



Theses and Dissertations

2015-03-01

An Investigation into the Motivational Practice of Teachers of Albanian and Japanese

Ana-Lisa Clark Mullen
Brigham Young University - Provo

Follow this and additional works at: <https://scholarsarchive.byu.edu/etd>



Part of the [Other Languages, Societies, and Cultures Commons](#)

BYU ScholarsArchive Citation

Mullen, Ana-Lisa Clark, "An Investigation into the Motivational Practice of Teachers of Albanian and Japanese" (2015). *Theses and Dissertations*. 5767.
<https://scholarsarchive.byu.edu/etd/5767>

This Thesis is brought to you for free and open access by BYU ScholarsArchive. It has been accepted for inclusion in Theses and Dissertations by an authorized administrator of BYU ScholarsArchive. For more information, please contact scholarsarchive@byu.edu, ellen_amatangelo@byu.edu.

An Investigation into the Motivational Practice
of Teachers of Albanian and Japanese

Ana-Lisa Clark Mullen

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

Dan P. Dewey, Chair
Paul J. Warnick
Gregory L. Thompson

Center for Language Studies

Brigham Young University

March 2015

Copyright © 2015 Ana-Lisa Clark Mullen

All Rights Reserved

ABSTRACT

An Investigation into the Motivational Practice of Teachers of Albanian and Japanese

Ana-Lisa Clark Mullen
Department of the Center for Language Studies, BYU
Master of Arts

This study explores the use and effectiveness of motivational strategies with teachers and learners of Albanian and Japanese at the Missionary Training Center (MTC) in Provo, UT. Each teacher was observed three times using a modified version of the Motivation Orientation of Language Teaching (MOLT) observation scheme that was first used by Guilloteaux & Dornyei (2008). Learners were surveyed using an instrument from that same study. Teachers were surveyed using a modified version of the instrument created by Cheng & Dornyei (2007). Data collected from these three instruments provide insight into (a) the relationship between teacher motivational practice and learner motivated behavior in this context and (b) teachers' awareness and use of motivational strategies. The significant relationship found between teacher motivational practice and learner motivated behavior indicates that teachers' use of motivational strategies does influence learner engagement in this context, similar to results from previous studies. Although teachers were observed using some motivational strategies, they underused many other strategies because they lacked confidence, forgot to use them, or did not see how the strategies support the MTC curriculum. Training teachers to use strategies within the framework of MTC principles may help increase teachers' confidence in using motivational strategies, thus improving the teachers' motivational practice.

Keywords: motivation, motivational strategies, L2 motivation, teacher motivational practices, language teaching, language learning, teacher training, Japanese, Albanian

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I would like to thank my parents for all of the support and encouragement they have provided up to this point, for trusting me, believing in me, and rejoicing in every small success. I would like to thank my husband, Joseph, for listening carefully, providing helpful feedback and always being the voice of optimism.

I am deeply grateful to have had the opportunity to work with several incredible professors. My chair, Dr. Dewey, who first got me involved in motivation research as his undergraduate student, has not only given much of his valuable time to guide me through this process, he has consistently expressed confidence in me which was genuinely motivating. In the initial stages of this project, Dr. Anderson was also a very inspiring and motivating mentor. Dr. Thompson has been a great source of enthusiasm and helpful feedback, always willing to take the time to really understand whatever it was I needed help with. From the time I began as a Japanese 101 student until now, Dr. Warnick has always been an uplifting teacher in the way he combines kindness with meaningful instruction and feedback. I admire, respect and have learned much from every one of you and truly appreciate the care you have shown me individually and personally.

I would also like to thank the MTC managers, teachers and other employees who gave of their time to help make this research possible.

Thank you all, classmates, co-workers, teachers, friends and family for encouraging me and supporting me throughout this project.

Table of Contents

Table of Contents	iv
Index of Tables	v
Chapter 1: Introduction	1
Purpose of the Study	3
Chapter 2: Literature Review	5
Motivation and Language Learning	5
Motivational Strategies	6
Teacher-Focused Survey Studies	8
Learner-Focused Survey Studies	13
Observational Studies	15
Teacher Training Studies	17
Research Questions	19
Chapter 3: Methodology	20
Missionary Training Center (MTC) Context	20
Participants	21
Instruments	24
Procedures	27
Data Analysis	28
Chapter 4: Results and Discussion	32
1. Is there a significant correlation between teacher motivational practice and learner motivated behavior?	32
2. How closely does teachers' perceived use of strategies correlate with their observed use? Which strategies are underused relative to teachers' perceptions of their use?	38
3. Which strategies are underused relative to their perceived importance? Why?	43
Chapter 5: Conclusions	47
Pedagogical Implications	47
Limitations	49
References	53
Appendix A	56
Appendix B	57
Appendix C	59
Appendix D	61
Appendix E	63
Appendix F	64

Index of Tables

TABLE 1: <i>Perceptions of Strategy Importance of Students and Teachers</i>	14
TABLE 2: <i>Teachers' Self-Reported Teaching Experience and Language Ability</i>	22
TABLE 3: <i>Missionaries' Self-Reported Language Ability (Survey 1)</i>	23
TABLE 4: <i>Strategies Removed from the MOLT and Teacher Survey</i>	25
TABLE 5: <i>Added MOLT Strategies</i>	26
TABLE 6: <i>Correlations between Teacher Motivational Practice and Learner Surveys and Learner Motivated Behavior</i>	33
TABLE 7: <i>Strategies that Elicit Participation</i>	35
TABLE 8: <i>Data from Multiple Studies: Correlations between Teacher Motivational Practice and Learner Motivated Behavior</i>	38
TABLE 9: <i>MOLT Strategies Ranked by Average Duration</i>	39
TABLE 10: <i>Responses from Teacher Survey Open-Ended Question: What do you do in the classroom to motivate the missionaries you teach?"</i>	42
TABLE 11: <i>Survey Strategy Importance and Survey Strategy Frequency with Ranked MOLT Scores</i>	43

Chapter 1: Introduction

Language learning is a complex process involving multiple dynamic factors. Some factors affecting classroom learning include learner characteristics, teacher characteristics, environment, materials, teaching methods, the nature of the L1 and L2, and learner motivation. Among these, learner motivation is considered by some to be one of the most crucial to success in learning: “Motivation is related to one of the most basic aspects of the human mind, and most teachers and researchers would agree that it has a very important role in determining the success or failure in any learning situation” (Dornyei, 2001, p. 52). Consequently, there has been much research and exploration on the topic of motivation within the field of second or foreign language learning and teaching.

Early studies in language learning motivation relied on theories from social psychology (Gardner 1985). The socio-educational model defined motivation as the combination of three different parts: the desire to learn the language, motivational intensity or effort expended to learn the language, and the attitudes toward learning the language (Gardner, 1985). This model also emphasized the importance of integrative motivation, or openness and interest towards the target language culture. While these theories were interesting, they did little to provide direction as to how to improve learner motivation.

In the 1990s, scholars began to push for researchers to connect language motivation theory more directly with the classroom (Crookes & Schmidt, 1991; Oxford & Shearin, 1994). They felt that while the current models were exploring and defining what motivation is, teachers were generally unaware of student motivation. According to Oxford and Shearin (1994), “actual motivations of students, in our observation, are infrequently employed for establishing the nature of classroom activities” (p. 16). Without an awareness of learner motivation, teachers did not

design classroom activities with learner motivation in mind. These scholars urged language motivation researchers to investigate ways to apply theories about motivation to actual pedagogical practices.

Oxford and Shearin (1994) began the conversation by suggesting a few ways that teachers could influence student motivation, such as helping learners develop a vision of what was possible, or helping students have an increased sense of self-efficacy. Crookes and Schmidt (1991) suggested that teachers could increase learner motivation by talking about learning activities in a way that learners would find interest in the activities.

Among these researchers of the early 1990s, Dornyei (1994) also assented that language motivation research needed to align with more current educational theories and find practical applications for the classroom. As a part of his assessment of the state of the field of language motivation research, Dornyei (1994) offered a list of 30 different techniques that could be used by teachers to motivate students in the L2 classroom. These techniques came to be called “motivational strategies.”

Over the past two decades, numerous studies have sought to explore the effectiveness of motivational strategies. Using surveys and classroom observational instruments, several researchers have demonstrated empirically as well as theoretically that the use of motivational strategies in the classroom can affect learners’ motivation (Alrabai, 2011; Alrabai, 2014; Cheng & Dornyei, 2007; Dornyei & Csizer, 1998; Guilloteaux & Dornyei, 2008; Guilloteaux, 2013; McEown & Takeuchi, 2012; Moskovsky, Alrabai, Paolini and Ratcheva, 2013; Papi & Abdollazadeh, 2012; Ruesch, Bown & Dewey, 2012; Sugita & Takeuchi, 2010; Thayne, 2013). These studies have revealed several strategies to be effective in a variety of contexts. However, since the majority of these studies have examined teachers and learners of English as a second

language in public schools, replications in other contexts are needed to further generalize the applicability of their results. Furthermore, it is not yet clear whether or not teachers can be taught to use strategies effectively that they do not use naturally. More research is needed to investigate the effectiveness of teaching teachers motivational strategies.

The aim of the current study is to extend the generalizability of motivational teaching principles and explore the potential effectiveness of motivational strategy instruction by conducting classroom observations and surveys in a new context with new languages, namely teachers and learners of Japanese and Albanian as second languages at the Missionary Training Center in Provo, Utah.

Purpose of the Study

The present study intends to explore whether or not a motivational strategy framework can be a useful tool in teacher training at the Missionary Training Center (MTC). This will involve two main investigations: (1) to determine whether a relationship exists between teachers' use of motivational strategies and learner motivated behavior within the MTC context and (2) to assess MTC teachers' level of motivational teaching practice. The latter will involve finding out which strategies MTC teachers already use with their current training, which strategies MTC teachers fail to use in the classroom, and why they struggle to use them.

MTC teachers' awareness and use of motivational strategies and their effectiveness within the MTC context was assessed by (a) observing teachers' current use of motivational strategies and learners' motivated behavior in the classroom and (b) surveying both teachers and learners. The following three instruments (see Appendices A, B and C) were used: (1) the Motivation Orientation of Language Teaching (MOLT), originally developed by Guilloteaux and Dornyei (2008), (2) teacher surveys, created by Cheng and Dornyei (2007), (3) learner surveys,

also developed by Guilloteaux and Dornyei (2008). All instruments were modified for the current study to fit the context of the MTC. If motivational strategies are found to be effective in this context, these data may provide a rationale for incorporating more motivational strategies into MTC curriculum and teacher education.

These data may also demonstrate that combining data from teacher surveys and observations is a useful practice for assessing teachers' strengths and weaknesses that can provide direction for how to help teachers increase their awareness of motivational strategies and how to implement them more effectively in their classes. With increased awareness, individual teachers will be in a better position to improve their use of motivational strategies and to monitor and positively influence the motivation of their students.

Chapter 2: Literature Review

Motivation and Language Learning

Any kind of learning requires time and effort from the learner, but time on task is especially crucial for language learning. Time on task is more than just clocking time; it implies real engagement and focus on the learning task. Learning a language is not simply learning a body of knowledge – it is learning a skill that requires regular practice and study. Therefore, reaching functional proficiency in a second language requires consistent effort over an extended period of time (Blake, 2013).

The willingness of a learner to put forth the necessary time and effort has much to do with their motivation. “Motivation, by definition refers to the magnitude and direction of behavior. In other words, it refers to the choices people make as to what experiences they will approach or avoid, and the degree of effort they will exert in that respect” (Keller, 1983, p. 389). Leading scholars in the field of motivation in language learning have said, “Motivation provides the primary impetus to initiate second or foreign language (L2) learning and later the driving force to sustain the long and often tedious learning process” (Guilloteaux & Dornyei, 2008, pp.55-56).

Dornyei (2001) further asserts that motivation is not only important, but the primary determining factor to success in language learning for all kinds of learners:

My personal experience is that 99 percent of language learners who really want to learn a foreign language (i.e. who are really motivated) will be able to master a reasonable working knowledge of it as a minimum, regardless of their language aptitude (p. 52).

According to Dornyei (2001), learners with sufficient motivation can overcome limiting factors and achieve their language learning goals. Every learner’s ability is mediated by several learner

variables, such as linguistic aptitude, intelligence, personality factors, willingness to communicate, or analytical ability. Dornyei believes that a wide range of learners, including those with lower natural aptitude, can learn to function in the language if they are sufficiently motivated.

Multiple studies support this assertion by demonstrating that among many variables, motivation is a crucial for language learning. A study done with 107 beginning learners of Japanese demonstrated that among a variety of factors, motivation was found to be one of the most important predictors of Japanese language achievement (Oxford, Park-Oh, Ito & Sumrall, 1993, p. 361). The more motivated the students were, the more learning strategies they used on their own to develop language skills. Similar results were found with 520 language learners from various government agencies learning one of 32 different languages as part of an intensive foreign language program (Oxford & Ehrman, 1995). Results revealed that the stronger a learner's motivation, the more they used learning strategies that led to higher gains in language proficiency. These two studies demonstrate that learner motivation strongly affects learners' use of strategies as well as achievement, indicating that improving learner motivation should be an important priority for language teachers and researchers.

Motivational Strategies

Many researchers and scholars believe that classroom teachers can influence learner motivation (Brewster, C. & Fager, J., 2000; Crookes & Schmidt, 1991; Dornyei, 1994; Oxford & Shearin, 1994). If it is true that teachers can influence learner motivation, then what kinds of teacher practices aid in increasing learner motivation? Learners come to the classroom with their own set of needs and interests, and unless they perceive that their needs will be met by a learning situation, it may be difficult to sustain their individual motivation (Brewster, 2000; Keller, 1983).

While learners may not always change their specific interests and attitudes, teachers can help learners connect their individual interests and goals with course activities; “It is possible that interest may be engendered in students partly by remarks the instructor makes about the forthcoming activities” (Crookes & Schmidt, 1989, p. 487). They can also influence learner beliefs; “Teachers can help shape their students’ beliefs about success or failure in L2 learning. They can inculcate the belief that success is not only possible but probable, as long as there is a high level of effort” (Oxford & Shearin, 1994, p. 24). They can help keep learners on task by directing their motivation and teaching them how to use their time most effectively both in and out of class to help them accomplish their learning goals. Most importantly, teachers can help students become more self-reliant learners; “teachers can enable students to have an increased sense of self-efficacy, whereby they attribute the outcome of their study to their own efforts rather than to the behaviors of teachers or other students. Greater self-efficacy increases motivation to continue learning the L2” (Oxford & Shearin, 1994, pp. 24-25).

Much of the research on motivation in language learning has focused on the use of specific motivational strategies, which are defined as “instructional interventions applied by the teacher to elicit and stimulate student motivation” (Guilloteaux & Dornyei, 2008, p. 57). These are techniques applied by teachers to draw out and direct student motivation. In his book on motivation in the language-learning classroom, Dornyei (2001) outlined a framework for motivational strategies, including 35 macro-strategies and 102 micro-strategies which instructors could employ to motivate learners. With this theoretical framework established, a number of survey studies, observational studies and experimental studies with teacher training have been conducted to test and explore the effectiveness of these strategies (e.g. Alrabai, 2011; Alrabai, 2014; Cheng & Dornyei, 2007; Dornyei & Csizer, 1998; Guilloteaux & Dornyei, 2008;

Guilloteaux, 2013; Kubanyiova, 2006; McEown & Takeuchi, 2012; Moskovsky, Alrabai, Paolini and Ratcheva, 2013; Papi & Abdollazadeh, 2012; Ruesch, Bown & Dewey, 2012; Sugita & Takeuchi, 2010; Thayne, 2013).

Teacher-Focused Survey Studies

Most of the preliminary studies on motivation were based on survey data. In their surveys, researchers sought to investigate instructor beliefs about what kinds of teacher practices lead to an increase in student motivation. Dornyei and Csizer (1998) surveyed Hungarian teachers of English to see which practices they believed to be most effective and which practices they regularly employed in the classroom. Similar studies have been conducted in a variety of EFL contexts within Taiwan, South Korea, and Saudi Arabia (Alrabai, 2011; Cheng & Dornyei, 2007; Guilloteaux, 2013).

In a study with 200 Hungarian teachers of English, Dornyei and Csizer (1998) administered surveys asking teachers to rate the importance of 51 motivational strategies and how frequently they use them. They presented their results as the “Ten commandments for motivating language learners,” or the ten strategies which were ranked as most important by teachers (Dornyei & Csizer, 1998). These ten strategies are:

1. Set a personal example with your own behavior
2. Create a pleasant, relaxed atmosphere in the classroom
3. Present tasks properly
4. Develop a good relationship with the learners
5. Increase the learners' self-confidence
6. Make language classes interesting
7. Promote learner autonomy

8. Personalize the learning process
9. Increase the learners' goal-orientedness
10. Familiarize learners with the target language culture (Dornyei & Csizer, 1998, p. 215)

They also compared importance scores with frequency scores for each strategy to find out which strategies were underused relative to their perceived importance. Five of the top ten strategies were found to be underused relative to their perceived importance: *Set a personal example, Develop a good relationship with learners, Increase learners' self confidence, Make language classes interesting, and Increase learners' goal-orientedness*. They concluded that there was room for improvement in these areas of motivational teaching within this particular context. They also acknowledged that the applicability of these results may be limited to European contexts, and that the study should be replicated in other contexts. The present study is a partial replication in that importance and frequency surveys are used in order to find out which strategies are considered most important by teachers as well as which strategies are underused relative to their perceived importance.

Cheng and Dornyei (2007) followed up on Dornyei and Csizer's (1998) original study with a parallel study in Taiwan. Strategy frequency and importance surveys were administered to 387 Taiwanese teachers of English. The ten strategies considered most important in this context were:

1. Proper teacher behavior
2. Recognise students' effort
3. Promote learner's self-confidence
4. Creating a pleasant classroom climate
5. Present tasks properly

6. Increase learners' goal-orientedness
7. Make the learning tasks stimulating
8. Familiarise learners with L2-related values
9. Promote group cohesiveness and group norms
10. Promote learner autonomy (Cheng & Dornyei, 2007, p. 161)

Eight of these ten strategies also appeared in the Hungarian survey. The remaining three that did not appear in the Hungarian survey were *Recognise students' effort* and *Promote group cohesiveness* and *Group norms*. The researchers concluded that while there are strategies that are motivating universally (*Teacher behavior*, *Promoting learner's self confidence*, *Creating a pleasant classroom climate*, *Presenting tasks properly*), there are some strategies which are context-dependent, such as *Promote learner autonomy* (Cheng & Dornyei, 2007). In the context of Taiwan, strategies that did not align well with the teacher's position of authority, such as *Promote learner autonomy*, were valued less and used less than they were in the Hungarian context. The present study will use the teacher surveys created by Cheng and Dornyei (2007), with slight modifications for the context of the MTC.

Another replication of Dornyei and Csizer's (1998) study was conducted by Guilloteaux (2013) with 268 teachers of English in South Korea. Teachers completed surveys asking about the importance and self-reported frequency of use of 48 motivational strategies. The twelve strategies ranked as most important were:

1. Display appropriate teacher behaviors
2. Encourage positive retrospective self-evaluation
3. Encourage students to try harder
4. Present and select tasks properly

5. Model enthusiasm for English
6. Act naturally in front of the students
7. Teach students learning strategies
8. Help students design individual study plans
9. Create an accepting, friendly classroom climate and a cohesive learner group with appropriate group norms.
10. Enhance the learner awareness of the values associated with the knowledge of the L2
11. Make learning stimulating and enjoyable
12. Promote learner autonomy (Guilloteaux, 2013, pp. 5-6)

Three strategies that have been ranked high consistently are *Teacher behavior*, *Task presentation*, and *Create an accepting, friendly classroom climate*. In addition to ranking strategies according to perceived importance, Guilloteaux (2013) also compared importance scores with reported frequency of use scores in order to find out which strategies were underused relative to their perceived importance. Nearly all of the strategies were found to be underused relative to their perceived importance. Guilloteaux suggested that increasing learner motivation is not a high priority for Korean teachers, and that they may benefit from learning how to use certain motivational strategies more effectively. The present study similarly seeks to identify which strategies are relatively underused. However, rather than relying on survey data alone, the current study uses observational data to measure strategy use instead of the strategy frequency survey.

The original study was also replicated in Saudi Arabia (Alrabai, 2011). However, in that study, the researchers did not use importance surveys; they administered only frequency surveys. They surveyed 30 university teachers of English in Saudi Arabia using a questionnaire that asked

teachers how often they used 55 different micro-strategies. These micro-strategies were grouped into nine macro-strategies, which were then ranked according to frequency as follows:

1. Demonstrate Proper Teacher Behavior
2. Diminish learners' anxiety and build their self-confidence
3. Increase learners' satisfaction
4. Increase learners' expectancy of success
5. Make learning stimulating and enjoyable
6. Familiarize learners with L2 culture and L2 related values
7. Promote group cohesiveness and set group norms
8. Promote learners' positive goals and realistic beliefs
9. Promote learners' autonomy (Alrabai, 2011, pp. 268-271)

These results demonstrate that strategies which have often been rated as highly important were actually being used in Saudi Arabia, including strategies such as *Proper teacher behavior*, *Make learning stimulating and enjoyable*, *Promote learner autonomy*, *Promote learners' positive goals and realistic beliefs* and *Diminish learners' anxiety and build their self-confidence*.

Most of these initial studies have emphasized which strategies teachers feel are important. There are nine strategies that have appeared consistently: *Teacher behavior*, *Make activities interesting/stimulating*, *Promote learner autonomy*, *Promote integrative values*, *Positive Atmosphere*, *Task presentation*, *Build learner's self confidence*, *Encourage goal setting*, and *Effort feedback*. All of these studies also included a frequency of strategy use teacher survey in order to assess how often teachers used strategies. By doing so, they were able to compare teachers' reported use with teachers' perceived importance and evaluate which strategies are used frequently or underused relative to their perceived importance. While this is useful, none of

these studies measured teachers' actual use of strategies, nor how strategy use actually affects learner motivation in the classroom. The following studies were steps in that direction; they emphasized teachers' use of strategies and investigated how well this use of strategies correlated with learner motivation.

Learner-Focused Survey Studies

While most initial studies focused on teachers' perceived importance and use of strategies, later studies administered student surveys in addition to teacher surveys in order to assess which strategies learners find motivating (Alrabai, 2014; Ruesch, Bown & Dewey, 2012).

In 2012, Ruesch, Bown and Dewey conducted a survey study with 30 North American teachers and 126 students of various languages. Both teachers and students ranked strategies according to their perception of strategy importance. This study differed from previous studies in that it included student perspectives and did not ask teachers how frequently they use strategies. Ranked perceptions of strategy importance are shown for both students and teachers in Table 1. Based on these results, the researchers concluded that *Teacher behavior, Rapport, Climate, Task* and *Building learner's self-confidence* are universally motivating strategies while *Comparison* and *Focus on learner's effort* are valued differently in different cultural contexts. These results demonstrate that several of the strategies that teachers have found important in multiple contexts are also important to students (*Teacher behavior, Rapport, Climate, Task* and *Building Learner's self-confidence*).

Later, in 2014, Alrabai conducted a survey study with 35 Saudi Arabian teachers of English as well as 826 students. In addition to surveying teachers to find out how often they use 58 motivational strategies, Alrabai (2014) surveyed learners to assess how motivating they found these same strategies.

TABLE 1

Perceptions of Strategy Importance of Students and Teachers

Student Perceptions	Teacher Perceptions
Teacher	Rapport
Rapport	Teacher
Climate	Comparison
Task	Climate
Self-confidence	Effort
Personal Relevance	Self-confidence
Interest	Language usefulness
Language usefulness	Autonomy
Autonomy	Interest
Effort	Task
Comparison	Personal Relevance
Goal	Group
Group	Goal
Culture	Reward
Reward	Culture
Peer Modeling	Finished Product

(Ruesch, Bown & Dewey, 2012, p. 20)

These macro-strategies were also ranked according to teachers' reported frequency of use:

1. Develop a positive relationship with your students
2. Familiarize learners with the target language culture and related values
3. Promote learner's self-confidence
4. Make the learning tasks stimulating
5. Present learning tasks in stimulating ways
6. Promote group cohesiveness and set group norms
7. Reduce learners' anxiety
8. Promote learners' autonomy (Alrabai, 2014, pp. 230-233)

Alrabai found high correlations with teachers' reported use of strategies and learners' reported motivation on nearly all of the strategies. The least frequent strategies, *Reduce learners' anxiety* and *Promote learners' autonomy* also had the lowest rating for motivational value by students

(Alrabai, 2014). Similar to Ruesch, Bown and Dewey (2012), these results demonstrate that several of the strategies that teachers believe are important are strategies that learners also find motivating, such as *Promote learners' self confidence*, *Make learning tasks stimulating*, *Present tasks in motivating ways* and *Promote integrative values* (target culture values).

Although most of these earlier studies in motivational strategies have relied primarily on survey data, a call for more empirical support has pushed researchers to incorporate more objective methods of measurement into their research designs (Ellis, 2009). These survey studies in motivation have helped to outline a body of foundational strategies, but since they are based solely on survey instruments, they reflect only beliefs and attitudes of teachers and students, not actual practice in the classroom. In order to better determine the value of motivational strategies, researchers have begun to measure what actually occurs in the classroom. Following this pattern, the current study incorporates both surveys and observational data, thus measuring both perceptions and actual classroom interaction and behavior. By doing so, teacher perceptions of strategies can be compared with actual use in order to better understand teachers' awareness of motivational strategies and identify areas where improving their awareness could improve their practice. While the overwhelming majority of studies on motivational strategies have looked at EFL teachers and learners, this study will look into the motivational practice of teachers and learners of Japanese and Albanian.

Observational Studies

Understanding the need to provide better evidence for the usefulness of motivational strategies, Guilloteaux and Dornyei (2008) included an observational element in their study to supplement questionnaire data. They created an observational instrument specifically for their study called the motivation orientation of language teaching (MOLT), using the coding system

created by Spada and Frohlich (1995) called the communication orientation of language teaching (COLT) scheme. Instead of measuring the communicative element of language teaching, they based their observation scheme on Dornyei's (2001) motivational strategies for language teaching. The MOLT examines both teachers and students simultaneously. The teacher's use of motivational strategies or motivational teaching practice is recorded as well as the corresponding observed level of student motivation. There is much debate as to the measurability of actual motivation; however, Guilloteaux and Dornyei (2008) chose to measure what they call learner motivated behaviors, namely alertness, engagement, and volunteering.

In their study, Guilloteaux and Dornyei (2008) observed 27 South Korean EFL teachers and more than 1,300 learners in the classroom using this instrument. Twenty-five observable strategies were chosen for observation (see Appendix D for strategy names and definitions). Additionally, they used a post-lesson teacher rating scale and learner survey for triangulation. When teacher motivational practice was compared with observed learner motivated behavior, a high correlation ($r=.61, p<.01$) was found, suggesting that teachers' use of motivational strategies can influence learner motivation.

This study has been replicated a number of times in a variety of contexts, including EFL classes in Iran (Papi & Abdollahzadeh, 2012) and ESL classes in Utah in the United States (Thayne, 2013). The study in Iranian secondary schools used the same three instruments used by Guilloteaux and Dornyei (2008): the MOLT observation scheme, student questionnaires, and post-lesson teacher evaluation (a simple rubric filled out by the observer to evaluate overall teaching ability) (Papi & Abdollahzadeh, 2012). They found a significant correlation between the teachers' use of motivational strategies and learner motivated behaviors, including volunteering ($r=.529, p<.01$), participation ($r=.647, p<.001$), and alertness ($r=.726, p<.01$). The overall

correlation was also significant ($r=.720, p<.01$). The study in American ESL classes used two instruments from Guilloteaux and Dornyei (2008), the MOLT observation scheme and post-lesson teacher evaluation, as well as two additional instruments—a post-lesson teacher interview and a teacher questionnaire (Thayne, 2013). Significant correlations between teacher motivational practice and learner motivated behaviors were also found in this context: volunteering ($r=.337$), participation ($r=.590, p<.01$), alertness ($r=.168$), overall ($r=.671, p<.01$) (Thayne 2013). While these two studies provided useful support for the effectiveness of motivational strategies, they were conducted in limited contexts— the former with large classrooms of all male English-language learning Iranian students and the latter with smaller classes of English language learning international students in the United States. More studies in different contexts are needed to extend the applicability of these claims. This study is a step in that direction by using the MOLT instrument with teachers and learners Japanese and Albanian in an intensive program with small class sizes.

Teacher Training Studies

After finding a significant correlation between teachers' use of strategies and learner motivated behavior, Guilloteaux and Dornyei (2008) proposed that the next step in the motivational strategies research agenda should be to investigate whether or not teachers can be taught to use motivational strategies that they do not already use naturally.

Answering Guilloteaux and Dornyei's (2008) call to investigate the usefulness of teacher training, Kubanyiova (2006), Moskovsky, Arabai, Paolini and Ratcheva (2013), and the aforementioned Thayne (2013), investigated the effectiveness of motivational strategy training.

The first to attempt motivational strategy teacher training was Kubanyiova (2006) with eight teachers of English in Slovakia. Although there was no significant increase in teacher

motivational practice, the author attributed the lack of change to the teachers' reasons for participating and lack of institutional support for the in-service training (Kubanyiova, 2006). However, a separate experimental study conducted with 14 Saudi-Arabian teachers of English demonstrated a higher increase in student motivation with teachers who had been trained in motivational strategies (Moskovsky, Alrabai, Paolini & Ratcheva, 2013).

In Thayne's (2013) study in American ESL classes, teachers were trained in motivational strategies during two sessions between observations. Qualitative data showed that teachers found the trainings useful because they "raised their awareness of the role of motivation in the classroom and in the possibility of modifying their own teaching practices through the use of motivational strategies" (Thayne, 2013, p. 32). While this study does not include a training component, it investigates the use and effectiveness of motivational strategies in this context to demonstrate the need and potential benefit of incorporating motivational strategies in MTC teacher education.

Although these observational studies and teacher training studies have produced more sound evidence for the effectiveness of motivational strategies, they have not continued the practice of administering importance and frequency surveys to teachers in order to better understand teachers' awareness of motivational strategies. Previous survey studies provided insight into teachers' perceptions of the importance of motivational strategies and how often they believe they use them. Observational studies have provided insight into how teachers actually use strategies. The current study will incorporate both strategy frequency and importance surveys as well as observations using the MOLT observation scheme in order to evaluate how well teachers' actual use of strategies reflects their beliefs. Areas of strength will be identified, as well as strategies that are underused relative to their perceived use and importance. Doing so

will provide direction as to how teachers can improve their motivational practice and consequently, learners' motivated behavior.

The present study will investigate the use and effectiveness of motivational strategies in the context of Japanese and Albanian language learning classrooms within the intensive immersion program at the Provo Missionary Training Center by administering teacher importance and frequency surveys, a learner motivational state survey, and observations using the same MOLT observation scheme used in several previous studies (Guilloteaux & Dornyei, 2008; Papi & Abdollahzadeh, 2012; Thayne, 2013). Assuming positive results are found in this context, these data will serve to better understand the applicability and effectiveness of motivational strategy use in non-EFL contexts with smaller class sizes than have previously been studied.

Research Questions

The following are the research questions that directed this study:

1. Is there a significant correlation between teacher motivational practice and learner motivated behavior?
2. How closely does teachers' perceived use of strategies correlate with their observed use?
Which strategies are underused relative to teachers' perceptions of their use?
3. Which strategies are underused relative to their perceived importance? Why are they underused?

Chapter 3: Methodology

Missionary Training Center (MTC) Context

The MTC is a private religious institution that trains volunteer missionaries at the beginning of their period of service. The majority of volunteers are young men and women ranging in age from 18 to 26. There are also single women ages 27 and above and retired couples. While all participants are trained in proselyting, many of the volunteers also undergo an intensive language program for one of 50 different languages taught in preparation for proselyting missions in various countries all over the world (mtc.byu.edu/themtc.htm). These language programs are content-based immersion programs, where even proselyting training is done mostly in the target language. Teachers are recently returned former missionaries who are fluent in the language of instruction. Missionaries attend class for six hours on most days of the week, divided into two blocks of three one-hour long classes, with an additional three or more hours a day for study. Class and study schedules vary for each group; some have class in the morning and afternoon, some have it morning and evening, and others have class in the afternoon and evening blocks. Since the primary objectives of their training are learning how to proselyte and how to speak their assigned language, language instruction makes up at least one-third of instruction time, some of which is missionary-directed. The length of stay for language-learning missionaries ranges from six to nine weeks, depending on the language. Missionaries learning the languages involved in this study (Japanese and Albanian) stay in the MTC for nine weeks.

Although missionaries at the MTC are generally highly motivated, some still struggle to stay focused in class and during study times. This is likely the result of a combination of factors,

including each individual's level of intrinsic motivation, teachers' ability to facilitate learning activities in a motivating manner, length of classes, and the missionaries' age.

Participants

Four groups of missionaries and their teachers were selected to participate in this study. They were chosen because each of the four groups of missionaries arrived simultaneously and would follow the same schedule and course of study for their nine-week period of stay at the MTC. Two groups were to learn Albanian and two groups were to learn Japanese.

In the MTC, each group of missionaries is assigned two main teachers who alternate teaching daily shifts. The four teachers of Japanese and three teachers of Albanian (one of the Albanian teachers was a fellow researcher, and was not included in the study), seven in total, were all non-native speakers of the target languages. The teachers' teaching experience was relatively similar – the length of time they had taught at the MTC ranged from less than 1 semester to 4 semesters (shown in Table 2). Only one had experience teaching a language in another context (high school German). Their self-reported language abilities were also relatively equivalent. Their scores, averaged between the two surveys are shown in Table 2.

Unfortunately, one of the Japanese teachers involved in the study was reassigned to a different group of missionaries partway through the study, and a new teacher was assigned to the class. By that point, the original teacher had already taken the first survey and had been observed twice. For the purposes of this study, the original teacher completed the second survey and returned to teach a third time for observation.

TABLE 2

Teachers' Self-Reported Teaching Experience and Language Ability

Teachers	Language Teaching Experience	Please give a self-assessment of your language abilities in the language of instruction on a scale of 1-5: 1=poor, 2=below average, 3=average, 4=above average, 5=excellent					
	# of Semesters*	Listening	Speaking	Reading	Writing	Grammar	Vocabulary
Albanian #1	<1	3.5	3.5	4	3	3	3
Albanian #2	<1	4	4	4	3	4	3
Albanian #3	2	3.5	4	4	4	4	4
Japanese #4	2	5	5	4	3	4	4.5
Japanese #5	2	4	4	3	2.5	4	4
Japanese #6	4	4	4	4	3	4	4
Japanese #7	2	4	4	3.5	3.5	5	3

*one semester is four months

There were 29 missionaries total who participated in the study. The two Japanese groups consisted of eight and eleven missionaries, while the two Albanian groups consisted of five missionaries each. The ages of the missionaries and teachers were not reported, but it is estimated that the missionaries' ages ranged from 18 to 22, while the teachers' ages ranged from 20-25. There was more variation in the missionaries' previous language experience than the teachers' teaching experience. Most of the missionaries had studied a foreign language in high school, such as Spanish, German, Chinese, Russian, or ASL. Several had studied Japanese before becoming missionaries, for as briefly as one month to more than two years. None had previous experience with Albanian. When asked about their abilities in their current language of study (mission language), missionaries revealed a variety of confidence levels in each of the language skills. Responses were given on a scale of one to five, one being poor, five being excellent. Reported listening, reading and writing ability among all missionaries ranged from 1-

5, while speaking and grammar ranged from 1-4. Specific responses from the first survey are shown in Table 3.

TABLE 3

Missionaries' Self-Reported Language Ability (Survey 1)

Please give a self-assessment of your abilities in your mission language on a scale of 1-5: 1=poor, 2=below average, 3=average, 4=above average, 5=excellent						
Missionaries	Listening	Speaking	Reading	Writing	Vocabulary	Grammar
Japanese #1	5	4	3	3	5	4
Japanese #2	1	1	2	1	1	1
Japanese #3	1	1	1	1	1	1
Japanese #4	3	3	5	5	2	2
Japanese #5	2	2	2	2	2	2
Japanese #6	3	3	3	3	3	3
Japanese #7	1	1	1	1	1	1
Japanese #8	2	2	2	2	2	2
Japanese #9	1	1	2	1	1	1
Japanese #10	2	2	2	2	2	1
Japanese #11	3	4	3	2	4	4
Japanese #12	3	3	2	4	4	3
Japanese #13	3	2	3	3	3	3
Japanese #14	2	2	2	2	2	2
Japanese #15	2	2	2	2	2	2
Japanese #16	2	2	2	2	2	2
Japanese #17	2	3	3	3	2	2
Japanese #18	1	2	1	1	2	2
Albanian #19	3	3	3	3	3	3
Albanian #20	3	3	3	3	1	1
Albanian #21	4	3	2	2	3	2
Albanian #22	4	4	4	4	4	4
Albanian #23	3	3	3	3	3	3
Albanian #24	3	3	3	3	3	3
Albanian #25	3	3	4	3	4	2
Albanian #26	4	3	1	2	3	2
Albanian #27	2	4	5	3	3	3
Albanian #28	3	3	3	3	3	3

Instruments

The instruments used for observations and surveys were based on those developed by Guilloteaux and Dornyei (2008) and Cheng and Dornyei (2007), with slight modifications to fit the MTC context. The observational instrument (see Appendix A) was used to measure teacher motivational practice, learner motivated behavior, and the frequency of strategy use. The teacher survey (see Appendix B) was given to find out teachers' perceptions of motivational strategies as well as their own use of strategies. The learner survey (see Appendix C) assessed each learner's overall level of motivation.

Surveys. The teacher survey instrument was a modified version of the questionnaires used by Cheng and Dornyei (2007). The main changes included switching words such as "learner" to "missionary," or "group" to "district" (the label for groups at the MTC). Further changes will be discussed below. The teacher survey (see Appendix B) asked questions about the frequency and importance of certain motivational strategies. A few open-ended questions were also included to better understand teachers' intended use of strategies. The learner survey, which was developed by Guilloteaux and Dornyei (2008), gauged missionaries' overall level of motivation by asking various questions about their attitudes and feelings towards their language learning experience (see Appendix C).

Several strategies were removed from the teacher survey because they were highly unlikely to be used in the MTC, due to the nature of its unique environment (see Table 4). They were also removed from the MOLT observational instrument. For example, teachers are not supposed to give missionaries treats, toys or anything that could be used as a reward, so the strategy "tangible reward" was removed. Missionaries are also supposed to focus their studies and activities on areas of personal and religious content, so the strategy where teachers

incorporate a “creative/interesting/fantasy” element into their teaching would not be appropriate or useful.

TABLE 4

Strategies Removed from the MOLT and Teacher Survey

Removed Strategy	Rationale
<i>Tangible task product</i>	Creating tangible products is not a part of MTC Curriculum
<i>Creative/interesting/fantasy</i>	MTC Curriculum emphasizes personal/religious content.
<i>Tangible reward</i>	Tangible rewards (candy, stickers, prizes, etc.) are not used to motivate missionaries.
<i>Process feedback</i>	In MTC context, overlaps with Scaffolding
<i>Neutral feedback</i>	Not relevant

Observations. Classroom observations were conducted using a modified version of the MOLT (see Appendix A) originally developed by Guilloteaux and Dornyei (2008). The current researcher and an Albanian-speaking research partner piloted this observational instrument over several weeks before actually collecting data. Both attended several Japanese class sessions (there were no Albanian missionaries available for observation at the time) to try coding using the MOLT categories for teacher motivational practice and learner motivated behavior within the MTC context.

Through this piloting experience, the current researchers determined that the original MOLT would require modification in order to more adequately measure the motivational elements of the MTC classroom. Two original categories, Pair work and Group work, were combined because nearly all group work in the MTC is pair work. Sixteen new categories were also added. Most of these categories are motivational strategies from Dornyei’s 2001 framework that were not present on the original MOLT (Table 5).

TABLE 5

Added MOLT Strategies

Added Categories	Description
<i>Effort feedback*</i>	Attributing a student's or class' success or failure to effort
<i>Ability feedback*</i>	Attributing a student's or class' success or failure to ability
<i>Target/native language use**</i>	The class has a culture of speaking the language. As a rule, the teacher speaks the mission language at all times.
<i>Warm up/review activity*</i>	Reviewing previously covered material to begin the lesson. Starting the class with a warm-up activity to engage students.
<i>Individual Work*</i>	Students are working individually to complete a task
<i>Easy task*</i>	Providing students with an easy task so that they can experience success.
<i>Vary the normal routine*</i>	Make learning more stimulating and enjoyable by breaking the monotony of classroom events. Occasionally do the unexpected.
<i>Teacher model for enthusiasm*</i>	Teacher clearly identifies personal reasons for being interested in the topic and shares those with students.
<i>Positive atmosphere*</i>	Establishes a <i>norm of tolerance</i> , where “students feel comfortable taking risks because they know that they will not be embarrassed or criticized if they make a mistake. It has been made clear to them that mistakes are a natural part of learning.
<i>Listening to learners**</i>	Showing missionaries that the teacher respects, accepts, and cares about each of them by listening to them.
<i>Communication over grammar *</i>	Make clear to missionaries that the important thing in learning a foreign language is to communicate meaning effectively rather than worrying about grammar mistakes.
<i>Explicit instruction*</i>	Provide appropriate strategies to carry out the task. Make sure that they receive sufficient preparation and assistance. Make sure they know exactly what success in the task involves.
<i>Effective demonstration**</i>	Showing missionaries what to do more often than telling them what to do; providing demonstrations of skills when appropriate.
<i>Promoting individual/class goals*</i>	Pointing out the class goals or reminding students of their individual goals for the class or language learning generally. Instructing on and encouraging students to regulate their motivation by using self-motivating learner strategies.
<i>Teacher Monitoring*</i>	Walking around monitoring group, pair or individual work
<i>Encouraging class norms/culture**</i>	Formulate group norms explicitly, and have them discussed and accepted by the learners. Include a specific “group rules” activity at the beginning of a group's life to establish the norms explicitly. Explain the importance of the norms you mandate and how they enhance learning, and ask for the students' agreement. Put the group rules (and the consequences for violating them) on display. Have the group norms consistently observed. Make sure that you yourself observe the established norms consistently. Never let any violations go unnoticed.

**From Thayne (2013) **Added by present researchers*

Thayne (2013) used twelve of these categories as part of the MOLT in her study. The remaining four added strategies were those that the researchers found during piloting to be an integral part of the MTC training context and therefore decided to include in the instrument (see Table 5). Complete definitions for all strategies are outlined in Appendix D.

Procedures

The current researchers conducted five pilot observations in random MTC Japanese classrooms during July of 2014 to refine the instrument and become familiar with the MOLT coding procedures. Based on this pilot, the researchers adjusted the MOLT instrument to better suit the MTC context. This piloting stage also served to strengthen inter-rater reliability as the researchers met before and after each observation to discuss coding methods and definitions to ensure that they were fairly consistent. Inter-rater agreement between the researchers was 96%.

The missionaries involved in this study arrived at the MTC in the summer of 2014. Both Albanian-learning missionaries and Japanese-learning missionaries stayed for a period of nine weeks. Each group was observed three times spaced throughout the nine-week period. Observations were scheduled with each teacher in advance. The Japanese-speaking researcher observed the Japanese classrooms while the Albanian-speaking researcher observed the Albanian classrooms. They took place at varying times during the day, in the morning, afternoon or evening according to each group's schedule. Although missionaries were in class for a total of six hours each day, they were only observed for one hour during one of the three-hour blocks. There were three occasions when not all missionaries were present. One missionary arrived to the MTC late, and was therefore not present for the first observation. Two missionaries were absent due to illness one day; the third time four were missing due to illness.

Surveys were distributed via email through the MTC. Teachers and missionaries received a link in their email from the MTC inviting them to participate in the survey. Both teachers and missionaries were asked to complete the survey twice – once during the first two weeks, and once during the last two weeks.

Teachers gave verbal consent to participate in the surveys and observations. Missionaries' consent to participate was implied in their completion of the survey; they were given an opportunity to opt out at the beginning. Missionaries were not exempt from observation, however, as normal MTC procedure includes regular observation by MTC personnel for purposes of research, analysis or training.

Four missionaries did not complete the first survey. One of them is the missionary who arrived to the MTC late. The others may have been absent when the teacher reminded them, were too busy, forgot to do it, or opted out. All missionaries but one completed the second survey.

Data Analysis

The following sections will describe how the data were collected from each instrument as well as the data analysis used to answer each research question.

1. Is there a significant correlation between teacher motivational practice and learner motivated behavior? The MOLT produced two sets of variables needed to answer this question—scores for teacher motivational practice and scores for learner motivated behavior. To get these scores, the total number of minutes marked for each strategy used or each learner behavior exhibited was entered into an Excel spreadsheet for each observation. Although each lesson is supposed to take 60 minutes, there was some variation in the actual duration of each lesson. Some started slightly later or earlier. To make scores from each observation comparable,

scores were adjusted by dividing the scores by the total number of minutes for that particular class period, and then multiplying by 60, resulting in scores that reflect the amount of time each strategy was used per 60 minutes.

Teacher motivational practice scores were calculated by totaling the marked strategies for each observation, resulting in 21 total scores (three scores for each of the seven teachers).

Learner motivated behaviors (volunteering, participation, alertness) were separated from the rest of the MOLT scheme and were similarly totaled for each observation (21 total).

Learner survey scores were entered into an Excel spreadsheet. Scores for negative statements, such as “I get very worried if I make mistakes” were reversed so that they could be averaged with the rest of the survey scores. Scores for all of the missionaries in each class were grouped and averaged so that they could be compared with MOLT scores and teacher surveys, which would be grouped by class.

Correlations. In Guilloteaux and Dornyei (2008), the researchers created a composite score for teacher motivational practice combining data from two different instruments to answer this question. In this study, however, a composite score was not used because (a) the current study used a teacher survey instead of a post-lesson rating scale, and (b) the teacher survey and the MOLT measured different things. The teacher’s beliefs about their motivational practice as assessed by the teacher survey were found to be significantly different from the teacher’s observed motivational practice. When observed teacher motivational practice was correlated with the teacher survey, a correlation of $r=.072$ (importance: $r=.015$, frequency: $r=.10$) resulted. Therefore, the observed teacher motivational practice was compared separately.

First, a correlation was calculated with the data from the 21 observations using the MOLT observation scheme. The teacher motivational practice scores and the learner behavior scores

from the 21 observations were all converted to z-scores. A set of Pearson correlations were then calculated. Teacher motivational practice scores were then correlated separately with each of the three learner motivated behaviors—volunteering, participation, and alertness. Finally, observed learner motivated behaviors were correlated collectively and individually with learner survey scores.

2. How closely does teachers’ perceived use of strategies correlate with their observed use? Which strategies are underused relative to teachers’ perceptions of their use?

Data from the MOLT and Teacher surveys were used to answer this question. MOLT scores for each strategy were calculated by averaging the number of minutes a strategy was used during each observed class period. All strategies were then ranked according to average duration.

Teacher survey scores were entered into an Excel spreadsheet, then grouped and averaged according to classroom (totals are shown in Appendix E). Both importance scores and frequency scores were averaged across all teacher surveys for each strategy. Qualitative data from the open-ended questions was analyzed and coded according to relevance to motivational strategy use or underuse.

Strategies that are underused relative to their perceived use were calculated following the procedures used in Dornyei and Csizer (1998) and Guilloteaux (2013) when answering similar questions. First, MOLT strategy scores and strategy frequency scores were all converted to z-scores. Then, the strategy frequency z-scores were subtracted from the MOLT strategy z-scores. A negative difference indicates that observed strategy use is lower than perceived use.

3. Which strategies are underused relative to their perceived importance? Why are they underused? Strategy importance scores from the teacher survey were compared with the MOLT observed duration scores using the same procedures as the previous research question (z-

score difference) to see which strategies are being underutilized relative to their perceived importance. Additional open-ended question responses from the teacher survey were also analyzed to discover potential reasons teachers underuse certain strategies.

Chapter 4: Results and Discussion

Results will be presented and discussed in reference to each of the three research questions as follows.

1. Is there a significant correlation between teacher motivational practice and learner motivated behavior?

This first question will be answered by using data from two instruments: the MOLT and the learner survey. The observed teacher motivational practice will be compared with the observed learner behaviors. Following the same procedure as Guilloteaux and Dornyei (2008) the observed learner behaviors will be compared with the learner survey to see how well the MOLT learner behaviors reflect learners' motivational state.

Observations. Observed teacher motivation practice scores were correlated with learner motivated behaviors. The results can be seen in Table 6. According to Guilloteaux and Dornyei (2008), “L2 motivation studies typically detect meaningful correlations within the .3-.5 range¹” (p.69). According to this standard, correlations between teacher motivational practice and volunteering, participation and the all three learner motivated behaviors combined are meaningful. Two of these three measures were found to be statistically significant – the correlation with overall learner behavior ($r=.505, p<.05$), and the correlation with volunteering alone ($r=.659, p<.01$). The implications of these results will be discussed in a later section.

Learner Surveys. In order to assess the strength of the relationship between observed learner behavior and learner's reported motivational state, a Pearson correlation was calculated for each

¹ Dornyei's recommendation appears to be based on his extensive study of the research on motivation in psychology, sociology, education and other fields, but he does not provide specific reasons regarding how the determination of “meaningful correlations” was made.

learner behavior (volunteering, participation, alertness) individually and all together (see Table 6).

TABLE 6

Correlations between Teacher Motivational Practice and Learner Surveys and Learner Motivated Behavior

	Volunteering	Participation	Alertness	All
Teacher motivational practice	0.659**	0.394	-0.225	0.505*
Learner survey	0.423	0.309	-0.103	0.344

* $p < .05$; ** $p < .01$; *** $p < .001$

Similar results for the overall correlation between learner surveys and observed learner motivated behavior were found by Guilloteaux and Dornyei (2008) with a coefficient of $r = .35$, $p < .05$). The results were not significant, however, all but Alertness are meaningful. The correlations between the learner surveys and learner behaviors do show similar relationships to the correlation with teacher motivational practice, in that volunteering had the highest correlation, followed by participation, followed by a low negative score for alertness.

Discussion of learner motivated behaviors. Although the correlation between teacher motivational practice and overall learner motivated behavior was significant ($r = .505$, $p < .05$), correlations with each individual behavior were markedly varied. The following sections outline potential reasons for the variation.

Alertness. Correlations with alertness was likely low because alertness occurred 90% percent of the time, regardless of the varying strategy use by teachers. While strategy use may have contributed to learner alertness, the connection is unclear. Alertness may at times be an outward indicator of inward motivation, but being alert does not necessarily always mean one is motivated. For this reason it is important to triangulate observational data with other instruments, such as the learner survey. When learner behaviors were compared with the learner

surveys, alertness still had a very low, negative correlation ($r = -.103$), further indicating that alertness may not be the best measure of learner motivation. Learners that appear to be less alert may still be motivated, and less-motivated learners may appear to be alert.

The levels of alertness are especially high in this context, which is particularly surprising considering the length of time missionaries spend in the classroom every day. They spend nine hours a day in the classroom Monday through Saturday. Six of those hours are with a teacher, while three of those hours are independent study time. Some of the observations took place during the last few hours of the day, when one would expect learners to be tired and less alert.

There are a few possible explanations for the high levels of alertness in this context. Since diligence is strongly emphasized at the MTC, missionaries want to be seen as hard-working and focused. They may try very hard to appear alert in class even if they are tired or their minds are elsewhere. Since missionaries do not have the distraction of cell phones, iPods, books, or any other devices for personal entertainment, they may be more focused. Additionally, the small classrooms and class sizes make it difficult to hide; there is more pressure to look engaged when there are only four to ten other learners. Thus the correlation between strategy use and alertness is probably low because alertness was so high.

A similar low correlation ($r = .168$) was found by Thayne (2013) between teacher motivational practice and alertness in an ESL context. Similar to the average class size of 7.5 in this study, class sizes were relatively small in this context as well, averaging 13.8 students per class (Thayne, 2013). These sizes contrast strongly with the larger class sizes observed in previous studies, including an average of 34.5 students per class in the original study conducted by Guilloteaux and Dornyei (2008) and an average class of 28.5 students in the replication study conducted by Papi and Abdollahzadeh (2012). Class size may affect alertness more than

motivational teaching practice.

Participation. Participation ($r=.394$) had a higher correlation with teacher strategy use than alertness, but still had a much lower correlation than volunteering. Unlike alertness, participation can occur only when elicited by a strategy, which explains why it has a higher correlation than alertness. However, only some strategies elicit participation, such as *Group/Pair work*, *Individual work*, *Warmup/Review activity*, *Easy task*, *Challenging task* or *Elicitation of self/peer feedback correction session*. Means for these strategies are shown in Table 7. These strategies require the learner to do more than watch and listen. Since these strategies are only a fraction of the total number of strategies (7 out of 33), the correlation can be expected to be relatively low.

TABLE 7

Strategies that Elicit Participation

Strategies	Mean	St Dev	Range (minutes)
Group/pair work	13.66	9.16	0-29
Individual work	9.57	8.91	0-29
Challenging task	9.52	12.44	0-41
Warm-up/review activity	4.02	3.40	0-11
Easy task	3.95	9.66	0-30
Elicitation of self/peer feedback correction session	1.25	1.85	0-5
Team/individual competition	1.03	6.25	0-21.64

The standard deviations for these strategies are mostly high, revealing the variation in the data. This variation between observations is likely due to the differences between instruction types being observed. The two different types of instruction both included strategies that elicit

instruction, but they elicit different types for different durations. For example, *Warm/up review activity* and *Challenging task* were used more frequently during grammar instruction than during Fundamental instruction, and *Individual work* was used more frequently during Fundamental instruction than during Grammar instruction. This high variation could also explain in part why the correlation with participation is not as high as volunteering. Not all of the strategies that elicit participation were used in classes of both instruction types. If only two or three were used throughout each class, there would be less opportunity for these strategies and the resulting participation to occur.

Furthermore, teachers did not always continue to use strategies with missionaries throughout the time they were participating in a task. Teachers would almost always use some kind of strategy to start the missionaries on a task, at which point the missionaries began “participating.” At this point, some teachers continued to use strategies such as *Teacher monitoring*, *Scaffolding*, or *Listening to learners* to guide them as they worked. Some teachers, however, simply watched the missionaries without engaging. Perhaps some of the missionaries did not need a teacher working alongside them to keep them participating in the task at hand. For some, having the teacher watch them may have been enough incentive to keep working, especially because the classrooms are very small. In this context, teacher watching may be considered part of a strategy—“*Teacher monitoring*.” For this study, however, researchers marked “teacher monitoring” only when teachers seemed prepared to actively engage with their students. No strategy was marked for teachers who simply watched.

In those cases, participation would have been marked for the each of the 10-15 minutes missionaries were actively working on the task, even though the teacher used a strategy for only

one minute at the very beginning. This could explain the slight, but lower, correlation between participation and motivational teaching practice.

When observed participation was correlated with the learner surveys, a similar relationship was found; participation still fell lower than volunteering and higher than alertness. The .394 coefficient reveals there is a moderate relationship between observed level of participation and overall learner motivation. This suggests that participation, though not sufficient alone, is one outward indicator of learner motivation, and should therefore be taken into account when seeking to understand what influences learner motivation.

Participation was found to have a higher correlation than alertness in Thayne's (2013) study ($r=.590, p<.01$). In that context, participation was also found to be higher than volunteering ($r=.337$). It appears that a possible reason for this is that the type of strategies used most often in that particular ESL context were those that would elicit participation more than volunteering, such as individual work, group work, or warm up/review activity (Thayne, 2013).

Volunteering. Volunteering produced the highest correlations of all of the learner motivated behaviors. It was also the most rarely occurring. The average number of minutes volunteering occurred in a classroom was 3.5 (participation: 23.6, alertness: 54.5), the most being 14 minutes and the fewest being 0 minutes. Its high correlation with teacher motivational practice is likely due to the fact that it probably only ever occurred around the same time a teacher used a strategy. Unlike alertness and participation, which could continue without teacher intervention, volunteering largely did not occur unless the teacher used some kind of strategy that provided an opportunity for learners to volunteer, such as asking a referential question, promoting autonomy or listening to learners. Since the purpose of motivational strategies is to help learners take responsibility for their own learning, volunteering is perhaps the most clear

outward indicator of inward motivation. The correlation with the learner survey strengthens this reasoning, as volunteering was more closely correlated with the surveys than the other behaviors ($r=.423$).

Overall correlation. Despite the variation among the correlations with the different learner behaviors, the overall correlation ($r=.505$, $p<.05$) was significant, suggesting a strong relationship between observed teacher motivational practice and observed learner motivation, similar to results found in previous studies (Guilloteaux & Dornyei, 2008; Papi & Abdollahzadeh, 2012; Thayne 2013). These previous results are shown in Table 8.

TABLE 8

Data from Multiple Studies: Correlations between Teacher Motivational Practice and Learner Motivated Behavior

Name of Study	Volunteering	Participation	Alertness	All
Guilloteaux & Dornyei (2008)				.61**
Papi & Abdollahzadeh (2012)	.529**	.647**	.726**	.720**
Thayne (2013)	.337	.590**	0.168	0.671**
The present study	.659**	.394	-.225	.505*

* $p<.05$; ** $p<.01$; *** $p<.001$

2. How closely does teachers' perceived use of strategies correlate with their observed use?

Which strategies are underused relative to teachers' perceptions of their use?

To effectively compare reported strategy use with observed strategy use, ranked duration scores from the MOLT instrument are shown alongside frequency averages from the teacher surveys in Table 9. Strategies are bolded if they are disproportionately higher than the corresponding MOLT score. The difference was calculated using z-scores following the same procedure used in Dornyei and Csizer (1998) and Guilloteaux (2013). Survey frequency z-scores were subtracted from MOLT z-scores. A negative difference would indicate that the perceived

use of the strategy is proportionally higher than the observed strategy use. Mean scores that produced a negative z-score difference are bolded in Table 9.

TABLE 9

MOLT Strategies Ranked by Average Duration

Ranked Strategies	Means	St Dev	Range (minutes)	Survey Frequency	# of survey comments*
Group/pair work	13.66	9.16	0-29	4.71	1
Scaffolding	10.14	11.68	0-36	4.21	
Individual work	9.57	8.91	0-29	4.00	
Challenging task	9.52	12.44	0-41	4.14	1
Personalization	7.11	6.62	0-21	4.57	
Teacher monitoring	6.74	5.87	0-17	4.93	
Listening to learners	6.73	5.50	0-23	2.93	
Warm-up/review activity	4.02	3.40	0-11	4.29	
Easy task	3.95	9.66	0-30	4.36	1
Referential Questions	3.53	3.29	1-11.84	3.21	
Encouraging class norms/culture	3.22	2.47	0-9	4.43	
Explicit instruction	2.77	2.14	0-7.85	4.64	
Teacher model for enthusiasm	2.07	2.97	0-9.69	4.07	6
Effective demonstration	1.99	2.38	0-7.5	4.57	
Effective Praise	1.98	3.25	0-10	4.50	3
Elicitation of self/peer feedback correction session	1.25	1.85	0-5	4.07	
Establishing relevance	1.15	2.07	0-6.19	4.21	1
Social chat	1.13	2.82	0-10.82	3.71	
Vary the normal routine	1.09	1.87	0-7	4.57	1

Positive atmosphere	1.08	2.25	0-9	2.71	
Team/individual competition	1.03	6.25	0-21.64	3.50	
Arousing curiosity or attention	0.81	1.58	0-4.43	4.79	1
Stating purpose/utility of activity	0.77	0.92	0-2.81	4.29	
Signposting	0.71	0.91	0-2	3.36	
Promoting Autonomy	0.63	1.03	0-3.75	3.71	1
Promoting Individual/class goals	0.50	0.96	0-3	4.86	1
Ability feedback	0.46	0.83	0-2.77	3.07	1
Promoting integrative values	0.36	0.92	0-2.8	4.43	2
Promoting cooperation	0.34	0.74	0-1.97	4.71	
Class Applause	0.33	1.16	0-4	3.29	
Effort feedback	0.33	1.06	0-3	3.79	1
Promoting instrumental values	0.09	0.37	0-1	4.21	
Communication over grammar	0.00	0.00	0-0		

Bold – strategies where frequency scores are higher than average MOLT duration

*# of times a strategy was mentioned in the responses to the open-ended questions on the teacher survey

Discussion. Out of the total 32 strategies, 17 were underused relative to teachers' reported use. The remaining 15 strategies were used at least as often as teachers reported using them, if not more often.

Five of these 15 strategies are among those ranked in the top ten most important strategies within previous survey studies, including *Scaffolding*, *Personalization*, *Challenging task*, *Social chat*, and *Positive atmosphere* (Dornyei & Csizer, 1998; Cheng & Dornyei, 2007; Reusch, Bown & Dewey, 2012; Guilloteaux, 2013). This demonstrates that MTC teachers use several motivational strategies that are considered universally important even without specific training in motivation. Part of the reason may be that some motivational strategies are built into

the MTC curriculum. Many strategies are procedures that appear in many MTC lesson plans, specifically *Group/pair work*, *Individual work*, *Teacher monitoring*, *Warm up/review activity*, *Referential questions*, and *Explicit instruction* (*A Guide for MTC Teachers*, 2012). However, these are not the only motivational strategies that align well with MTC Training Principles; most of the strategies would be appropriate in this context. According to the frequency portion of the teacher survey, teachers believe they are using nearly all of the strategies regularly. That being the case, why is it that teachers were only observed using some strategies frequently?

One reason some of the strategies may not have been observed could be that only two types of instruction were observed as part of this study – group grammar instruction and basic proselyting techniques (called “Fundamentals”). MTC teachers may employ a broader variety of motivational strategies during other classroom activities, such as coaching missionary study, demonstrate teaching, practice teaching, teacher as a progressing investigator, or reading the scriptures.

Additionally, the sample used for this study was relatively small, and each group was observed only three times for about an hour each, so some of the strategies may not have been observed. Future studies with larger sample sizes may serve to enhance these results.

Recognizing that not all strategies that teachers use would necessarily be observed, a question on the teacher survey asked teachers, “What do you do in the classroom to motivate the missionaries you teach?” This allowed teachers to identify practices that may not have been observed during the brief observation periods. Their responses and the strategies they correlate with are shown in Table 10. Strategies mentioned in this portion of the teacher survey are also marked in Table 9 and Table 11 for comparison with the corresponding MOLT scores.

TABLE 10

Responses from Teacher Survey Open-Ended Question: What do you do in the classroom to motivate the missionaries you teach?"

Strategy	Teacher Responses
<i>Teacher model for enthusiasm</i>	Be enthusiastic! Share my beliefs I like to show them my love for the language and missionary work Share my feelings Be excited about being a missionary Be encouraging and enthusiastic
<i>Effective Praise</i>	Encourage improvement and successes each time one occurs Really try to encourage and uplift them whenever possible I try to get excited over everything they do that shows improvement
<i>Promote integrative values</i>	I tell them how precious it is to see the change in others lives. Help them to focus on people and their purpose.
<i>Establish relevance</i>	Try to create a vision behind each activity and help them understand how this will help them.
<i>Promote individual/class goals</i>	Help them set appropriate short term and long term goals, and help them in succeeding at these goals
<i>Vary the normal routine</i>	I think I work off what motivates them, sometimes they are not motivated at all but when something clicks I just ride the wave and build off of it.
<i>Effort Feedback</i>	I try really hard to praise not only their successes but their efforts. I think this can help them see that there is no wasted effort.
<i>Ability Feedback</i>	Help them to believe in their calling and purpose more and more
<i>Challenging task</i>	I try to give them a challenge. That forces them, I think, to try harder.
<i>Easy task</i>	I give opportunities for them to succeed and see the effects of their efforts.
<i>Promote autonomy</i>	Just get them involved in the activities
<i>Group/Pair Work</i>	Have them get involved and teach
<i>Arousing curiosity or attention</i>	Help them gain a vision of what is possible through reading from the scriptures and other resources

Eight of the thirteen strategies mentioned in these responses are strategies that appear to be underutilized relative to their perceived use: *Easy task*, *Teacher model for enthusiasm*, *Effective praise*, *Establishing relevance*, *Vary the normal routine*, *Arousing curiosity or attention*, *Promoting autonomy*, *Promoting individual/class goals*, and *Promoting integrative values*. This confirms the possibility that teachers use some of these strategies more often than was observed in this study. It is possible that teachers were not observed using these strategies because only two different classroom activities were observed. If they had been observed while conducting

different classroom activities, they may have been observed using these strategies that they mention more often. Also, teachers may not use these strategies every day; they may feel that some of them are appropriate to use few days or every week, depending on the needs of the learners.

3. Which strategies are underused relative to their perceived importance? Why?

To compare reported strategy importance with actual strategy use, ranked strategy durations from the MOLT instrument are shown alongside importance averages from the teacher surveys in Table 11. Following the procedures used with the previous research question, underused strategies were calculated by subtracting survey importance z-scores from MOLT z-scores. Strategies are bolded if the difference between z-scores resulted in a negative score, indicating that the importance score is disproportionately higher than the corresponding MOLT score (see Table 11).

TABLE 11

Survey Strategy Importance and Survey Strategy Frequency with Ranked MOLT Scores

Strategies	MOLT Means	Survey Importance	# of survey comments*
Group/pair work	13.66	4.79	1
Scaffolding	10.14	4.86	
Challenging task	9.52	4.36	1
Personalization	7.11	4.71	
Teacher monitoring	6.74	4.64	
Listening to learners	6.73	5.00	
Warm-up/review activity	4.02	3.64	
Easy task	3.95	4.57	1
Referential Questions	3.53	4.57	

Encouraging class norms/culture	3.22	4.50	
Explicit instruction	2.77	4.93	
Teacher model for enthusiasm	2.07	4.36	6
Effective demonstration	1.99	4.71	
Effective Praise	1.98	4.64	3
Elicitation of self/peer feedback correction session	1.25	4.93	
Establishing relevance	1.15	4.79	1
Social chat	1.13	4.43	
Vary the normal routine	1.09	4.57	1
Positive atmosphere	1.08	5.00	
Team/individual competition	1.03	3.14	
Arousing curiosity or attention	0.81	3.71	1
Stating purpose/utility of activity	0.77	4.71	
Signposting	0.71	5.00	
Promoting Autonomy	0.63	4.50	1
Promoting Individual/class goals	0.50	4.79	1
Ability feedback	0.46	5.00	1
Promoting integrative values	0.36	4.00	2
Promoting cooperation	0.34	4.93	
Class Applause	0.33	4.64	
Effort feedback	0.33	4.14	1
Promoting instrumental values	0.09	4.14	
Communication over grammar	0.00	4.64	

Bold – strategies where importance scores are higher than average MOLT duration

*# of times a strategy was mentioned in the responses to the open-ended questions on the teacher survey

Analysis shows a disparity between importance scores and the corresponding MOLT scores for 18 of the 32 total strategies surveyed. Clearly, teachers felt that nearly all of the strategies are

important, but their observed use of many of the strategies does not match the level of importance they attach to them.

Discussion. There are a variety of reasons that could explain these gaps. As previously mentioned, the sample size was small and only two different types of instruction were observed. Teachers reported using several “underused strategies” in their responses to the first open-ended question on the teacher survey (what do you do to motivate your missionaries?). Seven of the strategies are those that appear to be underutilized relative to their perceived importance:

Promoting autonomy, Promoting individual/class goals, Ability feedback, Vary the normal routine, Effective praise, Establishing relevance, and Teacher model for enthusiasm (shown in Table 11). However, there are still many more underutilized strategies (eleven) that were not mentioned in these responses. Even if they use some strategies more often than was observed, it is very likely that they still do not use all of the strategies they feel are important as frequently as they feel they should.

To better determine why teachers may underuse strategies they consider important, the following question was included at the end of the teacher survey: “If there are some strategies that you feel are important but do not use, what keeps you from using them?” Teacher responses to this question are included in Appendix F. The main reasons teachers say they do not use strategies they feel are important are (1) they lack confidence, (2) they are not sure some strategies fit into the curriculum, or (3) they forget to use them.

As previously mentioned, most of the strategies do align with MTC training principles. Teachers may not have known about motivational strategies, but they believe that they are important. While they use some strategies regularly, there are some strategies they either do not know about or do not know how to apply them within the MTC classroom context. Training

teachers to use them within the framework of MTC principles may help increase teachers' confidence in using motivational strategies, thus improving the teachers' motivational practice.

Chapter 5: Conclusions

This study investigated how teachers of Albanian and Japanese at the Missionary Training Center (MTC) use motivational strategies in order to find out a) whether or not there was a correlation between teachers' use of strategies and learners' motivated behavior, and b) which strategies are underused relative to their perceived use and importance and why. A significant correlation found between teacher motivational practice and learner motivated behavior indicates that teachers' use of motivational strategies does have a relationship with learner engagement in this context, similar to results from previous studies. Although teachers felt that nearly all of the strategies are important and report using them regularly, slightly more than half of the strategies were underused relative to the teachers' perceptions of their importance and use. When asked why, teachers responded that they struggle to use some strategies in the classroom because they lack confidence, they forget, or are unsure that the strategies align with the MTC curriculum. Helping teachers increase their awareness of motivational strategies within the context of MTC principles may help them gain the confidence necessary to use them effectively more often.

Pedagogical Implications

Teachers were observed using a variety of motivational strategies in the classroom. Their use of motivational strategies correlated significantly with learners' motivated behavior. These findings demonstrate that motivational strategies are effective in a different context from previous studies. While much of the research in motivational strategies has been conducted in EFL environments with larger class sizes (20-30 students), very little research has been done in non-EFL contexts. For that reason, this study was conducted with a content-based immersion program with small class sizes learning languages other than English, namely Japanese and

Albanian. Further investigation into the effectiveness of motivational strategies within other non-EFL programs will serve to strengthen the assertion that motivational strategies can be effective in these contexts as well as EFL contexts.

Another significant finding from this study is that language teachers and programs may use motivational strategies without specific training in motivational teaching practice. Although teachers may not be consciously aware of the motivational elements present in the MTC language program, several strategies are built into the MTC curriculum. Since teachers are expected to follow a lesson outline for the majority of class activities, they regularly use strategies such as *Individual work*, *Pair work*, *Teacher monitoring*, *State the purpose/utility of a task*, *Effective demonstration*, *Scaffolding*, and *Listen to learners*. Consequently, teachers were observed using several of these strategies frequently in the classroom. However, some teachers used them more frequently than others. Teachers also used several strategies that were not always included in their specific lesson plan, such as *Personalization*, *Effective praise* or *Referential questions*. This demonstrates that although some of teachers' use of motivational strategies may be attributed to the curriculum, teachers do use some strategies naturally without awareness of their motivational value.

Even though many MTC teachers had no experience with motivational teaching before, they recognized all strategies as important and helpful in supporting language learners' motivation, including those they did not use often. They saw value in the strategies, but did not always know how to use them effectively while teaching. With additional training in motivational teaching practice, teachers could develop confidence to use strategies and improve their ability to positively influence learner motivation. The instruments used in this study, particularly the MOLT, could be used as diagnostic tools to assess which strategies teachers need

help mastering. This new framework could provide a structured, systematic direction for motivational teacher training.

Limitations

There were a number of limitations in this study that may have affected the results, such as changes to teacher assignments, missing survey data, missing participants during observation, the nature of self-report, and the overall difficulty of measuring learner motivation.

During the study, one teacher's classroom assignment changed. This teacher had already participated in the first parts of the study, however, for purposes of the study, the original teacher completed the second survey and returned to teach the original group of missionaries for the last observation. Although the researchers did everything possible to prevent this type of change mid-study by coordinating with teacher supervisors, this change was inevitable due to scheduling issues. It is possible that this teacher change impacted the missionaries' survey responses and observed behavior.

Missing survey data is another limitation. Four missionaries did not complete the initial survey, and one did not complete the second survey. The one missionary who did not complete either survey was the missionary who arrived to the MTC late. It is possible that his email address did not make it into the email system used by the MTC to distribute the surveys. All missionaries were informed of the survey first by their teachers after which they received an email from the MTC. They were strongly encouraged by their teachers to complete the survey. Some may have forgotten to complete it or chose to opt out.

On a few different occasions, not all missionaries were present during observations, due to late arrival to the MTC or illness. While in most cases only one or two missionaries were

absent, there was one occasion where four missionaries were missing. Their absence may have affected the observed motivated behavior data for these particular observational sessions.

Another limitation to this study is the reliance on self-report data. Both the teacher survey and learner survey asked participants to assess themselves; the teacher survey asked teachers about their use of motivational strategies while the learner survey asked learners about their individual motivational state. Self-report data can be limiting because participants' perceptions of themselves are not always fully accurate. This accounts for some of the differences between observational data and survey data. As suggested by Sugita and Takeuchi (2010), this type of triangulation with other instruments is important in order to better understand the full picture (p. 31).

Measuring motivation is difficult. Although the three motivated behaviors have been established as relatively adequate measures of a learner's internal motivation, they do not paint the full picture. Additionally, not all of the strategies elicit each motivated behavior. For example, participation as a behavior is inherently linked to certain strategies that involve doing a task, but is less likely to occur with other strategies. For that reason, triangulation with multiple instruments was used to increase validity. Positive correlations were found between teacher behavior and both volunteering and participation, but alertness proved to be particularly problematic in this context.

An additional concern with the MOLT instrument is its effectiveness in measuring good motivational teaching practice. The MOLT measures the duration in minutes that teachers use certain strategies. However, teachers who use a high quantity of strategies may not necessarily be more motivating than others. It is possible that amount of strategy use is not as good an

indicator of motivational practice as strategy appropriateness for students' needs, something that is much more difficult to measure.

Suggestions for Further Research

The question of measuring strategy appropriateness versus strategy amount is an area requiring further exploration. As McEown and Takeuchi (2012) concluded in their study, "frequency of usage does not translate into effectiveness," suggesting that the way strategies are used may be more important than sheer quantity. Sugita and Takeuchi (2010) also stated: "Since the effectiveness of motivational strategies differ[s] according to students' proficiency level, more attention should be paid to the difference in proficiency level when teachers attempt to motivate their students." Proficiency level may factor into how well teacher strategies positively influence learner motivation. Future studies on this topic could investigate the effectiveness of strategies according to their strategic use, or appropriateness for students' level and/or needs in the moment of use. Similarly, it may be interesting to investigate the relationship between specific teacher behaviors and specific learner responses, rather than looking at correlations between overall use of strategies and overall behavior.

Activity design is an element of motivational teaching that differs from other strategies, but has generally been measured the same way as other strategies. For example, group/pair work was the most frequent strategy observed during this study; this is an element of task design that was built into the curriculum and individual lesson plans. The use of group work as part of a lesson plan, however, does not reveal anything about a teacher's individual ability to motivate their learners. It may be interesting to study activity/task design strategies separately to see if those elements have as great an impact on motivation as actual teacher practices.

Motivational strategies were found to correlate well with learner motivated behavior in this context of smaller class sizes. However, as more learner-centered innovations such as the flipped classroom become more popular, it may be useful to study the application of these strategies in a one-on-one or tutoring setting.

This study demonstrated that MTC teachers use motivational strategies even without specific training. Future studies within different language classrooms (other than Japanese or Albanian) both inside and outside the MTC could serve to confirm these results. Also, conducting an experimental study with training in motivational strategies could confirm whether using the motivational framework increases the effective use of motivational strategies in this and other contexts.

References

- Alrabai, F.A. (2011). Motivational instruction in practice: do EFL instructors at King Khalid University motivate their students to learn English as a foreign language? *Arab World English Journal* 2(4), 257-285. Retrieved from <http://www.awej.org/>
- Alrabai, F.A. (2014). Motivational Practices in English as a Foreign Language Classes in Saudi Arabia: Teacher Beliefs and Learners Perceptions. *Arab World English Journal*, 5(1). Retrieved from <http://www.awej.org/>
- Blake, R.J. & Kramsch, C. (2013). *Brave new digital classroom: Technology and foreign language learning*. Washington, D.C.: Georgetown University Press.
- Brewster, C. & Fager, J. (2000). *Increasing student engagement and motivation: from time-on-task to homework*. Northwest Regional Educational Laboratory.
- Cheng, H.F. & Dörnyei, Z. (2007). The use of motivational strategies in language instruction: The case of EFL teaching in Taiwan. *Innovation in Language Learning and Teaching*, 1(1), 153-174. doi: 10.2167/illt048.0
- Crookes, G. & Schmidt, R.W. (1991). Motivation: Reopening the research agenda. *Language Learning* 41, 469-512.
- Dörnyei, Z. (1994). Motivation and motivating in the foreign language classroom. *Modern Language Journal* 78, 273-284. doi: 10.1111/j.1540-4781.1994.tb02042.x
- Dörnyei, Z. (2001). *Motivational strategies in the language classroom*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. doi: [http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/S0346-251X\(02\)00010-6](http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/S0346-251X(02)00010-6)
- Dörnyei, Z., & Csizér, K. (1998). Ten commandments for motivating language learners: Results of an empirical study. *Language Teaching Research*, 2, 203-229.

- Ellis, R. (2009). A reader responds to Guilloteaux and Dornyei's "Motivating language learners: A classroom-oriented investigation of the effects of motivational strategies on student motivation." *TESOL Quarterly*, *41*, 105-109. doi: 10.1002/j.1545-7249.2009.tb00229.x
- Gardner, R.C. (1985). *Social Psychology and second language learning: The role of attitudes and motivation*. London: Edward Arnold. Retrieved from <http://publish.uwo.ca/~gardner/docs/>
- A Guide for MTC Teachers*. (2012). Provo, UT: MTC.
- Guilloteaux, M. J. (2013). Motivational strategies for the language classroom: Perceptions of Korean secondary school English teachers. *System* *41*, 3-14. doi: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.system.2012.12.002>
- Guilloteaux, M.J., & Dornyei, Z. (2008). Motivating language learners: A classroom-oriented investigation of the effects of motivational strategies on student motivation. *TESOL Quarterly*, *42*, 55-77. doi: 10.1002/j.1545-7249.2008.tb00207.x
- Keller, J.M. (1983). Motivational Design of Instruction. In C.M. Reigeluth (Ed.) *Instructional design theories and models* (pp. 386-433). Hillsdale, New Jersey: Erlbaum.
- Kubanyiova, M. (2006). Developing a motivational teaching practice in EFL teachers in Slovakia: Challenges of promoting teacher change in EFL contexts. *TESL-EJ* *10*(2), 1-17. Retrieved from <http://www.tesl-ej.org>
- McEown, M., & Takeuchi, O. (2014). Motivational strategies in EFL classrooms: How do teachers impact students' motivation? *Innovation in Language Learning and Teaching*, *8*, 20-38.
- Moskovsky, C., Alrabai, F., Paolini, S., & Ratcheva, S. (2013). The effects of teachers' motivational strategies on learners' motivation: A controlled investigation of second language acquisition. *Language Learning*, *63*, 34-62. doi: 10.1111/j.1467

- Oxford, R.L. & Ehrman, M.E. (1995). Adults' Language Learning Strategies in an Intensive Foreign Language Program in the United States. *System*, 23(3), 359-386.
- Oxford, R., Park-Oh, Y., Ito, S., & Sumrall, M. (1993). Japanese by Satellite: Effects of Motivation, Language Learning Styles and Strategies, Gender, Course Level, and Previous Language Learning Experience on Japanese Language Achievement. *Foreign Language Annals*, 26(3): 359–371. doi: 10.1111/j.1944-9720.1993.tb02292.x
- Oxford, R. L., & Shearin, J. (1994). Language learning motivation: Expanding the theoretical framework. *Modern Language Journal* 78, 12-28. doi: 10.1111/j.1540-4781.1994.tb02011.x
- Papi, M., & Abdollahzadeh, E. (2012). Teacher motivational practice, student motivation, and possible L2 selves: An examination in the Iranian EFL context. *Language Learning* 62, 571-594. doi: 10.1111/j.1467-9922.2011.00632.x
- Ruesch, A., Bown, J., & Dewey, D. (2012). Student and teacher perceptions of motivational strategies in the foreign language classroom. *Innovation in Language Learning and Teaching*, 6, 15-27. doi: 10.1080/17501229/2011.562510
- Spada, N., & Frohlich, M. (1995). *COLT Communicative Orientation of Language Teaching Observation Scheme: Coding conventions and applications*. Sydney, Australia: Macquarie University, National Centre for English Language Teaching and Research.
- Sugita, M., & Takeuchi, O. (2010). What can teachers do to motivate their students? A classroom research on motivational strategy use in the Japanese EFL context. *Innovation in Language Learning and Teaching*, 4, 21-35.
- Thayne, S.W. (2013). *Facilitating language learner motivation: Teacher motivational practice and teacher motivational training*. (Unpublished Master's Thesis) Brigham Young University, Provo, Utah, United States.

Appendix A

Extract from the modified MOLT Observation Scheme

Adapted from Guilloteaux & Dornyei (2008) and Thayne (2013).

Date: _____		Motivational Orientation of Language Teaching (MOLT) Observation Scheme (Adapted from Guilloteaux & Dornyei 2008)											
District/Teacher: _____		Start Time: _____	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	
Learner Behavior Total:	Volunteering 1/3:												
	Participation (Engagement)												
	Alertness (Attention) 2/3:												
TL vs. NL use	Native Language Use												
Encouraging Positive Retrospective Self-Evaluation	Self/Peer correction												
	Class Applause												
	Effective Praise												
	Ability Feedback												
	Effort Feedback												
Generating, Maintaining, and Protecting Situation-Specific Task Motivation	Activity Design	Warm-up/review activity											
		Easy task											
		Challenging task											
		Vary the normal routine											
		Personalization											
		Competition element											
	PO (Participation Organization)	Listen to teacher/others/audio*											
		Choral work*											
		Pair/Group work											
	Teacher Discourse	Individual work											
		Display Questions*											
		Referential Questions											
		Social chat											
		Teacher model for enthusiasm											
		Arousing curiosity or attention											
		Establishing relevance											
		Stating purpose/utility of activity											
		Positive atmosphere											
		Listening to learners											
		Communication over grammar											
		Promoting cooperation											
		Teacher monitoring											
		Promoting Autonomy											
		Explicit strategy instruction											
		Scaffolding											
		Effective demonstration											
		Promoting instrumental values											
		Promoting integrative values											
		Promoting Individual/class goals											
	Signposting												
Encouraging class norms/culture													

*Other features of teacher's practice (not strategies)

Appendix B

MTC Teacher Survey

Importance Questions

Please put a check mark (✓) in the appropriate box on the continuum between ‘Unimportant’ to ‘Very important’ that indicates your *opinion on the importance* of the motivational strategy. Please put only one check mark for each item. Remember that *you are not being asked if you use the motivational strategy but rather how **important** you believe it could be in your current class.*

	Unimportant	Of little importance	Moderately important	Important	Very important
1. Bring in and encourage humor and laughter frequently in your class.					
2. Show missionaries that you respect, accept, and care about each of them.					
3. Create opportunities so that missionaries can mix and get to know each other better (e.g., group work, game-like competition).					
4. Familiarize the missionaries with the cultural background of the language.					
5. Explain the importance of the district rules that you regard as important (e.g., let's not make fun of each other's mistakes) and how these rules enhance learning, and then ask for the district's agreement.					
6. Give clear instructions about how to carry out a task by modeling every step that missionaries will need to do.					
7. Invite positive role models who are enthusiastic about learning the language to talk to your missionaries about their positive language learning experiences/successes.					
8. Monitor missionaries' accomplishments, and take time to celebrate any success or victory.					
9. Regularly remind missionaries that the successful mastery of the language is beneficial to their future.					
10. Encourage missionaries to select specific, realistic and short-term learning goals for themselves (e.g., learning 5 words every day).					
11. Design tasks that are within the missionaries' ability so that they get to regularly experience success.					
12. Introduce in your lessons various interesting content and topics which missionaries are likely to find interesting.					
13. Make tasks challenging by including some activities that require missionaries to solve problems or discover something.					
14. Teach the missionaries self-motivating strategies (e.g., self-encouragement) so as to keep them motivated when they encounter distractions.					
15. Make sure evaluation questions not only measure the missionaries' achievement but also the effort they have put into in the task.					
16. Ask missionaries to think of any classroom rules that they would like to recommend because they think those will be useful for their learning.					
17. Show your enthusiasm for teaching the language by being committed and motivating yourself.					
18. Break the routine of the lessons by varying presentation format (e.g., a grammar task can be followed by one focusing on pronunciation; a whole-class lecture can be followed by group work).					
19. Have missionaries interact with native-speakers					
20. Help the missionaries develop realistic beliefs about their learning (e.g., explain to them realistically the amount of time needed for making real progress in the language).					
21. Use short and interesting opening activities to start each class					

(e.g., fun games).					
22. Involve missionaries as much as possible in designing and running the language course (e.g., make real choices about the activities and topics they are going to cover; decide whom they would like to work with).					

Frequency Questions

Please put a check mark (✓) in the appropriate box on the continuum between “Never” to “Very frequently” that indicates *how often you actually use* the motivational strategy. Please put only one check mark for each item. Remember that you *not being asked about the importance of the motivational strategies but how often you believe that you currently use them in your teaching.*

	Never	Rarely	Occasionally	Frequently	Very frequently
23. Establish a good relationship with your missionaries.					
24. Encourage participation by assigning activities that require active involvement from each participant (e.g., group presentation or peer teaching).					
25. Give good reasons to missionaries as to why a particular activity is meaningful or important.					
26. Try and find out about your missionaries’ needs, goals and interests, and then build these into your curriculum as much as possible.					
27. Allow missionaries to create products that they can display or perform.					
28. Encourage missionaries to try harder by making it clear that you believe that they <i>can</i> do the tasks.					
29. Give missionaries choices in deciding how and when they will be assessed/evaluated.					
30. Create a supportive and pleasant classroom climate where missionaries are free from embarrassment and ridicule.					
31. Display the class goals on the wall and review them regularly in terms of the progress made towards them.					
32. Show missionaries that their effort and achievement are being recognized by you.					
33. Make clear to missionaries that the important thing in learning a foreign language is to communicate meaning effectively rather than worrying about grammar mistakes.					
34. Notice missionaries’ contributions and progress, and provide them with positive feedback.					
35. Include activities that require missionaries to work in groups towards the same goal in order to promote cooperation.					
36. Teach missionaries various learning techniques that will make their learning easier and more effective.					
37. Adopt the role of a facilitator (i.e., Your role would be to help and lead your missionaries to think and learn in their own way, instead of solely giving knowledge to them).					
38. Highlight the usefulness of the language and encourage your missionaries to use the language outside the classroom.					
39. Motivate your missionaries by increasing the amount of the language you use in class.					
40. Share with missionaries that you value language learning as a meaningful experience that produces satisfaction and which enriches your life.					
41. Avoid social comparison amongst your missionaries.					
42. Encourage missionaries to see that the main reason for most failure is that they did not make sufficient effort rather than their poor abilities.					
43. Try to be yourself in front of missionaries without putting on an artificial mask, and share with them your hobbies, likes and dislikes.					
44. Encourage missionaries to share personal experiences and thoughts as part of the learning tasks.					
45. Give missionaries opportunities to assess themselves (e.g., give themselves marks according to their overall performance).					

Appendix C

Learner Motivated State Survey Questions

Below is a list of statements about language learning. Please indicate *how true* you believe the statement is of you.

	Definitely not true of me	Slightly true of me	Somewhat true of me	Fairly true of me	Quite true of me	Totally true of me
1. I wish I had language instruction more often.						
2. I feel I am making progress in my mission language.						
3. I get very worried if I make mistakes.						
4. I know that I am responsible for my own learning.						
5. I study hard.						
6. The language I am studying is a very important subject for me so that I can be successful in the future.						
7. The teachers should tell me what I need to study in order for me to make progress.						
8. I believe I will do well on online language assessments.						
9. I like language instruction.						
10. I am afraid that others will laugh at me when I have to speak in my language class.						
11. I choose to study outside of class things that I want to.						
12. I learn well in language instruction as well as other activities (Lessons in Ch. 3, Fundamentals, Coaching).						
13. It is essential that I have strong ability in the language I am currently studying in order to be successful as a missionary.						
14. I feel more nervous learning a language in the MTC than I did learning in school.						
15. I often experience a feeling of success with the language in the MTC.						
16. Learning the language is one of my favorite parts of the MTC.						
17. I pay careful attention in class when the teacher corrects errors (mine or those of my classmates) so that I can learn.						
18. When I make mistakes I am <i>not</i> too embarrassed but use the mistake as a learning opportunity.						
19. When the language instruction ends, I often wish it could continue.						
20. I often volunteer to speak in class.						
21. When I meet a native-speaker of the language, I take the opportunity to practice my language.						
22. I need the language I am currently studying in order to accomplish my future goals.						
23. I want to work hard in class to make my teacher happy.						
24. I reward myself when I have successes in my language.						
25. I have set clear goals for myself in my study of language.						
26. I am sure that one day I will be able to speak the language well.						
27. I learn from my mistakes.						
28. I enjoy language instruction because what we do is neither too hard nor too easy.						
29. I seek input from my teachers on ways to improve my language.						
30. My mission language is a very important one for me to study.						
31. I learn from the mistakes of others.						
32. I seek input from other missionaries who have higher language proficiency than me, on ways to improve my language.						
33. I would rather spend my time studying things other						

than language.						
34. In class I usually understand what to do and how to do it.						
35. I am responsible to motivate myself to learn and study.						
36. Although studying a language can be difficult at times, I know I can meet the learning challenge.						
37. I can learn anything I set my mind to.						
38. Sometimes studying the language is challenging but I know that I have to keep working hard.						
39. My teachers are responsible to motivate me in class.						
40. I think I am good at learning my mission language.						
41. I know that I will be using my mission language for many years to come.						
42. Learning language in the MTC is a burden for me.						
43. I am worried about my ability to do well in my mission language.						
44. In language instruction in the MTC, we are learning things that will be useful for me in the future.						
45. Sometimes I am so nervous in class that I cannot think well.						

Appendix D

Learner Behavior/Motivational Strategy Definitions

Category	Description
<i>Volunteering</i>	At least one third of the students are volunteering without the teacher having to coax them in any way.
<i>Participation</i>	More than 2/3 of the students are actively taking part in classroom interaction or working on assigned activity.
<i>Alertness</i>	More than 2/3 of the students appear to be paying attention
<i>Elicitation of self/peer feedback correction session</i>	Encouraging students to correct their own mistakes, revise their own work, or review/correct their peers' work.
<i>Class Applause</i>	Celebrating a student's or group's success, risk-taking, or effort
<i>Effective Praise</i>	Offering praise for effort or achievement that is sincere and specific
<i>Ability Feedback</i>	Encourage missionaries to try harder by making it clear that you believe that they <i>can</i> do the tasks.
<i>Effort Feedback</i>	Encourage missionaries to see that the main reason for most failure is that they did not make sufficient effort rather than their poor abilities.
<i>Warm-up/review activity</i>	Reviewing previously covered material to begin the lesson. Starting the class with a warm-up activity to engage students.
<i>Easy task</i>	Providing students with an easy task so that they can experience success.
<i>Challenging task</i>	Make tasks challenging.
<i>Vary the normal routine</i>	Make learning more stimulating and enjoyable by breaking the monotony of classroom events. Occasionally do the unexpected.
<i>Personalization</i>	Creating opportunities for students to express personal meanings (e.g., experiences, feelings, opinions).
<i>Team/individual competition</i>	The activity involves an element of competition.
<i>Listen to teacher/others/audio</i>	Passively listening or watching teacher, the student talking, or a video presented to the class
<i>Choral work</i>	Choral repetition of words, phrases or sentences
<i>Group/Pair work</i>	Regularly use small-group tasks where students can mix.
<i>Individual work</i>	The students are working individually
<i>Referential Questions</i>	Asking the class questions to which the teacher does not already know the answer, including questions about the students' lives.
<i>Social chat</i>	Having an informal (often humorous) chat with the students on matters unrelated to the lesson. Establish a good relationship with your missionaries by getting to know them and being yourself in front of them (share with them your hobbies, likes and dislikes)
<i>Teacher model for enthusiasm</i>	Teacher clearly identifies personal reasons for being interested in the topic and shares those with students.
<i>Arousing curiosity or attention</i>	Introduce in your lessons various interesting content and topics which missionaries are likely to find interesting.
<i>Establishing</i>	Use needs analysis techniques to find out about your students' needs,

<i>relevance</i>	goals, and interests, and then build these into your curriculum as much as possible; relate the subject matter to the everyday experiences and backgrounds of the students.
<i>Stating purpose/utility of activity</i>	While presenting an activity, mentioning its purpose, its usefulness outside the classroom.
<i>Positive atmosphere</i>	Establishes a <i>norm of tolerance</i> , where “students feel comfortable taking risks because they know that they will not be embarrassed or criticized if they make a mistake. It has been made clear to them that mistakes are a natural part of learning.
<i>Listening to learners</i>	Pay attention and listen to each of them Show missionaries that you respect, accept, and care about each of them by listening to them.
<i>Communication over grammar</i>	Make clear to missionaries that the important thing in learning a foreign language is to communicate meaning effectively rather than worrying about grammar mistakes.
<i>Promoting cooperation</i>	Setting up a cooperative learning activity, or explicitly encouraging students to help one another, offering suggestions on how best to do this.
<i>Teacher monitoring</i>	Teacher walks around and monitors group, pair, or individual work.
<i>Promoting Autonomy</i>	Allow learners real choices about as many aspects of learning as possible; hand over as much as you can of the various leadership/teaching roles and functions to learners; adopt the role of a facilitator
<i>Explicit instructions</i>	Provide appropriate strategies to carry out the task. Make sure that they receive sufficient preparation and assistance. Make sure they know exactly what success in the task involves.
<i>Scaffolding</i>	Teach missionaries various learning techniques that will make their learning easier and more effective.
<i>Effective demonstration</i>	Demonstrating a skill or technique simply and clearly
<i>Promoting instrumental values</i>	Highlighting the role that the L2 plays in the world and how knowing the L2 can be potentially useful for the students themselves as well as their community.
<i>Promoting integrative values</i>	Encouraging learners to conduct their own explorations of the L2 community, Promoting contact with L2 speakers and cultural products and encouraging students to explore the L2 culture and community.
<i>Promoting Individual/class goals</i>	Pointing out the class goals or reminding students of their individual goals for the class or language learning generally. Instructing on and encouraging students to regulate their motivation by using self-motivating learner strategies.
<i>Signposting</i>	Stating the lesson objectives explicitly or giving retrospective summaries of progress already made toward realizing the objectives.

Appendix E

MOLT Data

Class and Teacher	Observation #	Teacher Strategies	Volunteering	Participation	Alertness	All Behaviors
201-A	1	45.7	4.8	23.8	59.0	87.6
	2	81.2	0.0	19.4	55.4	74.8
	3	82.0	0.0	26.3	48.8	75.1
201-B	1	72.5	0.0	21.0	56.0	77.0
	2	100.2	1.8	24.0	55.4	81.2
	3	97.5	0.0	29.0	59.0	88.0
229-A	1	46.9	1.9	18.8	57.2	77.9
	2	73.2	0.9	24.5	54.5	79.9
	3	69.8	0.0	16.9	60.0	76.9
229-B	1	61.5	0.0	26.6	47.2	73.8
	2	77.8	0.9	23.4	56.3	80.6
	3	72.6	1.6	6.3	58.4	66.3
313-B	1	125.0	7.0	26.0	60.0	93.0
	2	157.0	14.0	10.0	48.0	72.0
	3	145.0	2.0	45.0	60.0	107.0
315-A	1	105.0	1.0	19.0	50.0	70.0
	2	126.0	1.0	29.0	55.0	85.0
	3	133.0	9.0	25.0	49.0	83.0
315-C	1	118.0	6.0	23.0	56.0	85.0
	2	117.0	12.0	18.0	45.0	75.0
	3	168.0	10.0	41.0	54.0	105.0

Appendix F

Teacher Survey Question Responses

Question	Summarized Responses
<p><i>“If there are some strategies that you feel are important but do not use, what keeps you from using them?”</i></p>	<p>Maybe a desire to follow the curriculum keeps me from doing that. I know I should apply the curriculum to meet needs but sometimes I worry if I will go too far. Also sometimes I worry that if I make class too fun that it can create a less hard working environment so sometimes I hold back and I probably overcompensate and keep myself from creating some really good experiences.</p> <p>Sometimes when there are varying levels of language ability, language learning tasks that involve an element of competition can be detrimental to the less able missionaries. If they understand the principle of hard work and self assessment then it can be very helpful. If I feel that the missionaries have a good grasp of this, or the class is pretty much on the same level I think competition can be helpful.</p> <p>Forgetting to.</p> <p>Mainly probably because of lack of preparation time. The more I prepare the more the really important things are emphasized.</p> <p>I just get caught up in something while teaching and completely forget to teach that principle or concept.</p> <p>Because I find that missionaries tend to participate more with other activities then some that I have created.</p> <p>The feeling of doubt that it would be effective.</p> <p>The missionaries not understanding or maybe might lead them off topic.</p> <p>I often may just forget, or lack of confidence in trying something different.</p>