts that this sentence contains (verbs, prepositions, etc.). Particularly point out specific grammatical markers, such as verb endings, that help to understand the sentence. Help the missionaries see how the grammar is used. Show them that this is a good way to learn and understand the grammar.

Step 04  **Practice breaking sentences into grammatical parts.**

- Have them turn to a paragraph from one of the discussions.
- Have them identify specific grammatical principles contained in the paragraph one at a time, for example:
  - Underline all present or past tense endings.
  - Circling all verbs in the paragraph.
  - Drawing a box around all of the dative prepositions.
  - Circling the dative case objects.
  - Etc . . .
- Have the missionaries comment on what they found and what it contributes to the meaning of the text. Ask them if there were grammar points that they don’t understand.
Step 05  Explain why we practice using grammar rules?  It is one thing to learn about a language, but does it mean that we can speak it?  We need to practice using rules until we can do it automatically without thinking about it.

Step 06  Conduct an in depth practice of a specific grammar principle.

  ▶  Draw their attention to a specific grammar principle that they need more practice with. (Keep it really simple--choose one verb tense or one structure like agreement or gender or case.)

  ▶  Ask them what they already know about the principle and how it functions within the text that they have been using.

Step 07  Conduct a pattern practice.

  ▶  Write a sentence pattern on the board that allows practice of this grammar principle (e.g. a "verb-cross" for a tense of verb conjugation or sentence completion drill for a concept such as showing possession).

  ▶  Conduct a pattern practice drill having the missionaries use the sentence pattern on the board and filling in different examples or completions with their companions.  Apply the rule to new situations, words, etc...

  ▶  Have them look for this particular grammar principle in the discussions or other materials.

Step 08  Summarize.  Point out the importance of these strategies and encourage them to continue practicing them in the future.  Remind them that they can do this on their own--they don’t need the teacher to lead them in the practice.  Ask them what other kinds of grammar rules this type of practice can apply to.
LESSON 08
SPEAKING 2
(30 minutes)

OBJECTIVES

1. Improve speaking by means of circumlocution.
2. Learn how to imitate native speakers.

MATERIALS AND EQUIPMENT

1. *How to be a Better Language Learner.*
2. Copy of the missionary discussions in the language for each missionary.
3. Chalkboard, Chalk and Eraser.
4. Audio Cassette player
5. Tape of a native speaker reading a discussion principle.

PROCEDURE

Step 01 Review the strategies that were discussed in lesson 07, *Grammar*, on the strategy sheet.

Step 02 Read aloud the items under Speaking on the sheet.

Step 03 Imitate Native Speakers

1. **Play a section of tape for them.** Point out to them the voice inflections of the speaker. Have the missionaries copy the inflections--don't worry about the words. Have them just say "da da da" with the native inflections. Let them listen to the sentence a couple of times until they feel comfortable with the voice inflections (the ups and downs).

2. **Write the selected sentence on the board** and let the missionaries transfer the inflections to the words. Let them listen to the tape sentence again.

3. When the missionaries are comfortable with this sentence, have them **open up the discussion book and follow along** in the discussion, listening for the voice inflections.

Step 04 Circumlocution of unfamiliar words.

1. **Choose a list of ten words** that the missionaries are likely to be unfamiliar with in the mission language, but that they might encounter in the mission field. For example:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Umbrella</th>
<th>Oatmeal</th>
<th>Sticky</th>
<th>Typewriter</th>
<th>Flexible</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Library</td>
<td>Coin</td>
<td>Razor blade</td>
<td>Vacuum</td>
<td>Slippery</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2. **Have the missionaries work with a companion.** Have the missionaries turn their seats so that they are facing one another and so one is facing the chalkboard and the other is facing away from the chalkboard. Write five of the words on the board in English.
3. **Talking around the words.** The missionary facing the board is to describe to his/her partner in the mission language what that word is, using no hands, gestures, or English. The teacher is not to give any word definitions but rather to encourage the missionaries to describe what it is that they are unable to say. No dictionaries are allowed.

4. **Change roles.** After all five words have been described, the missionaries change places and the other partner describes the next five words written on the board.

**Circumlocution in a contextual situation.**

1. **Choose four situations** that the missionaries are likely to encounter on their missions. The following are examples.

   - You have locked your keys in your apartment and you must explain to the landlord what the problem is.
   - You are looking for shaving cream/hair brush at the local market and can’t seem to locate it anywhere.
   - Your watch band on your watch broke and you must buy a new one at a jewelry store.
   - Your drain is plugged up and you have to call a plumber and explain what the problem is and arrange to get it fixed.
   - You are at the tailor shop and need to get your suit/skirt altered.
   - Your bike chain broke and you need to explain to the bike shop what the problem is.
   - An investigator asks what an angel looks like and you need to describe what angels really are and what the church teaches about them.
   - Explain what the Book of Mormon is.
   - Describe a sacrament meeting.

2. **Explain the roles.** (for example--in situation #1 tell him/her that she is the landlord and that the other person is a missionary that is a tenant). Tell the missionary role what situation is to be described and inform them that they are to use no English whatsoever and no dictionary. They must talk around what they do not know in order to communicate. The missionaries alternate taking the role of the missionary in the different situations.

3. **Demonstration.** Have one or two sets of missionaries demonstrate what they did in the situation above.
LESSON 09
LISTENING
(30 minutes)

OBJECTIVES

1. Learn to use the context of a situation to understand what people are saying.
2. Learn to listen for main ideas.

MATERIALS AND EQUIPMENT

1. How to be a Better Language Learner.
2. Audio Cassette recorder.
3. Tape of 2-3 minute conversation of two natives meeting for the first time.
4. Tape of 2-3 minute mini-gospel lesson taught or read by a native speaker.

MATERIALS AND EQUIPMENT

1. How to be a Better Language Learner.
2. Chalkboard, Chalk and Eraser.
3. Copy of the missionary discussions in the mission language for each missionary.

PROCEDURE

Step 01  Review the strategies that were discussed in lesson 04. Learning Vocabulary, on the strategy sheet.

Step 02  Read aloud the bulleted items under Learning Grammar on the strategy sheet.

Step 03  Explain that sentences are made of many small grammatical parts. All sentences, even complex ones, are really just a combination of many smaller understandable parts.

Example

- Write a sentence from the standard missionary discussions on the board.
- Pick out the grammatical concepts that this sentence contains (verbs, prepositions, etc.). Particularly point out specific grammatical markers, such as verb endings, that help to understand the sentence. Help the missionaries see how the grammar is used. Show them that this is a good way to learn and understand the grammar.
Practice breaking sentences into grammatical parts.

- Have them turn to a paragraph from one of the discussions.
- Have them identify specific grammatical principles contained in the paragraph one at a time, for example:
  - Underline all present or past tense endings.
  - Circling all verbs in the paragraph.
  - Drawing a box around all of the dative prepositions.
  - Circling the dative case objects.
  - Etc...
- Have the missionaries comment on what they found and what it contributes to the meaning of the text. Ask them if there were grammar points that they don’t understand.

Step 05 Explain why we practice using grammar rules? It is one thing to learn about a language, but does it mean that we can speak it? We need to practice using rules until we can do it automatically without thinking about it.

Step 06 Conduct an in depth practice of a specific grammar principle.

- Draw their attention to a specific grammar principle that they need more practice with. (Keep it really simple--choose one verb tense or one structure like agreement or gender or case.)
- Ask them what they already know about the principle and how it functions within the text that they have been using.

Conduct a pattern practice.

Step 07

- Write a sentence pattern on the board that allows practice of this grammar principle (e.g. a “verb-cross” for a tense of verb conjugation or sentence completion drill for a concept such as showing possession).
- Conduct a pattern practice drill having the missionaries use the sentence pattern on the board and filling in different examples or completions with their companions. Apply the rule to new situations, words, etc...
- Have them look for this particular grammar principle in the discussions or other materials.

Step 08 Summarize. Point out the importance of these strategies and encourage them to continue practicing them in the future. Remind them that they can do this on their own—they don’t need the teacher to lead them in the practice. Ask them what other kinds of grammar rules this type of practice can apply to.
OBJECTIVES

1. Learn the missionary discussions in an outline form.
2. Learn the meaning of each discussion paragraph.
3. Learn the discussions by practicing them over and over until familiar.

MATERIALS AND EQUIPMENT

1. *How to be a Better Language Learner*.
2. Complete set of the discussion in English and mission language for each missionary.
3. Chalk, Eraser, and Chalkboard.

PROCEDURE

Step 01 Review the strategies that were discussed in lesson 09, *Listening*, on the strategy sheet.

Step 02 Read aloud the bulleted items under *Learning Missionary Discussions* on the strategy sheet.

Step 03 Learn the outline of the discussions in sequence

1. Help them understand the importance of seeing the "whole picture" before trying to deal with all of the details.
   - Jigsaw puzzle - do the border first to get idea of size and have a reference point.
   - Road map - find the destination before you start driving.

2. Compare the discussion to a large filing cabinet with six drawers.
   - On the outside of each drawer is a colored label. Each label corresponds to the color and title of each of one of the six discussions.
   - Within each drawer are 4 to 7 file folders. Each folder has a title that corresponds to the principle headings of the discussion contained within that specific drawer.
   - Within each file folder are several sheets of paper. Each piece of paper contains the heading of one of the paragraphs and a scripture that relates to that file folder principle.

   Example: First Discussion

   1. Top drawer
      - Blue label (color of first discussion)
      - Title "The Plan of our Heavenly Father"
2. Six file folders titled:
   - The Plan of our **Heavenly Father**
   - Jesus **Christ** is the Son of God
   - The **Method** that the Plan is Revealed
   - The Prophet **Joseph Smith**, A Modern Witness of Jesus Christ
   - The **Book of Mormon**, Another Witness of Jesus Christ
   - The **Holy Ghost**, A Witness of the Truth

3. Papers in the first file folder (The Plan of our Heavenly Father - God)
   - We believe in God
   - God is perfect
   - Scripture: Genesis 1:26-27
   - God is our Father
   - God has a plan for us

**Step 04**  
**Learn the colors of the six discussions.** Use some kind of memory game if applicable (Cool colors and then hot).

- Disc. 1 = Blue
- Disc. 2 = Green
- Disc. 3 = Purple
- Disc. 4 = Pink
- Disc. 5 = Red
- Disc. 6 = Orange

**Step 05**  
**Learn the discussion Titles.** Write them on the board and try to relate to them in an easy way to remember them. Have them repeat them several times as a group, give them a minute to review individually and then erase the board and have them recite them several times.

- The Plan of our Heavenly Father
- The Gospel of Jesus Christ
- The Restoration
- Eternal Progression
- Living a Christ-like life
- Membership in the Kingdom

**Step 06**  
**Learn the principle titles.** Write the on the board, and again try to relate them in a logical manner. Have them repeat them several times as a group, give them a minute to review individually and then erase the board and have them recite them several times.

- The Plan of our **Heavenly Father**
- Jesus **Christ** is the Son of God
- The **Method** that the Plan is Revealed
- The Prophet **Joseph Smith**, A Modern Witness of Jesus Christ
- The **Book of Mormon**, Another Witness of Jesus Christ
- The **Holy Ghost**, A Witness of the Truth

**Step 07**  
**Principle paragraphs.** As before write them on board, go over them several times as a group in a logical manner, have some individual practice time and then review without the aid of the board.

**Step 08**  
**Missionary demonstration.** Have one or two of the missionaries come to the front of the class and demonstrate that they know all of the information that was covered in the outline learning process.
Step 09  **An outline can help you find the way.** Show them how having an outline in mind can help them find their place if they get lost when teaching, or be able to instantly “pull out” information on a variety of topics and go into as much detail as needed.

Step 10  **Learn the meaning of each paragraph**

1. Point out the fact that it is a lot easier to learn something in another language when you know what it means already. If you don’t know what a sentence or a paragraph means, it will just be a group of sounds.

2. Discuss how to break down each paragraph into its main topics. Take a discussion paragraph and show the missionaries how to break it down. Then have the missionaries take a different paragraph and break it down into its main ideas. Have a couple of missionaries share what they came up with to see if they came up with the same ideas.

Step 11  **Practice saying each paragraph aloud many times until you can present it with only occasional glances at the written text**

1. Remind them that this is basically the method that the MTC uses to teach the discussions, but with the “whole picture” or an outline in mind it is easier to see where you are going and to keep track of where you are in the discussions.

2. Have them read through the paragraph one, principle one, discussion one several times and then turn to a companion and teach it trying only to look occasionally if they get stuck. When they get stuck remind them of the outline.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>I. THE PLAN OF OUR HEAVENLY FATHER</th>
<th>II. THE GOSPEL OF JESUS CHRIST</th>
<th>III. THE RESTORATION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. THE PLAN OF OUR HEAVENLY FATHER (Gen 1:26-27)</td>
<td>1. SALVATION FROM PHYSICAL DEATH (Alma 11:42-43)</td>
<td>1. TRUTH VERSUS ERROR (Ether 4:13)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A. We Believe in God</td>
<td>A. We Are Physically Different from Our Heavenly Father</td>
<td>A. We Must Find and Accept the Truth</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. God Is Perfect</td>
<td>B. Our Spirits and Bodies Will Be Separated</td>
<td>B. The Ideas of Men Are Limited</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. God Is Our Father in Heaven</td>
<td>C. Jesus Overcame Physical Death</td>
<td>C. Christ Formed His Church</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D. God Has a Plan for Us.</td>
<td>D. Resurrection is the Reuniting of the Body and Spirit</td>
<td>D. The Church Is Led by Revelation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. THE DIVINE SONSHIP OF JESUS CHRIST (John 3:16 / John 14:6)</td>
<td>2. SALVATION FROM SIN (Alma 34:8-9)</td>
<td>2. APOSTASY (2 Thessalnians 2:1-3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A. We Need Help to Overcome Sin and Death</td>
<td>A. The Plan of Our Heavenly Father Allows Us to Choose</td>
<td>A. The Apostles of Jesus Christ Were Rejected</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. God Sent Jesus Christ to Fulfill the Plan</td>
<td>B. Sin Is Acting against the Will of God</td>
<td>B. Priesthood Authority Was Lost</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. Christ Overcame Sin and Death</td>
<td>C. Separation from God Is Spiritual Death</td>
<td>C. Confusion and Apostasy Resulted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D. Christ Showed Us How to Fulfill the Plan</td>
<td>D. Through Christ We Can Be Cleansed from Sin</td>
<td>D. Christ Translated the Book of Mormon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E. Have Faith to Do What He Taught</td>
<td>E. To Be Forgiven, We Must Accept Christ</td>
<td>D. Joseph Recorded Other Revelations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. HOW THE PLAN HAS BEEN REVEALED (Amos 3:7)</td>
<td>3. FAITH IN CHRIST (Heb 11:6)</td>
<td>4. THE RESTORATION OF THE CHURCH (D&amp;C 1:50)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A. God Follows a Pattern</td>
<td>A. The First Principle is Faith in Christ</td>
<td>A. Joseph Smith Received the Aaronic Priesthood</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. He Chooses Witnesses</td>
<td>B. Faith in Christ Means Loving and Following Him</td>
<td>B. Joseph Received the Melchizedek Priesthood</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. The Prophets Testify of Christ</td>
<td>4. REPENTANCE (Alma 34:17)</td>
<td>C. Gospel Ordinances Can Be Performed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D. The Holy Ghost Confirms Truth</td>
<td>A. The Second Principle is Repentance</td>
<td>D. The Church Was Organized</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E. We Are Invited to Obey</td>
<td>B. We Can Repent</td>
<td>E. The Church Is Named after Christ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. THE PROPHET JOSEPH SMITH: A MODERN WITNESS OF JESUS CHRIST (JSII 1:12 / JSII 1:11-12 / JSII 1:16-17)</td>
<td>5. BAPTISM BY IMMERSON FOR THE REMISSION OF SINS (Acts 2:38)</td>
<td>F. This Is the Only True Church</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A. God Has Followed His Pattern for Revealing Truth Today</td>
<td>A. The Third Principle is Baptism</td>
<td>5. MEMBERSHIP IN THE TRUE CHURCH (Mormal 6:2-4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. Joseph Smith Was Confused about Religion</td>
<td>B. We Make a Covenant</td>
<td>A. God Has Called Apostles and Prophets in Our Day</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. Joseph Learned How to Gain Wisdom</td>
<td>C. Baptism Is a Symbol</td>
<td>B. Come unto Christ by Belonging to His Church</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D. Joseph Prayed for Wisdom</td>
<td>D. We Must Be Baptized by Authority</td>
<td>6. ATTENDING CHURCH MEETINGS AND PARTAKING OF THE SACRAMENT (Mormal 6:5-6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E. Joseph SAW God the Father and Jesus Christ the Son</td>
<td>6. THE GIFT OF THE HOLY GHOST (3 Nephi 27:28)</td>
<td>A. Meet Together Often</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F. Joseph Smith Was a Prophet of God</td>
<td>A. We Must Be Spiritually Born</td>
<td>B. The Sacrament Is Part of Our Worship Services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G. Joseph Is a Witness of Christ</td>
<td>B. Receiving the Holy Ghost Is the Baptism of Fire</td>
<td>C. The Savior Introduced the Sacrament</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. THE BOOK OF MORMON: ANOTHER TESTAMENT OF JESUS CHRIST (2 Corinthians 13:1)</td>
<td>C. The Holy Ghost Is Given by the Laying on of Hands</td>
<td>D. We Use Bread and Water</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A. Joseph Smith Brought Forth the Book of Mormon</td>
<td>D. We Can Have the Gift of the Holy Ghost</td>
<td>E. We Make a Covenant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. The Book of Mormon Contains the Writings of Prophets</td>
<td>7. OBEDIENCE TO THE COMMANDMENTS OF GOD (D&amp;C 52:1-10 / 2 Nephi 31:4-7)</td>
<td>F. The Lord Promises Us His Spirit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. Book of Mormon Prophets Taught about Christ</td>
<td>A. We Must Endure to the End in Obedience</td>
<td>G. In Worship Services, the Members Strengthen Each Other</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D. Another Testament of Christ</td>
<td>B. The Purpose of Obedience</td>
<td>H. Attending Worship Services Will Bring You Blessings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>* Commitment Invitation: Read</td>
<td>* Commitment Invitation: Baptism</td>
<td># Commitment Invitation: Church Attendance</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. THE RESTORATION OF THE CHURCH (D&C 1:30)
IV. ETERNAL PROGRESSION

1. OUR PREMORTAL EXISTENCE (Abraham 3:22-25)
   A. We Lived before Our Mortal Birth
   B. We Are Children of God
   C. We Were Unlike God
   D. Our Father Prepared a Plan

2. MORTAL LIFE ON EARTH (Alma 12:24)
   A. This Life Has a Purpose
   B. We Each Receive a Physical Body
   C. We Are Free to Make Choices
   D. Growth Depends on Choices

3. LIFE AFTER DEATH (Comeethhans 15:40-42)
   A. Death Is Part of the Plan of Our Father
   B. Our Spirits Go to the Spirit World
   C. We Will Be Resurrected and Judged
   D. We Can Live in Celestial Glory
   E. There Are Lesser Degrees of Glory
   F. Paul Talks of These Degrees of Glory

4. WORK FOR THE DEAD (1 Peter 3:18-19 / 1 Peter 4:6)
   A. Many Die without the Gospel
   B. The Gospel Is Taught in the Spirit
   C. We Can Perform Baptism for the Dead
   D. Baptism Is Performed in Holy Temples

5. THE ETERNAL FAMILY (1 Corinthians 11:11)
   A. We Have the Power of Procreation
   B. The Creative Power Is Sacred
   C. Families Need Not End at Death

6. CHASTITY (D&C 42:22-25)
   A. Procreation Is Sacred
   B. God Gives Laws to Govern This Power
   C. The Law of Chastity
   * Commitment Invitation: Live the Law of Chastity

7. THE WORD OF WISDOM (D&C 98:18-21)
   A. Our Bodies and the Freedom to Choose Are Gifts
   B. We Should Avoid Harmful Substances
   C. We Should Use Wholesome Foods
   D. The Lord Promises Health
   E. The Lord Promises Us His Spirit
   * Commitment Invitation: Live the Word of Wisdom

V. LIVING A CHRISTLIKE LIFE

1. THE TWO GREAT COMMANDMENTS
   A. We Tend to Seek Our Self-interest
   B. God Gives Two Great Commandments
   C. We Show Our Love for God by Keeping His Commandments
   D. We Show Our Love for Others through Service

2. SACRIFICE BRINGS BLESSINGS (3 Nephi 13:33)
   A. We Must Sacrifice Our Own Interests
   B. We Must Put the Things of God First
   C. We Should Give What Is Required
   D. Sacrifice Requires Faith
   E. Sacrifice Brings Blessings

3. FASTING AND FAST OFFERINGS (Alma 5:46)
   A. Fasting Helps Us Put God First
   B. We Receive Blessings from Fasting
   C. Fasting Should Include Prayer
   D. One Sunday Each Month Is Set Aside as a Fast Day
   E. Through Fasting We Can Help Those in Need
   F. Our Fast Offerings Should Be Generous
   G. Fasting Helps Us Be Selfless
   H. Sacrifice Shows Love for God

4. TITHING (Malachi 3:8-11)
   A. Tithing Helps Us Put God First
   B. God Is the Source of All We Have
   C. We Participate in the Work of the Lord
   D. Tithing Develops Unselfishness
   * Commitment Invitation: Tithing

VI. MEMBERSHIP IN THE KINGDOM

1. THE ROLES OF JESUS CHRIST IN THE PLAN OF SALVATION (Mosiah 3:18)
   A. Jesus Christ Is the Creator
   B. He Is Our Redeemer and Savior
   C. He Is Our Judge

2. EXALTMATION THROUGH CHRIST AND HIS CHURCH
   (John 14:6)
   A. Exaltation Is the Greatest Gift of god
   B. Immortality Is Given to All People
   C. Exaltation through Christ
   D. The Church Helps Us Progress

3. THE MISSION OF THE CHURCH: PERFECTING THE SAINTS (Moses 1:39)
   A. Come unto Christ by Being Baptized
   B. We Work for the Salvation of Others
   C. The First Mission: To Perfect the Saints
   D. We Receive Truth and Inspired Guidance
   E. We Receive Gospel Ordinances
   F. We Receive Fellowship and Strength
   G. We Serve Others

4. THE MISSION OF THE CHURCH: PROCLAIMING THE GOSPEL (D&C $8:81)
   A. We Share the Gospel with Others
   B. We Should Invite Friends to Learn More

5. THE MISSION OF THE CHURCH: REDEEMING THE DEAD (1 Corinthians 15:29)
   A. We Can Perform Temple Ordinances
   B. We Can Do Genealogical Research
   C. We Must Be Worthy to Attend the Temple

6. THE STRAIT AND NARROW PATH (2 Nephi 31:17-21)
   A. We Can Follow the Path to Perfection
   B. Come unto Christ through Baptism
   * Commitment Invitation: Take Part in the Church
LESSON 11
VOCABULARY 2
(30 minutes)

OBJECTIVES

1. Learn vocabulary from environment, street signs, natives, etc.
2. Remember vocabulary through using similar sounding words.
3. Remember vocabulary through visual imagery.

MATERIALS AND EQUIPMENT

1. *How to be a Better Language Learner.*
2. Chalk, Eraser, and Chalkboard.
3. List of difficult vocabulary words for the missionaries to practice with.

PROCEDURE

Step 01  Review the strategies that were discussed in lesson 10, *Learning Missionary Discussions*, on the strategy sheet.

Step 02  Read aloud the bulleted items under *Learning Vocabulary* on the strategy sheet.

Step 03  Learning vocabulary from the environment.

1. **What is it?** A great way of picking up new vocabulary is to learn it from the environment—signs, posters, and fluent speakers everywhere. It helps you see how the words are used in a live context (it also assures you that the word isn’t out of date).

2. **Brainstorm activity.** Ask the missionaries to generate a list of ways they can learn new words in the environment: billboards, advertisements, store names, street signs, food labels, things their landlady says, things members say at church, etc. Impress upon them that this is one of the best methods of learning new and useful vocabulary.

Step 04  Remembering vocabulary through similar sounding words.

1. **Generate list of difficult vocabulary.** With the help of the teacher, have the missionaries come up with a list of words in the mission language that they are having a hard time remembering and write these words on the board.

2. **Associate the sounds of a new word with those of a familiar word.** Think of a familiar English word that sounds like the foreign word. The English word does not have to sound exactly like the foreign word, as long as it helps you remember the word and its pronunciation. For example:

   - The Portuguese word for *evangelho* (gospel) sounds like “Evan jell you.”
   - The Cantonese word for *Sahn* sounds like “sun.”
   - The German word *Wie gehts?* (How are you?) sounds like “V gates.”
3. **Practice.** Let the missionaries try this strategy out with some of the words listed on the board. Have some of the missionaries share what they come up with.

**Remembering vocabulary through visual imagery.**

1. **What is it?** Create a mental picture or image that includes a representation of both the sound and the meaning of the new word. (If the meaning of the word is abstract (e.g. *love, idea, slow*), then think of some concrete way to represent it in the mental picture.) The two parts of the mental image should be linked so that when you see one image you see the other. Follow these steps:

   1. Think of an English word for a concrete item (tangible object) that sounds like the foreign word.
   2. Pick a tangible object that represents the meaning of the foreign word.
   3. Link the two tangible objects in an interactive (and creative) way.

   Examples:

   - 1. *Moscow* sounds like the Spanish word *mosca*.
   - 2. *Fly* (the insect) is the literal meaning for the word *mosca*.
   - 3. Imagine a swarm of flies descending on the city of Moscow.

   - 1. The English word *beehive* sounds like the Portuguese word *hiva*.
   - 2. The literal meaning of the word *hiva* is anger. Imagine a clenched fist representing anger.
   - 3. Now imagine a beehive with a clenched fist smashing into it.

2. **Practice.** Let the missionaries try this strategy out with some of the words listed on the board. Have some of the missionaries share what they come up with.

**Step 06** Warn the missionaries that these two strategies are good to use, but not all of the time. If they have too many little tricks in their heads, they won’t have enough space for the words themselves. Additionally, they might forget the tricks. Also, these strategies aren’t necessary for the easier words. Thus, they may want to reserve these strategies for words that are harder to remember.
OBJECTIVES

1. Discuss reading daily in the language and looking for grammatical markers
2. Practice learning by looking for cognates.
3. Practice learning by figuring out the meaning from context.

MATERIALS AND EQUIPMENT

1. How to be a Better Language Learner.
2. Copy of the Book of Mormon in the mission language for each missionary.
3. Chalk, Eraser, and Chalkboard.

PROCEDURE

Step 01  Review the strategies that were discussed in lesson 06, Speaking, on the strategy sheet.

Step 02  Read aloud the bulleted items under Reading on the strategy sheet.

Step 03  Explain the importance of reading daily in the language.

- Reading in the language can help you learn grammar, vocabulary, native phrases, etc. There are many things that missionaries can read in the language on their mission—The Book of Mormon, other scriptures, and church publications (Ensign, Church News, discussions, Gospel Principles, etc.)

Step 04  Discuss the importance of paying attention to grammatical markers.

- Paying attention to grammatical markers and parts of speech can help in understanding a text (e.g. finding the subject of the sentence, the verbs, the direct object).

Step 05  Practice looking for cognates.

1. Explain what a cognate is: words in the language that are similar to English words you know. Give at least five language specific examples to the missionaries.

2. Guided practice. Have the missionaries open up their copies of the Book of Mormon (in the language) to the introduction. Quickly go through the first paragraph with them, pointing out the cognates.

3. Individual practice. Once you feel that they understand what a cognate is, have the missionaries start at the second paragraph and have them find all the cognates they can in 3 min. After the time, see who has the most. Have that missionary read his/her list aloud and have the other missionaries comment on whether or not they found that cognate and whether or not they agree that it is a cognate.
4. **Summarize.** After discussing the cognates, have a missionary summarize what the paragraphs were about. Link this to the idea that cognates can help them understand reading materials, even if they don’t know all the words.

**Step 06**

**Practice gaining understanding meaning from context.**

1. **Pick a short verse from the Book of Mormon** that has many familiar words and maybe one or two new words.

2. **Read the verse together.**

3. **Have a missionary summarize what it’s about.** Ask the missionaries which words are unfamiliar, and then have them guess the meaning. (If time permits, you could have one missionary actually look the word up in the dictionary to check the definition.)

4. **Individual reading.** Give the missionaries a new set of verses to read, and have them write down the words they don’t know. While they are reading, have them guess at the definitions of these words and have them write down their guesses.

5. **Conclusion.** After about 5 min., have a few missionaries share the unfamiliar words, what they guessed the definitions to be, and how they came up with the definitions from the context.
LESSON 13  
TASK 2  
(30 minutes)

OBJECTIVES

1. Learn to use all of the task strategies in order to prepare and accomplish a task.

MATERIALS AND EQUIPMENT

1. *How to be a Better Language Learner.*
2. Chalk, Eraser, and Chalkboard.

PROCEDURE

Step 01  Review the strategies that were discussed in lesson 12, Reading, on the strategy sheet.

Step 02  Read aloud the bulleted items under *Learning Language Tasks* on the strategy sheet.

Step 03  Introduce the idea of tasks. To introduce the missionaries to the task idea further, ask them what they would do and say in various situations:

- You just witnessed an accident and had to call an ambulance.
- You went to the barber for a haircut for the first time.
- You have to answer the phone for the first time in the mission field.
- You are getting transferred and get lost on the way.
- You have to buy a train ticket.

Step 04  Task selection

1. **Task brainstorm.** As a group, ask the missionaries what kind of tasks they will need to perform as missionaries that they feel uncomfortable with or want to learn. These tasks may be more missionary related such as making an appointment or they may be more survival type skills such as asking directions, making a phone call etc...  

2. **Selecting a task.** As the missionaries are coming up with tasks as a group, make a list of many of the best ones on the board. After there are several good suggestions, decide as a group the one task that they would most like to work on learning. The task should involve at least two parties so possible interactions and predictions can be identified and analyzed.
Step 05  Making strategy assignments

1. **Subtasks.** As a group, divide the task into subtasks. Write the subtasks on the board.

   **Example Task:** Mailing a package home

   **Subtasks:**
   - Explain that you want to mail a package
   - Describe what is in the package
   - Explain how you want it sent (airmail, by boat, etc.)
   - Ask how much it will cost
   - Pay for the service

2. **Strategies of task learning.** Divide the missionaries into companionships and give each companionship one of the following assignments to work on for approximately 5 minutes for the selected task.

   - Identify vocabulary and phrases that can be used in accomplishing the task
   - Identify sentence patterns and grammar rules that are used in the task
   - Get a native model (or teacher example) or how the task might be approached
   - Identify possible situations and contexts in which this task might be used
   - Predict possible responses and come up with possible responses

**Practice learning the task**

1. **Report of strategies.** Have each companionship give a report on the specific information that they came up with. Make notes of vocabulary, grammar, etc. and the board as needed. Have the missionaries that had the assignment to get a model give a model for the class.

**Step 07  Practicing the task**

1. **Companion practice.** Pair up the missionaries in companionships and have them all practice for 5 or 10 minutes. Make sure that each missionary has a chance to play the role of the missionary in each task at least once.

2. **Demonstration.** Have another companionship come forward and do the task one more time. This time the task should be rather smooth incorporating the vocabulary, grammar, examples and predictions that were brainstormed and practiced.

3. **Apply to new situations.** Emphasize to the missionaries that this is a strategy made up of smaller strategies that can be applied to almost any task that they will face as missionaries. Briefly review the steps to learn the task.
LESSON 14
WRITING
(30 minutes)

OBJECTIVES

1. Understand how the process of writing is valuable in learning language.
2. Practice the strategies for writing in a given situation.
3. Learn to evaluate what is written.

MATERIALS AND EQUIPMENT

1. How to be a Better Language Learner.
2. Three prepared situations for writing practice.

PROCEDURE

Step 01 Review the strategies that were discussed in lesson 08, Listening, on the strategy sheet.

Step 02 Read aloud the bulleted items under Writing on the strategy sheet.

Step 03 Explain the value of writing in learning a language.
   - Studies done by the MTC and in the academic world indicate that writing in the language contributes greatly to learning the language. Writing in the language was one of the most often mentioned strategies by good language learners.

Step 04 Identify times when writing can be practiced.
   - Taking notes in meetings
   - Writing letters (home, mission president, members, etc.)
   - Notes to investigators
   - Journal
   - Talks, lessons, other church related information

Step 05 Practice writing situations. Each missionary receives one of the following situations or a similar situation of your choice (approximately three missionaries will receive each situation). Each missionary reads the situation and writes the necessary information as required. They may use dictionaries and any other strategies they choose, except help from a companion.
   - You did not show up for a Zone Conference and have to explain to the Mission President in a letter that the reason that you did not show up was because on your way to the conference you and your companion witnessed an accident, had to call an ambulance and go to the hospital with the injured person.
One of your investigators wants to visit church on Sunday but doesn’t know how to get to the church. They were not there when you came to tell them how to get there, so you need to leave a note that explains that Brother Jones will be by their house to pick them up at 9:45 a.m. on Sunday and take them to church as the meetings start at 10:00. Tell them that you will meet them there and remind them that they should dress nicely and that the block of church meetings lasts three hours.

A member family in the ward has been particularly helpful to you in teaching one of their friends. Last Thursday evening they had their friend over to their house for the fourth discussion. The family provided refreshments and came and picked you up for the discussions as well as taking you home afterward. Write the family a short letter thanking them for the evening, refreshments and for the ride as well as expressing your excitement for them in having their good friend investigate the church.

Have the missionaries interpret what was written

1. **Exchange writing exercises.** After the missionaries have finished writing, or after the allotted time is done, the missionaries trade what they have written with someone else who did not have the same situation.

2. **Interpretation.** One or more missionaries who read what another missionary wrote describes the situation as they understand it from what was written. The original situation is then read to see how well the information was communicated.

3. **What did they learn?** Ask the missionaries what they learned from the experience. Did they learn new vocabulary, language specific writing skills, grammar, etc.

4. **Encourage the missionaries** to write as much as possible in the language.
LESSON 15
DISCUSSION 2
(30 minutes)

OBJECTIVES
1. Learn to use key words in the missionary discussions.
2. Practice teaching the discussions in different contexts and formats.

MATERIALS AND EQUIPMENT
1. *How to be a Better Language Learner*.
2. Copy of the discussions in the mission language for each missionary.

PROCEDURE

**Step 01** Review the strategies that were discussed in lesson 14, *Writing*, on the strategy sheet.

**Step 02** Read aloud the bulleted items under *Learning Missionary Discussions* on the strategy sheet.

**Step 03 Write key words**

1. **Where to use key words.** Have the missionaries take out their first discussion.
2. **What is a key word?** Explain that a key word is a word that represents the main ideas of the paragraph—it may or may not be a word actually in the discussion paragraph.
3. **Model key word selection.** Go through a paragraph as an example (3rd principle of the 1st discussion), picking one key word or phrase per sentence.
4. **Model** how to teach using the key words as prompts.
5. **Pick out key words.** Give them a paragraph in the same principle and have them pick out the key words of that paragraph.
6. **Write the key words.** Have them write the key words in the margin or on an index card.
7. **Share key words.** Let some of the missionaries share the key words they came up with. Emphasize that each missionary can use whatever words work best for him/her.
8. **Produce in your own words.** Have the missionaries cover up the paragraph and practice giving the paragraph in their own words from the key words.

**Step 04 Different contexts**

1. **Brainstorm different contexts.** Get the missionaries to brainstorm different people that they may have to teach in the field (e.g. different ages, socio-economic classes, religious backgrounds, etc.) Write these things on the board. Discuss how they would have to change the way they present the message.

2. **Practice context.** Assign the missionaries a context (give each one a different one) and have them practice giving the discussion to a partner in the new context. Just have them give part of the second principle of the first discussion (depending on time constraints).
**Step 05** Different formats.

1. **Brainstorm different formats.** Have the missionaries brainstorm different ways that they could give the discussions (e.g. as a talk, Sunday school lesson, less-active visit, family home evening lesson, etc.) Write these things on the board as well. Discuss what changes they would need to make in their presentation.

2. **Practice format.** Assign the missionaries a format (give each one a different one) and have them practice giving the discussion to a partner in the new format. Just have them give part of the second principle of the first discussion (depending on time constraints).

**Step 06** In conclusion, explain to the missionaries how these techniques will help them become more familiar with the discussions and how the techniques will help them to personalize the message while teaching.
LESSON 16
SIMULATION ACTIVITY
(2 hours)

OBJECTIVES

1. Have missionaries use strategies in a real-life situation, including preparation time, actual performance time, and in talking about strategies retrospectively through an interview.
2. Evaluate which strategies missionaries use, how well they use them and what their personal feelings about strategies and training in strategies are.

MATERIALS AND EQUIPMENT

1. *How to be a Better Language Learner*.
2. Enough audio cassette players to provide each companionship with one.
3. Tape of native playing role of the bishop/relief society president.
4. Letter from native playing the role of the young boy’s mother.
5. Enough rooms scheduled to put one companionship in a room by themselves.
6. Recording equipment and tapes to tape the role play and feedback interview.

PROCEDURE

**Step 01 Prepare for simulation activity.** In each of the rooms scheduled for use in the activity set up a recorder with the tape ready and provide a pre-prepared letter.

**Step 02 Introduction to simulation activity.** With the class together as a group, inform the missionaries that this simulation will consist of three phases and they should be aware of the following points:

**Phase 1**

- They will be working in companionships during this activity.
- A 30 minute preparation time in which they prepare to teach the situation that they are given.
- Each companionship will go to a room where they will find a tape recorder and a sealed letter. The tape and the letter will inform them of the specifics of the situation they need to prepare for.

- During this time they may use any strategies or resources that are available to them.
- A native speaker (teacher or trainer) will be available for questions or reference in the role of a family member with whom the missionaries live, but they will only respond in the mission language.
- After the 30 minutes of preparation time is over, they will return to the classroom and wait for their turn to participate in the role play situation. They are not permitted to talk to others in the class or further discuss the situation.
Phase 2

- Each companionship will participate in the particular situation that they have prepared for.
- The role play will be in the mission language with a trainer or teacher that speaks that language. The trainer or teacher playing the role does not understand English.
- The role play will last approximately 15 minutes and will be recorded for data collection purposes.
- Missionaries may bring and use any resources available to them.

Phase 3

- Immediately following the role play, each companionship will participate in a feedback interview with a trainer that lasts approximately 15 minutes.
- The feedback interview will be conducted in English.
- The interview will be taped for data collection purposes.
- After the interview the missionaries will return to the classroom to continue with the scheduled activities for the day.

**Start phase 1.** Take each companionship to their respective rooms and inform them that they will have 30 minutes to prepare and that a “native” will be available for reference if needed.

**Start phase 2.** After 30 minutes take all companionships back to the classroom and pull one companionship out for performance of the role play situation. Use one of the rooms that had been previously used for phase 1 activities.

**Start phase 3.** As each companionship finishes their performance, show them to another room that has been set up for interviews. The interviewer conducts the feedback interview, shows the companionship back to the classroom and prepared for the next interview. The person conducting the role play retrieves another companionship from the classroom to participate in the role play.

**Step 06** Conclusion. Thank all of the missionaries for their participation and answer any questions that might arise.
Dear Native Speaker:

Play the role of a native Relief Society President and express the following information using your own words in a native like manner.

The situation is a telephone message that you are leaving the missionaries about a nine year old boy (John) from a less-active family that is getting ready to be baptized. You want to have the missionaries make a visit to John and make sure that he is ready for his baptism. The following are the essential points.

- John is from a less-active family that has recently been attending church on a regular basis.
- John has been attending primary with his friends and has expressed a desire to be baptized now that he is nine years old.
- His parents do not feel adequately prepared to get him ready for his baptism and would like a visit from the missionaries to make sure he understands the covenant of baptism and what baptism is really about.
- It will not be necessary to teach a missionary discussion, but rather a simplified tailored message that John can easily relate to.
- I (the bishop) will be out of town for a week, but if you need resources for help please contact the Jones, the member family that you live with.
- John’s mother has left a short letter with me about some additional concerns that John has about baptism that you should address. I will drop of the letter at your apartment this evening.
Dear Native Speaker:

Play the role of a less-active mother who has a nine-year old boy (John) that is getting ready to be baptized. Express the following information using your own words in a native like manner.

The situation is that you have less-active for some time and now that your son want to be baptized, you feel unprepared to get him ready. You would like the missionaries to come talk with John about baptism and in particular the following concerns that he has expressed.

- Who will be doing the actual baptizing.
- What John needs to wear and bring for the baptism.
- What actually takes place during the ordinance, such as how to stand, how long he will be under water, etc.
- Will he feel different after having been baptized?

Liebe Missionare:

Mein Sohn, Thorsten möchte gerne getauft werden, und ich hätte gerne, daß Sie mit ihm sprechen, und ihn auf die Taufe besser vorbereiten. Auch möchte er wissen, wer ihn taufen wird, was er anziehen und zur Taufe bringen soll.

Könnten Sie ihm auch bitte erklären, was während der Taufe und der Taufversammlung stattfinden wird. Erklären Sie ihm bitte auch, wo er stehen wird, was er tun muß, wie lange er unter wasser sein wird u.s.w. Bitte beschreiben Sie ihm auch wie er sich vor und nach der Taufe fühlen wird.

Herzlichen Dank für Ihre Hilfe,

Schwester Herber
Dear Native Speaker:

Play the role of a less-active mother who has a nine-year old boy (John) that is getting ready to be baptized. Express the following information using your own words in a native like manner.

The situation is that you have less-active for some time and now that your son want to be baptized, you feel unprepared to get him ready. You would like the missionaries to come talk with John about baptism and in particular the following concerns that he has expressed.

- Who will be doing the actual baptizing.
- What John needs to wear and bring for the baptism.
- What actually takes place during the ordinance, such as how to stand, how long he will be under water, etc.
- Will he feel different after having been baptized?

Caro Élderes,

Meu nome é Teresa; eu sou a mãe do João; não sou muito firme na Igreja e meu filho de nove anos de idade quer se batizar.

Ele está me fazendo algumas perguntas que eu não sei responder; gostaria que vocês o ajudasse em suas dúvidas que são: como será realizado o batismo; o que ele precisa vestir e levar; o que acontecerá durante a cerimônia, como ele será mergulhado na água, quanto tempo ele precisa ficar debaixo d’água; quem realizará o batismo, e como ele se sentirá depois.

Se vocês puderem esclarecer essas dúvidas, eu agradeço desde já.

Sinceramente,

Teresa Batista
WARM UP QUESTIONS
1. What did you think of this experience?
2. How do you think that you did?
3. Why do say that?

ACTIVITY QUESTIONS
1. Think through what you did when you got in the room, and tell me in as much detail as possible what you did and why?
2. Additional what and why questions as applicable.

REACTION QUESTIONS
1. What did you think about the strategy training?
2. Suggestions and comments?
3. Do you feel that this training would be beneficial for future missionaries?
4. Do you plan to continue using the strategies in the field? If so which ones and why or why not?
LESSON 17
LANGUAGE LEARNING STRATEGY TRAINING CONCLUSION
(1 hour)

OBJECTIVES

1. Review the strategy worksheet.
2. Process the MTC language learning strategy training experience.
3. Discuss fossilization and the importance of studying the language daily to avoid it.
4. Discuss ways to build daily language study into the existing missionary schedule.
5. Create a customized and personalized in field language study program.

MATERIALS AND EQUIPMENT

1. Copies of the “Learning the Language in the Mission Field” sheet
2. Extra copies of the strategy sheet
3. Transparencies:
   - Graph of missionary language proficiency
   - Language proficiency scale
   - Missionary daily schedule from the white handbook
   - Revised Missionary daily schedule
   - The Missionary Handbook
   - Pencil and paper for each missionary

PROCEDURE

Step 01 Welcome. Welcome the missionaries to the meeting and begin with a song and a prayer in the mission language.

Step 02 Read objectives. Read through the list of objectives for the meeting as a large group.

OBJECTIVE #1 - (15 minutes)
Review How to be a Better Language Learner handout

Step 03 Have the missionaries pull out their strategy training sheets. Make sure that every missionary has a sheet and distribute additional sheets as necessary.

Step 04 Small group discussion. Put the missionaries into small groups (3-4 missionaries each) and have each one explain 1 or 2 of his/her favorite language learning strategies to the small group, talking about why they felt is was a good strategy, how they used it, and how they plan on using it in the mission field. They may refer to the strategy worksheet if they wish.

Step 05 Gather the missionaries into the large group again.
OBJECTIVE #2 - (10 minutes)
Processing the MTC experience

Step 06 Ask the following questions and solicit answers from the missionaries:

- Which language learning strategies seemed most useful?
- Did you use any of the strategies on your own?
- Did you use any of the strategies on the sheet but not practiced in class?
- Did you use any strategies not on the sheet?
- What did you think of the strategy training overall?
- Would you recommend the training for missionaries in the future?
- What would you change or recommend?

Step 07 Discuss these questions as appropriate.

OBJECTIVE #3 - (10 minutes)
Discuss Fossilization

Step 08 Hand out the In field Worksheet.

Step 09 Show the transparency with the proficiency scale.

- Read through the descriptions
- Ask them all to silently decide what level they are at and want level they want to attain
- Leave the proficiency scale on the overhead

Step 10 Play the proficiency tape.

- Have them listen to where they think they fit into the scale and where they want to be.

Step 11 Show the overhead of the proficiency graph.

- Discuss the idea of fossilization, the concept that at a certain point no real progress is made, but where the missionary becomes comfortable.
- Show how most missionaries tend to fossilize before becoming proficient
- Encourage the missionaries to make constant progress throughout their missions
- Tell them that the only way to achieve a high level of proficiency is to work hard and study the mission language daily

Step 12 Discuss moving from level to level and what it takes to be at a certain level from the in field worksheet.

Step 13 Discuss how it is easier to move from levels 1 to 2 than from 6 to 7. The farther one moves up the scale the more effort is needed.

Step 14 Have the missionaries fill in the boxes at the bottom of the in field worksheet as to where they think they are and where the want to be.
OBJECTIVE #4 - (5 minutes)
Building daily language study into the missionary schedule

Step 15  Have the missionaries pull out their white handbooks and read what the handbook says about language study in the field (pages 17).

Step 16  Show the transparency of the missionary daily schedule from the handbook
  > Where do you fit in language study?

Step 17  Show the transparency of the modified missionary daily schedule.
  > Explain that they can half the companionship study time
  > Have the missionaries write the study time directly into their handbooks

OBJECTIVE #5 - (20 minutes)
Creating a customized infield language learning study plan

Step 18  Read through the examples on the back of the in field worksheet with the missionaries.
  > Have the missionaries fill out the sheets
  > Have some missionaries comment on what they wrote on their sheets

Step 19  Encourage the missionaries to commit to use strategies in the field in order to continue progressing in their mission language and bear testimony.

Step 20  Close with a prayer in the mission language
The Fossilized Missionary

Missionary Language Proficiency in the Field

- Proficient
- Functional
- Partly functional

Months in Field: 0 2 4 6 8 10 12 14 16 18 20

Brazil, Russia, Japan
Missionary Language Proficiency

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Less Proficient</th>
<th>More Proficient</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 2 3</td>
<td>4 5 6 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missionary cannot communicate well enough to accomplish the basic purpose of the discussion; no control of grammar; many pronunciation errors; knows few words and expressions in the language; does not comprehend enough to respond appropriately</td>
<td>Missionary can be understood by someone accustomed to dealing with nonnative speakers; frequent grammar and pronunciation errors; vocabulary is limited; comprehends enough to respond some of the time</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missionary can be understood, with some effort, by someone not accustomed to dealing with nonnative speakers; some grammar and pronunciation errors; vocabulary adequate for task; comprehends to respond appropriately all of the time with help</td>
<td>Missionary can easily be understood by someone not accustomed to dealing with nonnative speakers; handles spontaneous elements smoothly; few if any errors in grammar or pronunciation; appropriate and precise vocabulary; comprehends enough to respond appropriately all of the time without help</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Missionary Daily Schedule

- 6:30 Arise
- 7:00 Study time with companion
- 8:00 Breakfast
- 8:30 Personal Study
- 9:30 Proselyting
- 12:00 Lunch
- 1:00 Proselyting
- 5:00 Dinner
- 6:00 Proselyting
- 9:30 End proselyting; plan next day
- 10:3 Retire
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Activity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6:30</td>
<td>Arise</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7:00</td>
<td>Study time with companion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7:30</td>
<td>Language Study</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8:00</td>
<td>Breakfast</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8:30</td>
<td>Personal Study</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9:30</td>
<td>Proselyting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12:00</td>
<td>Lunch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1:00</td>
<td>Proselyting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5:00</td>
<td>Dinner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6:00</td>
<td>Proselyting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9:30</td>
<td>End proselyting; plan next day</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10:3</td>
<td>Retire</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX D

Missionary Language Background Questionnaire

(MLBQ)
MISSIONARY LANGUAGE BACKGROUND QUESTIONNAIRE

The Missionary Training Center is doing research to find better ways to help missionaries learn foreign languages. To assist us in this effort, please answer the following questions as accurately and completely as you can. Your responses are confidential and will not be shared with your teachers or other missionaries.

1. Please check one box to indicate whether you are an elder or sister missionary.
   - elder
   - sister

2. When did you enter the Missionary Training Center?
   
   ______/_____/______
   month/day/year

3. What foreign language are you learning at the MTC?
   - Spanish
   - Japanese
   - Portuguese
   - French
   - Russian
   - Italian
   - German
   - Mandarin
   - Korean

4. Please check the box representing the highest level of school you have attended.
   - high school
   - less than 1 year of college
   - 1-2 years of college
   - 3 or more years of college
   - college graduate

5. How much experience with foreign language(s) did you have before your mission? Check one or more boxes in each column.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>In your mission language</th>
<th>In other languages</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>none</td>
<td>none</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-2 years in jr/sr high school</td>
<td>1-2 years in jr/sr high school</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>over 2 years in jr/sr high school</td>
<td>over 2 years in jr/sr high school</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>one or more college classes</td>
<td>one or more college classes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>lived in foreign country</td>
<td>lived in foreign country</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>spoke the language in my home</td>
<td>spoke the language in my home</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
6. How good would you say you are at school work? *Check one box.*

- poor
- fair
- average
- good
- very good
- exceptional

7. How confident are you in your ability to learn your mission language?

- not at all confident
- somewhat confident
- moderately confident
- quite confident
- very confident

8. Compared with other areas of missionary training such as learning the discussions or acquiring good teaching skills, how important is learning your mission language to you? *Check one.*

- much less important than other areas of training
- less important than other areas of training
- about the same as other areas of training
- more important than other areas of training
- much more important than other areas of training

9. How challenging is it for you to learn your mission language? *Circle one number.*

very challenging [1 2 3 4 5 6 7] very easy

10. Some missionaries see their mission language simply as a tool for doing missionary work. Others plan to use the language for other purposes in addition to missionary work. Please indicate how likely you are to use the language for each purpose listed below. *Check one box for each item.*

- D = Definitely  P = Possibly  N = Probably Not

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>D</th>
<th>P</th>
<th>N</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
|  □ | □ | □ | handle the basic requirements of missionary work in the mission language
|  □ | □ | □ | handle more advanced aspects of missionary work (e.g., training, interpreting)
|  □ | □ | □ | talk intelligently about things other than missionary work (e.g., politics, etc.)
|  □ | □ | □ | read books, magazines or other materials in the language after my mission
|  □ | □ | □ | take some college classes in the language after my mission
|  □ | □ | □ | teach the language to missionaries at the MTC
|  □ | □ | □ | major in the language in college
|  □ | □ | □ | use my mission language in international business
|  □ | □ | □ | teach the language at the high school or college level
|  □ | □ | □ | become a professional interpreter or translator in the language
APPENDIX E

Situational Strategy Evaluation Worksheet

(SSEW)
SITUATIONAL STRATEGY EVALUATION WORKSHEET

For the following questions, please write up to five items on the blanks provided after each question.

1. You have a half hour for personal language study time, what will you do in order to maximize this study time?

   1. __________________________________________
   2. __________________________________________
   3. __________________________________________
   4. __________________________________________
   5. __________________________________________

2. You have a list of new vocabulary words to learn. What will you do to learn these words?

   1. __________________________________________
   2. __________________________________________
   3. __________________________________________
   4. __________________________________________
   5. __________________________________________

3. You are sitting in a class or a study session and are feeling very stressed and tense. What would you do to help yourself feel better?

   1. __________________________________________
   2. __________________________________________
   3. __________________________________________
   4. __________________________________________
   5. __________________________________________

4. You are giving advice to some new missionaries that just entered the MTC. What advice would you give them in order to improve their speaking ability in the language?

   1. __________________________________________
   2. __________________________________________
   3. __________________________________________
   4. __________________________________________
   5. __________________________________________
5. You just found out that the Branch President/Relief Society President is out of town and he wants you to fill in for him/her in conducting a Meeting. What would you do to prepare for the assignment?

1. ____________________________________________________________
2. ____________________________________________________________
3. ____________________________________________________________
4. ____________________________________________________________
5. ____________________________________________________________

6. You are trying to read a passage in the Bible that has some grammar and vocabulary that you are not familiar with. What would you do to help you better understand the passage?

1. ____________________________________________________________
2. ____________________________________________________________
3. ____________________________________________________________
4. ____________________________________________________________
5. ____________________________________________________________

7. You are attending your first sacrament meeting in the mission field. What would you do to help yourself understand what is being said in the meeting?

1. ____________________________________________________________
2. ____________________________________________________________
3. ____________________________________________________________
4. ____________________________________________________________
5. ____________________________________________________________

8. You are trying to learn the third discussion in the mission field. What would you do to learn it quickly and effectively?

1. ____________________________________________________________
2. ____________________________________________________________
3. ____________________________________________________________
4. ____________________________________________________________
5. ____________________________________________________________
APPENDIX F

Learning the Language in the Mission Field Worksheet

(LLMF)
PERSONALIZED PLAN FOR
LEARNING THE MISSION LANGUAGE IN THE FIELD

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Mission</th>
<th>Mission Language</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Goal** Review the missionary language proficiency scale and explanation below. Then set a goal for your own language proficiency by filling in the two boxes at the bottom of the page.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>more proficient</th>
<th>less proficient</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1  2  3  4  5  6  7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Missionary cannot communicate well enough to accomplish the basic purpose of the conversation; no control of grammar, many pronunciation errors; knows few words and expressions in the language; does not comprehend enough to respond appropriately

Missionary can be understood by someone accustomed to dealing with nonnative speakers; frequent grammar and pronunciation errors; vocabulary is limited; comprehends enough to respond appropriately some of the time.

Missionary can be understood, with some effort, by someone not accustomed to dealing with nonnative speakers; some grammar and pronunciation errors; vocabulary adequate for task; comprehends enough to respond appropriately all of the time with help (e.g. when others repeat or slow down)

Missionary can be easily understood by someone not accustomed to dealing with nonnative speakers; handles spontaneous elements smoothly; few if any errors in grammar or pronunciation; appropriate and precise vocabulary; comprehends enough to respond appropriately without help

---

How to Achieve Different Levels of Language Proficiency

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Levels 1-3</th>
<th>Levels 4-5</th>
<th>Levels 6-7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Stop working on your mission language as soon as you leave the MTC.</td>
<td>• Study language occasionally.</td>
<td>• Study the language daily throughout your mission.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Pick up whatever you can as you go about your daily activities.</td>
<td>• Keep listening, speaking, writing, learning, evaluating, and asking.</td>
<td>• Don’t fossilize! Continue making progress</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Stop working on your language skills when you begin to feel comfortable.</td>
<td>•</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As you get higher up on the language performance scale, more effort is required to progress. It takes longer, for example, to move from a 5 to a 7 than from a 3 to a 5. At present only a small percentage of missionaries reach the level of a 7 on their missions.

What is your estimated **current level** of language proficiency? Write a number from 1-7 in the box. ➔

What is your **goal**—the level on the proficiency scale that you want to achieve as a missionary? ➔
Strategies

In the blanks below, write in some specific language learning strategies that you plan to use to learn your mission language in the mission field. You may select strategies from the *How to Be a Better Language Learner* handout or identify your own strategies.

Examples
- I will study my mission language for 30 minutes each day throughout my mission.
- I will listen for things native speakers say and incorporate them into my own speech.
- I will do as many of my daily activities as possible in the mission language.

1. ________________________________________________________________

2. ________________________________________________________________

3. ________________________________________________________________

4. ________________________________________________________________

5. ________________________________________________________________

6. ________________________________________________________________

7. ________________________________________________________________

8. ________________________________________________________________

9. ________________________________________________________________

10. ______________________________________________________________

11. ______________________________________________________________

12. ______________________________________________________________

13. ______________________________________________________________

14. ______________________________________________________________

15. ______________________________________________________________

16. ______________________________________________________________

17. ______________________________________________________________

18. ______________________________________________________________

19. ______________________________________________________________

20. ______________________________________________________________
APPENDIX G

Missionary Task Performance Task and Retrospective Interview

(TPRI)
Dear Native Speaker:

Play the role of a native Relief Society President and express the following information using your own words in a native like manner.

The situation is a telephone message that you are leaving the missionaries about a nine year old boy (John) from a less-active family that is getting ready to be baptized. You want to have the missionaries make a visit to John and make sure that he is ready for his baptism. The following are the essential points.

- John is from a less-active family that has recently been attending church on a regular basis.
- John has been attending primary with his friends and has expressed a desire to be baptized now that is nine years old.
- His parents do not feel adequately prepared to get him ready for his baptism and would like a visit from the missionaries to make sure he understands the covenant of baptism and what baptism is really about.
- It will not be necessary to teach a missionary discussion, but rather a simplified tailored message that John can easily relate to.
- I (the bishop) will be out of town for a week, but if you need resources for help please contact the Jones, the member family that you live with.
- John’s mother has left a short letter with me about some additional concerns that John has about baptism that you should address. I will drop of the letter at you apartment this evening.
Dear Native Speaker:

Play the role of a less-active mother who has a nine-year old boy (John) that is getting ready to be baptized. Express the following information using your own words in a native like manner.

The situation is that you have less-active for some time and now that your son want to be baptized, you feel unprepared to get him ready. You would like the missionaries to come talk with John about baptism and in particular the following concerns that he has expressed.

- Who will be doing the actual baptizing.
- What John needs to wear and bring for the baptism.
- What actually takes place during the ordinance, such as how to stand, how long he will be under water, etc.
- Will he feel different after having been baptized?

15 May 1997

Liebe Missionare:

Mein Sohn, Thorsten möchte gerne getauft werden, und ich hätte gerne, daß Sie mit ihm sprechen, und ihn auf die Taufe besser vorbereiten. Auch möchte er wissen, wer ihn taufen wird, was er anziehen und zur Taufe bringen soll.

Könnten Sie ihm auch bitte erklären, was während der Taufe und der Taufversammlung stattfinden wird. Erklären Sie ihm bitte auch, wo er stehen wird, was er tun muß, wie lange er unter wasser sein wird u.s.w. Bitte beschreiben Sie ihm auch wie er sich vor und nach der Taufe fühlen wird.

Herzlichen Dank für Ihre Hilfe,

Schwester Herber
Dear Native Speaker:

Play the role of a less-active mother who has a nine-year old boy (John) that is getting ready to be baptized. Express the following information using your own words in a native like manner.

The situation is that you have less-active for some time and now that your son want to be baptized, you feel unprepared to get him ready. You would like the missionaries to come talk with John about baptism and in particular the following concerns that he has expressed.

- Who will be doing the actual baptizing.
- What John needs to wear and bring for the baptism.
- What actually takes place during the ordinance, such as how to stand, how long he will be under water, etc. . .
- Will he feel different after having been baptized?

Caro Élderes,

Meu nome é Teresa; eu sou a mãe do João; não sou muito firme na Igreja e meu filho de nove anos de idade quer se batizar.

Ele está me fazendo algumas perguntas que eu não sei responder; gostaria que vocês o ajudasse em suas dúvidas que são: como será realizado o batismo; o que ele precisa vestir e levar; o que acontecerá durante a cerimônia, como ele será mergulhado na água, quanto tempo ele precisa ficar debaixo d'água; quem realizará o batismo, e como ele se sentirá depois.

Se vocês puderem esclarecer essas dúvidas, eu agradeço desde já.

Sinceramente,

Teresa Batista
WARM UP QUESTIONS

1. What did you think of this experience?

2. How do you think that you did?

3. Why do you say that?

ACTIVITY QUESTIONS

1. Think through what you did when you got in the room, and tell me in as much detail as possible what you did and why?

2. Additional what and why questions as applicable.

REACTION QUESTIONS

1. What did you think about the strategy training?

2. Suggestions and comments?

3. Do you feel that this training would be beneficial for future missionaries?

4. Do you plan to continue using the strategies in the field? If so which ones and why or why not?
APPENDIX H

Missionary Language Learning Questionnaire

(MLLQ)
MISSIONARY LANGUAGE LEARNING QUESTIONNAIRE

Instructions: The items below describe various strategies that missionaries may use to help them learn their mission language. Please read each statement. On the separate answer sheet, mark the response (A, B, C, D, or E) that best describes how often you use each strategy. There are no right or wrong answers. Use the following key to mark your responses:

In situations where this strategy might be used:

A = I never use it
B = I rarely use it (less than 10% of the time)
C = I sometimes use it (10% - 50% of the time)
D = I often use it (50% - 90% of the time)
E = I always or almost always use it (over 90% of the time)

Language Study

1. I have a study time each day when I study the mission language on my own or with my companion.

2. Each time I sit down to study the language, I plan what I want to accomplish in the time available.

3. I consciously notice which activities are the most helpful and try to spend my time doing those activities.

4. I make short-term goals for language learning (for instance, how proficient I want to become in the long run), and try to achieve these goals.

5. I make short-term goals for language learning (for example, each week or month), and evaluate my progress in achieving those goals.

6. I regularly review material that I learned previously.

7. I record important information about the language in an organized way, such as in a language notebook.

8. I try to improve my language skills every day and strive for a high level of language proficiency.

Learning Language Tasks

When I need to prepare to perform a specific language task (such as giving a talk or making an appointment):

9. I think through the task in my mind and figure out what I might need to say and how to say it.
In situations where this strategy might be used:

\[
\begin{align*}
A &= \text{i never use it} \\
B &= \text{i rarely use it (less than 10% of the time)} \\
C &= \text{i sometimes use it (10% - 50% of the time)} \\
D &= \text{i often use it (50% - 90% of the time)} \\
E &= \text{i always or almost always use it (over 90% of the time)}
\end{align*}
\]

10. I identify and learn vocabulary and phrases that can be used to accomplish the task.
11. I identify and study sentence patterns and grammar rules that are useful in accomplishing the task.
12. I have a native speaker model the task or show me how to do it.
13. If the task involves interacting with other people (such as asking for a referral or teaching a discussion), I try to predict the other person’s responses and decide how I would respond to them.
14. If the language task involves interacting with other people, I practice doing it several times with another person.
15. I practice doing the task in several different contexts—for example, with investigators, members, and other missionaries.

**Speaking**

16. I try to do as many of my daily activities as possible in the language.
17. I initiate conversations in my mission language and actively participate in the conversation.
18. I take risks and try not to let fear of making mistakes hinder me from speaking the language.
19. I try to find ways to use grammar rules and new vocabulary I have learned in my everyday speech.
20. I keep track of things I don’t know how to say, and find out how to say them later.
21. In conversation with others in the language, I ask questions or make comments in order to be as involved as possible.
22. When I don’t know how to say something in the language, I try to say it another way (for example, describing and object if I don’t know the exact word for it) rather than resorting to English.
In situations where this strategy might be used:

A = I never use it
B = I rarely use it (less than 10% of the time)
C = I sometimes use it (10% - 50% of the time)
D = I often use it (50% - 90% of the time)
E = I always or almost always use it (over 90% of the time)

23. I make the most of classroom activities where I have opportunities to speak the language with others.

24. I imitate the pronunciation and intonation or native speakers.

25. When I am not sure if I am saying something correctly, I ask other people if I am saying it right.

Listening

26. I make a note of things I hear native speakers say, and incorporate them into my own speech.

27. I watch Church videos or listen to tapes in the language.

When I am listening to another person who is speaking my mission language:

28. I try to concentrate on what the person is saying.

29. I listen for main ideas without trying to understand every word I hear.

30. I listen for familiar sounding words or words from the context.

31. I try to guess the meaning of unfamiliar words from the context.

32. When I don’t understand what the other person is saying, I ask him or her to repeat or slow down.

33. When I don’t understand completely, I summarize what I have understood and ask the other person for verification.

Reading

34. I read from the Book of Mormon or other scriptures in the language.

35. I read out loud in the language.
In situations where this strategy might be used:

A = I never use it
B = I rarely use it (less than 10% of the time)
C = I sometimes use it (10% - 50% of the time)
D = I often use it (50% - 90% of the time)
E = I always or almost always use it (over 90% of the time)

When I read something in the mission language:

36. I look for cognates (words that are similar to English words) to help me understand the meaning of a passage.

37. I try to guess the meaning of new words instead of looking them up.

38. When I don’t understand a word, I try to figure out the meaning from the context of the sentence or paragraph.

39. I pay attention to grammatical markers such as particles or word endings that might give clues about the meaning.

40. I read a passage of text several times until I can understand it.

Writing

41. I write everyday things in the language (such as letters, notes from meetings, journal entries, etc.).

42. I go back and revise what I write in the language or have someone else help me revise it.

43. I practice using the alphabet or writing system of the language.

Learning Grammar

44. I look for patterns in the language.

45. When I study grammar, I try to relate new patterns or rules to what I already know about the language.

46. I try to look for and figure out new rules rather than waiting for someone to point them out and explain them.

47. I look for examples of particular grammar points in authentic native speech or writing.

48. I break sentences down into their grammatical parts such as subject, verb, and word endings.
In situations where this strategy might be used:

A = I never use it
B = I rarely use it (less than 10% of the time)
C = I sometimes use it (10% - 50% of the time)
D = I often use it (50% - 90% of the time)
E = I always or almost always use it (over 90% of the time)

49. I practice using grammar rules in drills and exercises until I can apply the rules accurately and consistently.

50. I make up my own pattern practices and exercises.

51. When I encounter a new situation, I try to apply rules I have already learned.

**Learning Vocabulary**

52. I try to learn new vocabulary words in context (e.g. from speech or written text) rather than as isolated words.

53. I remember new words by associating them with similar-sounding English words.

54. I use mental pictures or images to remember new words.

55. I try to learn words in meaningful groups (e.g. foods, family members, a specific gospel topic, words with a similar grammar feature, etc.).

56. When learning a new word, I put the word in a meaningful phrase or sentence to help me remember it.

57. I say or write new words repeatedly to practice them.

58. I try to remember new words and phrases by using them when I speak or write in the language.

59. I remember words by associating them with the situation in which I first saw or heard them.

60. I use flash cards or a notebook to study vocabulary, with the new words and their English equivalents listed.

61. I listen for specific words that fluent speakers of the language use and try to use them in my own speech.

62. I learn vocabulary by paying attention to words I read in books, messages, signs, or other written sources around me.

63. I use reference materials such as glossaries or dictionaries to help me learn new words.
Learning Missionary Discussions

When learning the missionary discussions in my mission language:

64. I learn an outline of the discussions (discussion titles, principle titles, and paragraph headings).

65. I learn the meaning of each paragraph; for example, by reading the paragraph for the main ideas, looking up unfamiliar words, or translating the paragraph into English.

66. I practice saying each paragraph aloud many times until I can present it with only occasional glances at the written text.

67. I write key words in the mission language alongside each paragraph and practice saying the paragraph in my own words using the key words as prompts.

68. I memorize the discussion text word for word so I can present it from memory.

69. I practice presenting the discussion in a variety of contexts—to different types of investigators, to different age levels, to people with different types of concerns, etc.

70. I teach the content of a discussion principle in my own words in a different format (e.g., sacrament meeting talk, street contact, answer to investigator’s question).

Spiritual and Mental Preparation

71. When I feel stressed about learning the language, I try to relax by taking several deep breaths or by tensing and relaxing the muscles in my body.

72. I try to laugh and not take my language learning too seriously.

73. When I feel anxious or discouraged, I make encouraging statements to myself to help me feel better.

74. I look back at what I have accomplished in the language and try to focus on the progress I have made.

75. I try to think in the language.
In situations where this strategy might be used:

A = I never use it
B = I rarely use it (less than 10% of the time)
C = I sometimes use it (10% - 50% of the time)
D = I often use it (50% - 90% of the time)
E = I always or almost always use it (over 90% of the time)

76. I try to learn all I can about the culture of the place where the language is spoken.

77. I pray for help in learning the language.

78. I thank the Lord in prayer for specific achievements I have made in learning the language.

79. I recorded in my journal my feelings and experiences with language learning and how the Lord has helped me learn the language.

80. I exercise faith that the Lord will help me learn my mission language.

81. What is the single activity or strategy that has been most helpful to you in learning your mission language? Write your response in Write-in Area 1 on the front of your green answer sheet.

82. What are your long-term goals for learning your mission language (for example, how proficient do you want to become in the language, and what do you hope to be able to do in the language)? Write your response in Write-in Area 2 on the front of your green answer sheet.
APPENDIX I

Statistical Information Tables
SITUATIONAL STRATEGY EVALUATION WORKSHEET (SSEW)
Total Score Results

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>DF</th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F Value</th>
<th>Pr &gt; F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Model</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>350.10202</td>
<td>116.70067</td>
<td>4.17</td>
<td>0.0123*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Error</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>1006.29798</td>
<td>27.95272</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corrected Total</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>1356.4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>R-Square</th>
<th>C. V.</th>
<th>Root MSE</th>
<th>Situational Total Mean</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0.258111</td>
<td>23.70867</td>
<td>5.287</td>
<td>22.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>DF</th>
<th>Type III SS</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F Value</th>
<th>Pr &gt; F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Language</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.10629</td>
<td>2.10629</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>0.7853</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Training</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>205.89323</td>
<td>205.89323</td>
<td>7.37</td>
<td>0.0101*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lang X Train</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>139.99373</td>
<td>139.99373</td>
<td>5.01</td>
<td>0.0315*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Training</th>
<th>Situational Total LSMEAN</th>
<th>Standard Error LSMEAN</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Untrained</td>
<td>20.00555556</td>
<td>1.2146121</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trained</td>
<td>24.5545455</td>
<td>1.1550356</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Language</th>
<th>Training</th>
<th>Situational Total LSMEAN</th>
<th>Standard Error LSMEAN</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>German</td>
<td>Untrained</td>
<td>22.11111111</td>
<td>1.7623445</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>German</td>
<td>Trained</td>
<td>22.90909090</td>
<td>1.5941005</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Portuguese</td>
<td>Untrained</td>
<td>17.90000000</td>
<td>1.6719067</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Portuguese</td>
<td>Trained</td>
<td>26.20000000</td>
<td>1.6719067</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Alpha level of significance, p < .05
### SITUATIONAL STRATEGY EVALUATION WORKSHEET (SSEW)
#### Weighted Score Results

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>DF</th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F Value</th>
<th>Pr &gt; F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Model</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1219.3104</td>
<td>406.4368</td>
<td>4.62</td>
<td>0.0078*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Error</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>3168.6646</td>
<td>88.0185</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corrected Total</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>4387.97.50</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>R-Square</th>
<th>C. V.</th>
<th>Root MSE</th>
<th>Situational Weighted Mean</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0.277875</td>
<td>24.86896</td>
<td>9.3818</td>
<td>37.725</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>DF</th>
<th>Type III SS</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F Value</th>
<th>Pr &gt; F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Language</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.87706</td>
<td>1.87706</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>0.8847</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Training</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>629.88812</td>
<td>629.88812</td>
<td>7.16</td>
<td>0.0112*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lang X Train</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>581.28510</td>
<td>581.28510</td>
<td>6.60</td>
<td>0.0145*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Language</th>
<th>Situational Weighted LS Mean</th>
<th>Standard Error LS Mean</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>German</td>
<td>37.934334</td>
<td>2.1084062</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Portuguese</td>
<td>37.500000</td>
<td>2.0978377</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Training</th>
<th>Situational Weighted LS Mean</th>
<th>Standard Error LS Mean</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Untrained</td>
<td>33.7388889</td>
<td>2.1553234</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trained</td>
<td>41.6954545</td>
<td>2.0496051</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Language</th>
<th>Training</th>
<th>Situational Weighted LS Mean</th>
<th>Standard Error LS Mean</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>German</td>
<td>Untrained</td>
<td>37.7777778</td>
<td>3.1172718</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>German</td>
<td>Trained</td>
<td>38.0909091</td>
<td>2.8287238</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Portuguese</td>
<td>Untrained</td>
<td>29.7000000</td>
<td>2.9667906</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Portuguese</td>
<td>Trained</td>
<td>45.3000000</td>
<td>2.9667906</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Alpha level of significance, \( p < .05 \)
SITUATIONAL STRATEGY EVALUATION WORKSHEET (SSEW)

List Score Results

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>DF</th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F Value</th>
<th>Pr &gt; F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Model</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>178.31886</td>
<td>178.31886</td>
<td>14.22</td>
<td>0.0006*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Error</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>476.45614</td>
<td>12.53832</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corrected Total</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>654.775</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

R-Square          | C. V. | Root MSE | Situational List Mean
0.272336          | 31.26666 | 3.5409 | 11.325

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>DF</th>
<th>Type III SS</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F Value</th>
<th>Pr &gt; F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Training</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>178.31886</td>
<td>178.31886</td>
<td>14.22</td>
<td>0.0006*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Training</th>
<th>Situational List LS Mean</th>
<th>Standard Error LS Mean</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Untrained</td>
<td>9.1052632</td>
<td>0.8123494</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trained</td>
<td>13.33333333</td>
<td>0.7726984</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Alpha level of significance, p < .05
SITUATIONAL STRATEGY EVALUATION WORKSHEET (SSEW)
Context Score Results

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>DF</th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F Value</th>
<th>Pr &gt; F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Model</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>355.37261</td>
<td>35.53726</td>
<td>2.78</td>
<td>0.0152*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Error</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>370.22739</td>
<td>12.76646</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corrected Total</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>725.6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>R-Square</th>
<th>C. V.</th>
<th>Root MSE</th>
<th>Situational Context Mean</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0.489764</td>
<td>21.7867</td>
<td>3.573</td>
<td>16.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>DF</th>
<th>Type III SS</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F Value</th>
<th>Pr &gt; F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bkgd. 5.2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>228.94103</td>
<td>228.94103</td>
<td>2.73</td>
<td>0.1077</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Language</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>60.90238</td>
<td>60.90238</td>
<td>0.73</td>
<td>0.4003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Training</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>724.43487</td>
<td>724.43487</td>
<td>8.63</td>
<td>0.0058*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lang X Train</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>669.46323</td>
<td>669.46323</td>
<td>7.97</td>
<td>0.0078*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Training</th>
<th>Situational Context LS Mean</th>
<th>Standard Error LS Mean</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Untrained</td>
<td>33.4104393</td>
<td>2.1148273</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trained</td>
<td>42.0226059</td>
<td>2.0119591</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Language</th>
<th>Training</th>
<th>Situational Context LS Mean</th>
<th>Standard Error LS Mean</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>German</td>
<td>Untrained</td>
<td>38.9202111</td>
<td>3.1322964</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>German</td>
<td>Trained</td>
<td>39.2593068</td>
<td>2.8524520</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Portuguese</td>
<td>Untrained</td>
<td>27.9006676</td>
<td>3.0962873</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Portuguese</td>
<td>Trained</td>
<td>44.7859050</td>
<td>2.9148194</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Alpha level of significance, p < .05
LEARNING THE LANGUAGE IN THE MISSION FIELD WORKSHEET (LLMF)
Total Score Results

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>DF</th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F Value</th>
<th>Pr &gt; F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Model</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1302.4706</td>
<td>186.0672</td>
<td>12.43</td>
<td>0.0001*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Error</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>479.1294</td>
<td>14.9728</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corrected Total</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>1781.6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>R-Square</th>
<th>C. V.</th>
<th>Root MSE</th>
<th>In-Field Total Mean</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0.731068</td>
<td>37.20644</td>
<td>3.8695</td>
<td>10.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>DF</th>
<th>Type III SS</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F Value</th>
<th>Pr &gt; F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bkgd. 4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>110.76201</td>
<td>268.8501</td>
<td>7.40</td>
<td>0.0105*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bkgd. 5.1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>79.75152</td>
<td>380.4563</td>
<td>5.33</td>
<td>0.0276*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bkgd. 8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>121.30514</td>
<td>2767.3008</td>
<td>8.10</td>
<td>0.0077*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Language</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>176.92387</td>
<td>176.92387</td>
<td>11.82</td>
<td>0.0016*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Training</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>702.29672</td>
<td>702.29672</td>
<td>46.90</td>
<td>0.0001*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lang X Gend</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>104.76891</td>
<td>104.76891</td>
<td>7.00</td>
<td>0.0125*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Language       In-Field LSMean  Standard Error LSMean
---             --------------  --------------
German          13.0911751     1.2554009
Portuguese      5.8256113     1.2725478

Training       In-Field LSMean  Standard Error LSMean
---             --------------  --------------
Untrained       5.0687541     0.9803714
Trained         13.8480323    0.9067512

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Language</th>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>In-Field LSMean</th>
<th>Standard Error LSMean</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>German</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>9.9767703</td>
<td>1.9143828</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>German</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>16.2055798</td>
<td>1.4717034</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Portuguese</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>6.3903745</td>
<td>1.8254448</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Portuguese</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>5.2608480</td>
<td>1.3860714</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Alpha level of significance, $p < .05$
## Learning the Language in the Mission Field Worksheet (LLMF)

**Weighted Score Results**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>DF</th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F Value</th>
<th>Pr &gt; F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Model</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4045.3385</td>
<td>674.2231</td>
<td>10.82</td>
<td>0.0001*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Error</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>2056.5615</td>
<td>62.32</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corrected Total</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>6101.9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>R-Square</th>
<th>C. V.</th>
<th>Root MSE</th>
<th>In-Field Weighted Mean</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0.662964</td>
<td>43.97941</td>
<td>7.8943</td>
<td>17.95</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>DF</th>
<th>Type III SS</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F Value</th>
<th>Pr &gt; F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bkgd. 8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>268.8501</td>
<td>268.8501</td>
<td>4.31</td>
<td>0.0457*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Language</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>380.4563</td>
<td>380.4563</td>
<td>6.10</td>
<td>0.0188*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Training</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2767.3008</td>
<td>2767.3008</td>
<td>44.40</td>
<td>0.0001*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Language</th>
<th>In-Field Weighted LS Mean</th>
<th>Standard Error LS Mean</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>German</td>
<td>22.3134733</td>
<td>2.5561564</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Portuguese</td>
<td>11.9497345</td>
<td>2.4566992</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Training</th>
<th>In-Field Weighted LS Mean</th>
<th>Standard Error LS Mean</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Untrained</td>
<td>8.5240423</td>
<td>1.9954759</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trained</td>
<td>25.7391655</td>
<td>1.7685025</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Alpha level of significance, $p < .05$
LEARNING THE LANGUAGE IN THE MISSION FIELD WORKSHEET (LLMF)
List Score Results

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>DF</th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F Value</th>
<th>Pr &gt; F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Model</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>646.35938</td>
<td>161.58985</td>
<td>12.83</td>
<td>0.0001*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Error</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>440.74062</td>
<td>12.59259</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corrected Total</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>1087.1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>R-Square</th>
<th>C. V.</th>
<th>Root MSE</th>
<th>In-Field List Mean</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0.594572</td>
<td>57.70088</td>
<td>3.5486</td>
<td>6.15</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>DF</th>
<th>Type III SS</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F Value</th>
<th>Pr &gt; F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Training</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>608.53438</td>
<td>608.53438</td>
<td>48.32</td>
<td>0.0001*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Training</th>
<th>In-Field List LS Mean</th>
<th>Standard Error LS Mean</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Untrained</td>
<td>1.74136072</td>
<td>0.893</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trained</td>
<td>9.73087121</td>
<td>0.789</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Alpha level of significance, $p < .05$
### Total Score Results

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>DF</th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F Value</th>
<th>Pr &gt; F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Model</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>29.081287</td>
<td>29.081287</td>
<td>5.91</td>
<td>0.0264*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Error</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>83.655556</td>
<td>4.920915</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corrected Total</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>112.736842</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### R-Square

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>R-Square</th>
<th>C. V.</th>
<th>Root MSE</th>
<th>Interview Total Mean</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0.257957</td>
<td>16.39998</td>
<td>2.2183</td>
<td>13.526</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Source

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>DF</th>
<th>Type III SS</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F Value</th>
<th>Pr &gt; F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Language</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>29.081287</td>
<td>29.081287</td>
<td>5.91</td>
<td>0.0264</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Language

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Language</th>
<th>Interview Total LS Mean</th>
<th>Standard Error LS Mean</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>German</td>
<td>12.22222222</td>
<td>0.739</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Portuguese</td>
<td>14.70000000</td>
<td>0.701</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Alpha level of significance, \( p < .05 \)

### Weighted Score Results

Nothing Significant / Pr > F = 0.9074 on Full Model

### List Score Results

Nothing significant / Pr > F = 0.3203 on Full Model
MISSIONARY LANGUAGE LEARNING QUESTIONNAIRE (MLLQ)

Study Score Results

Nothing significant / Pr > F = .03946 on Full Model

Task Score Results

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>DF</th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F Value</th>
<th>Pr &gt; F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Model</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6.6574933</td>
<td>2.2191644</td>
<td>5.83</td>
<td>0.0024*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Error</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>13.6996496</td>
<td>0.3805458</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corrected Total</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>20.3571429</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>R-Square</th>
<th>C. V.</th>
<th>Root MSE</th>
<th>Questionnaire Task Mean</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0.327035</td>
<td>18.18184</td>
<td>0.6169</td>
<td>3.3929</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>DF</th>
<th>Type III SS</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F Value</th>
<th>Pr &gt; F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Language</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.0014273</td>
<td>0.0014273</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.9515</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Training</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.6301423</td>
<td>0.6301423</td>
<td>1.66</td>
<td>0.2064</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lang &amp; Train</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6.0055909</td>
<td>6.0055909</td>
<td>15.78</td>
<td>0.0003*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Language</th>
<th>Training</th>
<th>Questionnaire Task LS Mean</th>
<th>Standard Error LS Mean</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>German</td>
<td>Untrained</td>
<td>3.111111111</td>
<td>0.20562799</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>German</td>
<td>Trained</td>
<td>3.63636364</td>
<td>0.18599751</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Portuguese</td>
<td>Untrained</td>
<td>3.90000000</td>
<td>0.19507584</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Portuguese</td>
<td>Trained</td>
<td>2.87142857</td>
<td>0.19507584</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Alpha level of significance, p < .05
MISSIONARY LANGUAGE LEARNING QUESTIONNAIRE (MLLQ)

Speak Score Results

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>DF</th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F Value</th>
<th>Pr &gt; F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Model</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.641907</td>
<td>1.3209535</td>
<td>4.06</td>
<td>0.0254*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Error</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>12.0284356</td>
<td>0.3250929</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corrected Total</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>14.6703426</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

R-Square C. V. Root MSE Questionnaire Speak Mean

<p>| | | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0.180085</td>
<td>14.85568</td>
<td>0.5702</td>
<td>3.8381</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source DF Type III SS Mean Square F Value Pr > F

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>DF</th>
<th>Type III SS</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F Value</th>
<th>Pr &gt; F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bkgd. 5.1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.7184225</td>
<td>1.7184225</td>
<td>5.29</td>
<td>0.0272*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Language</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.6364353</td>
<td>2.6364353</td>
<td>8.11</td>
<td>0.0071*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Language Questionnaire Speak LS Mean Standard Error LS Mean

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Language</th>
<th>Questionnaire Speak LS Mean</th>
<th>Standard Error LS Mean</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>German</td>
<td>3.42880518</td>
<td>0.16964558</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Portuguese</td>
<td>4.24730594</td>
<td>0.16964558</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Alpha level of significance, $p < .05$

Listen Score Results

Nothing significant / Pr > F = 0.9316 on Full Model

Read Score Results

Nothing significant / Pr > F = 0.7252 on Full Model

Write Score Results

Nothing significant / Pr > F = 0.1091 on Full Model
MISSIONARY LANGUAGE LEARNING QUESTIONNAIRE (MLLQ)

Grammar Score Results

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>DF</th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F Value</th>
<th>Pr &gt; F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Model</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.6556714</td>
<td>2.6556714</td>
<td>6.19</td>
<td>0.0173*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Error</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>16.293938</td>
<td>0.4287878</td>
<td>0.4287878</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corrected Total</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>18.9496094</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

R-Square | C. V. | Root MSE | Questionnaire Grammar Mean
---|------|--------|----------------|
0.140144 | 17.65308 | 0.6548 | 3.7094 |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>DF</th>
<th>Type III SS</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F Value</th>
<th>Pr &gt; F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Training</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.6556714</td>
<td>2.6556714</td>
<td>6.19</td>
<td>0.0173*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Training | Questionnaire Grammar LS Mean | Standard Error LS Mean
---|----------------|----------------|
Untrained | 3.98026316 | 0.15022577 |
Trained | 3.46428571 | 0.14289321 |

* Alpha level of significance, $p < .05$

Vocabulary Score Results

Nothing significant / Pr > F = 0.9128 on Full Model

Discussion Score Results

Nothing significant / Pr > F = 0.3074 on Full Model

Preparation Score Results

Nothing significant / Pr > F = 0.4657 on Full Model

Overall Score Results

Nothing significant / Pr > F = 0.4657 on Full Model
APPENDIX J

Rebecca L. Oxford’s Taxonomy of Language Learning Strategies
I. Direct Strategies

1. Memory Strategies
   A. Creating mental images
      1. Grouping
      2. Associating/elaborating
      3. Placing new words into context
   B. Applying images and sounds
      1. Using imagery
      2. Semantic mapping
      3. Using keywords
      4. Representing sounds in memory
   C. Reviewing well
      1. Structured reviewing
   D. Employing action
      1. Using physical response or sensation
      2. Using mechanical techniques

2. Cognitive Strategies
   A. Practicing
      1. Repeating
      2. Formally practicing with sounds and writing systems
      3. Recognizing and using formulas and patterns
      4. Recombining
      5. Practicing naturalistically
   B. Receiving and sending messages
      1. Getting the idea quickly
      2. Using resources for receiving and sending messages
   C. Analyzing and reasoning
      1. Reasoning deductively
      2. Analyzing expressions
      3. Analyzing contrastively (across languages)
      4. Translating
      5. Transferring
   D. Creating structure for input and output
      1. Taking notes
      2. Summarizing
      3. Highlighting

3. Compensation Strategies
   A. Guessing intelligently
      1. Using linguistic clues
      2. Using other clues
   B. Overcoming limitations in speaking and writing
      1. Switching to the mother tongue
      2. Getting help
      3. Using mime or gestures
      4. Avoiding communication partially or totally
      5. Selecting the topic
      6. Adjusting or approximating the message
      7. Coining words
      8. Using a circumlocution or synonym
II. Indirect Strategies

1. Metacognitive Strategies
   A. Centering your learning
      1. Overviewing and linking with already known material
      2. Paying attention
      3. Delaying speech production to focus on listening
   B. Arranging and planning your learning
      1. Finding out about language learning
      2. Organizing
      3. Setting goals and objectives
      4. Identifying the purpose of a language task (purposeful modalities)
      5. Planning for a language task
      6. Seeking practice opportunities
   C. Evaluating your learning
      1. Self-monitoring
      2. Self-evaluating

2. Affective Strategies
   A. Lowering your anxiety
      1. Using progressive relaxation, deep breathing, or meditation
      2. Using music
      3. Using laughter
   B. Encouraging yourself
      1. Making positive statements
      2. Taking risks wisely
      3. Rewarding yourself
   C. Taking your emotional temperature
      1. Listening to your body
      2. Using a checklist
      3. Writing a language learning diary
      4. Discussing your feelings with someone else

3. Social Strategies
   A. Asking questions
      1. Asking for clarification or verification
      2. Asking for correction
   B. Cooperating with others
      1. Cooperating with peers
      2. Cooperating with proficient users of the new language
   C. Empathizing with others
      1. Developing cultural understanding
      2. Becoming aware of others' thoughts and feelings