



Theses and Dissertations

2005-11-22

The Effects of Reading & Reading Strategy Training on Lower Proficiency Level Second Language Learning

Lane O. Steinagel
Brigham Young University - Provo

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



Part of the [Educational Psychology Commons](#)

BYU ScholarsArchive Citation

Steinagel, Lane O., "The Effects of Reading & Reading Strategy Training on Lower Proficiency Level Second Language Learning" (2005). *Theses and Dissertations*. 710.
<https://scholarsarchive.byu.edu/etd/710>

This Dissertation 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.

THE EFFECTS OF READING AND READING STRATEGY TRAINING
ON LOWER PROFICIENCY LEVEL SECOND LANGUAGE LEARNERS

by

Lane O. Steinagel

A dissertation submitted to the faculty of

Brigham Young University

In partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of

Doctor of Philosophy

Department of Instructional Psychology and Technology

Brigham Young University

November 2005

BRIGHAM YOUNG UNIVERSITY

GRADUATE COMMITTEE APPROVAL

Of a dissertation submitted by

Lane O. Steinagel

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

Date

Paul F. Merrill, Chair

Date

Richard R Sudweeks

Date

Neil J. Anderson

Date

Ray Graham

Date

Greg Waddoups

BRIGHAM YOUNG UNIVERSITY

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

Date

Paul F. Merrill
Chair, Graduate Committee

Accepted for the Department

Andy S. Gibbons
Chair, Department

Accepted for the School

K. Richard Young
Dean, School of Education

ABSTRACT

THE EFFECTS OF READING AND READING STRATEGY TRAINING ON LOWER PROFICIENCY LEVEL SECOND LANGUAGE LEARNERS

Lane O. Steinagel

Department of Instructional Psychology and Technology

Doctor of Philosophy

The purpose of this study was to investigate what effect reading in a second language has on the knowledge and language performance of young adult missionaries studying to learn a foreign language. It was hypothesized that reading would improve vocabulary acquisition and reading comprehension, and it was further hypothesized that reading aloud would improve language speaking performance.

The subjects of the study were 214 missionaries learning Spanish as a second language at the Missionary Training Center in Provo, Utah. The missionaries were all beginner level students of Spanish, and they were randomly assigned to reading aloud and silent reading groups, as well as groups which received reading strategy training and groups that received no training. Missionaries were also assigned to a control group. The treatment groups were each part of a 2 by 2 factorial design.

All treatment groups read a scriptural text for thirty minutes each day for five weeks. One group read the text aloud each day while another group read silently. The third and fourth groups read aloud and silently, respectively, but they also received metacognitive reading strategy training on their first day, followed by weekly surveys which asked the learners which reading strategies they were using.

The learners were tested for vocabulary knowledge and reading comprehension, as well as grammar knowledge and performance in completing language tasks. The factorial design was used to test for the effects of the combined treatments and for any interaction. The treatment groups were also pooled to test for the effect of reading versus not reading.

The study found that reading had a significant effect on vocabulary learning, when compared with the control group. No significant differences were found in reading comprehension, grammar, or speaking performance, however. Reading aloud had no significant effect on language knowledge or performance, when compared to reading silently. Reading strategy training had no effect on language outcomes.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

List of Tables	xv
List of Figures	xvii
I. Introduction	1
A. Teaching Reading Strategies.....	8
B. Statement of the Problem	10
C. Statement of Purpose.....	10
II. Literature Review.....	11
A. Research on L2 Reading	11
B. Language Learning Strategies	15
C. Progress in Language Learning Strategies Research	16
D. Correlations between Language Learning Strategies and Language Outcomes	19
E. Evidence that LLS are not Significant Factors in Language Learning	20
F. Language Learning Strategies Ranked	20
G. Reading Strategies.....	21
H. Learning Strategy Interactions with Learner Characteristics.....	26
I. Metacognition.....	27
J. Teaching Learners how to Learn.....	30
K. Teaching Language Learning Strategies.....	31
L. Strategy Teaching and Instructional Design.....	34
M. MTC Pilot Study in SBI.....	35

N. Summary of the Literature	37
O. Context of the Study	38
P. Research Hypotheses	39
III. Methodology and Design.....	41
A. Sample.....	41
B. Design	41
C. Instrumentation	45
1. Missionary Speaking Performance Assessment	45
2. Missionary Vocabulary Test.....	46
3. Spanish Reading Comprehension Test	47
4. Spanish Grammar Test.....	49
5. Strategy Usage Questionnaire.....	49
6. Missionary Reading Self Report.....	50
7. Background Questionnaire.....	50
D. Procedure	51
IV. Results.....	53
A. Missionary Speaking Performance Assessment	54
B. Spanish Grammar Test.....	56
C. Missionary Vocabulary Test	58
D. Spanish Reading Comprehension Test	59
E. Hypothesis 4: Effect of Reading on Language Knowledge and Performance	60
V. Discussion	63
A. Research Hypotheses	64

B. Treatment Implementation	65
C. Reliability	68
D. Power	68
E. Limitations.....	69
F. Recommendations.....	71
G. Conclusion	72
References	75
Appendices.....	95
A. Language Learning Strategies Training Documents.....	95
B. Missionary Speaking Performance Assessment.....	99
C. Missionary Vocabulary Test	103
D. Spanish Reading Comprehension Test.....	111
E. Spanish Grammar Test.....	153
F. Strategy Usage Questionnaire	163
G. Missionary Reading Self Report	165
H. Background Questionnaire.....	167
I. Consent to Be a Research Subject Form	169

LIST OF TABLES

Table	Page
Table 1	Descriptive Statistics for the Factorial Groups on the Missionary Speaking Performance Assessment.....55
Table 2	Descriptive Statistics for the Factorial Groups on the Spanish Grammar Test.....57
Table 3	Descriptive Statistics for the Factorial Groups on the Missionary Vocabulary Test.....59
Table 4	Descriptive Statistics for the Factorial Groups on the Reading Comprehension Test.....60
Table 5	Descriptive Statistics for Pooled Treatment Groups and Control Groups.....61

LIST OF FIGURES

Figure	Page
Figure 1 Factorial Design and Control Group.....	42

Chapter 1: Introduction

The history of language teaching reads like a laundry list of instructional approaches, methods, and techniques. From grammar translation and the direct method of the early 1900s to the series and audio-lingual methods, most early language teaching approaches attempted to help learners to acquire competence in language structures (Crystal, 1997; Nunan, 1999). More recent approaches have focused on communicative competence (Brown, 2001; Wardhaugh, 1986). Wardhaugh defined communicative competence as “[the speaker’s] ability to select, from the totality of grammatically correct expressions available to him, forms which appropriately reflect the social norms governing behavior in specific encounters” (1986, p. 241). The quest to be competent in communication has led to a variety of communicative approaches in language teaching, the common features of which Brown (2001, p. 43) lists under the accepted name, communicative language teaching (CLT):

1. Classroom goals and instructional objectives focus on all components of communicative competence.
2. Focus of instruction is on pragmatic, authentic, functional use of meaningful language.
3. Fluency and accuracy are complementary goals.
4. Students learn to use language productively in real situations.
5. Students focus on their own learning processes, styles, and strategies to develop autonomous learning.
6. The teacher is a facilitator of language use and interaction between students.

From these concepts Brown distilled the following list to describe what happens during communicative language teaching. It reflects current, independently occurring notions and activities, both in language teaching and in general pedagogy:

1. Learner-centered instruction
2. Cooperative and collaborative learning
3. Interactive learning
4. Whole language education
5. Content-based instruction
6. Task-based instruction

There seems to be broad agreement that these concepts and activities should be part of formal language teaching (Celce-Murcia, et al., 1997; Lee & Van Patten, 1995; Nunan, 1991; Richard-Amato, 1996). Today's most popular approach, known as communicative language teaching, focuses on learning styles and strategies, on the four skills (reading, writing, speaking, listening), on putting content before form, and on interaction techniques. CLT depends on language tasks, or the activities that learners need to be able to perform in the language, as the way to bring about real communication (Bailey & Nunan, 2000; Brown, 2001; Chaudron, 2001; Hedge, 2000; Nunan, 1999). Activities such as grammar instruction, while still seen as important, fill a supporting role, since multiple competencies lead to true communicative competence. In such task-based language learning, grammar and vocabulary are given a meaningful context, and learners understand them better, acquire them faster and retain them longer (Nunan, 1999).

Part of the effort to help learners communicate includes focusing on how learners actually use language to function in society. This whole language emphasis looks at the

many uses to which language is put, as well as the skills needed to use language in a variety of ways. Four of these skills, speaking, listening, reading, and writing, are so commonly recognized as being necessary that they are referred to widely as the four skills, or the four modalities, and respectable language courses are expected to address each of them.

What is the best way for a language course to teach each of these skills? Brown says that the study of the four skills is less effective when they are isolated and focused on individually, at least to the complete exclusion of the others. That is, reading without writing, or speaking without listening is both artificial and hard to do. On the other hand, each skill is complemented and supported by additionally practicing or working on any of the others, and they progress more rapidly when they are improved in combination. For example, reading regularly in the target language may improve overall language comprehension, or part of the listening skill, while improved listening may help one's understanding of a text that is read. Practice in writing not only helps one to become more familiar with the symbols of a language, but reading is often cited as one way to help one to write well (Brown, 2001).

Current approaches to using reading in the language classroom are based on both schema theory and decoding theory. Schema theory, also known as top-down processing, involves "the application of prior knowledge to working on the meaning of a text" (Hedge, 2000, p. 189). Hedge says that decoding theory, also referred to as bottom-up processing, includes "decoding the letters, words, and other language features of the text" (p. 189). Most how-to books recommend a combined, or interactive approach, with learners relying on background, experiential knowledge, as well as knowledge of the

language to decipher the text. Nunan argues that “reading is an interactive process, in which the reader constantly shuttles between bottom-up and top-down processes”

(Nunan, 1999, p. 254).

This leads to a question. How much background knowledge, linguistic or otherwise, does a reader need to have for a text to be helpful? It would seem that much would depend on the individual experience of the learner. It could also depend very much on what deciphering aids are available to him as he reads. Krashen (1980) argues that input must be comprehensible for successful language learning to occur, and Graham (R. Graham, personal interview, May 24, 2004) estimates that for typical L2 reading programs, the comprehensibility of the text should be at or above 90%. Brown (2001) also says that the ability of the reader to negotiate meaning depends on the accessibility of the L2 vocabulary. That is, does the reader know most of the words, or can the reader infer the meaning from the context and from his/her past experience?

L2 reading is often categorized into the following types: (a) receptive reading (for enjoyment), (b) reflective reading (for review), (c) skim reading (for global impressions), (d) scanning (for searching), and (e) intensive reading (for studying precise wording) (from Hedge, 2000, as cited from Pugh, 1978, and Lunzer & Gardner, 1979). This last reading style, intensive reading, focuses on word choice and placement, which would seem to direct the reader’s attention to the structural organization of the text. If intensive reading can lead to increased structural competency in L2, then what effect might reading ultimately have on other skills, such as speaking?

Hedge also says that intensive reading is partly done to teach students how to employ good reading strategies, so that when they are engaged in extensive reading (that is, when they are alone), they will continue to use the strategies (2000).

Brown (2001) says that affective factors also play a significant role in how reading helps one learn a language. Learners who want to or like to read usually improve their reading. Those who like what they read keep reading. They also read more, and there is a high correlation between those who read a lot and those who improve in their comprehension and vocabulary acquisition when they read (Silver, 1997). Thus, choosing what types of writing to read, and identifying the critical features of the genre, becomes important.

Linguists agree that the form of written language is based on, or “mapped onto” spoken language (Cipollone, Keiser, & Vasishth, 1998, p. 6). It is similar, or sometimes identical, to spoken language, in structure and meaning. Nonetheless, written language is considered different enough from spoken language that many linguists believe that “oral reading is not very authentic language,” at least to be used as normal conversational speech (Brown, 2001, p. 312).

The permanence of the written word makes it unique among the modalities of a language. A writer’s ability to edit, and a reader’s to ponder, and to store, and to retrieve what is written, makes written language both different, and uniquely useful. Written language can be such an integrated part of a literate society that going without it is hard to imagine. In fact, research has shown that literacy changes the way a society thinks (Ong, 1998). A question that arises then is if written language makes us, or enables us to think differently, then what is the benefit, or the good effect of reading, either silent or

oral, on other skills, such as speaking? Are they so different (and is our thinking so different, between reading and speaking), that say, writing the way we speak, or speaking as we read, are a bad idea?

With those questions in mind, Brown lists several advantages and disadvantages of oral reading in L2 acquisition, which he says can help students at the beginning and intermediate levels:

1. It can serve “as an evaluative check on bottom-up processing skills”
2. It can “double as a pronunciation check”
3. It may “serve to add some extra student participation if you want to highlight a certain short segment of a reading passage”

Brown cautions that too much oral reading “may have the outward appearance of student participation, when in reality it is mere recitation” (2001, p. 312).

One language learning institution has used a unique approach to teach reading and to try to improve performance in the other modalities as well. The Missionary Training Center, in Provo, Utah, has encouraged its missionary language learners to read daily from one of its books of scripture, *The Book of Mormon* (The Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints, 1981). Learners who have had only 1-2 months of language training often begin reading from it, both practicing pronunciation and learning the words and phrases they need to use in their assignments as teachers in the new language. They practice reading so that they can be comprehensible when they read with those they teach, and so they can understand what they read.

The Book of Mormon is 531 pages long in English, and it contains over 10,000 different words. Even accounting for some words appearing more frequently, this number

suggests that a beginner-level language learner encounters a high percentage of unfamiliar words and phrases when reading the text. If, according to Krashen (1980) and Graham (2004), the reading material should be mostly comprehensible, and if, according to Brown (2001) and Nunan (1999), reading aloud is a practice of somewhat inauthentic speech, then is there any advantage to having language learners read aloud so much (15-30 minutes daily), and having them read something that is significantly beyond their language level?

MTC language trainers often say that this activity works because missionaries are already familiar with *The Book of Mormon*. Most of them have already read it in their native language, and many have read it more than once. In addition, they each possess a translation of the foreign text, which significantly facilitates their understanding, and diminishes the need to access a dictionary. How much does this compensate for the disparity in comprehensibility?

An interview was recently held with two of these missionaries who are learning Spanish. Each of them had just finished reading the book, although they are still in their first six months of learning Spanish. They said that they thought that the experience was very helpful. When asked whether they had noticed improvement in their language, they said that while the reading was very hard at first, and while they depended at first on their native language copy of the book, they eventually were able to set it aside, since they ultimately felt that they understood the text very well by itself.

The findings of this interview were similar to those of more than 100 held with learners who were products of this institution. In each case, if the learner read *The Book of Mormon* with the intent of helping his language, he said that it seemed to be very

helpful. And just as intriguing, in view of the question of how reading may influence the other skills, each reader said that he or she chose to read often and to read aloud. They said they chose to read aloud because it helped their speaking.

Most of these interviews were with individuals who had finished their missionary service, and had thus learned the language intensively for many months. Less clear is the effect of having L2 learners use such a text in their first months or weeks of instruction.

Silver (1997) did a study of the difference between missionaries who read the Spanish Book of Mormon and those who read a Spanish diglot Book of Mormon reader in the MTC. In her study the missionaries began reading *The Book of Mormon* their first day of language training, and they were given an anxiety measurement test after two weeks. Then at the end of their two months training, their vocabulary acquisition and reading comprehension were tested. Those who used the diglot reader showed better scores on all three measures. She concluded that beginning reading *The Book of Mormon* the first day of language training was too early, and she cited some of the arguments listed earlier, including the concern about it being too incomprehensible.

Teaching Reading Strategies

Language Learning Strategy (LLS) training has become a requisite part of nearly every institution that provides language instruction. The shift in educational institutions from teacher centered to learner centered instruction has led to an increasing focus on what the learner needs to do to succeed in learning. Some of that focus has been on discovering learner characteristics, and then using them to individualize the training and to empower the learner to make choices about his or her learning (Brown, 2001). Other quarters have emphasized identifying effective, commonly used learning strategies

and providing methods for training learners in their use (Pearson & Dole, 1987; Oxford, 1990; Chamot & O'Malley, 1994).

While LLS training currently receives broad support, a survey of current research suggests that a variety of approaches to LLS training are being promoted, and no one method has been shown to be significantly more effective than others. A number of methods seem to lead to greater learning outcomes, but the results of research into these methods, and comparisons between them, seems more mixed. While prominent advocates of LLS training argue for its efficacy, there is still disagreement on the most effective method of its conduct (Cohen, 1999; Anderson, 2005).

Most approaches to LLS training rely on teachers and learners choosing strategies which are relevant to the language content and which are appropriate for a given learner. Teachers model the strategies, and learners practice them, while being monitored by their teachers. Often absent from these approaches is specific guidance to the teachers about which strategies may be more suitable, or universally more appropriate for any learner, among the many strategies which are often cited in publications (Chamot & O'Malley, 1994; Oxford, 1990; Pearson and Dole, 1987).

These approaches prepare teachers for providing LLS training to groups of learners, but a review of studies suggest that only a relatively small amount of time is spent one-on-one between teachers and learners during LLS training (Cohen, 1999; Oxford & Leaver, 1996), or in significant, monitored repetition of the primary, more proven strategies.

Statement of the Problem

L2 learners are often required to read large and complex examples of the language they are learning. The texts they read in their language courses are often dissimilar from the language they use when functioning in the L2. Those learner texts are often used only to improve student reading ability of the target language, such as their comprehension of isolated vocabulary items and phrases. Reading in the language is seen as helping only reading. There is little expectation by teachers or course designers that reading will have a direct or significant effect on pronunciation or speaking fluency. Furthermore, there is little agreement about how best to teach reading strategies to language learners.

Statement of Purpose

This study will probe the possibility of improving the receptive and the productive skills of L2 learners through reading. It will also consider whether that improvement can be accelerated through direct instruction and practice in reading strategies. It will do this by having learners read daily from an advanced text, *The Book of Mormon*, with appropriate reading aids, and by having teachers train some of those learners in effective reading strategies.

Chapter 2: Literature Review

The purpose of this section will be to review and summarize current approaches and research on teaching reading in second language acquisition. This will be accomplished in several parts. First, studies showing the role and benefits of L2 reading will be surveyed, as well as any research which shows the effect of reading in the language on the other skills. Second, methods for teaching reading will be considered, as well as research supporting what works and what does not. Third, studies on strategy based reading instruction will be surveyed. Finally, the review will investigate what we know about language learning strategies, including methods and research in strategy based language instruction, so that a theoretically sound means for teaching reading strategies may be included in the research design.

This literature survey will be limited to the most relevant sources in each of the above areas. Most of these fields are broad and include large bodies of work. The review will therefore discuss only those studies which directly influence the focus of this research, the premises and assumptions of its hypotheses, and the mechanics of the research design.

Research on L2 Reading

Early studies in L2 reading focused on trying to show that reading was in some way helpful to language learning. While some studies were questioned for their methodology or design (Jenkins, Pacy, & Schreck, 1978; Miller, 1941; Sachs, 1943), others began to show significant gains in vocabulary learning (Grabe, 1991; Krashen, 1989; Saragi, Nation, & Meister, 1978). Establishing the role of written speech in L2 acquisition has

become a by-product of reading research. As source accessibility, or where the words will come from, is a frequently occurring issue in teaching vocabulary, and more particularly, teaching vocabulary learning strategies, written language is often seen as being more available, or more reliable, than spoken language, as well as being less fleeting, and more on hand for study (Ong, 1998).

Concomitant with the mounting evidence that reading could help in learning vocabulary was a growing debate about how reading should be taught. Original approaches for teaching reading were based in the behavioral sciences, and they emphasized the form of the language, and that learners had to habituate themselves to it through practice. Skinner's book *Verbal Behavior* (1957) argued that all language was an evolution of conditioned responses, and that if we wanted our students to speak differently, we would have to provide the appropriate stimuli to change their speech. Behaviorist theories helped create a fertile environment for the germination of many popular phonics approaches to teaching reading, which were designed to teach students how to decode and properly form their voices around what they read, beginning at the phonemic level.

Soon, however, educators began to react to the results of this approach, which sometimes included students who appeared to be able to read, meaning that they could sound clear and fluent, but who could not understand what they were reading (Nunan, 1999; Smith, 1978). Smith's work on the psycholinguistic side of reading (1978), and Goodman and Burke's miscue analysis techniques (1972) led to an alternative approach to reading, known as schema theory. As stated earlier, it required that the reader draw on his or her experience in the world, thus activating schema, to make sense of the L2 text.

Schema theory had many advocates, but it also came under fire for some of its assumptions (Stanovich, 1980), such as expecting that reading be an ongoing process of “developing and testing hypotheses” (Nunan, 1999, p. 253), since such a process would likely take too long and bog the reader down.

An attempt to overcome the inadequacies of schema theory led to the interactive approach. It is a combination of schema theory, or top-down processing, and decoding theory, or bottom-up processing. It encourages L2 learners to use all of their background knowledge to understand a text, and to decode what is necessary for comprehension. It is a balance between the two approaches, which at their extremes could be characterized by two ends of a scale. On one end, learners pronounce and give conscious attention to every symbol, like a computer scanner, and on the other, they glance at the title and a sentence here and there and guess what the story is about, based on their experience. In reality, students work more in the middle of the scale. In fact, Anderson & Vandergriff (1996) found that successful readers did the following when they read:

1. They read ahead silently; they read under their breath; they read out loud.
2. They did not get anxious when they did not understand.
3. They made inferences about the meaning of words based on the ‘data’ that they had worked out so far.
4. They had doubts about their interpretation.
5. They used awareness of syntax to check comprehension.
6. They divided the text into chunks.
7. They attacked the text holistically as a problem-solving exercise.

These observations indicate that successful L2 students access many available tools when they read, including activating schema and decoding as they go along.

Another debated theory in second language reading is the transfer hypothesis. It argues that students who are good readers in their first language should also be good L2 readers. Studies have shown, however, that this is not always the case. Hudson (1988) showed that beginner readers needed to be shown how to activate schema, through pre-reading activities, and that when this occurred, their comprehension of L2 texts improved significantly. This step was not so necessary for intermediate and advanced readers.

Almost no research has been done to quantify the relationship between written (or reading) and oral L2 skills. That is, while linguists believe that teaching writing and reading is generally beneficial for all four language skills (reading, writing, speaking, and listening), they cannot precisely say how strong the positive effect is. What they can and do say is that students who read more usually improve their reading ability, as well as their vocabulary learning and their reading comprehension skills. The same is true for the other skills: that speaking improves speaking, listening practice improves listening comprehension, and so forth. They also state that some attempts at teaching reading strategies have led to higher reading outcomes (Braxton, 1999; Chamot, 1999; Green, 1999; Hedge, 1990; O'Malley & Chamot, 1990; Oxford, 1990; Ott, 1994; Thomas, 1996).

Graham (R. Graham, personal interview, May 24, 2004) said that there are no studies where reading was the independent variable and oral proficiency the dependent variable. Graham said that "learning to read and learning to speak can be and usually are relatively independent" of each other, thus reflecting a view commonly held in the field. The

English Language Center at Brigham Young University, where he works, emphasizes reading, where students are supposed to read 15-30 pages each day, depending on the level of proficiency. They read materials which are just above their language level, with an established target of 5-10% unfamiliar words in each reading assignment. Dr. Graham claims to be getting promising results there, both in vocabulary learning and reading comprehension.

A review of sources which look at the link between oral reading and language proficiency has not yet turned up any studies. This is both surprising and intriguing, since the four skills are generally seen as being so interacting and inter-beneficial for language learning. Zimmerman (2004) and other studies (Alderson, 1984; Qian, 1999) have shown that a larger L2 vocabulary correlates both with higher reading comprehension as well as with higher speaking scores. If L2 reading has a positive effect on vocabulary learning, then could there be a connection between L2 reading and speaking?

Language Learning Strategies

In his seminal book, *The Study of Second Language Acquisition*, Rod Ellis (1994) lists several issues that “need sorting out before [language learning] strategy training can be implemented effectively” (p. 557). His six points, which summarize where language learning strategy research needs to go next, mirror the recommendations of other experts in the field, including Rebecca Oxford, Andrew Cohen, Anna Chamot, Madeline Ehrman, Joan Rubin, David Nunan, Neil Anderson, and others. In summary, they are:

1. What strategies or combination of strategies should be taught?
2. What is the best way to find out which strategies learners prefer?
3. What is the best way to help learners to adopt new strategies, when they do not

want to?

4. Should strategy based instruction (SBI) be embedded or a separate strand of the curriculum?
5. How soon in the instruction should SBI begin?
6. How conscious should learners be of the strategies they are being taught?

Several of these issues are reflected in the questions listed in chapter one about the reading programs at the MTC. The questions relating to which strategies should be taught, how they should be taught, when they should be taught, and whether they make a difference, as well as the general question of whether reading aloud in an advanced text can improve language learning, are the object of this research.

Progress in Language Learning Strategy Research

Research in language learning strategies began in the 1970s and 80s when researchers first formally hypothesized a connection between good language learners and what they did to acquire their second language (Stern, 1975; Rubin & Thompson, 1983).

Subsequent work first focused on defining, categorizing, and developing ways of measuring strategy use, while later research worked toward understanding their interaction with learner characteristics and knowing which strategies might be best for which learners (Chamot, Barnhardt, El-Dinary, & Robbins, 1999).

O'Malley and Chamot (1990) defined language learning strategies as “special ways of processing information that enhance comprehension, learning, or retention of the information” (p. 1). Nunan cast his net even wider when he called strategies “the mental and communicative procedures learners use in order to learn and use language” (1999, p. 171). Oxford’s definition focused more on the pragmatic use of strategies when she

called them “specific actions taken by the learner to make learning easier, faster, more enjoyable, more self-directed, more effective, and more transferable to new situations” (Oxford, 1990, p. 2).

Macaro (2001) has said that language learning strategies (LLS) are difficult to see. What can be observed are the behaviors which are evidence of the strategies which exist in the mind of the learner. According to Macaro, “skills and processes are the surface manifestations of the strategies that learners use. Strategies are the network of thousands of decisions put into action, consciously or subconsciously.” (p. 43).

More recently, language learning strategies have been categorized in several ways. Many LLS researchers (Macaro, 2001; Cohen, 1998; Oxford, 2002) recognize two groups: language learning strategies versus language use strategies. Language learning strategies refer to strategies used during formal study, while language use strategies are those employed during real communication in the target language.

Another common two-part categorization is direct and indirect strategies (Bimmel, 1996; Macaro, 2001; Oxford, 2002; Oxford, 1990). These two categories have been further divided into sub-categories, initially by Oxford (1990) and now widely used in the Strategy Inventory for Language Learning (SILL) (Oxford, 1990, p. 283). The first category, direct strategies, includes cognitive, memory, and compensation strategies. The second category, indirect strategies, includes social, affective, and metacognitive strategies. Categorizations used by other researchers include three main strategy categorizations: metacognitive, cognitive, and socio-affective (Chamot, 1990; Robbins, 1993), five strategy categorizations: memorization, clarification, communication,

monitoring, prior knowledge (Anderson, 2004), and categorizations based on the four skills: speaking, listening, reading and writing (Rubin & Thompson, 1994).

Many studies have surveyed the methods used to assess LLS usage (Oxford, 1996; Cohen & Scott, 1996; Macaro, 2001). Common methods include diaries and reflective journals, questionnaires (Gardner, Tremblay, Masgoret, 1997; Gu & Johnson, 1996), interviews (Palacios-Martinez, 1995), self-report (Cohen, 1996; Mendoza de Hopkins & Mackay, 1997), think-aloud protocols (Young & Oxford, 1997), observations (Raby & Baille, 1997), and automatic assessment while using computer (Bailey, 1996; Hyte, 2002; Kohler, 2002; Mangiafico, 1996).

While other LLS surveys have been developed, such as the Survey of Reading Strategies (Sheorey, 1999) and the Language Strategy Use Survey (Cohen & Chi, 2005), Oxford says that the strength of the SILL is evident in how it compares with learning outcomes (Oxford, 1996). Other studies agree that the SILL is the best survey designed so far (Dreyer & Van Der Walt, 1995; Park, 1997; Hsiao & Oxford, 2002). While the SILL is the most widely used survey, they suggested some modifications which if made could improve the SILL.

Chamot (2001) said that the goals of LLS research are to identify the LLS used by more and less successful language learners, and teach less successful learners how to use the strategies of more successful learners. She says that there are three critical parts to this research: (a) learn what strategies are being used, (b) define the approach to teaching them, and (c) investigate whether they make any difference. Anderson (2005) indicates that progress has been made in each of these areas. He says that there have been five important developments in LLS research: (a) the classification and measurement of LLS,

(b) the distinction between use and learning strategies, (c) the relationship between strategies and L2 proficiency, (d) the transferability of LLS, and (e) explicit instruction of LLS.

Correlations between Language Learning Strategies and Learning Outcomes

Number three on both Anderson's and Chamot's lists is the goal to find out if there is a link between the use of LLS and the success of those who use them in learning a language. Many studies now indicate that more successful learners use more strategies, and they use them more often (Anderson, 1991; Braxton, 1999; Green, 1999; Hedge, 1990; O'Malley & Chamot, 1990; Ott, 1994; Oxford, 1990; Thomas, 1996). Subsequent studies have shown that "less proficient L2 learners draw on a smaller number of strategies and do so in a less effective manner" (Anderson, 1991; Chamot, 2001; Cohen, Mendoza de Hopkins, 1997; Weaver, & Li, 1997).

The more frequently occurring strategies which correlate with successful language learning include the following: information organization, mnemonics, creating learning opportunities (Rubin & Thompson, 1983), setting goals, practicing, analyzing (Brown, 2002), reading more (Ott, 1995; Hosenfeld, Arnold, Kirchofer, Laciura, & Wilson, 1981; Carrell, Pharis, & Liberto, 1989), using keyword learning methods, visual imagery, mnemonic associations, and inferring word meaning from context (Chamot, 1999; Ellis, 1997). While all of these could be used during reading, the strategies of setting goals, visual imagery and inferring meaning from context seem to be examples of what would more naturally occur during the reading process.

Evidence that LLS are not Significant Factors in Language Learning

In a study comparing high and low proficiency language learners among native Asians learning English, Kang (2002) found that LLS correlated only weakly with language proficiency. In another study, again among Asians learning English, the frequently claimed significant correlations between the SILL and higher language proficiency were questioned, at least when strategy use data are obtained “in tandem” with language outcomes (Bremner, 1999). Pickard’s study of higher level young adult German learners suggested that some reading and listening strategies were not the cause of language proficiency, but the result of it (1995). Rees-Miller questioned the methods and assumed effectiveness of strategy based instruction (SBI) (1993). In another study (1994) she concluded that SBI had not led to significant results, and the time could be better spent on the language itself.

Language Learning Strategies Ranked

Several studies have tried to show that the choice of strategies used affected language learning success (Black, 1993; Braxton, 1999; Flemming & Walls, 1998; Oxford & Crookall, 1989). Bremner (1997) found that increased speaking, practicing aloud, manipulating the language, watching television, writing, avoiding word-for-word translations, and asking questions were all strongly correlated with learning outcomes. A study by Kawai, Oxford, and Iran Nejad (2002) suggested that holistic, contextual, and naturalistic learning strategies were more effective than sequential strategies.

Watanabe (1991) posited communicative strategies as the most important, while Clark (2000) suggested that cognitive, compensation, and metacognitive strategies were

more associated with higher achievement in language learning. Another study argued that the best strategies were planning, persistence, and motivation (Oxford & Ehrman, 1995).

Quoting her earlier studies from 1985 and 1987, Chamot (2000) said good learners are “active and strategic, focus on the requirements of the task, reflect on their own learning processes, and transfer previously learned concepts and learning strategies to the demands of the [language being learned] or general education content classroom” (p. 31). She also found that more successful learners monitored their success more, they related new information to their prior knowledge, and they “made inferences about possible meanings when encountering unfamiliar words.”

Ehrman (1996) suggests that “deep processing” strategies are more effective for long-term retention. Deep processing, which she contrasts with surface processing, or focusing on finishing the task at hand, is defined as “an active process of making associations with material that is already familiar, examining interrelationships within the material, elaborating the stimulus through further development of it, connecting the new material with personal experience, and considering alternative interpretations” (p. 173).

One challenge in ranking learning strategies, according to Gu and Johnson (1996), is that some strategies are hard to observe, and others are not reported. They show that rote memorization strategies are not often reported in learning vocabulary. Finally, Anderson (2004) said, “There are no good or bad strategies;... there is good or bad application of strategies.”

Reading Strategies

Anderson (2003) defined reading as the interaction of four things. He said that together with the reader and the text there must also be fluent reading, or “the ability to

read at an appropriate rate with adequate comprehension,” and strategic reading, or “the ability of the reader to use a wide variety of reading strategies to accomplish a purpose for reading” (p. 68). Discovering the best methods and techniques for achieving fluent reading with adequate comprehension, and identifying what techniques or processes the learners choose to access, is the goal of research in reading strategies.

Oxford (1990) lists a large number of strategies which she argues have been shown to correlate positively with those who use reading successfully to learn language. Among those, she lists the following strategies for reading: repeating, or “saying or doing something over and over;” “formally practicing with sounds (pronunciation, intonation, register, etc.) in a variety of ways, but not yet in naturalistic communicative practice;” “using resources for receiving and sending messages,” which she says includes “using print or non-print resources to understand incoming messages or produce outgoing messages;” and “placing new words into a context,” which includes “placing a word or phrase in a meaningful sentence” in order to remember it. Oxford’s research suggests that reading something repeatedly, and aloud, benefits the L2 student. She also suggests that print materials can be used to produce L2 utterances.

In languages that use phonetic orthographies, Rubin & Thompson (1994) advocate beginning to read within the first month of language learning. They say that reading should be done daily, and that what is read should be of interest to readers as well as something they are already familiar with (Rubin & Thompson, 1994).

Nunan (1999) lists a typology of 21 proven reading strategies, including “reading to present,” which he defines as “understanding the text fully and then presenting it to

others” (p. 266). This strategy supports both reading with a meaningful, or pragmatic purpose, but also reading to present, or said differently, reading to speak, tell, or explain.

When considered together, Oxford, Rubin and Thompson, and Nunan appear to support the notion that reading can and often does help speaking. This raises the question of whether, in spite of the resistance of some teachers to phonics-type approaches to reading, as well as the concern some have for too much reading aloud, a word-by-word focus may be acceptable, depending on the purpose for reading.

Ott (1995) surveyed over 300 missionaries after they had departed the Missionary Training Center at BYU. He found that while only 10% of the missionaries listed reading scriptures in the language as the strategy which helped them most to learn the language, the strategy of “reading and writing in the language” was used more frequently by the more successful language learners than any other learning strategy. What inferences can be made from this? Was the correlation high because reading helped them speak better, or just because they were being told to read, and those who studied harder tried harder to read?

Brown (2001, pp. 306-310) suggests the following reading strategies for those learning a second language:

1. Identify the purpose in reading.
2. Use graphemic rules and patterns to aid in bottom-up decoding (especially for beginning level learners).
3. Use efficient silent reading techniques for relatively rapid comprehension (for intermediate and advanced levels).
4. Skim the text for main ideas.

5. Scan the text for specific information.
6. Use semantic mapping or clustering.
7. Guess when you are not certain.
8. Analyze vocabulary.
9. Distinguish between literal and implied meanings.
10. Capitalize on discourse markers to process relationships.

Brown also stresses the importance of giving instruction in reading skills.

Grabe (1991, p. 379) listed several “knowledge areas” which are necessary for effective second language reading:

1. Automatic recognition skills
2. Vocabulary and structural knowledge
3. Formal discourse structural knowledge
4. Content/world background knowledge
5. Synthesis and evaluation skills/strategies
6. Metacognitive knowledge and skills

These knowledge areas have implications for what skills are taught during reading strategy instruction. Some of them, such as background knowledge, clearly apply to top-down processing, while others, like structural knowledge, are necessary for bottom-up processing.

Chamot’s research supports many of those strategies and skills already listed. She also says that learners should:

1. Use what they know (background knowledge) about the phrase to understand it.
2. Ask themselves if it makes sense.

3. Use selective attention or focusing.
4. Cooperate with other readers.
5. Use deduction to apply language (grammar) rules when reading.
6. Evaluate the strategies they are using while they read.
7. Predict what will happen next.
8. Summarize what they have read.
9. Infer meaning.
10. Use other resources to check meaning.

The need to get at the meaning of the text, and the emphasis on improving comprehension seems clear. This is something that should not be passed over in any study of oral reading for fluency and pronunciation improvement. Regardless of the benefits for the form of one's language, conveying or accessing meaning is ultimately why one communicates, and why one chooses to learn a language. Anderson says that "since comprehension is the goal of reading, your primary focus in the classroom should be on getting meaning from print. Make silent reading the goal in your classroom instead of using oral reading" (2003, p. 69).

At the same time, if reading for pronunciation or fluency is the primary goal, and comprehension is the secondary goal, then the importance of oral reading increases. Oral reading of incomprehensible content may seem un-motivating, or even pointless. But if comprehension is aided, such as in cases when students have already read the text in their native language, or if they have other resources to help them access its meaning, then the activity becomes reading with meaning, rather than for meaning. Once comprehension is

made possible, then other motives for reading, such as for the joy of hearing the story in the language, and of hearing oneself speak the language, seem possible.

Learning Strategy Interactions with Learner Characteristics

Rather than review all literature on learner characteristics and language learning strategies, this section will focus on characteristics which may hinder a learner's inclination to use language learning strategies.

Anderson (2005) stated that "there is a link between the LLS and learning styles." Some studies have shown that motivation and anxiety interact with strategy choice (MacIntyre, 1996; Oxford and Nyikos, 1989). Studies have shown that a correlation may well exist between goal orientations (intrinsic versus extrinsic motivations) and strategy use (He, 2002; Hirai, 1998). Brown showed that internal motivation is better for learning a language than external motivation (2002). Djigunovic (1999) argued that strategies and motivation correlate significantly, and that communicative language learning strategies correlate highly with motivation and achievement. Chen (2000) found that self-betterment and acceptance were more prominent motivators than ego orientation, task orientation, or work avoidance.

Kaylani (1996) linked both motivation and gender to strategy frequency in a study of second language learners in Jordan. But research showing gender differences in strategy choices seem to be more mixed. Some studies have suggested little or no difference in strategies used by men and women (Saleh, 2000; Young & Oxford, 1997). Other studies seem to show clear differences between strategy choices, based on gender. Two studies by Sheory showed that females used more strategies than men. (Sheory, 1999; Sheorey & Dies, 1997). Macaro (1998) and Ehrman & Oxford (1989) showed that females used

more strategies and they used them more often than men. Oxford confirmed these findings again in 1993. Graham and Rees (1995) noted specific differences in learning styles of males and females, including that boys exhibit some inclination to control what they learn and to “pursue personal agendas,” while girls want to master what they are told, usually before being asked to use it.

Levine et al. (1996) found cultural differences between Russian and Israeli learners which led them to access different language learning strategies. Bedell and Oxford (1996) summarized 14 studies showing different LLS measuring systems, depending on the country and culture. Others found similar differences (Dreyer & Oxford, 1996), suggesting that strategy choices should be tailored not only to learner L2 proficiency, age, and gender, but also to past learning experience.

Brown (2002) said that any “one group of learning styles is not best for foreign language learning. Successful language learners usually understand their own learning styles and preferences, know which styles help them and use those styles, [and] know which styles might hurt them and change or avoid those styles” (p. 6). This implies that while helping learners to find the strategies which fit their style may be a worthy goal, learners must also be willing to fit their learning style to the learning task before them. This action, of making conscious decisions about one’s learning, is known as the subfield of metacognition.

Metacognition

Metacognition has been defined as “thinking about thinking” (Anderson, 2002, p. 23). The term metacognition was first coined by J. H. Flavell in the mid 1970s. According to Byrd, Carter, & Waddoups (2001), it was defined at that time as self-awareness of mental

processes. More recently, Oxford said that metacognitive strategies “provide a way for learners to coordinate their own learning process” (1990, p. 136). Others have added that metacognition “refers to peoples’ ability to predict their performances on various tasks and to monitor their current levels of mastery and understanding” (Bransford, Brown, & Cocking, 2000, p. 12).

Chamot, Barnhardt, El-Dinary, & Robbins (1999), said that “metacognition, or reflecting on one’s own thinking and learning, is the hallmark of the successful learner” (p. 2). Anderson (2002) also stated that “understanding and controlling cognitive processes may be one of the most essential skills that classroom teachers can develop in themselves and the students with whom they work” (p. 24). He added that “learners need to connect their strategies for learning with their purpose for learning” (p. 25). Bransford (2002), et al. said that “a ‘metacognitive’ approach to instruction can help students learn to take control of their own learning by defining learning goals and monitoring their progress in achieving them” (p. 18). Those who are metacognitively inclined “continually question their current levels of expertise and attempt to move beyond them” (p. 48). They also said that “the teaching of metacognitive skills should be integrated into the curriculum in a variety of subject areas” (p. 48).

Brown (2002) said that “most successful learners of languages are those who understand their own abilities and capabilities well and who autonomously engage in systematic efforts within and beyond the classroom to reach self-determined goals of acquisition” (p. vii).

Oxford (1990) stated that metacognitive strategies include: overviewing and linking with already known material, paying attention, delaying speech production to focus on

listening, finding out about language learning, organizing, setting goals and objectives, identifying the purpose of a language task, planning for a language task, seeking practice opportunities, self-monitoring, and self evaluating. She said that “research shows that learners use these strategies sporadically and without much sense of their importance” (p. 138).

Chamot, Barnhardt, El-Dinary, & Robbins (1999) asserted that metacognition should be organized into the following areas: planning, monitoring, problem solving, and evaluating. They said that since many metacognitive strategies are not observable, explaining and discussing them are essential. Learners who are about to begin language learning should ask themselves questions like “What are you going to do? How did you come up with that? What makes you think so? What were you thinking about? How can you solve your problem? What led to that decision?” After study or learning they should ask: “Did that strategy help you? Why was that strategy helpful for this task? Is there another strategy that might work better? In what situation does this strategy work well for you? When does it not work so well?” (1999, pp. 25-110)

Byrd, Carter, & Waddoups (2001) argue that metacognition can be taught. They also say that metacognition is an on-going process. “Metacognition contains three types of awareness: self-awareness, task-awareness, strategy awareness” (p. 8). Self awareness includes knowledge of one’s learning styles, habits, interests, abilities. “Task awareness is knowledge about the length, difficulty level, conditions, and particular requirements of tasks that need to be completed. Strategy awareness combines knowledge of the content ...with an understanding of how to use a variety of procedures and control strategies” (pp. 11-12).

In a survey of metacognitive studies on language learning, Wenden (2001) found that most studies were descriptive studies, categorizing and defining metacognitive strategies. In a study which looked at metacognitive strategy training, however, Kohler, who used questions similar to those of Chamot, et al., (1999), found that metacognitive strategy training could influence lower level learners to increase their strategy use, as well as to improve their language outcomes as a result of that training (2002).

In summary, current metacognitive strategy research consists primarily of strategy description and categorization, with some studies comparing strategy use with learning outcomes. Very few studies have shown how to train on metacognitive strategies. Anderson states, "I hypothesize that the metacognitive strategies play a more significant role because once a learner understands how to regulate his/her own learning through the use of strategies, language acquisition should proceed at a faster rate" (2004, pp. 23-24). It appears that future metacognitive strategy research should include studies on how to train on those strategies, so that the effect of such training may be determined.

Teaching Learners How to Learn

Chamot, et. al., (1999) provide a summary of learning theories which have guided and sometimes dominated teaching and learning theory for the last century. From behavioral theory to constructivism, theorists have tried to learn how to help learners to better organize, store, and retrieve information. Deciding what to learn, and then choosing, as a learner, how to accomplish that learning, is a relatively recent focus of learning theory research. Social-cognitive theory by Bandura and social learning theory by Vygotsky prepared the way for Wenden and others to introduce learning strategy instruction, and particularly SBI which focuses on metacognitive strategies.

Bransford, Brown, and Cocking (2000) differentiate usable knowledge over disconnected facts, and memory learning versus understanding. They say that the understanding of something is harder to acquire than simple recall. To know if a learner understands, teachers must look for evidence of transfer, or applying what is learned to new situations. They say that people construct new knowledge and understanding based on what they already know (p. 9-10). “Teachers need to pay attention to the incomplete understandings, the false beliefs, and the naïve renditions of concepts that learners bring with them to a given subject. . . . Schools and classrooms must be learner-centered” (p. 23). They add that “formative assessments—ongoing assessments designed to make students’ thinking visible to both teachers and students—are essential” (p. 24).

Teaching Language Learning Strategies

Brown says that “strategy based instruction (SBI) is difficult for many teachers to implement” (2002, p. vii). Chamot, et. al., (1999) stated that the goal of SBI should be “to assist students in developing awareness of their own metacognition and thus control of their own learning” (p. 53). They have developed an approach to strategy instruction known as the cognitive academic language learning approach (CALLA). Its major components include curriculum content, academic and literacy language development, and explicit LLS instruction. They assert that a language teacher has to create a strategic mindset in their learners for SBI to succeed. “A learner-centered classroom must initially be created by the teacher and then accepted by students. It does not occur automatically” (p. 53). Some strategies which they emphasize in their approach include: having a class contract with the students, sharing student goals with the class, identifying students’ current strategies and sharing them with the class, holding interviews, using think-aloud

protocols, questionnaires, and diaries. Formal strategy training lesson plans which accompany their materials are similar to those used at other language institutions, such as the Missionary Training Center.

Dickinson (1987) argued that there are several very good reasons to promote learner self-instruction, which is the goal of most SBI training. Self-instruction is important for several reasons: (a) because sometimes there is no alternative, (b) because learners' needs do not fit with the course goals, and (c) because of learner variables. He says that learning how to learn is a matter of developing knowledge about the learning processes, about oneself as a learner, of planning learning, and "of discovering and then using appropriate and preferred strategies to achieve the objectives specified by the plans" (p. 34).

Macaro (2001) said that SBI should focus on "combinations of learning strategies rather than individual strategies." He recommends the following features for effective SBI: (a) raise student LLS awareness, (b) explore alternative LLS with the students, (c) model LLS for the students, (d) combine strategies for specific purposes or tasks, (e) apply them with support (scaffolding), (f) encourage student evaluation of the strategies, (g) remove the scaffolding of teacher guidance, and (h) evaluate student success in strategy use. He explained that awareness training is not enough by itself, and he continues that strategies must be embedded in the language content for the strategies to be learned. Cohen's earlier conclusions (1999) reflected each of those of Macaro.

Cohen (1999) and Anderson (2004) said that very little research has been completed to show that SBI works. Others claim that it does and has worked, and their claims shall be described here. Feyten, Flaitz, and LaRocca (1999) found that one hour of LLS awareness training led to much higher learning outcomes. Others claimants of L2

improvement because of SBI include Kohler (2002), Chamot, et al., (1999) and Rubin and Thompson (1994).

Rubin and Thompson (1994) argued that effective SBI should include setting objectives, planning study, discussing the nature of the communication process, the nature of language, using resources, taking charge (i.e., trying out our learning strategies and making decisions), and using what you know. Macaro (2001) agreed. This is important, since as Anderson said, (1991) “It is not sufficient to know about strategies; a reader must also be able to apply them strategically” (pp 468-9).

To measure the success of SBI, Anderson argued for using think aloud protocols, where students verbalize what skills they are using to learn, both for the benefit of any observers, as well as to help themselves (1996). Oxford, et al. (1996) suggested using diaries and recollection activities, which help get at and record what students are thinking, or what they are doing when not being observed.

Kubler (1997) stressed the importance of practicing strategies with the students, while Palacios Martinez (1995) emphasized the importance of student autonomy in SBI. He also found that memorization strategies could be successfully taught, as did Gruneberg and Sykes (1996) and Nayak, Hansen, Krueger, McLaughlin (1990), whereas Gu and Johnson disagreed (1996). Their study favored open communication over memorization. Perrin (1996) successfully taught students how to better memorize vocabulary, as did Mahous (1997).

Johnson and Steele (1996) found that monitoring student strategy choices had an impact on which strategies they chose. Roswell and Libben (1994) found that successful

learners talked to themselves and practiced all portions of their language verbally and regularly.

Hajer, et al. (1996) suggested that having the right print materials on strategy instruction would lead to better implementation of SBI. Not only the right instruction, but how it is presented, both to teachers and students, can affect whether and how it is followed in its implementation.

Strategy Teaching and Instructional Design

As described, the goal of SBI is to teach learners how to learn. Gagne, Briggs, and Wager (1992) write that “instructional design must be aimed at aiding the learning of the individual” (p. 4). As explained earlier, that has been an overriding assumption in learner-centered instruction and in the communicative approaches to language teaching. They go on to state that instruction should be designed “based on knowledge of how human beings learn.”

Gagne, et al., (1992) state that “all the stages in any instructional systems model can be categorized into one of three functions: (1) identifying the outcomes of the instruction, (2) developing the instruction, and (3) evaluating the effectiveness of the instruction” (p. 21). He further breaks these areas down into the following ten steps, following the model proposed by Dick and Carey (1990):

1. Identify instructional goals
2. Conduct needs analysis
3. Identify entry behaviors and characteristics
4. Write performance objectives
5. Develop criterion-referenced test items

6. Develop an instructional strategy
7. Develop and select instructional materials
8. Develop and conduct a formative evaluation
9. Revise instruction
10. Conduct summative evaluation

Gagne, et al., go on to explain that performance, or learning objectives, should be defined in terms of intellectual skills, cognitive strategy, motor skills, and attitudes.

In summary, a variety of sources argue that strategy based instruction leads to a broader use of a larger number of language learning strategies. A smaller number of studies have shown improvements in language learning outcomes as a result of training in language learning strategies, such as metacognition. As significant as these findings are, it seems surprising that more studies have not been conducted to support them and show that SBI can accelerate language learning.

MTC Pilot Study in SBI

In a pilot study conducted in the fall of 2002 it was shown that a prescribed, personalized, intensive approach to language strategy training may be the most promising method yet tried to help missionaries, particularly slower ones, to learn how to learn language. Twenty-five struggling missionaries were chosen, based on their difficulty in understanding grammar, learning vocabulary, and memorizing missionary presentations. One teacher was assigned to each missionary, and that teacher worked with him or her for ten days, one hour each day.

From among the many learning techniques often used by MTC missionaries, a few strategies were identified which have been more often employed by successful

missionary language learners to study their language (Ott, 1995). Over the years it had been observed that successful learners almost always did these things, while struggling learners usually lacked more than one of them in how they studied. These techniques were basic enough to be common to the varied strategies and approaches employed by missionaries and teachers with different learning or teaching styles.

The techniques included (a) focusing on meaning, (b) mimicking native pronunciation, (c) drilling, (d) reviewing, and (e) teaching and practicing in real situations. The teachers began by modeling these strategies individually on the first day, and then the missionaries would practice them repeatedly, imitating what they had seen the teachers do. Each day, the missionary was held more accountable than the day before for using the steps to learn lines of the missionary presentations. His teacher would first have him practice a single technique, immediately following the teacher model, with the teacher watching and giving feedback. Later, the missionary would be expected to use several of the techniques in succession, with the teacher watching. As time passed, the teacher would not always watch the missionary learn, but the teacher would always follow up, through a short performance evaluation, to see if the missionary had done what he had said he would do.

By the last day, the missionaries were shown to have increased their ability to memorize an average of 300% over what they had been doing before (Steinagel, 2003). A control group was shown to increase twenty-five percent during a comparable amount of time. Furthermore, there were indications that the group's grasp of grammatical structures had increased more than it would have (test scores increased from 39% to 58%, whereas the control group scores rose from 44% to 53%), and that their use of the

mission language to speak had increased as well (scores increased from 2.75 to 3.5, on a 1-4 scale, compared to 3.0 to 3.25 for the control). Their use of many language learning strategies had also increased, and they indicated that they felt they were more likely to succeed as missionaries following the treatment. The pilot study seemed to show that missionaries could be taught how to learn, using one specific set of prescribed strategies, and that other learning activities could be affected thereby in a positive way.

Summary of the Literature

In summary, research shows that L2 reading should be interactive, or a combination of schema and decoding approaches. Multiple studies have established a connection between reading and vocabulary acquisition, as well as improvements in reading comprehension. In addition, some argue that reading should be silent and for obtaining meaning, but others suggest that it should include practicing sounds, reading to present content, and reading to organize and produce outgoing messages (Brown 2001; Oxford 1990).

Studies focused on teaching reading as a means of improving other language skills, particularly speaking performance, have not been done before. The connection between oral reading and oral language proficiency is one which some experts question, at least if the reading material is beyond the language proficiency level of the learner. This is intriguing, in view of the astonishing numbers of successful L2 learners who are products of the LDS Missionary Training Center, and who claim that reading aloud was important for learning how to speak the language.

Reading aloud as a strategy for language acquisition nevertheless has some support in the literature, (Brown, 2001; Nunan, 1999; Ott, 1995; Oxford, 1990) as do several meta-

cognitive, cognitive, social and affective reading strategies. Research in language learning strategies has progressed from defining and listing learning strategies to identifying which ones are used, depending on both the learner and the learning activity. This has led to progress in finding which strategies correlate more highly with successful language learning. Efforts now focus on strategy based instruction, or teaching learners how to learn, but after much research the results are more mixed. Teaching learning strategies, particularly metacognition, or the organizing and planning of one's study and learning, has become the primary, albeit elusive goal of research in language learning strategies.

Nevertheless, much research indicates that reading plays a beneficial role in language acquisition, and there are several agreed-on strategies and techniques which appear to help some learners more than others. The most proven of these include reading frequently, reading silently as well as aloud, and reading something which the learner wants to read, as well as accessing background knowledge, decoding the written text based on structural knowledge of the language, and accessing other resources to help in the decoding. Other recurring successful strategies, based on the literature, include analyzing and looking for patterns, setting goals and organizing one's learning.

Context of the Study

As described earlier, the Missionary Training Center in Provo, Utah, currently encourages its missionary language learners, numbering more than 10,000 each year, to begin reading daily from one of its books of scripture no later than two months after language training begins. Furthermore, the learners are encouraged to read aloud. They receive very little training or information on how to read, including what skills or

strategies to use, or how to make the jump from beginner level language competency to being able to comprehend the text. They also do not receive any training to guide them as they practice their pronunciation and fluency by reading aloud.

In spite of these challenges, many new missionaries say that they want to and plan to read *The Book of Mormon* in the language, and many more later argue that the reading was very helpful in their language learning.

Research Hypotheses

This study will test the following hypotheses, based on the literature that has been reviewed and the rationale that has been presented for it:

1. Trainees who read aloud from *The Book of Mormon* for 30 minutes per day will have higher mean scores on the Missionary Speaking Performance Assessment, the Missionary Vocabulary Test, the Spanish Grammar Test, and the Spanish Reading Comprehension test, than trainees who do not read aloud.
2. Trainees who receive reading strategy training will have higher mean scores on the Missionary Vocabulary Test, the Spanish Grammar Test, the Spanish Reading Comprehension Test, and the Missionary Speaking Performance Assessment than trainees who do not receive reading strategy training.
3. Trainees who read aloud and receive strategy training will have higher mean scores on the Spanish Vocabulary Test, the Spanish Reading Comprehension Test, the Spanish Grammar Test, and the Missionary Speaking Performance Assessment, than trainees who receive strategy training but do not read aloud, or those who do not receive strategy training but do read aloud.

4. Trainees who read from *The Book of Mormon* for thirty minutes each day, regardless of whether the reading is silent or aloud, will have higher mean scores on the Missionary Vocabulary Test, the Spanish Reading Comprehension Test, the Spanish Grammar Test, and the Missionary Speaking Performance Assessment, than trainees who do not participate in such regular reading.

Chapter 3: Methodology and Design

Sample

The subjects of this study were 214 native English-speaking missionaries at the Missionary Training Center in Provo, Utah. They were selected from groups of missionaries assigned to learn Spanish, including the 123 missionaries entering the MTC on June 30, 2004, and the 91 arriving on July 14, 2004. All participating missionaries were assigned to beginner level Spanish classes, which are nine weeks in duration, and which terminate in the missionaries departing to serve in Spanish speaking countries or environments. All missionaries assigned to the beginner level classes either had had no prior Spanish language training, or they had not learned enough Spanish to communicate in the language, even at the most basic level. The missionaries ranged in age from 19 to 24. Twenty of the 230 missionaries were female.

Missionaries always receive their mission and training assignments in pairs, or companionships. Assignment to treatment groups were thus made by companionship, rather than by individual.

Design

The experimental design to be used in this study consisted of a 2 by 2 factorial plus a control group. Using a random numbers table, pairs of missionaries (companionships) were randomly assigned to one of the five experimental conditions shown in Figure 1.

	No Strategy Training	Strategy Training
Read Silently	Silent, No Strategy Group	Silent, Strategy Group
Read Aloud	Aloud, No Strategy Group	Aloud, Strategy Group

Control Group

Figure 1. Factorial Design and Control Group.

The two independent variables that made up the factorial design included (a) whether or not missionary trainees regularly read silently or aloud from the Spanish *Book of Mormon*, and (b) whether they received reading strategy training or not. The third independent variable of the study was whether or not learners read the Spanish *Book of Mormon*. For the purposes of this study, all of the missionary trainees in the factorial groups read the Spanish version. The trainees in the control group read the English *Book of Mormon*. Because it is central to the message they teach, all missionaries receive copies of the book upon arrival at the MTC.

For this study missionaries read 1 Nephi and 2 Nephi, which are the first two books, or sections, in *The Book of Mormon*. Missionaries were asked not to read the “Isaiah chapters,” since they contain more difficult text than what is found in the rest of *The Book of Mormon*. These excluded chapters consisted of chapters 20 and 21 of 1 Nephi and chapters 7, 8, and 12-24 of 2 Nephi. The missionaries who participated in this study were asked to skip these 17 chapters. But they were expected to read the other 20 chapters in 1 Nephi and the other 20 chapters in 2 Nephi.

All missionaries, except for those in the control group, were asked to read for thirty minutes each day from the Spanish *Book of Mormon*, during their unsupervised non-teacher time. Following an initial orientation, they were allowed to make their own choices about the best way to read, and how to negotiate the challenges that can arise when working through a more advanced L2 text.

The fifth group was the control group. They did not read *The Book of Mormon* during the designated thirty minutes of personal study time each day. These missionaries studied task vocabulary and task phrases used in teaching their doctrinal message. The missionaries had access to these words and phrases in Spanish task manuals which they used during their MTC training.

The first independent variable was reading mode. The two levels of reading mode were (a) read aloud and (b) read silently. Reading aloud was defined as reading with one's mouth moving, with the sound level varying between whispering and normal speaking.

The second independent variable was reading strategy training. The strategy instruction introduced techniques that missionaries should use during their reading to help in studying, comprehending, and learning to use the language in the text. A one-page document was provided which presented a short two paragraph rationale for learning strategically, followed by short segments describing how each of the following five strategies might be used:

1. Activating schema by looking for key words, phrases, or concepts that they already know

2. Looking for patterns and familiar grammatical structures in the structure of the phrases
3. Accessing meaning by using the native language text, and then using the dictionary if necessary to look up additional words
4. Organizing words and phrases for further study
5. Reading the text aloud to practice pronunciation, intonation and fluency (for the reading aloud group)

The sheet asked questions based on the ASWE technique to encourage strategy use.

ASWE is an acronym which comes from the four questions:

1. What am I trying to Accomplish?
2. What Strategy am I using?
3. Is it Working?
4. What Else could I use?

These questions already appear on the training document, *How to be a Better Language Learner*, which every missionary receives, although it is not currently referenced in any MTC training. Research by Ott (2000) and Kohler (2002) has shown that missionaries who ask themselves these questions regularly use a broader range of learning strategies, and they use them more frequently. See Appendix A for examples of the strategy training documents.

At the beginning of the fourth week of training, five separate test groups of approximately 45 missionaries each were given 30 scheduled minutes each day either to read *The Book of Mormon* in Spanish, or to study vocabulary and phrases.

In the read silent group, missionaries were instructed to read silently in the Spanish *Book of Mormon* for thirty minutes each day. In the read aloud group, missionaries were instructed to read aloud in the Spanish *Book of Mormon* for thirty minutes daily.

In the read silent with strategies group, missionaries received reading strategy training. On the first day of the treatment an instructor who was not the regular teacher of the missionaries explained and demonstrated five strategies for reading *The Book of Mormon*. A handout describing the strategies was given to the missionaries, who were instructed to practice the strategies using *The Book of Mormon*. The training lasted for thirty minutes.

Then beginning the second day, the missionaries began reading *The Book of Mormon* silently on their own. Once each week they were given a short strategy usage questionnaire which asked which strategies they were using, how often they used them, whether they were working, and if there were other strategies that they had tried or might try. The purpose of the questionnaire was to remind the missionaries to use the strategies listed on the strategy handout.

The read aloud with strategies group was the same as the previous group, except that the missionaries of this group were instructed to read aloud. The strategies that they were trained to use included a focus on pronunciation and fluency strategies. See Appendix A for an example of that strategy training.

Instrumentation

Missionary Speaking Performance Assessment. This measure yielded a series of five ratings of each missionary's speaking performance by their teacher. The five ratings included (a) pronunciation, (b) vocabulary, (c) grammar, (d) fluency, and (e) a global

rating of the missionary's overall ability to perform language tasks. The ratings were based on a seven-point scale, ranging from nonfunctional to proficient. The rating scales used are shown in Appendix B.

The ratings were analyzed separately to measure specific learning outcomes. In addition, they were combined to obtain an overall language performance rating. Four of the scales were the same as in the Missionary Language Performance Test (MLPT). The MLPT has been used with missionaries for many years to measure their speaking performance in completing specific missionary language tasks. The Missionary Speaking Performance Assessment included a new scale for fluency, which the MLPT did not assess.

Nevertheless, the MSPA was conducted in a similar way to the MLPT. Two trained language raters assessed each missionary's speaking ability during interviews that they held with them in Spanish. The interview focused on the missionary's performance of four randomly chosen tasks from a larger group of twenty-four tasks which surveys have shown that missionaries engage in the most often during their work. The context for each 3-5 minute situation was explained to the missionary, as well as the steps he or she must complete to successfully accomplish the task. The task was also described on a card which the missionary could refer to during the performance test. Sample situation cards are shown in Appendix B.

Missionary Vocabulary Test. A vocabulary acquisition test was constructed to measure the difference in vocabulary learned between those who read *The Book of Mormon* and those who do other vocabulary and phrase learning activities. It was made up of Spanish phrases in which one word had been removed and a blank left in its place.

To narrow the choices down to one contextually appropriate response, the first letters of the missing word were provided. The test was piloted with native Spanish speaking missionaries first, and it was adjusted until they could answer all questions on the test.

Missionaries were asked to provide the correct Spanish word to complete each of the phrases. The following is an example:

Por la ca_____ de Adán, Jesu Cristo tenía que venir al mundo.

Translation: Because of the fa_____ of Adam, Jesús Christ had to come to the Earth.

Answer: caída (fall)

The words for the test were chosen from two databases. One was the list of all words appearing in the first two books of *The Book of Mormon* (except for the Isaiah chapters). The other was the current vocabulary list for the Spanish technology assisted language learning (TALL) program at the MTC. Words occurring only once were eliminated, and the remaining words were stratified by frequency of occurrence in the databases. One word was randomly chosen out of every 45 words, resulting in a test with 86 items. Words occurring in both databases were not chosen, so that the words learned by those reading, as oppose to those who did not read, could be differentiated. See Appendix C for the complete test.

Spanish Reading Comprehension Test. This test measured improvement in the missionaries' ability to understand and respond to written Spanish text. It used a transcription of the Spanish Listening Comprehension Test currently used at the MTC.

The missionaries were given twenty situations in Spanish, and they had to answer one English multiple choice question about each situation. The following sample test item was taken from the Spanish Reading Comprehension Test found in Appendix D:

Situation #1

MISIONERO:

El segundo principio del evangelio es el arrepentimiento. Al arrepentirnos nosotros admitimos ante diós que hemos hecho mal. Sentimos dolor por causa de nuestros pecados. Dejamos de hacer las cosas que estuvieron mal, y tratamos de corregir cualquier problemas que hayamos causado. Señor Alfreir, por lo que hemos dicho, ¿qué significa para usted el arrepentimiento de nuestros pecados?

INVESTIGADOR:

Significa dejar de hacer las cosas que no son buenas que diós quiere que no hagamos.

MISIONERO:

Está bien. ¿Cómo se siente usted personalmente acerca de este principio?

INVESTIGADOR:

Creo que lo que pasa es que uno no puede parar de hacer las cosas que son malas. A mí me gustaría por ejemplo dejar de tomar, pero, estaba tomando por años. Yo sé que no es bueno, pero he tratado de parar muchas veces, y no he podido.

What should the missionary do now?

- A. Help the person resolve a problem or concern
- B. Follow up on a previous commitment
- C. Continue with the discussion
- D. Talk about common beliefs
- E. Identify the presence of the Spirit

When the missionaries had completed the Spanish test, they were given the same test in English, but with the test items reordered. The scores obtained for the English test

items account for any variance that is due to non-language factors, such as missionary situational knowledge.

Spanish Grammar Test. This test measured grammatical knowledge. It is a fifty-item multiple-choice test. It is based on and covers most of the basic level Spanish grammar currently taught at the MTC. Like the vocabulary test, the items contain a phrase with one word missing. A translation of the phrase is provided, so that the missionary can see which grammatical form is required for a correct response. Four choices are provided, and the missionary chooses one of them. The following is a typical question. The complete test is found in Appendix E.

- | | |
|-----------------------------------------------------|-------------|
| Mateo: _____, élderes. Acabo de llegar del trabajo. | a. Entran |
| <u>Come in</u> , elders, I just got home from work. | b. Entren |
| | c. Entre |
| | d. Entramos |

Strategy usage questionnaire. This short questionnaire asked missionaries which strategies they had been using in the previous week during their reading time. It first asked which strategies they were using from the strategy training, and then what new strategies they had come up with. It then asked the missionaries if the strategies were working and if there was anything else that they might try. The questions appearing on the questionnaire are listed below:

1. Which of the strategies from the training have you used this past week?
2. Which of these have seemed most helpful?
3. What other strategies have you tried?
4. Are these additional strategies working?

5. Is what you are doing sufficient? If not, what else might you try to do?

A sample questionnaire can be found in Appendix F.

Missionary reading self-report. To help confirm whether and how much missionaries did or did not read during the study, all groups were given a questionnaire at the end of the study to determine how frequently and how regularly they actually read from the Spanish Book of Mormon, including days they were not monitored, such as Sundays. The questionnaire also helped to determine if members of the control group read the Spanish Book of Mormon during the study, and if missionaries assigned to read silently read aloud as well. See Appendix G for an example of this questionnaire.

Background questionnaire. Missionaries were asked about their educational background, their previous language experience, grades earned in school, and other biographical information such as age and gender. These data were compared with their responses on the dependent measures to help see what other factors might affect their performance scores, and to help the researchers understand why reading seems to help some missionaries more than others. The intent was that if the data indicated significant influence from one or more of these variables, these variables could be accounted for in the statistical model.

Other factors which could affect performance included previous training in Spanish and other language learning experience. Although the missionary groups were in beginner level classes, the classes included some missionaries who had had up to three years of Spanish instruction in high school and possibly one semester in college. The Spanish of incoming missionaries' typically lies evenly along a continuum, ranging from no Spanish to some Spanish. This is because there are only three language proficiency

levels for Spanish in the MTC, beginning, intermediate, and advanced, and each level is based on conversational ability, not vocabulary or grammar knowledge.

Other factors included average grades earned in language courses, number of years of college completed, or amount of any previous language studied. The intent was to control for each of these, especially if the groups were not equally balanced for these variables.

These variables were measured via the background questionnaire. See Appendix H for an example of this questionnaire.

Procedure

Before the treatments began, the teachers of the missionaries included in the study were given instruction not to encourage their missionaries to read the Spanish Book of Mormon before the beginning of the test. They were also asked not to discuss the study with their missionaries as a group until the last week, when the purposes of the study would be shared with them. They were asked to help encourage their missionaries not to discuss the study outside their companionships or treatment rooms either. Missionaries then completed the background questionnaire and consent forms in their classrooms during that week prior to the beginning of the treatment.

The treatment began on Monday, the beginning of the fourth week of Spanish language training. During the previous week, the missionary companionships were assigned randomly to one of five treatment rooms, and they were asked to report to the room assigned to that treatment group each day at a time they chose. The regular teachers of the missionary groups were not present during the daily reading time. On the first day and throughout the first week, the researcher or his assistant was present in or outside the treatment rooms to help the missionaries to stay on task and to log missionaries in and

out, to assure that they were reporting in each day. In the two strategy training rooms, training was held at specified times throughout the first day, and missionaries in those groups were asked to come on the first day during one of those times.

The missionaries were regularly monitored to be sure they remained in the treatment rooms and remained on task, and so that they did not discuss the treatment in the hallway. Each week the strategy usage questionnaire was given to the two strategy treatment groups. No pre-tests were administered to the five treatment groups, since the missionaries were assigned randomly to their treatment groups. All missionaries were instructed to read *The Book of Mormon* in their native language for thirty minutes each day, just as all MTC missionaries do. The missionaries were monitored frequently throughout the five weeks of treatment, similar to the manner in which they were monitored the first week.

During the ninth week, all missionaries were given the Missionary Vocabulary Test, the Spanish Reading Comprehension Test, the Spanish Grammar Test, the Missionary Speaking Performance Assessment, and the Language Learning Strategies Questionnaire. All missionaries completed the Missionary Reading Self-Report as well.

When the study was completed, the missionaries were told the purposes of the study, and they were encouraged to read the Spanish Book of Mormon after the MTC.

Chapter 4: Results

This chapter will present the results of the two month study which tested the following hypotheses:

1. Trainees who read aloud from *The Book of Mormon* for 30 minutes per day will have higher mean scores on the Missionary Speaking Performance Assessment, the Missionary Vocabulary Test, the Spanish Grammar Test, and the Spanish Reading Comprehension test, than trainees who do not read aloud.
2. Trainees who receive reading strategy training will have higher mean scores on the Missionary Vocabulary Test, the Spanish Grammar Test, the Spanish Reading Comprehension Test, and the Missionary Speaking Performance Assessment than trainees who do not receive reading strategy training.
3. Trainees who read aloud and receive strategy training will have higher mean scores on the Spanish Vocabulary Test, the Spanish Reading Comprehension Test, the Spanish Grammar Test, and the Missionary Speaking Performance Assessment, than trainees who receive strategy training but do not read aloud, or those who do not receive strategy training but do read aloud.
4. Trainees who read from *The Book of Mormon* for thirty minutes each day, regardless of whether the reading is silent or aloud, will have higher mean scores on the Missionary Vocabulary Test, the Spanish Reading Comprehension Test, the Spanish Grammar Test, and the Missionary Speaking Performance Assessment, than trainees who do not participate in such regular reading.

A series of univariate, two-by-two factorial analyses of variance (ANOVA) were performed on the data obtained from each of the language learning outcome tests. The ANOVA tested for the main and interaction effects of the independent variables on the various dependent variables. Following the ANOVA tests, *t*-tests were performed comparing the weighted, grand mean of the four experimental groups with the mean of the control group, in order to investigate the general effect of reading on language learning.

The results of the ANOVA tests revealed no significant main or interaction effects on any of the dependent variables that would support the first three hypotheses. There was no observable effect to support the first hypothesis of reading aloud versus reading silently on language performance. There was no observable effect to support the second hypothesis of reading strategy training on language knowledge and performance. There was also no observable interaction effect of reading aloud and reading strategy training on language knowledge and performance in support of the third hypothesis. However, the fourth hypothesis was supported. An effect for reading in the language was found, when compared to those who did not read in the language. A more detailed analysis of the data by dependent variable will now be presented.

Missionary Speaking Performance Assessment

The Missionary Speaking Performance Assessment was used to measure speaking ability in language tasks. The descriptive statistics for the Missionary Speaking Performance Assessment are reported in Table 1. The mean speaking performance score for the read aloud groups was 4.00, while the mean for the read silent groups was 3.82.

While the two groups who read out loud scored slightly higher than the two groups which read silently, the reading mode main effect was not significant, $F(1, 165) = .58, p = .44$.

The mean score for strategy training was 3.87, while the mean score for no strategy training was 3.96. However, the main effect for strategy use was not significant, $F(1, 165) = 2.00, p = .16$. Thus, there were no significant differences between groups who received reading strategy training and those who did not receive it on the Missionary Speaking Performance Assessment.

Table 1

Descriptive Statistics for the Factorial Groups on the Missionary Speaking Performance Assessment

	No Strategy Training	Strategy Training	Combined
Read Silently	M = 3.81 SD = 0.88 n = 42	M = 3.83 SD = 0.83 n = 41	M = 3.82 SD = 0.83 n = 83
Read Aloud	M = 4.12 SD = 0.75 n = 39	M = 3.90 SD = 0.66 n = 43	M = 4.00 SD = 0.71 n = 82
Combined	M = 3.96 SD = 0.81 n = 81	M = 3.87 SD = 0.72 n = 84	M = 3.82 SD = 0.83 n = 165

The interaction effect of reading strategy training and reading aloud on speaking performance as measured by the Missionary Speaking Performance Assessment was not significant, $F(1, 165) = .84, p = .36$. In the Missionary Speaking Performance

Assessment, each treatment group included outliers. In each case, the outliers were found to have had significant language training in Spanish before entering the Missionary Training Center. This previous language training may be one of the causes for the variance observed in the scores within each group. The MTC attempts to control for pre-missionary language training through the speaking evaluation described in chapter four, but occasionally some low-intermediate or high-beginner level missionaries are placed in the beginner Spanish classes. Thus, students in these classes are usually spread over a range of ability, rather than representing the same level of proficiency.

The number of missionaries who participated in this assessment was lower than the number of those who participated in the other tests. The Missionary Speaking Performance Assessment was given after the other three tests, and in the interim, nine of the 212 missionaries unexpectedly departed the MTC for their infield assignments.

Spanish Grammar Test

The Spanish Grammar Test was used to measure the effect of reading aloud on language performance, particularly speaking accuracy. The descriptive statistics for the Spanish Grammar Test shown in Table 2 reveal that the means for the four groups were very similar. There was a slight difference between the read aloud groups and the read silent groups. The mean grammar score for the read aloud groups was 64.29, while the mean for the read silent groups was 63.59. The groups which received no strategy training scored slightly higher than those who received reading strategy training. The reading mode and strategy use main effects, and the interaction between them were not significant, $F(1, 164) = .28, p = .60$, $F(1, 164) = .04, p = .84$, and $F(1, 164) = .00, p = .96$,

respectively. These results do not support the hypothesis that trainees who receive strategy training would perform better on language knowledge and performance, as measured by the Spanish Grammar Test than those who do not receive it. They also do not support the hypothesis that trainees who read aloud would perform better on the test. Finally, the results do not support the hypothesis that there would be a positive interaction between reading aloud and strategy training, as measured by the Spanish Grammar Test.

Table 2

Descriptive Statistics for the Factorial Groups on the Spanish Grammar Test

	No Strategy Training	Strategy Training	Combined
Read Silently	M = 64.21 SD = 16.94 n = 39	M = 62.95 SD = 17.33 n = 44	M = 63.59 SD = 17.12 n = 83
Read Aloud	M = 65.3 SD = 16.2 n = 40	M = 63.37 SD = 16.14 n = 41	M = 64.29 SD = 16.17 n = 81
Combined	M = 64.74 SD = 16.57 n = 79	M = 63.17 SD = 16.75 n = 85	M = 64.64 SD = 16.68 n = 164

The variance within treatment groups was very high again, when compared with the differences between the group means. However, a comparison of the range of scores in each of the groups shows similar high and low scores.

Missionary Vocabulary Test

The Missionary Vocabulary Test was used to measure the effect of reading aloud on number of new words learned. The descriptive statistics for the Missionary Vocabulary Test shown in Table 3 reveal that the means for the four groups were similar. There was a slight difference between the read aloud groups and the read silent groups and between the strategy training and the no strategy training groups. The mean vocabulary score for the read aloud groups was 19.83, while the mean for the read silent groups was 19.05. The groups which received no strategy training scored slightly higher than those who received reading strategy training. The reading mode and strategy use main effects, and the interaction between them were not significant, $F(1, 164) = .21, p = .64$, $F(1, 164) = .16, p = .69$, and $F(1, 164) = .01, p = .93$, respectively. These results do not support the hypothesis that trainees who receive strategy training would perform better on language knowledge and performance, as measured by the Missionary Vocabulary Test than those who do not receive it. They also do not support the hypothesis that trainees who read aloud would perform better on the test. Finally, the results do not support the hypothesis that there would be a positive interaction between reading aloud and strategy training, as measured by the Missionary Vocabulary Test.

As with the scores of the Missionary Speaking Performance Assessment, the highest vocabulary scores in each group included significant outliers. Background information on the missionaries who received these scores again showed that the greatest outliers in each group had studied Spanish at least two years before coming to the MTC and in every case but one they had earned an A grade in those classes. Most of the missionaries in the study had not studied Spanish, or if they had, they did not earn an A grade in their classes.

Table 3

Descriptive Statistics for the Factorial Groups on the Missionary Vocabulary Test

	No Strategy Training	Strategy Training	Combined
Read Silently	M = 19.14 SD = 11.17 n = 42	M = 18.96 SD = 9.93 n = 45	M = 19.05 SD = 10.53 n = 87
Read Aloud	M = 20.75 SD = 13.32 n = 36	M = 19.11 SD = 11.25 n = 46	M = 19.83 SD = 12.13 n = 82
Combined	M = 19.88 SD = 12.11 n = 78	M = 19.03 SD = 10.6 n = 91	M = 19.43 SD = 11.33 n = 169

Spanish Reading Comprehension Test

The Spanish Reading Comprehension Test measured the effect of reading aloud on L2 comprehension. The mean scores were obtained by eliminating any of the English items that the missionaries missed, and then finding the percentage of those items that the missionaries answered correctly in the Spanish section of the test. There was no significant difference between the read aloud groups and the read silent groups and between the strategy training and the no strategy training groups. The mean comprehension score for the read aloud groups was .76 (76% of test items answered correctly), while the mean for the read silent groups was .74. The groups which received no strategy training scored slightly higher (.76) than those who received reading strategy training (.74), as shown in Table 4. The reading mode and strategy use main effects, and the interaction between them were not significant, $F(1, 173) = 1.43, p = .23$, $F(1, 173) = .05, p = .48$, and $F(1, 173) = .23, p = .63$, respectively. These results do not support the

hypothesis that reading comprehension improves with reading strategy training, as measured by the Spanish Reading Comprehension Test than those who do not receive it. They also do not support the hypothesis that trainees who read aloud would perform better on the test. Finally, the results do not support the hypothesis that there would be a positive interaction between reading aloud and strategy training, as measured by the Spanish Reading Comprehension Test.

Table 4

Descriptive Statistics for the Factorial Groups on the Reading Comprehension Test

	No Strategy Training	Strategy Training	Combined
Read Silently	M = 0.75 SD = 0.19 n = 44	M = 0.73 SD = 0.18 n = 43	M = 0.74 SD = 0.18 n = 87
Read Aloud	M = 0.78 SD = 0.16 n = 41	M = 0.74 SD = 0.17 n = 45	M = 0.76 SD = 0.17 n = 86
Combined	M = 0.76 SD = 0.18 n = 85	M = 0.74 SD = 0.17 n = 88	M = 0.75 SD = 0.175 n = 173

Hypothesis 4: Effect of Reading on Language Knowledge and Performance

To test the fourth hypothesis, a two sample *t*-test was performed, comparing the mean of the pooled treatment groups and the mean of the control group for each of the following dependent variables: the Missionary Vocabulary Test, the Spanish Reading Comprehension Test, and the Missionary Speaking Performance Assessment.

Table 5 shows the descriptive statistics for each test. For the Missionary Vocabulary Test, a comparison of the means of the two samples yielded a t value of 2.01 and a p value of .046. The t -test shows a significant difference between the pooled treatment groups and the control group, thus suggesting that reading *The Book of Mormon* each day in a second language can increase vocabulary learning. This t -test supports the fourth hypothesis of the study.

Table 5

Descriptive Statistics for Pooled Treatment Groups and Control Groups

<i>Missionary Vocabulary Test</i>					
Group	N	Mean	SD	t value	p value
Treatment	169	19.43	11.30	2.01	.046
Control	38	15.53	8.27		
<i>Spanish Reading Comprehension Test</i>					
Group	N	Mean	SD	t value	p value
Treatment	172	0.75	0.18	1.48	.14
Control	39	0.70	0.18		
<i>Missionary Speaking Performance Assessment</i>					
Group	N	Mean	SD	t value	p value
Treatment	165	3.91	0.77	.65	.52
Control	37	4.01	0.86		

The same statistical procedure was used for the Spanish Reading Comprehension Test and the Missionary Speaking Performance Assessment. No significant difference was found between the samples with either test.

In summary, each of four instruments were used to test the four hypotheses of this study. With the first three hypotheses, no significant difference was found between the treatment groups and any other groups. With the final hypothesis, however, a significant difference was found. In this study missionaries who read daily in an advanced second language text learned more vocabulary words than missionaries who did not read.

Chapter 5: Discussion

As shown in Chapter 2, studies which investigate the effect of reading in the second language on language knowledge and performance have traditionally focused on improvements in vocabulary acquisition and reading comprehension. Most efforts to have second language learners read more and to teach them reading strategies have been undertaken so that those learners can read better. Studies show that they can improve comprehension and retain what they read. Interestingly, this study did not support the notion that reading more leads to improvements in reading comprehension.

Approximately 20,000 new LDS missionaries begin learning a second language throughout the world each year. For many years these missionaries have been encouraged to read *The Book of Mormon* regularly in the target language, so that they can improve their knowledge of and performance in using that language. Hundreds of missionary trainers tell them that they will speak better if they will read aloud daily.

This study investigated what the effect of daily reading from an advanced second language text would be on the language knowledge and performance of beginner learners of that language. The researcher hypothesized that such reading would have a significant effect on both knowledge and performance. It was further hypothesized that reading aloud, the benefit of which is still debated in second language reading literature, would be more beneficial than reading silently, and that receiving reading strategy training would also have a significant effect, both on second language knowledge and performance.

The results of this study support the hypothesis that reading *The Book of Mormon* each day in a second language can increase vocabulary learning. However, none of the

other hypotheses were supported. Before any conclusion can be made, however, the following questions must be addressed:

1. Were the hypotheses of the study justified by the literature?
2. Were the treatments implemented according to the design of the study?
3. Was there sufficient reliability in the measures of the variables?
4. Did the design of the study have sufficient power to detect a difference if it existed?

Each of these questions will now be addressed in turn.

Research Hypotheses

The research hypotheses of this study are based on two bodies of opinion. First, while the largest number of reading studies in second language acquisition do not focus on the effect of reading on speaking performance, they do examine its influence on one or more of the four skills (reading, writing, speaking, and listening). These skills cannot be viewed simply as isolated knowledge or performance areas, since the content in each of them can be and is regularly accessed in each of the other areas, whether a person is speaking, listening, reading or writing. Furthermore, many sources suggest that reading aloud for speaking practice is a valid language learning strategy and activity.

The second point of view is the accumulated language learning experience and instructional approach used at the Missionary Training Center located in Provo, Utah. The center has functioned for over forty years, training nearly one half million second language learners during that time. As noteworthy as that number is, a remarkable portion of those learners, estimated at higher than eighty percent, leave the center and soon perform at a functional level in their assigned language.

Teachers and trainers in the MTC regularly encourage missionaries to read aloud from *The Book of Mormon* in the target language, telling them that it will have a significant positive effect on their language speaking ability. Furthermore, these trainers believe they speak from their own experience. In addition, printed instructional materials support and encourage the trainers' conclusions that reading aloud is essential for second language improvement (The Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints, 2004, p. 130).

Based on these opinions, this study was undertaken to investigate the possible influence of reading on speaking. Many trainers at the Missionary Training Center have made decisions based on the assumption that such reading was essential for missionaries to learn their language appropriately. The question thus needed to be investigated.

Treatment Implementation

The first question in implementing the treatments is this: did the missionaries assigned to each treatment group participate in the treatments as described? The answer to this question is yes. The treatments were carried out throughout the day, from 7:00 a.m. to 10:00 p.m., Monday through Saturday for seven weeks. During the first week researchers monitored the treatment rooms constantly as the missionaries reported to the rooms and signed in and out. They were observed regularly, and surprisingly few times were they not on task, reading, or learning phrases if they were the control group. During subsequent weeks the missionaries in the treatment rooms were observed often, at random times, and the results were the same. The sign-in logs were checked regularly, and few missionaries were ever absent, and those absences which did occur were random and spread equally across all groups.

The missionaries completed the tasks as assigned all of the times that they were observed. Those observations numbered more than 300.

The second question is whether the missionaries did anything outside of the study which might have clouded the effect of the treatments. For example, did those assigned to read silently also read aloud on the side? Did those in the control group do reading as well? Did the teachers of the missionaries influence how they did their reading during the treatments?

A survey was administered at the end of the study to assess how much missionaries may have read the Spanish *Book of Mormon* outside the study. Approximately half of the missionaries from each group indicated that they had read the Spanish Book of Mormon outside of the study, averaging 49 minutes per week of reading, when compared with the 180 minutes per week read by those in the reading treatment groups. An analysis of covariance was performed to see whether reading outside the study covaried with the Missionary Vocabulary Test scores.

The analysis of covariance indicated that vocabulary scores and reading outside the study do not covary significantly. The R-square value is only .03, suggesting that 97% of the variance in the vocabulary scores is not due to reading outside the study.

The teachers of the missionaries agreed not to dispute or alter the instructions the missionaries were given for their specific treatment. This agreement was important, since before the study began most of the teachers said they felt strongly that all of the missionaries should be reading aloud from the Spanish *Book of Mormon* as soon as possible. Before the study most of them had habitually told missionaries that they should

begin reading the day they arrived at the training center, in spite of the fact that those missionaries might not have studied any Spanish before.

Whether the teachers kept to their agreement was difficult, if not impossible, to determine directly. What was much easier was to observe the missionaries during the treatments and note that they seemed to be doing what they had been instructed to do. They stayed on task and conversed or became distracted only rarely. In short, they appeared to take the study seriously.

Two additional questions should be raised and addressed in future studies which look for a connection between reading and speaking. First, does the influence of reading on speaking vary with when the reading begins? Could a learner, such as the missionaries in this study, have benefited more by waiting several more weeks or months before beginning reading? The question of using such an advanced text as *The Book of Mormon* for beginner learners is a valid one, although the missionaries used their English translations constantly, and they often said that they enjoyed the reading activity.

The second question relates to the percentage of daily language study time that was spent participating in the treatments. Thirty minutes each day may be a significant amount of reading for a person who studies only an hour a day, but what about those who study for eight or ten hours each day? It may be that a more significant difference could be detected if test subjects had been used who engaged in only one hour of language study each day.

A final question concerns the daily language learning activity of the control group. The missionaries in this group spent thirty minutes each day studying lists of Spanish words and phrases that are used in their teaching. These missionaries were often observed

to be reciting, memorizing, and otherwise practicing their language during the study. They worked consistently and actively to learn each day, as if theirs was the treatment which should have the greatest effect. So the question is this: how much more helpful should reading in a second language be in comparison to reading, practicing, memorizing, and verbally reciting useful words and phrases? If the control group activity was as helpful for language learning as it may have been, then was it realistic to expect the reading treatments to result in effects which exceeded those of the control group? There may not be a way to answer this question from the data of this study, but it is one that should be considered when designing similar future studies.

Reliability

To evaluate the reliability of the test instruments used in the study, an estimate of internal consistency was obtained for each of them. The formula used was Cronbach's Coefficient Alpha. The estimates were .93 for the Missionary Vocabulary Test, .89 for the Reading Comprehension Test, and .87 for the Spanish Grammar Test. They appear to be within the acceptable range for internal consistency.

Power

A power analysis was performed on the research design to be sure that any significant difference could be observed, if it existed. It was desirable to obtain a power rating of 0.8. When the analysis was performed, it was determined that the study needed 180 total subjects in order to achieve the 0.8 rating. As 214 subjects were used, the study seemed to have sufficient power to detect any significant treatment effects. Higher ratings could have been achieved with larger numbers (for example: 230 for a rating of 0.9, and 280 for a rating of 0.95).

The question of power relates to whether a significant difference exists which was not detected. The power analysis implied that this was not so. It should be noted, however, that significant, but unmeasurable differences might not be picked up by the measurement instruments. What if the full impact of the reading was not observable after five weeks, but only after several months?

Limitations

This study was limited to beginner level second language learners between the ages of 19 and 26. Learners of this age group are younger than many of the adult learners who are included in reading studies, but older than adolescent or child learners. Any inferences or comparisons should be made with those limitations in mind.

The Book of Mormon is a text which was noticeably familiar to the test subjects. While it was a relatively advanced language text, it was more accessible to the learners because of this familiarity. The learners also had access to an English language translation of the text, so working out the meaning of the unfamiliar grammar and words was less difficult than it might have been.

The amount of time the missionaries spent studying the language each day should be considered when concluding that reading aloud has little or no effect on speaking or language knowledge. The 214 missionaries who participated in this study were engaged in many speaking activities throughout the day, and they were encouraged constantly by those around them to speak in the language as much as they could. These variables should either be acknowledged and accounted for, or carefully controlled for, if not eliminated in future studies.

In addition to time spent speaking, the approach to learning Spanish at the MTC, as well as the learning resources the missionaries accessed, may have affected the test outcomes. Missionaries not only spend six hours each day with their Spanish speaking teachers, but they also have access to other resource centers and language laboratories where they can speak with or hear speakers of native Spanish. On the other hand, missionaries spend between a third and a half of their time studying non-language content, or content that is presented to them in their native language. In that respect they may be more similar to college-age language students who take multiple classes on a second language at the same time.

Inferences made about reading in languages other than Spanish must take into account that Spanish is a less difficult language for English speakers to learn and an easier language for English speakers to read when they learn it. The benefit, or the lack thereof, of reading daily in Spanish may not carry over to languages with different structures or orthographies.

The lack of any effect of reading strategy training on language knowledge or speaking performance was evident in each of the dependent variables. Much interest has been shown recently in metacognitive language learning strategy training. The metacognitive training provided in this study may not have been robust enough, however. It appears from this study that for learning strategy training to be effective, it must be more prominent, with more than just an initial thirty minutes of training and a weekly questionnaire. Perhaps it should be even more embedded in the curriculum. Missionaries may need to practice with the strategies more, using them in context. There may need to be more follow-up training or one-on-one time between trainers and trainees. The

Missionary Training Center should keep this in mind as it begins to develop new materials for language learning strategy training.

Recommendations

A follow-up study should be performed with students who could spend a larger percentage of their study time reading. For example, changing half of what students spend their time studying, in exchange for another activity, should show a greater effect than changing only 5% study activity for another, as was done in the study.

A similar reading study could be performed with missionaries who have studied their language for several months. Once missionaries leave the MTC they study their language far less, usually less than an hour each day. They could spend thirty minutes of that time reading. The study could track the learners for a longer period, such as six months, and then administer similar tests to those used in this study.

As mentioned, the examination of language learning strategy training could be improved in future studies. The strategy training that the learners received in this study was limited to the first day of the treatments. Although the missionaries filled in a strategy usage survey each week, the overall amount of their strategy training was minor. This should be increased in future studies. If learners could be trained more often, then their teachers could monitor their strategy use, and help them to apply strategies effectively. Learners' attention could be focused on evaluating their learning strategies each day, instead of each week, as long as their reading time was not affected, then a stronger effect for strategy training might be observed.

Conclusion

The purpose of this study was to look at the effect of reading aloud in a second language on speaking that language. It was hypothesized that reading aloud would improve learners' ability to speak, and that reading in general would improve learners' knowledge of the second language. It was further hypothesized that those who read and who received strategy training would achieve higher scores on second language knowledge and performance tests.

Some support for reading in the second language was found in this study. It was not shown, however, that reading aloud is more helpful than reading silently, nor was it discovered that reading strategy training like that performed historically at the MTC is particularly helpful. The test subjects did not show significant improvement as measured by most of the instruments. The groups who read aloud did not show greater grammar scores, greater reading comprehension scores, and they did not show greater language speaking performance scores. The results were the same for differences between those who read and those who did not, and between those who received strategy training and those who did not. In every case except for vocabulary, there was no significant difference.

On the other hand, second language vocabulary study and acquisition makes up a large part of the task and cognitive load of L2 learning. This study did show that reading daily in an advanced text leads to improved vocabulary learning. It may be assumed then that if vocabulary learning is a primary objective for L2 learners or language learning institutions, then reading might be one of the activities to include in the curriculum or in personal language learning activities.

Sentiment about the value of reading *The Book of Mormon* at the MTC runs strong. While the groups who read did not show significant speaking improvement, when compared to the missionaries who did not read, the fact that they kept up with the control group, which studied Spanish phrases for thirty minutes each day, suggests that daily reading is as helpful for speaking or learning grammar, as studying phrases is.

Therefore it is not recommended that reading in the second language be discontinued. It is instead recommended that further efforts be made to determine how and when to have learners such as missionaries read, and how much to have them read. At what point they begin their reading seems a particularly important question.

The knowledge gained from this study is important. It should help to dispel the growing notion that missionaries must begin reading an advanced text as soon as they begin studying their language. It should also show missionary trainers that reading aloud may not be the panacea that they claim it is. On the other hand, many missionaries in the study claimed after only two weeks in the treatments that their reading had become much easier and that they were enjoying it more. This may suggest that significant doses of daily reading do help someone to feel comfortable performing the act of reading aloud, which for missionaries is a task they perform every day in the field. That alone may be reason not only to continue reading as a language learning activity, but to plan further research into how best to use reading as a language learning strategy.

References

- Alderson, J. C. (1984). Reading in a foreign language: A reading or a language problem? In Alderson, J. C., & Urquart, A. H. (Eds.), *Reading in a foreign language* (pp. 1-24). London: Longman Publishers.
- Allen, J. S. (1997). Potato barrels, animal traps, birth control and unicorns: re-visioning teaching and learning in English classes. *English Teacher's Journal*, 51, 30-34.
- Anderson, N. J. (1991). Individual differences in strategy use in second language reading and testing. *Modern Language Journal*, 75, 460-472.
- Anderson, N. J. (2002). The role of metacognition in second/foreign language teaching and learning. *ERIC Digest*. Washington, D.C.: ERIC Clearinghouse on Languages and Linguistics.
- Anderson, N. J. (2003). Teaching reading. In D. Nunan (Ed.), *Practical English language teaching* (pp. 67-86). New York: McGraw Hill Publishers.
- Anderson, N. J. (2005). L2 strategy research. In E. Hinkel (Ed.), *Handbook of research in second language teaching and learning* (pp. 757-772). Mahwah, N.J.: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Anderson, N. J. & Vandergrift, L. (1996). Increasing metacognitive awareness in the L2 Classroom by using think-aloud protocols and other verbal report formats. In R. L. Oxford (Ed.), *Language learning strategies around the world: Cross-cultural perspectives* (pp. 3-18). Honolulu, HI: University of Hawaii Press.

- Baily, C. (1996). Unobtrusive computerized observation of compensation strategies for writing to determine the effectiveness of strategy instruction. In R. L. Oxford (Ed.), *Language learning strategies around the world: Cross-cultural perspectives* (pp. 141-150). Honolulu, HI: University of Hawaii Press.
- Bailey, K. M., & Nunan, D. (2000). *Voices from the language classroom*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Bedell, D. A., & Oxford, R. L. (1996). Cross-cultural comparisons of language learning strategies in the People's Republic of China and other countries. In R. L. Oxford (Ed.), *Language learning strategies around the world: Cross-cultural perspectives* (pp. 47-60). Honolulu, HI: University of Hawaii Press.
- Black, J. H. (1993). Learning and reception strategy use and the cloze procedure. *Canadian Modern Language Review*, 49, 418-445.
- Blaise, D. J. (1966). *A study of the problems encountered by modern foreign language teachers changing from a grammar approach to the audio-lingual approach*. Unpublished master's thesis. Brigham Young University, Provo, Utah.
- Bou Franch, P. (1995). Reflection on communication and learning strategies: the university student of English. *Quaderns de Filologia: Estudis Linguistics*, 1, 165-183.
- Bower, G. H., & Hilgard, E R. (1981). *Theories of Learning*. Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice Hall.
- Bransford, J. D., Brown, A. L., & Cocking, R. R. (2000). *How people learn: Brain, mind, experience, and school*. Washington, D.C.: National Academy Press.

- Braxton, M. A. (1999). *Adult ESL language learening strategies: Case studies of preferred learning styles and perceived cultural influences in academic listening tasks*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation. Ohio State University.
- Bremner, S. (1997). Language learning strategies and language proficiency: causes or outcomes? *Perspectives*, 9, 6-35.
- Bremner, S. (1999). Language learning strategies and language proficiency: investigating the relationship in Hong Kong. *Canadian Modern Language Review*, 55, 490-514.
- Brown, H. D. (2001). *Teaching by principles: An interactive approach to language pedagogy*. New York: Addison Wesley Longman.
- Brown, H. D. (2002). *Strategies for success: A practical guide to learning English*. White Plains, N.Y.: Longman.
- Brown, K. and Terdal, M. (1994). Through the looking glass: preservice teacher reflections on prior language learning experiences. *CATESOL Journal*, 7, 27-39.
- Byrd, E. H., Carter, E. C., & Waddoups, S. D. (2001). *Taking control of your college reading and learning*. Orlando, FL: Harcourt College Publishers.
- Celce-Murcia, M., Dornyei, Z., & Thurrell, S. (1997). Direct approaches in L2 instruction: a turning point in communicative language teaching? *TESOL Quarterly*, 31, 141-52.
- Celce-Murcia, M. (1998). Discourse analysis and grammar instruction. In D. D. Oaks (Ed.), *Linguistics at work: A reader of applications* (pp. 687-704). Fort Worth, TX: Harcourt Brace.

- Chaudron, C. (2001). Progress in language classroom research: evidence from The Modern Language Journal. *The Modern Language Journal*, 85, 57-76.
- Chamot, A. U. (1987). *A study of learning strategies in foreign language instruction: First year report*. Rosslyn, VA: Interstate Research Associates.
- Chamot, A. U. (1990). Cognitive instruction in the second language classroom: the role of learning strategies. Georgetown University Round Table on Languages and Linguistics. Washington, D.C.: Georgetown University.
- Chamot, A. U. (2001). The role of learning strategies in second language acquisition. In C. N. Candlin (Ed.), *Learner contributions to language learning: New directions in research* (pp. 25-43). Singapore: Pearson Education.
- Chamot, A. U., Barnhardt, S., El-Dinary, P. B., & Robbins, J. (1996). Methods for teaching learning strategies in the foreign language classroom. In R. L. Oxford (Ed.), *Language learning strategies around the world: Cross-cultural perspectives* (pp. 175-188). Honolulu, HI: University of Hawaii Press.
- Chamot, A. U., Barnhardt, S., El-Dinary, P. B., & Robbins, J. (1999). *The learning strategies handbook*. White Plains, N.Y.: Longman.
- Chamot, A. U. & Kupper, L. (1989). Learning strategies in foreign language instruction. *Foreign Language Annals*, 22, 13-24.
- Chamot, A. U., & O'Malley, J. M. (1996). Implementing the cognitive academic language learning approach (CALLA). In R. L. Oxford (Ed.), *Language learning strategies around the World: cross-cultural perspectives* (pp. 167-174). Honolulu, HI: University of Hawaii Press.

- Chen, Y. L. E. (2000). *Motivation and language learning strategies in learning English as a foreign language*. Unpublished dissertation, University of Michigan, Ann Arbor, MI.
- The Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints. (1981). *The Book of Mormon*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- The Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints. (2004). *Preach my gospel*. Salt Lake City, UT: Mill Pond Press.
- Cipollone, N., Keiser, S. H., & Vasishth, S. (1998). *Language files*. Columbus, OH: Ohio State University Press.
- Clennell, C. (1995). Communication strategies of adult ESL learners: a discourse perspective. *Prospect, 10*, 4-20.
- Cohen, A. D. (1996). Verbal reports as a source of insights into second language learner strategies. *Applied Language Learning, 7*, 5-24.
- Cohen, A. D. (1999). *Strategies in learning and using a second language*. New York: Addison Wesley Longman.
- Cohen, A. D., & Chi, J. C. (2005). *Language strategy use survey*. [Online]. Retrieved March 13, 2005, from http://www.carla.umn.edu/about/profiles/CohenPapers/Lg_Strat_Srvy.html
- Cohen, A. D., & Scott, K. (1996). A synthesis of approaches to assessing language learning strategies. In R. L. Oxford (Ed.), *Language learning strategies around the world: Cross-cultural perspectives* (pp. 89-106). Honolulu, HI: University of Hawaii Press.

- Cohen, A. D., Weaver, S. J., & Li, T. Y. (1997). *The impact of strategies-based instruction on speaking a foreign language*. Minneapolis, MN: Center for Advanced Research on Language Acquisition (CARLA), University of Minnesota.
- Corbeil, G. (1992). The role of information construction in second language learning. *Linguistica Atlantica*, 14, 1-15.
- Cowan, R. O. (2001). *Every man shall hear the gospel in his own language: A history of the Provo Missionary Training Center and its predecessors*. Volume 1. Provo, UT: Brigham Young University.
- Craig, C. M. (1998). Metacognition: facilitating academic success. In J. L. Higbee & P. L. Dwinell, (Eds.), *Developmental education: preparing successful college students* (pp. 111-112). University of South Carolina: National Association for developmental Education.
- Crystal, D. (1997). *The Cambridge encyclopedia of language*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Cudina Obradovic, M. (1999). Games as foreign language teaching and learning strategies. *Strani Jezici*, 28, 3-4, 156-168.
- Dadour, E. S., & Robbins, J. (1996). University-level studies using strategy instruction to improve speaking ability in Egypt and Japan. In R. L. Oxford (Ed.), *Language learning strategies around the world: Cross-cultural perspectives* (pp. 157-166). Honolulu, HI: University of Hawaii Press.
- Dick, W., & Carey, L. (1990). *The systematic design of instruction*, 3rd edition. Glenview, IL: Scott, Foresman, and Co.

- Dickinson, L. (1987). *Self-instruction in language learning*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Djigunovic, J. M. (1999). How do motivated foreign language learners go about learning? *Strani Jezici*, 28, 191-196.
- Donato, R., & McCormick, D. (1994). A sociocultural perspective on language learning strategies: the role of mediation. *Modern Language Journal*, 78, 453-464.
- Dornyei, Z. (1995). On the teachability of communication strategies. *TESOL Quarterly*, 29, 55-85.
- Dreyer, C., & Oxford, R. L. (1996). Learning strategies and other predictors of ESL proficiency among Afrikaans speakers in South Africa. In R. L. Oxford (Ed.), *Language learning strategies around the world: Cross-cultural perspectives* (pp. 61-74). Honolulu, HI: University of Hawaii Press.
- Dreyer, C., & Van Der Walt, J. L. (1995). The significance of learner variables as predictors of ESL proficiency. *Studia Anglica Posnaniensia*, 29, 91-103.
- Dufeu, B. (1994). *Teaching myself*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Ehrman, M. E. (1996). *Understanding second language learning difficulties*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Ehrman, M. E., & Oxford, R. L. (1989). Effects of sex differences, career choice, and psychological type on adult language learning strategies. *Modern Language Journal*, 73, 1-13.
- Ellis, R. (1994). *The study of second language acquisition*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

- Ellis, R. (2002). The place of grammar instruction in the second/foreign language curriculum. In E. Hinkel & S. Fotos (Eds.), *New perspectives on grammar teaching in second language classrooms* (pp. 17-34). Mahwah, N.J.: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Faustino, I. P. M. (1996). Learning strategies in language learning. *CTJ Journal*, 33, 11-19.
- Feyten, C. M., Flaitz, J. J., & LaRocca, M. A. (1999). Consciousness raising and strategy use. *Applied Language Learning*, 10, 15-38.
- Flaitz, J., & Feyten, C. (1996). A two-phase study involving consciousness raising and strategy use for foreign language learners. In R. L. Oxford (Ed.), *Language learning strategies around the world: Cross-cultural perspectives* (pp. 211-226). Honolulu, HI: University of Hawaii Press.
- Fleming, F., & Walls, G. (1998). What pupils do: the role of strategic planning in modern foreign language learning. *Language Learning Journal*, 18, 14-21.
- Gagne, R. M., Briggs, L. J., & Wager, W. W. (1992). *Principles of instructional design*. Orlando, FL: Harcourt Brace & Company.
- Gardner, R. C. (1991). Second language learning in adults: correlates of proficiency. *Applied Language Learning*, 2, 1-28.
- Gardner, R. C., Tremblay, P. F. and Masgoret, A. M. (1997). Towards a full model of second language learning: an empirical investigation. *Modern Language Journal*, 81, 344-362.
- Gilbert, T. F. (1978). *Human competence: engineering worthy performance*. New York: McGraw-Hill.

- Grabe, W. (1991). Current development in second language reading research. *TESOL Quarterly*, 25, 375-406.
- Graham, S., & Rees, F. (1995). Gender differences in language learning: the question of control. *Language Learning Journal*, 11, 18-19.
- Green, J. M. (1999). Predicting L2 proficiency and exploring patterns of strategy use among university students in Puerto Rico. In J. E. Purpura & R. L. Oxford (Eds.), *Language learning strategies in the context of autonomy*. Invitational Symposium for Researchers, Teachers College, Columbia University, New York, N.Y.
- Gruneberg, M., & Sykes, R. (1996). The use of mnemonic strategies in the learning of non-Roman foreign language alphabets. *Language Learning Journal*, 13, 82-83.
- Gu, Y., & Johnson, R. K. (1996). Vocabulary learning strategies and language learning outcomes. *Language Learning*, 46, 643-679.
- Hajer, M., Meestringa, T., Park, Y. Y., & Oxford, R. L. (1996). How print materials provide strategy instruction. In R. L. Oxford (Ed.), *Language learning strategies around the world: Cross-cultural perspectives* (pp. 119-140). Honolulu, HI: University of Hawaii Press.
- Haudeck, H. (1996). Making students aware of learning strategies, illustrated with negation and interrogation. *Fremdsprachenunterricht*, 40, 419-425.
- He, T. H. (2002). Goal orientations, writing strategies, and written outcomes: An experimental study. In J. E. Katchen (Ed.), *Selected papers from the eleventh international symposium on English teaching/fourth pan Asian conference* (pp. 198-207). Taipei, Taiwan, November 8-10, 2002.
- Hedge, T. (2000). *Teaching and learning in the language classroom*. Oxford: Oxford

Univeristy Press.

- Hinkel, E., & Fotos, S. (2002). *New perspectives on grammar teaching in second language classrooms*. Mahwah, N.J.: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Hirai, E. (1998). The relationship between affect and the use of language learning strategies. *Sophia Linguistica*, 42-43, 149-166.
- Hoeflaak, A., & Verloop, N. (2000). Toward an increasing autonomy of learning French as a foreign language? *Canadian Modern Language Review*, 56, 617-636.
- Hsiao, T-Y. (1997). A study of language learning strategies by college EFL students: A theoretical perspective. *Studies in English Language and Literature*, 2, 29-46.
- Hsiao, T-Y., & Oxford, R. (2002). Comparing theories of language learning strategies: a confirmatory factor analysis. *Modern Language Journal*, 86, 368-383.
- Hudson, T. (1988). The effect of induced schemata on the “short circuit” in L2 reading: Non-decoding factors in L2 reading performance. In Carrell, Devine, & Eskey (Eds.), *Interactive approaches to second language reading*. N.Y.: Cambridge University Press.
- Hyte, H. (2001). *Metacognitive strategy training on Finnish and Hungarian second language learners*. Unpublished Manuscript, Brigham Young University, Provo, UT.
- Hyte, H. (2002). *The effects of computer-based metacognitive strategy training for adult second language learners*. Unpublished Master’s Thesis. Brigham Young University, Provo, UT.
- Inouye, D. K. (1997). *Primordial responsibility and psychology*. Conference on Disenchantments with Modernism: Living in the 21st Century. Brigham Young University, April 16-17, 1997.

- Inouye, D. K., & Gong, W. (1996). *The Savior's laws of growth: A framework for learning and teaching*. Educational Psychology 301 lectures. Brigham Young University.
- Jenkins, J., Pany, D., & Schreck, J. (1978). *Vocabulary and reading comprehension: Instructional effects*. Champaign, IL: University of Illinois, Center for the Study of Reading.
- Johnson, D., & Steele, V. (1996). So many words, so little time: helping college ESL learners acquire vocabulary building strategies. *Journal of Adolescent and Adult Literacy*, 39, 348-357.
- Kang, S. (2000). *Modeling relationships between the use of English as a second language learning strategies and the test performance of Asian students*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation. University of Michigan, Ann Arbor, MI.
- Kawai, Y., Oxford, R. L., & Iran Nejad, A. (2000). Sources of internal self-regulation with a focus on language learning. *Journal of Mind and Behavior*, 21, 45-60.
- Kaylani, C. (1996). The influence of gender and motivation on EFL learning strategy use in Jordan. In R. L. Oxford (Ed.), *Language learning strategies around the world: Cross-cultural perspectives* (pp. 75-88). Honolulu, HI: University of Hawaii Press.
- Kelly, G. A. (1963). *A theory of personality: the psychology of personal constructs*. New York: W. W. Norton & Company, Inc.
- Kidd, R., & Marquardson, B. (1996). The foresee approach for ESL strategy instruction in an academic-proficiency context. In R. L. Oxford (Ed.), *Language learning strategies around the world: Cross-cultural perspectives* (pp. 189-204). Honolulu, HI: University of Hawaii Press.

- Kim, D. (2000). *An exploration of listening comprehension linked to authentic input and language learning strategies in a second language*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation. University of Michigan. Ann Arbor, MI.
- Kohler, B. (2002). *The effects of metacognitive language learning strategy training on lower-achieving second language learners*. Unpublished dissertation. Brigham Young University, Provo, UT.
- Kohler, D. B. (1998). *Learning to learn—the training of missionaries in language learning strategies at the Missionary Training Center*. Unpublished Master's Thesis. Brigham Young University, Provo, UT.
- Krashen, S. (1980). The input hypothesis. In Alatis, J (Ed.), *Current issues in bilingual education* (pp. 168-180). Washington, D.C.: Georgetown University Press.
- Krashen, S. (1989). We acquire vocabulary and spelling by reading: Additional evidence for the Input Hypothesis. *The Modern Language Journal*, 73, 440-465.
- Krumm, H. J. (1999). *Learning and teaching German in the context of multilingualism*. Deutsch und Andere Fremdsprachen, International Landerberichte Sprachenpolitische Analysen, Anregungen, Amsterdam: Rodopi.
- Kubler, C. C. (1997). A framework for basic Chinese language programs. *Journal of the Chinese Language Teachers Association*, 32, 41-49.
- Larsen-Freeman, D. (2001). Individual cognitive/affective contributions and differential success in second language acquisition. In C. N. Candlin (Ed.), *Learner contributions to language learning: New directions in research* (pp. 12-24). Singapore: Pearson Education.

- Larsen-Freeman, D. (2003). *Teaching language: From grammar to grammaring*. Boston: Heinle.
- Lee, J., & VanPatten, B. (1995). *Making communicative language teaching happen*. New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Levine, A., Reves, T., & Leaver, B. L. (1996). Relationship between language learning strategies and Israeli versus Russian cultural-educational factors. In R. L. Oxford (Ed.), *Language learning strategies around the world: Cross-cultural perspectives* (pp. 35-46). Honolulu, HI: University of Hawaii Press.
- Lunzer, E., & Gardner, K. (1979). *The effective uses of reading*. London: Heinemann Educational Books for The Schools Council.
- Macaro, E. (1998). Learner strategies: piloting awareness and training. *Tuttitalia*, 18, 10-16.
- Macaro, E. (2001). *Learning strategies in foreign and second language classrooms*. London: Continuum Publishing Company.
- MacIntyre, P. D., & Noels, K. A. (1996). Using social-psychological variables to predict the use of language learning strategies. *Foreign Language Annals*, 29, 373-386.
- Mahous, M. (1997). Learning strategies, the strategists, and his/her stratagems. *Cahiers de l'Apluit*, 16, 48-60.
- Mangiafico, L. (1996). Student use of interactive multimedia technology for second language listening comprehension. *Dimension*, 31, 49-68.
- Mendoza de Hopkins, N., & Mackay, R. (1997). Good and bad readers" a look at the high and low achievers in an ESP Canadian studies reading and writing course. *Canadian Modern Language Review*, 53, 473-490.

- Meskill, C. (1991). Language learning strategies advice: a study on the effects of on-line messaging. *System, 19*, 277-287.
- Miller, G. (1941). Vocabulary building through extensive reading. *The English Journal, 30*, 664-666.
- Nayak, N., Hansen, N., Krueger, N., & McLaughlin, B. (1990). Language learning strategies in monolingual and multilingual adults. *Language Learning, 40*, 221-244.
- Nunan, D. (1991). Communicative tasks and the language curriculum. *TESOL Quarterly, 25*, 279-95.
- Nunan, D. (1999). *Second language teaching and learning*. Boston: Heinle & Heinle.
- Nyikos, M. (1996). The conceptual shift to learner-centered classrooms: increasing teacher and student strategic awareness. In R. L. Oxford (Ed.), *Language learning strategies around the world: Cross-cultural perspectives* (pp. 109-118). Honolulu, HI: University of Hawaii Press.
- Nykos, M., & Oxford, R. (1993). A factor analytic study of language learning strategy use: interpretations from information processing theory and social psychology. *Modern Language Journal, 77*, 11-22.
- O'Malley, J. M., & Chamot, A. U. (1990). *Learning strategies in second language acquisition*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Ong, W. J. (1998). Some psychodynamics of orality. In Oaks, D. D. (Ed.), *Linguistics at work: A reader of applications* (pp. 574-594). Fort Worth, TX: Harcourt Brace College Publishers.
- Osguthorpe, R. T. (1996). *The education of the heart: rediscovering the spiritual roots of learning*. American Fork, UT: Covenant Communications, Inc.

- Ostrander, S., Schroeder, L., & Ostrander, N. (1994). *Super-learning 2000*. New York: Dell Publishing.
- Ott, C. E. (1995). *In their own tongue: The MTC infield language study*. The LDS Missionary Department: An unpublished departmental study.
- Oxford, R. L. (1990a). *Language learning strategies: What every teacher should know*. New York: Newbury House.
- Oxford, R. L. (1990b). Missing link: evidence from research on language learning styles and strategies. Georgetown University Round Table on Languages and Linguistics (pp. 438-458).
- Oxford, R. L. (1996). Employing a questionnaire to assess the use of language learning strategies. *Applied Language Learning*, 7, 25-45.
- Oxford, R. L. & Crookall, D. (1989). Research on language learning strategies: methods, findings, and instructional issues. *Modern Language Journal*, 73, 404-419.
- Oxford, R. L., & Ehrman, M. E. (1995). Adults' language learning strategies in an intensive foreign language program in the United States. *System*, 23, 359-386.
- Oxford, R. L., Lavine, R. Z., Felkins, G., Holloway, M. E., & Saleh, A. (1996). Telling their stories: language students use diaries and recollection. In R. L. Oxford (Ed.), *Language learning strategies around the world: Cross-cultural perspectives* (pp. 19-34). Honolulu, HI: University of Hawaii Press.
- Oxford, R. L., & Leaver, B. L. (1996). A synthesis of strategy instruction for language learners. In R. L. Oxford (Ed.), *Language learning strategies around the world: Cross-cultural perspectives* (pp. 227-246). Honolulu, HI: University of Hawaii Press.

- Oxford, R. L. & Nyikos, M. (1989). Variables affecting choice of language learning strategies by university students. *Modern Language Journal*, 73, 291-300.
- Palacios-Martinez, I. M. (1995). A study of the learning strategies used by secondary school and university students of English in Spain. *Revista Alicantina de Estudios Ingleses*, 8, Nov. 177-193.
- Palmer, P. J. (1983). *To know as we are known: education as a spiritual journey*. New York: Harper Collins Publishers.
- Park, G. P. (1997). Language learning strategies and English proficiency in Korean university students. *Foreign Language Annals*, 30, 211-221.
- Peacock, M. (1998). The links between learner beliefs, teacher beliefs, and EFL proficiency. *Perspectives*, 10, 125-159.
- Perrin, G. (1996). Necessity the mother of invention-learner strategies and language learning. *Fremdsprachenunterricht*, 40, 401-405.
- Pickard, N. (1995). Out of class language learning strategies: three case studies. *Language Learning Journal*, 12, 35-37.
- Pickard, N. (1996). Out of class language learning strategies. *English Language Teaching Journal*, 50, 150-159.
- Prokop, M. (1989). *Learning strategies for second language users: An analytical appraisal with case studies*. Lewiston, N.Y.: The Edwin Mellon Press.
- Polanyi, M. (1962). *Personal knowledge: towards a post-critical philosophy*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Pugh, A. K. (1978). *Silent reading*. London: Heinemann Educational Books.

- Qian, D. D. (1999). Assessing the roles of depth and breath of vocabulary knowledge in reading comprehension. *The Canadian Modern Language Review*, 56, 283-307.
- Raby, F. & Baille, J. (1997). An ergonomic approach to learning strategies in tutored second language instruction. *Cahiers de l'Apliu*, 16, 84-93.
- Rampillon, U. (1996). From strategy training to learner autonomy. *Levende Talen*, 510, 258-262.
- Rees-Miller, J. (1993). A critical appraisal of learner training: theoretical bases and teaching implications. *TESOL Quarterly*, 27, 679-689.
- Rees-Miller, J. (1994). The author responds. *TESOL Quarterly*, 28, 776-781.
- Richards-Amato, P. A. (1996). *Making it happen: interaction in the second language classroom, from theory to practice*. Second Edition. White Plains, N.Y.: Addison-Wesley.
- Robbins, J. (1993). Report on the pilot study of learning strategies for the Japanese language classroom. Georgetown University round table on languages and linguistics (pp. 593-612).
- Rowell, L. V., & Libben, G. (1994). The sound of one hand clapping: how to succeed in independent language learning. *Canadian Modern Language Review*, 50, 668-687.
- Rubin, J. (1996). Using multimedia for learner strategy instruction. In R. L. Oxford (Ed.), *Language learning strategies around the world: Cross-cultural perspectives* (pp. 151-156). Honolulu, HI: University of Hawaii Press.
- Rubin, J., & Thompson, I. (1994). *How to be a more successful language learner*. Boston: Heinle & Heinle.

- Sachs, H. (1943). The reading method of acquiring vocabulary. *Journal of Educational Research*, 36, 457-464.
- Saleh, S. M. (2000). *Cognitive and metacognitive learning strategies used by adult learners of Arabic as a foreign language*. Unpublished dissertation, Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University, Blacksburg, VA.
- Saragi, T., Nation, P., & Meister, G. (1978). Vocabulary learning and reading. *Systems*, 6, 70-78.
- Scherfer, P. (2000). "Malgre les efforts de professeurs on peut pas tout apprendre" –but foreign-language learners know best what they need. *Bulletin Suisse de Linguistique Appliquee*, 71, 87-106.
- Sheorey, R. (1999). An examination of language learning strategy use in the setting of an indigenized variety of English. *System*, 27, 173-190.
- Silver, M. (1997). *The effect of The Book of Mormon diglot reader: a study of the vocabulary acquisition, reading comprehension, and the reduction of negative affective variables in missionaries*. Unpublished master's thesis. Brigham Young University, Provo, UT.
- Skinner, B. F. (1957). *Verbal Behavior*. Acton, MA: The B. F. Skinner Foundation.
- Smith, F. (1978). *Understanding Reading: A psycholinguistic analysis of reading and learning to read*. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston.
- Steinagel, L. O. (2001). *An approach to language strategy training*. Unpublished development project. Brigham Young University, Provo, UT.
- Thomas, K. (1996). Motivation and learning strategies in and out of the classroom. *Carleton Papers in Applied Language Studies*, 13, 36-52.

- Vogely, A. (1995). Perceived strategy use during performance on three authentic listening comprehension tasks. *The Modern Language Journal*, 79, 49-56.
- Wardhaugh, R. (1986). *An introduction to sociolinguistics*. New York: Blackwell.
- Watanabe, Y. (1991). Classification of language learning strategies. *ICU Language Research Bulletin*, 6, 75-102.
- Wenden, A. L. (2001). Metacognitive knowledge in SLA: the neglected variable. In C. N. Candlin (Ed.), *Learner contributions to language learning: new directions in Research* (pp. 44-64). Singapore: Pearson Education.
- Wenden, A. L., & Rubin, J. (Eds.) (1987). *Learner strategies for language learning*. Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice Hall.
- White, C. (1995). Strategy choice and the target language: a comparative study of learners of Japanese and French. *Australian Review of Applied Linguistics*, 12, 169-182.
- Willing, K. (1989). *Teaching how to learn: learning strategies in ESL*. Sydney: National Centre for English Language Teaching and Research.
- Worthen, B. R., Sanders, J. R., & Fitzpatrick, J. L. (1997). *Program evaluation: Alternative approaches and practical guidelines*. New York: Addison Wesley Longman.
- Wittig, A. F. (1981). *Psychology of learning*. New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Yang, N. (1996). Effective awareness-raising in language learning strategy instruction. In R. L. Oxford (Ed.), *Language learning strategies around the world: Cross-cultural perspectives*. Honolulu, HI: University of Hawaii Press.

Young, D. J. & Oxford, R. (1997). A gender-related analysis of strategies used to process written input in the native language and a foreign language. *Applied Language Learning*, 8, 43-73.

Zimmerman, J. K. (2004). *The role of vocabulary size in assessing second language proficiency*. Unpublished Master's Thesis. Brigham Young University, Provo, UT.

Appendix A

Language Learning Strategies Training Documents

Language Learning Strategies (form A)

Learning a language is a big task. Deciding how you will learn it is as important as choosing the right tools to build a house, and drawing up a plan for how you will do it. Just as a house has a foundation, walls, and a roof, a language has a structure, and other parts like words and phrases. Begin making decisions now about how you will build each part of your language, and what tools you will use, so that your house will be constructed well, and so that it can meet your needs as a missionary.

Reading *The Book of Mormon* in Spanish can help you to learn your language well. Elder Richard G. Scott said that using the scriptures to learn a language “works marvelously.” This is partly because the Spirit will accompany you as you read.

As a missionary, you will use *The Book of Mormon* often. Become familiar with the language in it. You are already familiar with its message. Listed below are some tools which have been proven to work well when you read something in a new language, particularly when you read *The Book of Mormon*. They are strategies, or things that you can use to learn better. Use them continually as you work to understand what you read.

Reading Strategies

- **Look for words that you know.** Using the words that you know, ask yourself what you think the author is trying to say in the verse. Then read it again to see if you understand more.
- **Look for familiar grammar patterns.** As you read, you will begin to see many examples of the structures that you have been learning in class. Note how the various grammar rules are used, including the word order and word endings.
- **Use your English language Book of Mormon.** If you still struggle to understand the message of the verse, read the verse in English. Then read it again in Spanish. See if it makes more sense. If you still can't figure out a word, access your dictionary.
- **Organize words and phrases for further study.** As you find words or phrases that you want to remember, write them down. Organize them on flashcards or in columns on a sheet of paper so that you can review them later. When you review them, practice them aloud, placing them in sentences to help you learn.
- **Practice pronunciation and fluency.** Reading out loud, even if you do it quietly, is a good way to practice your pronunciation. It will also help you to become more fluent in the language. You can read slowly at first, and then if you choose, read the verse again until you can pronounce it well. If you aren't sure how to pronounce something, find out how.

As you read, ask yourself the **ASWE** questions:

- What am I trying to Accomplish?
- What Strategy am I using?
- Is it Working?
- What Else could I do?

Language Learning Strategies (form B)

Learning a language is a big task. Deciding how you will learn it is as important as choosing the right tools to build a house, and drawing up a plan for how you will do it. Just as a house has a foundation, walls, and a roof, a language has a structure, and other parts like words and phrases. Begin making decisions now about how you will build each part of your language, and what tools you will use, so that your house will be constructed well, and so that it can meet your needs as a missionary.

Reading *The Book of Mormon* in Spanish can help you to learn your language well. Elder Richard G. Scott said that using the scriptures to learn a language “works marvelously.” This is partly because the Spirit will accompany you as you read.

As a missionary, you will use *The Book of Mormon* often. Become familiar with the language in it. You are already familiar with its message. Listed below are some tools which have been proven to work well when you read something in a new language, particularly when you read *The Book of Mormon*. They are strategies, or things that you can use to learn better. Use them continually as you work to understand what you read.

Reading Strategies

- **Look for words that you know.** Using the words that you know, ask yourself what you think the author is trying to say in the verse. Then read it again to see if you understand more.
- **Look for familiar grammar patterns.** As you read, you will begin to see many examples of the structures that you have been learning in class. Note how the various grammar rules are used, including the word order and word endings.
- **Use your English language Book of Mormon.** If you still struggle to understand the message of the verse, read the verse in English. Then read it again in Spanish. See if it makes more sense. If you still can't figure out a word, access your dictionary.
- **Organize words and phrases for further study.** As you find words or phrases that you want to remember, write them down. Organize them on flashcards or in columns on a sheet of paper so that you can review them later. When you review them, practice them aloud, placing them in sentences to help you learn.

As you read, ask yourself the **ASWE** questions:

- What am I trying to Accomplish?
- What Strategy am I using?
- Is it Working?
- What Else could I do?

Appendix B

Missionary Speaking Performance Assessment

Sample Missionary Speaking Performance Assessment
Task Situations

Obtain Referrals

13.1

You are meeting with a Church member to help him/her identify nonmember friends to share the gospel with.

- A. Explain that it is important for us to share the gospel.
- B. Ask the member to think of people he/she knows that are not members of the Church.
- C. Find out the member's relationship to these people, and how interested they might be in learning about the Church.
- D. Ask the member to invite these people to hear the discussions.
- E. Make plans to follow up.

Obtain Referrals

When the missionary asks, say that there are a couple of people you work with (make up the names) that know you are LDS and have asked a few questions about the Church. When the missionary asks you to invite them to hear the discussions, say, "I'm not sure they're ready for the discussions. Is there anything I could do to help them prepare first?"

Be generally cooperative and agree to invite your friends to hear the discussions.

Evaluator Side — 25 Nov 1998

MISSIONARY SPEAKING PERFORMANCE

Non-Functional	Partially Functional		Functional		Proficient	
1	2	3	4	5	6	7

Pronunciation *(Production of correct sounds; correct stress and intonation; foreign accent)*

Pronunciation is often unintelligible; many errors in sounds, stress, and/or intonation	Difficult to understand at times; frequent errors in sounds, stress and/or intonation	Usually fairly easy to understand; sounds, stress and intonation are usually correct, although foreign accent may be distracting	Can be understood without any difficulty; no obvious errors in sounds, stress or intonation; accent is not distracting
-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

Grammar *(Appropriate application of language rules to generate correct forms and sentence structure)*

Does not use language rules; speech consists mainly of individual words strung together, with no regard for correct forms or sentence structure	Attempts to use language rules required for situation, but struggles to apply them appropriately; many errors in forms and sentence structure	Applies language rules appropriately most of the time; no obvious rules are consistently misused; some errors in forms and sentence structure	Habitually applies language rules appropriately; few if any errors in forms and sentence structure
-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

Vocabulary *(Correct usage of words and expressions required for situation)*

Vocabulary inadequate to communicate intended ideas; often lacks even common, basic words and expressions	Uses some situation-specific vocabulary, but often lacks words and expressions needed to convey intended ideas; gropes for words and/or uses words that fail to convey intended meaning	Uses a fairly broad range of situation-specific vocabulary; choice of words and expressions is sometimes imprecise, but generally adequate to convey intended meaning	Uses appropriate and precise words and expressions needed to convey intended ideas; no groping for words
-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

Fluency *(Rapid, prompt communication, without unnecessary pausing)*

Pauses and hesitates constantly; has to search for each word before saying it; pauses within words	Pauses frequently; struggles with longer word strings; rapid speech consists mainly of a few trite, memorized phrases; may seem to be concentrating on "how to say something"	Speaks fluently most of the time; sometimes has to slow down or pause with less familiar content; seems to focus more on meaning and real communication than rules	Speaks rapidly and freely varies the speed according to the situation; can speak with little or no pauses if necessary; doesn't seem to have to "think about the language" any more
----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

Task Performance *(Overall skill in accomplishing task)*

Unable to accomplish task well enough to be understood, even by someone accustomed to dealing with non-native speakers	Able to accomplish task well enough to be understood by someone accustomed to dealing with non-native speakers	Able to accomplish task well enough to be understood, with some effort, by someone <i>not</i> accustomed to dealing with non-native speakers	Able to accomplish task well enough to be easily understood by someone not accustomed to dealing with non-native speakers
------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

Appendix C

Missionary Vocabulary Test

Missionary Vocabulary Test

Missionary ID number or name: _____

Instructions

On the following pages you will encounter phrases in Spanish. In each phrase a blank has been inserted in the place of one of the words. The first letter or letters of the word have been provided to help you to choose the precise Spanish word that is missing. Read the phrase carefully, and think of the one Spanish word which makes the most sense, and is the most appropriate, for that sentence. For example, look at the phrase below:

Por la ca_____ de Adán, Jesucristo tenía que venir al mundo.

Translation: Because of the fa_____ of Adam, Jesus Christ had to come to the Earth.

Answer: caída (fall)

The only Spanish word which fits in this case is *caída*, or *fall*. Words such as *cada* or *caliente* are ungrammatical. Other Spanish words, such as *cabeza* or *casa* are grammatical, but they do not make sense.

For each phrase, fill in the blank with the word that is most appropriate, and which makes the most sense for that sentence. Each blank should be filled in with only one word.

Turn the page now and begin. Thank you for your help with this research.

1. Cuando Jesús murió, la tierra de los Nefitas **te**_____ mucho.
2. Los nefitas y los lamanitas son de la **po**_____ de Lehi.
3. Los prisioneros pasaron muchos años en la **ser**_____.
4. El **Me**_____ visitó las Américas, después de su muerte.
5. Las papas recién cosechadas son más **ti**_____ que las viejas.
6. Las planchas de bronce contenían los **an**_____ de los judíos.
7. Las personas que no dicen la verdad dicen muchas **men**_____.
8. Cuando Lehi se despertó, encontró la Liahona **del**_____ de la entrada de su tienda.
9. Las plantas crecen mejor en tierra **f**_____.
10. Las **no**_____ a veces son necesarias para alimentar a los bebés.
11. No sé donde puse mi **f**_____ ni mi arco, así que no puedo ir a cazar.
12. El barco estaba bajo **em**_____, y no podía entrar en el puerto.
13. La **impu**_____ del corazón será quitada con el arrepentimiento.
14. En el bosque tenemos que seguir la **se**_____ correcta, para no perdernos.
15. Es muy **po**_____ aprender español en el CCM.

16. Carlos usó sus talentos para **del** _____ a las personas.
17. Después de llegar, el pueblo se **as** _____ en el valle.
18. Los hijos de Israel pasaron muchos años en el **cau** _____, bajo el mandato de los egipcios.
19. En la batalla, los Lamanitas querían **apo** _____ de la ciudad de Manti.
20. El mundo es una **es** _____, como una pelota de fútbol.
21. Él fue **dest** _____ de su país; por eso no tenía donde vivir.
22. Una persona que sabe todo es **sum** _____ inteligente.
23. Moroni había **en** _____ las planchas de oro, y por eso sabía donde se encontraban.
24. Coriantón, un hijo de Alma, buscaba a la **r** _____ Isabel.
25. Como castigo, su padre le dio un **az** _____ en las nalgas.
26. En la visión de Lehi, los del edificio grande y **e** _____ se reían de los buenos.
27. Es normal **estre** _____ de miedo cuando mira una película de terror.
28. La expiación nos salva del **ab** _____ del infierno.
29. Si no les invitamos, se van a sentir **exc** _____.

30. Después de la muerte de Jesucristo vino una **os**_____ sobre la tierra de los Nefitas.
31. Los prisioneros fueron **impe**_____ a trabajar por los guardias.
32. Mi compañero estaba muy **af**_____ por sus enfermedades.
33. Las personas **lo**_____ a veces tienen enfermedades de la cabeza.
34. Los templos de Dios no son **inm**_____; son lugares de mucha pureza.
35. Cuando los ladrones entraron a nuestra casa, tuvimos que **h**_____ de ahí.
36. Lamán llegó a ser un hombre muy **deg**_____ por sus pecados.
37. Los pioneros usaron el **bu**_____ para jalar sus carros.
38. Que **cl**_____ que hubo en el estadio cuando Argentina ganó el mundial.
39. En una visión Nefi vio la **con**_____ de Dios, la cual se trata de la misión de Jesucristo.
40. Lamán y Lemuel ataron a su Hermano Nefi con **cu**_____.
41. Elderes, tenemos que tener mucho **á**_____, y no temer de hablar con la gente.
42. La **re**_____ de Cristo incluye dos cosas: la resurrección y la vida eterna.
43. Cuando Lamán y Lemuel no querían obedecer a su padre, **mu**_____ mucho.

44. Tenemos que leer el **di**_____ cada día para estar informados.
45. Si guardamos los mandamientos, podemos entrar en el reino **c**_____.
46. Cada mes nosotros **ah**_____ dinero para poder comprar una casa.
47. Los **m**_____ y los misioneros deben trabajar juntos.
48. Ellos se **pr**_____ a sus nuevos vecinos cuando llegaron a la fiesta.
49. Los líderes quieren que enseñemos el **m**_____ de la restauración con más convicción.
50. Los **eq**_____ de fútbol de Argentina son los mejores.
51. En la iglesia, es necesario tener el **sa**_____ para bendecir a los enfermos.
52. Sal y **p**_____ son ingredientes básicos para toda comida.
53. Los **mi**_____ reciben su capacitación en el CCM.
54. Por el **aná**_____ de sus enseñanzas, el misionero empezó a compartir más experiencias.
55. El barrio tiene sus reuniones en esta **ca**_____.
56. Los investigadores nos dejaron un **rec**_____ en el teléfono.
57. La palabra de sabiduría nos prohíbe **f**_____.

58. Me gusta jugar al **bal** _____, pero soy demasiado bajo.
59. Terminamos el **ay** _____ a las seis, y vamos a comer bocadillos.
60. El correo **a** _____ es más rápido que el terrestre.
61. La **s** _____ Pérez nos invitó a cenar con su esposo.
62. Es bueno **exp** _____ con cosas nuevas, pero no con cosas peligrosas.
63. Por favor lea la **pá** _____ que le asignamos.
64. Los **Al** _____ Suizos son lugares famosos para esquiar.
65. Cuando el maestro habla, los estudiantes no deben **conv** _____ entre sí.
66. Nosotros le **re** _____ una caja de bombones por su cumpleaños.
67. Las **es** _____ para mandar cartas de Argentina a El Salvador son muy caras.
68. Usted debe manejar más despacio, si no quiere tener un accidente **fa** _____.
69. Hasta esa **fe** _____ no había recibido noticias de mi familia.
70. El **b** _____ para entrar al estadio es muy caro.
71. La **d** _____ que nos dio de su casa está equivocada.
72. Me duele la **mu** _____, por escribir tanto a máquina.

73. Como yo no hablo muy bien el español, por favor tenga mucha **p**_____ conmigo.
74. El presidente quiere **im**_____ que los misioneros gasten su tiempo.
75. Señor Gómez, sabemos que usted **a**_____ mucho a su familia.
76. Si el distrito de miembros crece lo suficiente, puede llegar a ser una **e**_____.
77. Esta es la **dé**_____ vez que pasamos por aquí.
78. Los maestros siempre tienen que **de**_____ amor por sus estudiantes.
79. Hay mucho tráfico en esta **av**_____.
80. El bautismo por **in**_____ es un requisito para la salvación.
81. Después del himno, el obispo dará un **d**_____.
82. Los investigadores deben leer los **pa**_____ que marcamos.
83. Los misioneros tienen **dis**_____ maneras de enseñar las lecciones.
84. Se nota que el **le**_____ de este locutor de radio es muy elevado.
85. Ella se **pr**_____ mucho por su apariencia.
86. Para tener más dinero, los **ing**_____ deben sobrepasar a los gastos.

Appendix D

Spanish Reading Comprehension Test

Spanish Reading Comprehension Test

Instructions

During the next 60 minutes you will read twenty short dialogs between a missionary and an investigator or member of the church. Then you will be asked a question to see if you can determine what action or missionary skill is appropriate in that situation. The twenty items will be presented first in your mission language and then in English. You may find that the situations are more difficult in your mission language. But that should give you an opportunity to stretch and expand your skills. Unless you have had a lot of experience in your mission language, you will probably not understand everything. So just relax and do the best you can. If you are unsure about an answer, make the best guess you can. Please record your answers by filling in the appropriate circle on the green answer sheet. The score on this exercise will not be reported to your teachers or anyone else at the missionary training center. Your responses will be combined with those of other missionaries and used for research purposes.

You will be given 1-2 minutes to complete each situation, and then you will be asked to turn the page and begin reading the next situation. Do not turn to the first test question until you are told to do so.

Thank you for your help with this research.

Number 1

Misionero: El segundo principio del evangelio es el arrepentimiento. Al arrepentirnos nosotros admitimos ante Dios que hemos hecho mal. Sentimos dolor por causa de nuestros pecados. Dejamos de hacer las cosas que estuvieron mal y tratamos de corregir cualquier problemas que hayamos causado. Señora Friar, por lo que hemos dicho, ¿qué significa para usted el arrepentimiento de nuestros pecados?

Señora Friar: Um...significa dejar hacer las cosas que no son buenas que Dios no quiere que hagamos.

Misionero: Está bien. ¿Cómo se siente usted personalmente acerca de este principio?

Señora Friar: Um...pero ¿qué pasa si uno no puede parar de hacer las cosas que son malas? A mi me gustaría, por ejemplo, dejar de tomar pero he estado tomando por años y yo sé que no es bueno, pero traté de parar muchas veces y no he podido.

What should the missionary do now?

- A. Help the person resolve a problem or concern
- B. Follow up on a previous commitment
- C. Continue with the discussion
- D. Talk about common beliefs
- E. Identify the presence of the Spirit

Number 2

Misionero: Javier, ¿Cómo le va? Venimos hoy para verle y hablar un poco en cuanto a su bautismo el Sábado. ¿Está listo?

Javier: Pienso que sí, aún estoy planeando bautizarme. ¿Es esto lo que quiere decir?

Misionero: Uh-huh, exactamente. Pero...mire Javier...nosotros a veces nos gusta invitar a amigos o familiares de la persona que se bautizan para que vengan a ver lo que las personas están haciendo. No sé si sería posible si usted podría invitar a alguien. No sé...pero igual pensé que sería bueno mencionarlo.

Javier: No pienso que es una buena idea. Mis padres no están de acuerdo sobre mi bautismo. No pienso que ellos vendrán.

Misionero: Mm...

Javier: Y mis amigos están bien ocupados.

Misionero: Okay. No pasa nada. Pero igual, estamos muy contento que se bautiza el Sábado.

What did the missionary do wrong?

- A. No error was made
- B. He should have followed upon a previous commitment
- C. He was hesitant or apologetic
- D. He failed to build a relationship of trust
- E. He asked manipulative questions

Number 3

Misionero: Hermano y hermana Sabatina, nosotros realmente apreciamos su buena voluntad de ayudarnos en la obra misional.

Hermano: O, no pasa nada. No se preocupen. Nosotros nos encanta realmente ayudar a los misioneros.

Misionero: Tenemos en una lista dos familias que ustedes podrían invitar para reunirse con nosotros, los López, y los Morales. ¿Cuál de estas dos familias ustedes piensen que así estarían una invitación para venir a su casa y escuchar a la primera charla?

Hermano: Déjeme ver. Yo diría que los Morales, cada vez que hablamos con ellos en cuanto al evangelio su respuesta sigue bastante favorable.

What should the missionary do now?

- A. Help the person resolve a problem or concern
- B. Invite the person to make a commitment
- C. Talk about common beliefs
- D. Show empathy for the person's situation
- E. Present a gospel message or explain a doctrine

Number 4

Misionera: Necesitamos ser bautizados en la iglesia de Jesucristo para poder entrar el reino de los cielos. Gloria, ¿aceptará la invitación del Salvador siendo bautizado en su iglesia?

Gloria: Mire, lo siento, pero, me gusta lo que ustedes me han enseñado, pero no me puedo bautizar en su iglesia.

Misionera: Le importaría compartir con nosotras porque se siente así, ¿que es lo que la está frenando a ser bautizada?

Gloria: Bueno, lo que pasa es que mi padre es ministro de otra iglesia, y si yo me bautizaría en su iglesia, eso le causaría mucho dolor. Y yo amo bastante a mi madre y a mi padre y yo no podía hacerles esto.

Misionera: Hm...sabe Gloria, usted tiene que ser suficientemente fuerte para poder aceptar esta invitación sin importar lo que sus padres digan. En la Biblia misma Jesucristo dice que aquel que ama a su padre o a su madre más que a mí no es digno de mí.

What did the missionary do wrong?

- A. No error was made
- B. She should have found out more about the person's thoughts or feelings
- C. She should have followed up on a previous commitment
- D. She was hesitant or apologetic
- E. She should have shown empathy for the person's situation

Number 5

Misionero: Disculpe, ¿le importa si me siento?

Hombre: No, para nada

Misionero: Gracias. ¿Anda mucho en colectivo usted?

Hombre: Todos los días. Viajando en este omni es como voy y vengo de trabajar.

Misionero: Yo ando mucho en colectivo también. Soy un misionero de la iglesia de Jesucristo de los Santos de los últimos días. Algunos nos conocen con el nombre de los mormones.

Hombre: O, sí, ¿los mormones? He escuchado de su iglesia. Alguien me dijo alguna vez que los mormones no creen en Cristo. Si ustedes no son cristianos, entonces, ¿en qué creen?

What should the missionary do now?

- A. Follow up on a previous commitment
- B. Invite the person to make a commitment
- C. Identify the presence of the Spirit
- D. Show empathy for the person's situation
- E. Present a gospel message or explain a doctrine

Number 6

Elder Billarba: Hola!

Señor Casalova: ¿Cómo le va?

Elder Billarba: Señor Casalova, hemos visto su nombre en su casilla do correo. Su jardín luza muy lindo, ¿usted disfruta mucho trabajar con plantas?

Señor Casalova: Sí

Elder Billarba: Mi nombre es Elder Billarba, y este es mi compañero el Elder Gabriel. Nosotros somos misioneros de la iglesia de Jesucristo de los Santos de los últimos días y nos gustaría compartir un breve mensaje con usted y su familia. ¿Podríamos pasa?

Señor Casalova: Mire, este...ahora estoy preocupado, ¿verdad?

Elder Billarba: Sí, hemos visto dos niños jugando afuera, ¿ellos son sus hijos?

Señor Casalova: Sí, los dos.

Elder Billarba: Que bien. Yo tengo una sobrina y un sobrino de la misma edad y pienso que los niños son fabulosos.

Señor Casalova: Sí, eh, pero mire que también se pueden compartir en un dolor de cabeza

Elder Gabriel: Estoy seguro que ellos pueden serlo.

Elder Billarba: Señor Casalova, realmente nos gustaría compartir nuestro mensaje con usted y su familia. Lo que queremos compartir hará una gran diferencia en su vida en que haga sus hijos también. Vamos a tomar solamente 15 o 20 minutos de su tiempo. ¿Podemos compartir nuestro mensaje con usted?

What did the missionary do wrong?

- A. No error was made
- B. He should have borne his testimony or shared a spiritual experience
- C. He was hesitant or apologetic
- D. He should have invited the person to make a commitment
- E. He failed to build a relationship of trust

Number 7

Hermana: Por siglos la verdad acerca del plan de salvación ha estado únicamente en la Biblia, pero ahora Dios nos ha dado el Libro de Mormón cual es otro testigo acerca de Jesucristo. Señora Zamora, yo sé que este libro es la palabra de Dios tal como es la Biblia.

Señora Zamora: Puedo ver que usted realmente cree en lo que está diciendo.

Hermana: Pues, así es... y Señora Zamora, nos gustaría invitarla a que leyera el Libro de Mormón. Para ayudarle a empezar nosotros sugerimos que lea algunos pasajes antes de nuestra próxima visita. Aquí está el Libro de Mormón y están marcados algunos pasajes donde nos gustaría que leyera. ¿Terminará de leer estos pasajes para nuestra próxima visita?

Señora Zamora: Me encantaría leer este libro, pero no sé...no sé...no estoy segura. Lo que pasa es que me estoy poniendo vieja y mis ojos no funcionan como antes, y no puedo ver muy bien ahora.

What should the missionary do now?

- A. Bear her testimony or share a spiritual experience
- B. Identify the presence of the Spirit
- C. Present a gospel message or explain a doctrine
- D. Show empathy for the person's situation
- E. Follow up on a previous commitment

Number 8

Hombre: Buenas tardes élderes. ¿Cómo están esta noche?

Misionero: Muy bien gracias. Sabe que nos encanta poder visitar familias que son amistosos con los misioneros.

Hombre: Siempre bueno tenerlos en nuestra casa. ¿Qué podemos hacer por ustedes?

Misionero: Mire, queremos darle a su familia la oportunidad de trabajar con nosotros en la obra misional. ¿Harían por favor una lista de amigos y familiares, no miembros de la iglesia, y luego invitarles a escuchar a las charlas?

What did the missionary do wrong?

- A. No error was made
- B. He failed to build a relationship of trust
- C. He ignored a problem or concern
- D. He should have followed up on a previous commitment
- E. He should have shown empathy for the person's situation

Number 9

Misionera: Si bueno, como dijimos nosotros creemos en Dios, y sabemos que el vive y también creemos que el es perfecto que lo sabe todo y que es todopoderoso. ¿Usted cree en Dios?

Hermana: ¿Bueno, realmente no. Bueno, es decir, no estoy segura que exista Dios o no.

Misionera: ¿Qué es lo que le hace sentir así? ¿Qué es lo que le hace dudar de que haya un Dios?

Hermana: Bueno es que hay tanto sufrimiento en el mundo. Si deberes habría un Dios, entonces no creo que habría tanta miseria y tristeza en el mundo.

What should the missionary do now?

- A. Invite the person to make a commitment
- B. Continue with the discussion
- C. Identify the presence of the Spirit
- D. Follow up on a previous commitment
- E. Restate or summarize what the person said

Number 10

Elder Parola: Hermana Zetrola, usted invitaría algunos de sus amigos no miembro a fin de que nosotros pudiéramos enseñarle el evangelio.

Hermana Zetrola: Hm...Elder Parola, usted sabe que nosotros, yo especialmente haría cualquier cosa para ayudarle en la obra misional, pero como usted sabe tenemos un recién nacido en la familia y también yo estoy enseñando la primaria cada Domingo, y para decir la verdad no creo que en este momento puedo tomar más responsabilidades.

Elder Parola: Todos necesitamos participar en la obra misional. Estoy seguro que usted podría encontrar a alguien que se uniera con nosotros el próximo viernes. ¿Estaría dispuesto hacerlo?

What did the missionary do wrong?

- A. No error was made
- B. He should have talked about common beliefs
- C. He ignored a problem or concern
- D. He should have invited the person to make a commitment
- E. He should have borne his testimony or shared a spiritual experience

Number 11

Misionera: Nos alegre estar con usted otra vez hermana Diaz.

Hermana Diaz: Me alegre de que hayan venido nuevamente. Cada vez que vienen me siento tan relajada y cómoda.

Misionera: ¿Por qué cree que le vienen estos sentimientos?

Hermana Diaz: Las cosas que ustedes me dicen son tan bellas y confortantes me hace sentir feliz de estar viva.

Misionera: Hermana Diaz, los sentimientos que usted tiene vienen del espíritu de Dios para decirle que las cosas que estamos enseñando son verdad. Y esto es lo que usted está sintiendo ahora.

Hermana Diaz: Quizás ustedes tienen razón.

Misionera: Recuerda que le pedimos que hiciera la ultima vez que vinimos.

Hermana Diaz: Me pidieron que leyera parte del Libro de Mormón y que orara en cuanto a él.

What should the missionary do now?

- A. Follow up on a previous commitment
- B. Help the person resolve a problem or concern
- C. Identify the presence of the Spirit
- D. Restate or summarize what the person said
- E. Invite the person to make a commitment

Number 12

Misionero: Por medio de estas y otras experiencias José Smith fue llamado a ser un profeta tal como lo fue Moisés y los demás profetas de la Biblia que también vieron a Dios y fueron llamados a ser profetas y predicar su mensaje. ¿Cómo se siente en cuanto a José Smith siendo un profeta de Dios?

Hermana: Bueno me parece que está bien.

Misionero: Mire, me parece que usted no está muy segura.

Hermana: Pues, um...¿cómo sabes tú que él fue un profeta?

Misionero: Um...por motivo de que el vio a Jesucristo resucitado y habló personalmente con él, José Smith es uno de los testigos más poderosos de Jesucristo. Por medio de él, Dios reveló la verdad del plan de salvación incluso la misión de nuestro Señor Jesucristo.

What did the missionary do wrong?

- A. No error was made
- B. He asked manipulative questions
- C. He was hesitant or apologetic
- D. He should have born his testimony or shared a spiritual experience
- E. He should have invited the person to make a commitment

Number 13

Misionero: Hermano López, para usted, ¿qué es el Libro de Mormón?

Hermano López: Bueno, como usted dijo, es otro libro que habla acerca de Jesucristo como la Biblia.

Misionero: Muy bien, es cierto. Y ¿qué piensa en cuanto a la idea a leerlo?

Hermano López: Bueno, estoy seguro que es un buen libro y no creo que me dará daño leerlo.

Misionero: Pues estoy seguro que no. Hermano López, como usted dijo yo sé que es un buen libro pero aún más importante yo sé que es la palabra de Dios.

What should the missionary do now?

- A. Restate or summarize what the person said
- B. Show empathy for the person's situation
- C. Follow up on a previous commitment
- D. Invite the person to make a commitment
- E. Continue with the discussion

Number 14

Misionero: Perdón Señor, podría decirme cuando sale el vuelo para Córdova?

Señor: Yo creo que me dijeron 9:45.

Misionero: Ah, gracias. ¿Va a tomar el mismo vuelo?

Señor: Sí

Misionero : Parece que usted fue a una reunión, ¿está de viaje de negocio?

Señor: Sí, yo trabajo por una compañía de computación. Y, ¿a dónde va usted?

Misionero: Bueno yo soy un misionero de la iglesia de Jesucristo de los Santos de los últimos días, y voy para Uruguay a representar mi iglesia por dos años

Señor: Que bien. Yo pienso que el mundo necesita saber más acerca de Dios. Muchas personas lo han olvidado.

Misionero: Uh... ¿le gustaría saber más en cuanto a nuestra iglesia?

What did the missionary do wrong?

- A. No error was made
- B. He ignored a problem or concern
- C. He should have talked about common beliefs
- D. He was hesitant or apologetic
- E. He should have followed up on a previous commitment

Number 15

Misionero: Dios escoge a hombres justos para que sean sus testigos y les habla directamente para revelarles la verdad. A estos hombres a quienes Dios escoge se le llaman profetas. Hermana García, ¿qué piensa cuando yo digo la palabra profeta?

Hermano García: Moisés, Pedro y otras personas igual que ellos en la Biblia.

Misionero: Yo pienso en ellos también. Por ejemplo, Moisés, Pedro, como usted dijo fueron profetas. ¿Usted piensa hermano que estos profetas realmente hablaban con Dios?

Hermano García: Sí, yo creo que ellos lo hicieron.

What should the missionary do now?

- A. Continue with the discussion
- B. Help the person resolve a problem or concern
- C. Invite the person to make a commitment
- D. Show empathy for the person's situation
- E. Follow up on a previous commitment

Number 16

Misionera: Estoy tan a gusto de poder estar con usted de nuevo. ¿Cómo ha estado estos días?

Hermana: Um...bien gracias. Estuve un poco resfriada estos últimos días, pero parece que estoy mejor ahora. Acá tengo este libro que ustedes me dejaron para que leyera el Libro de Mormón, se las tengo que dar de vuelta, ¿lo quieren otra vez?

Misionera: No, no. Usted puede quedarse con el un poco más. Le va a gustar bastante el Libro de Mormón, es un libro maravilloso.

Hermana: Bueno gracias

Misionera: Bueno, nos gustaría hablar con usted este día acerca de algunos principios importantes acerca del evangelio de Jesucristo. El primer principio que nos gustaría hablarle es acerca de la fe...

What did the missionary do wrong?

- A. No error was made
- B. She should have followed up on a previous commitment
- C. She asked manipulative questions
- D. She should have talked about common beliefs
- E. She failed to build a relationship of trust

Number 17

Misionero: En resumen, nosotros hemos hablado esta noche acerca del evangelio de Jesucristo y los primeros principios del evangelio: fe en el Señor Jesucristo, arrepentimiento, bautismo, y el don del Espíritu Santo. Ustedes han sido muy pacientes y considerados. Hermana Martínez, nosotros queremos que usted sepa que hemos disfrutado al estar aquí en su casa para compartir nuestros sentimientos sobre el evangelio con usted.

Hermana Martínez: Yo lo disfruté mucho también. Me gusta mucha que vengan a mi casa. Ustedes siempre traen un sentimiento de paz muy grande. Ahora mismo estoy disfrutando de este sentimiento.

What should the missionary do now?

- A. Help the person resolve a problem or concern
- B. Talk about common beliefs
- C. Continue with the discussion
- D. Follow up on a previous commitment
- E. Identify the presence of the Spirit

Number 18

Misionero: Esa fue una cena deliciosa Hermana Gómez. Seguro que es muy agradable tener una buena cena de vez en cuando. Gracias por invitarnos.

Hermana Gómez: De nada es nuestro placer Elder. Nos encanta tener los misioneros en nuestra casa.

Misionero: Ahora, hablando de la obra misional, ¿ustedes hermanos tienen algunos amigos o parientes que no sean miembros de la iglesia y a quienes posiblemente podamos enseñarle el evangelio también?

Hermana Gómez: No, en realidad no.

Misionero: Um...ya veo. Entonces pienso que debemos de retirarnos. Gracias de nuevo por la cena.

What did the missionary do wrong?

- A. No error was made
- B. He should have talked about common beliefs
- C. He should have found out more about the person's thoughts or feelings
- D. He should have followed up on a previous commitment
- E. He should have shown empathy for the person's situation

Number 19

Elder Mendoza: Hermano León, gracias por permitirnos venir a su casa nuevamente esta tarde para explicarle más sobre el evangelio de Jesucristo.

Hermano León: Bueno Elder Mendoza, la verdad es que he disfrutado mucho tenerlos aquí. Híjoles, ustedes siempre me dan algo en que pensar.

Elder Mendoza: A nosotros nos gustaría regresar nuevamente. Quizás el Martes por la noche. ¿Estaría esto bien con usted?

Hermano León: Claro, martes en la noche está bien conmigo.

Elder Mendoza: Hermano León, usted tiene algún pariente o algún amigo que le gustaría invitar para reunirse con nosotros y así ellos pueden escuchar nuestro mensaje también cuando nosotros regresemos el martes.

Hermano León: Bueno, la verdad Elder Mendoza es que no sé si eso sería una buena idea o no.

What should the missionary do now?

- A. Bear his testimony or share a spiritual experience
- B. Present a gospel message or explain a doctrine
- C. Identify the presence of the Spirit
- D. Find out more about the person's thoughts or feelings
- E. Show empathy for the person's situation

Number 20

Hermana: La charla que tuvimos esta noche ha sido muy interesante. Aprendimos mucho acerca de su iglesia y en realidad disfrutamos mucho teniéndolos aquí en nuestra casa.

Misionero: O, a nosotros nos gusta mucho venir aquí también. A nosotros nos gustaría regresar nuevamente para enseñar a su familia más acerca del evangelio de Jesucristo. ¿Les gustaría tenernos de regreso otra vez?

Hermana: Si nos gustaría mucho.

Misionero: Entonces, ¿prometen ustedes que tendrán algunos de sus amigos aquí a quienes podemos enseñar el evangelio cuando nosotros regresemos?

Hermana: Sí, supongo que podríamos hacerlo.

What did the missionary do wrong?

- A. No error was made
- B. He asked manipulative questions
- C. He ignored a problem or concern
- D. He should have borne his testimony or shared a spiritual experience
- E. He should have talked about common beliefs

Number 21

Elder Collins: Sister Jackson, will you invite some of your nonmember friends to come over so we can teach them the gospel?

Sister Jackson: Elder Collins, you know that I would do anything to help the missionaries with their work, but as you know we have a new baby in our home and I teach the children in primary every week. To tell you the truth I just don't feel like I can handle any more pressure and responsibility right now.

Elder Collins: All of us need to be involved in missionary work. I'm sure you can find someone who can meet with us Friday night. Would you be willing to do that?

What did the missionary do wrong?

- A. No error was made
- B. He should have talked about common beliefs
- C. He ignored a problem or concern
- D. He should have invited the person to make a commitment
- E. He should have borne his testimony or shared a spiritual experience

Number 22

Missionary: We believe that there is a God in heaven. We believe that he is perfect, he knows everything, and he has the power to do anything that needs to be done. Mrs. Larsen, do you believe in God?

Mrs. Larsen: Not really. I don't even know if there is a God. Would you mind telling us why you feel that way? Why do you doubt that there is a God?

Missionary: Well, because of all the suffering in the world. If there really was a God I don't think that he would let so much misery and unhappiness go on in this earth.

What should the missionary do now?

- A. Invite the person to make a commitment
- B. Continue with the discussion
- C. Identify the presence of the Spirit
- D. Follow up on a previous commitment
- E. Restate or summarize what the person said

Number 23

Brother: Good evening Elders. How are you tonight?

Missionary: We're doing pretty good, thanks. It's good to be a with a friendly member family.

Brother: Well it's always good to have you in our home. Now then, what can we do for you?

Missionary: Well we want to give your family an opportunity to participate in missionary work. Would you please make a list of your nonmember friends and relatives, and then invite them to hear the discussions?

What did the missionary do wrong?

- A. No error was made
- B. He failed to build a relationship of trust
- C. He ignored a problem or concern
- D. He should have followed up on a previous commitment
- E. He should have shown empathy for the person's situation

Number 24

Missionary: For centuries the truth about the plan of salvation was available just in the Bible. But now, God has given us *The Book of Mormon*, a second witness of Jesus Christ. Mrs. Johnson I know that this book is the word of God just like the Bible.

Mrs. Johnson: I can tell that you really believe what you're saying.

Missionary: I do. Mrs. Johnson, we would like to invite you to read *The Book of Mormon*. And to help you begin, we suggest that you read a few selected passages by our next visit. Here's a copy of *The Book of Mormon* with the pages marked that we would like you to read. Will you read these passages by our next visit?

Mrs. Johnson: I would love to read your book, but I'm not sure I can. You see, I'm getting old now, my eyes are not very good and I can't read anymore.

What should the missionary do now?

- A. Bear her testimony or share a spiritual experience
- B. Identify the presence of the Spirit
- C. Present a gospel message or explain a doctrine
- D. Show empathy for the person's situation
- E. Follow up on a previous commitment

Number 25

Elder Holckam: Hello, Mr. Cramer. We noticed your name on the mailbox. Your place looks very nice. You must enjoy working in the yard.

Mr. Cramer: Uh...yeah...

Elder Holckam: My name is Elder Holckam, and this is my companion Elder Hall. We're missionaries for the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints. We'd like to share a brief message with you. May we come in?

Mr. Cramer: Well, I've really got my hands full right now.

Elder Holckam: Yeah, we noticed the two children playing outside. Are they your children?

Mr. Cramer: Yeah! Both of them!
That's great! I have a niece and nephew about the same ages. Kids are awesome!

Mr. Cramer: Well that's true, but they can be a handful too.

Elder Holckam: I'm sure they can be. Mr. Cramer, we would really like to share our message with you and your family. What we have to share will make all the difference in raising your children. We'll take only 15 or 20 minutes of your time. May we share our message with you?

What did the missionary do wrong?

- A. No error was made
- B. He should have borne his testimony or shared a spiritual experience
- C. He was hesitant or apologetic
- D. He should have invited the person to make a commitment
- E. He failed to build a relationship of trust

Number 26

Missionary: Do you mind if I sit down here?

Man: Not at all.

Missionary: Thanks! Do you ride this bus often?

Man: Just about everyday. Riding this bus is how I get to and from work.

Missionary: I ride buses a lot too. I'm a missionary for the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints. Most people know us by the name Mormons.

Man: Oh yes, Mormons. I've heard about your church. Someone told me once that Mormons don't believe in Christ. If you're not Christians, what do you believe?

What should the missionary do now?

- A. Follow up on a previous commitment
- B. Invite the person to make a commitment
- C. Identify the presence of the Spirit
- D. Show empathy for the person's situation
- E. Present a gospel message or explain a doctrine

Number 27

Sister: That was a very interesting discussion tonight. We've learned a lot about your church and have enjoyed having both of you here in our home.

Missionary: Thanks! We like coming here too. We'd like to come back again to teach your family more about the gospel of Jesus Christ. Would you like us to come back again?

Sister: Yeah that would be great.

Missionary: Then will you promise to have some of your friends here so we can teach them when we return?

Sister: Well, I guess I could do that.

What did the missionary do wrong?

- A. No error was made
- B. He asked manipulative questions
- C. He ignored a problem or concern
- D. He should have borne his testimony or shared a spiritual experience
- E. He should have talked about common beliefs

Number 28

Missionary: Brother and Sister Smith, we really appreciate your willingness to help us with our missionary work.

Brother: Hey we're just glad to help Elder.

Missionary: You've listed two families that you could invite to meet with us, the Thompson's and the Halls. Which of these families do you think would be most likely to accept an invitation to come to your home and hear the first discussion?

Brother: I'd have to say the Halls. They're the ones that have responded the best whenever we've talked to them about the church.

What should the missionary do now?

- A. Help the person resolve a problem or concern
- B. Invite the person to make a commitment
- C. Talk about common beliefs
- D. Show empathy for the person's situation
- E. Present a gospel message or explain a doctrine

Number 29

Missionary: Hi Jack. We came by to talk to you about your baptism Saturday. Is everything still okay?

Jack: I think so. I'm still planning to be baptized, if that's what you mean.

Missionary: Great! Uh...Jack, sometimes we like to invite people's friends and relatives to come to their baptism. I don't know if it would be possible to do that or not, but I thought I'd mention it anyways.

Jack: I don't think that would be a good idea. My parents aren't very excited about me getting baptized, so I don't think they'd come and my friends are so busy. Hm...well we understand. We're sure glad you're getting baptized!

What did the missionary do wrong?

- A. No error was made
- B. He should have followed upon a previous commitment
- C. He was hesitant or apologetic
- D. He failed to build a relationship of trust
- E. He asked manipulative questions

Number 30

Missionary: The second principle of the gospel is repentance. To repent we admit to God that what we've done is wrong. We feel sorrow for our sins. We stop doing the thing that was wrong and try to correct any problems that we may have caused. Mrs. Friar, from what we have said, what does it mean to you to repent of our sins?

Mrs. Friar: Well, it means to stop doing the things that are bad.

Missionary: That's right. How do you feel personally about this principle of repentance?

Mrs. Friar: What if you can't stop? I'd really like to stop drinking. I've been drinking for years and I know it's not good. I've tried to stop before, but I just can't do it.

What should the missionary do now?

- A. Help the person resolve a problem or concern
- B. Follow up on a previous commitment
- C. Continue with the discussion
- D. Talk about common beliefs
- E. Identify the presence of the Spirit

Number 31

Missionary: We must be baptized to become members of the church of Jesus Christ and to enter the kingdom of heaven. Mrs. Hansen, will you accept the Savior's invitation and be baptized to become a member of his church?

Mrs. Hansen: I'm sorry. I really like what you've told me but I just can't be baptized in your church.

Missionary: Would you mind sharing with us why you can't be baptized?

Mrs. Hansen: Well, my father's a minister in another church. If I got baptized into your church, I know he'd be deeply hurt. I love my mother and father very much and I just couldn't do that to them.

Missionary: You need to be strong enough to be baptized in spite of your family. In the Bible the Savior said he that loveth father and mother more than me is not worthy of me.

What did the missionary do wrong?

- A. No error was made
- B. She should have found out more about the person's thoughts or feelings
- C. She should have followed up on a previous commitment
- D. She was hesitant or apologetic
- E. She should have shown empathy for the person's situation

Number 32

Missionary: Mr. Lee, we want to thank you for letting us come into your home again tonight to explain more about the gospel of Jesus Christ.

Mr. Lee: Well we've enjoyed having you here. You always give us something to think about.

Missionary: Well thanks. We'd like to come back again. Maybe on Tuesday night, would that be okay?

Mr. Lee: Sure, Tuesday is fine.

Missionary: Great! Is there anyone else, like family members or friends that you would like to invite to meet with us so that they can hear our message too when we come back Tuesday?

Mr. Lee: I don't know if that would be a good idea or not.

What should the missionary do now?

- A. Bear his testimony or share a spiritual experience
- B. Present a gospel message or explain a doctrine
- C. Identify the presence of the Spirit
- D. Find out more about the person's thoughts or feelings
- E. Show empathy for the person's situation

Number 33

Missionary: That sure was a delicious dinner Sister Jameson. It's sure nice to get a good meal every now and then. Thanks for inviting us.

Sister Jameson: Oh you're welcome. We always like to have the missionaries in our home.

Missionary: Well speaking of missionary work, do you folks have any friends or relatives who aren't members of the church that we could teach the gospel to?

Sister Jameson: Well, I don't think so.

Missionary: All right. Well I guess we better be going on then. Thanks for dinner.

What did the missionary do wrong?

- A. No error was made
- B. He should have talked about common beliefs
- C. He should have found out more about the person's thoughts or feelings
- D. He should have followed up on a previous commitment
- E. He should have shown empathy for the person's situation

Number 34

Missionary: In summary we've talked tonight about the gospel of Jesus Christ and the first principles of the gospel: Faith in the Lord Jesus Christ, repentance, baptism and the gift of the Holy Ghost. You've been very patient and considerate Mrs. Thomas. We want you to know that we enjoy coming here to share our feelings about the gospel with you.

Mrs. Thomas: I really enjoy it too. I look forward to your visits because you always bring a peaceful feeling into my home. I feel that good feeling right now just having you here.

What should the missionary do now?

- A. Help the person resolve a problem or concern
- B. Talk about common beliefs
- C. Continue with the discussion
- D. Follow up on a previous commitment
- E. Identify the presence of the Spirit

Number 35

Missionary: It's good to be with you again Mrs. Cunningham. How have you been getting along?

Mrs. Cunningham: I'm doing okay thanks. I've had a cold the past couple of days, but it seems to be getting better. Oh, by the way, here's the book you left for me to read, *The Book of Mormon*. Do you want it back?

Missionary: No. You can keep it awhile longer. You'll enjoy *The Book of Mormon*. It's a wonderful book.

Mrs. Cunningham: Well thanks!

Missionary: Mrs. Cunningham, we want to talk to you today about some important principles of the gospel of Jesus Christ. The first principle that we want to talk about is faith...

What did the missionary do wrong?

- A. No error was made
- B. She should have followed up on a previous commitment
- C. She asked manipulative questions
- D. She should have talked about common beliefs
- E. She failed to build a relationship of trust

Number 36

Missionary: God chooses righteous men as his witnesses. They learn the truth from God himself. These men are called prophets. Mr. Rollins, what do you think of when you hear the word prophet?

Mr. Rollins: Um...Moses, Peter, people like that that are in the Bible.

Missionary: Well I think of those men too. Moses and Peter were prophets. Do you believe that prophets like Peter and Moses actually talked with God?

Mr. Rollins: Yeah, I believe that they did.

What should the missionary do now?

- A. Continue with the discussion
- B. Help the person resolve a problem or concern
- C. Invite the person to make a commitment
- D. Show empathy for the person's situation
- E. Follow up on a previous commitment

Number 37

Missionary: Excuse me sir, could you tell me what time the Delta flight headed for New York leaves?

Man: I believe it says 9:45

Missionary: Thanks! Are you taking the same flight?

Man: Yeah I am

Missionary: Well, you look like you're on your way to a meeting. Are you on a business trip?

Man: Yeah, I work for a computer company. Where are you headed?

Missionary: I'm a missionary for the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints. And I'm going to Africa so I can represent my church for two years.

Man: Well that's great. I think the world needs to know more about God. I know that I believe in God too, but most people have forgotten about him.

Missionary: Would you like to know more about our church?

What did the missionary do wrong?

- A. No error was made
- B. He ignored a problem or concern
- C. He should have talked about common beliefs
- D. He was hesitant or apologetic
- E. He should have followed up on a previous commitment

Number 38

Missionary: Brother Jones, what is *The Book of Mormon* to you?

Brother Jones: Well, like you said it's another book that talks about Jesus Christ, like the Bible.

Missionary: Exactly! And how do you feel about reading it?

Brother Jones: I'm sure it's a good book and that reading it couldn't hurt.

Missionary: Brother Jones, like you said, I know that it is a good book and more importantly that it is the word of God.

What should the missionary do now?

- A. Restate or summarize what the person said
- B. Show empathy for the person's situation
- C. Follow up on a previous commitment
- D. Invite the person to make a commitment
- E. Continue with the discussion

Number 39

Missionary: Through this and other experiences, Joseph Smith was called as a prophet. He was much like Moses and other biblical prophets. They also saw God and were called to preach his message. How do you feel about Joseph Smith as a prophet of God?

Sister: I guess it seems okay.

Missionary: You seem a little unsure.

Sister: Well, how do you know that he was a prophet?

Missionary: Because he saw and talked with the resurrected Savior, Joseph Smith is a powerful witness of Jesus Christ and through him God revealed the truths of the plan of salvation including the divine mission of Jesus Christ.

What did the missionary do wrong?

- A. No error was made
- B. He asked manipulative questions
- C. He was hesitant or apologetic
- D. He should have born his testimony or shared a spiritual experience
- E. He should have invited the person to make a commitment

Number 40

Missionary: It's good to be with you again Sister Bruner.

Sister Bruner: Well it's nice to have you here again. Every time you come I feel so relaxed and comfortable.

Missionary: Why do you suppose you feel that way?

Sister Bruner: I don't know. The things you tell me make me so happy.

Missionary: Sister Bruner, the feelings that you are having come from the Spirit of the Lord and are telling you that the things we are teaching are true.

Sister Bruner: It does sound true.

Missionary: Do you remember what we asked you to do the last time we were here?

Sister Bruner: Well yeah, you asked me to read part of *The Book of Mormon* and pray about it.

What should the missionary do now?

- A. Follow up on a previous commitment
- B. Help the person resolve a problem or concern
- C. Identify the presence of the Spirit
- D. Restate or summarize what the person said
- E. Invite the person to make a commitment

Appendix E

Spanish Grammar Test

SPANISH GRAMMAR TEST

Instructions:

On the following pages you will encounter several common missionary situations. Each situation is presented in both Spanish and English; however, the Spanish version contains several blanks with words missing. For each numbered blank, choose the Spanish word(s) from the options listed at the right, that *best* expresses the meaning given by the underlined English word(s).

The following is an example:

In this situation, Elder Jones is teaching María, an investigator, about God.

E. Jones:	Para Ud., ¿quién es Dios? <i>To you, who is God?</i>	1. a. nosotros b. nos c. nuestro d. nuestros
María:	Para mí, Dios es <u>(1)</u> Padre y Él nos ama. <i>To me, God is <u>our</u> Father, and He loves us.</i>	

For blank number 1, you need a Spanish word that means our, as in *God is our father*. Looking at the options listed at the right for number 1, you would pick (c), nuestro, and you would color in the corresponding bubble on your green answer sheet.

You are not expected to know all the answers to this test. Simply answer each question as best you can. If you are not sure about an answer, make the best guess you can. Your score on this test will not be reported to your teacher or anyone else at the MTC. Your answers will be combined with those of other missionaries and used for research purposes.

You may now begin the test.

Situation A In this situation, elders Davis and Hart are becoming acquainted with Mateo and Silvia, a member couple.

Mateo: <u>(1)</u> , élderes. Acabo de llegar del trabajo. <i>Come in, elders, I just got home from work.</i>	1. a. Entran b. Entren c. Entre d. Entramos
E. Davis: Gracias. Con permiso. <i>Thanks. With permission.</i>	2. a. trabaja Ud. b. hace Ud. trabajo c. Ud. trabajo d. hace Ud. trabajar
E. Hart: ¿Dónde <u>(2)</u> ? <i>Where <u>do you work</u>?</i>	
Mateo: Trabajo en la ciudad. <u>(3)</u> carros usados. <i>I work in the city. <u>I sell</u> used cars.</i>	3. a. Vendio b. Vendió c. Vendo d. Vendó
E. Davis: ¿Son estos <u>(4)</u> hijos? <i>Are these <u>your</u> children?</i>	4. a. suyos b. su c. Uds. d. sus
Mateo: Sí, él es Marcos y él es Pablo. Cristina <u>(5)</u> ahora. <i>Yes, this is Marcos, and this is Pablo. Cristina <u>is</u> <u>studying</u> right now.</i>	5. a. es estudiando b. está estudiado c. es estudiado d. está estudiando
E. Davis: Uds. tienen una familia muy bonita. ¿Hace cuánto tiempo que <u>(6)</u> miembros de la Iglesia? <i>You have a really nice family. How long <u>have you been</u> members of the Church?</i>	6. a. son b. fueron c. eran d. sean
Silvia: Pues, yo nací en la Iglesia, pero Mateo se con- <u>(7)</u> cuando tenía 19 años. <i>Well, I was born in the Church, but Mateo <u>was</u> <u>converted</u> when he was 19.</i>	7. a. -virtió b. -vertó c. -vertió d. -virtó
Mateo: Sí, un amigo <u>(8)</u> me llevó a la Iglesia. <i>Yes, a friend <u>of mine</u> introduced me to the Church.</i>	8. a. de yo b. mi c. mío d. de me

Situation B In this situation, Elders Alves and Keller are about to invite Luís and Mariano Santos to be baptized.

<p>E. Alves: A través del bautismo, le mostramos a Dios que estamos dispuestos a guardar sus mandamientos. Luís y Mariana, nos gustaría fijar su bautismo <u>(9)</u> 5 de octubre. <i>Through baptism, we show God that we're willing to keep His commandments. Luís and Mariana, we'd like to schedule your baptism <u>for the 5th of October.</u></i></p>	<p>9. a. para el b. al c. por el d. del</p>
<p>E. Alves: ¿Están Uds. dispuestos a <u>(10)</u> ese día? <i>Are you willing to <u>be baptized</u> on that day?</i></p>	<p>10. a. estar bautizado b. ser bautizado c. bautizarse d. estar bautizados</p>
<p>Luís: Mariana, ¿qué piensa Ud.? <i>Mariana, what do you think?</i></p> <p>Mariana: <u>(11)</u> asistir a un bautismo primero para ver cómo es. <i>I would like to attend a baptism first to see what it's like.</i></p>	<p>11. a. A mí me gustaría b. Yo me gustaría c. Mí gustaría d. Yo gustaría</p>
<p>E. Keller: Ésa es <u>(12)</u> buena idea. <i>That's <u>a</u> good idea.</i></p>	<p>12. a. a b. un c. la d. una</p>
<p>E. Keller: <u>(13)</u> un servicio bautismal este domingo a las cinco. <i>There will be a baptismal meeting this Sunday at five o'clock.</i></p>	<p>13. a. Será b. Va a ser c. Estará d. Habrá</p>
<p>E. Keller: Luís y Mariana, ¿nos <u>(14)</u> ? <i>Luís and Mariana, <u>will you come</u> with us?</i></p>	<p>14. a. acompañan b. acompañarán c. acompañamos d. acompañarían</p>
<p>Mariana: Está bien. ¿Puede Luís llevar a <u>(15)</u> hermanas también? <i>All right. May Luís bring <u>his</u> sisters too?</i></p> <p>E. Keller: ¡Claro! <i>Of course!</i></p>	<p>15. a. suyas b. su c. sus d. de él</p>

Situation C In this situation Elders Young and North are meeting with Pablo and Carmen Ceballos, a member couple, to find out if they have nonmember friends that are ready to hear the discussions.

Pablo:	Élderes, conocimos a una nueva familia, y esperábamos que ellos <u>(16)</u> las charlas pero no sabemos si tienen interés. <i>Elders, we met a new family, and we hoped that they would <u>hear</u> the discussions, but we don't know if they are interested.</i>	16. a. escucharían b. escuchan c. escucharan d. escuchen
E. Young:	¿De verdad? ¿Quiénes son? <i>Really? Who are they?</i>	17. a. llamarse b. llaman c. se llamen d. se llaman
Pablo:	Ellos <u>(17)</u> David y Ester. <i>Their names are David and Ester.</i>	
E. North:	¿Quieren Uds. que nosotros hablemos con ellos? <i>Do you want us to talk to them?</i>	18. a. no les nada digan b. no les digan nada c. no digan les nada d. no digan ellos nada
Pablo:	No, <u>(18)</u> . <i>No, <u>don't say anything to them.</u></i>	
Pablo:	Carmen pre- <u>(19)</u> hablar con ellos personalmente. Vamos a invitarles a asistir a la iglesia con nosotros este domingo. <i>Carmen <u>prefers</u> to talk to them personally. We're going to invite them to attend church with us this Sunday.</i>	19. a. -fire b. -fere c. -fera d. -fiere
E. Young:	¡Excelente! Entonces, ¿podemos <u>(20)</u> con ellos en la iglesia? <i>Great! Then, can we <u>talk</u> with them in church?</i>	20. a. hablar b. habla c. hablamos d. hablaremos
Pablo:	Sí, pueden. <u>(21)</u> de que ellos les conozcan a Uds. <i>Yes, you can. <u>We're excited</u> for them to meet you.</i>	21. a. Somos animados b. Nosotros animados c. Estamos animados d. Nosotros somos animados
Carmen:	También queremos <u>(22)</u> un Libro de Mormón. <i>We also want to <u>give them</u> a Book of Mormon.</i>	22. a. les dar b. darles c. darlos d. los dar
Carmen:	¿Cuándo piensan Uds. que debemos dár- <u>(23)</u> ? <i>When do you think we should <u>give it to them</u>?</i>	23. a. -leslo b. -selo c. -lo les d. -les lo
E. Young:	Tal vez después de la primera charla. <i>Maybe after the first discussion.</i>	

Situation D In this situation, Sisters Silva and Lima are teaching a teenage investigator, Rosa, about God.

S. Silva:	Nuestro Padre Celestial quiere que <u>(24)</u> a vivir con Él. <i>Our Heavenly Father wants us to <u>return</u> to live with Him.</i>	24. a. vovleremos b. volver c. volvemos d. volvamos
S. Silva:	Si seguimos el plan que Él preparó, <u>(25)</u> volver a su presencia. <i>If we follow the plan that He prepared, <u>we will be able to return</u> to His presence.</i>	25. a. podríamos b. podamos c. podremos d. podemos
S. Silva:	Rosa, ¿cómo se siente acerca de <u>(26)</u> ? <i>Rosa, how do you feel about <u>that</u>?</i>	26. a. eso b. este c. ese d. esa
Rosa:	Dios es muy importante para mí. Sin Él, la vida <u>(27)</u> sentido. <i>God is very important to me. Without Him, life <u>wouldn't have</u> any meaning.</i>	27. a. no tendré b. no tendría c. no tiene d. no tuviera
S. Silva:	Así es. Dios es importante para mí también. Para mí es un gran privilegio <u>(28)</u> misionera y enseñar el plan de Dios a mis hermanos. <i>That's right. God is important to me too. It's a great privilege for me <u>to be</u> a missionary and teach God's plan to my brothers and sisters.</i>	28. a. soy b. ser c. estoy d. estar
S. Silva:	<u>(29)</u> mucho acerca de Dios en la misión. <i><u>I have learned</u> a lot about God on my mission.</i>	29. a. He aprendido b. Yo he aprendí c. Tengo aprendido d. Tengo aprendiendo

Situation E In this situation, Elders Ball and Owens are becoming acquainted with Sergio and Adriana, an investigator couple.

E. Ball:	Adriana dijo que Uds. <u>(30)</u> a algunos miembros de nuestra iglesia. <i>Adriana said that you <u>know</u> some members of our church.</i>	30. a. saben b. conoce con c. conocen d. sabe
Sergio:	Sí, José Carlos y Lidia Gómez <u>(31)</u> nuestros vecinos. <i>Yes, José Carlos and Lidia Gomes <u>are</u> our neighbors.</i>	31. a. somos b. estarán c. son d. están
E. Owens:	¿Alguna vez <u>(32)</u> la oportunidad de hablar con ellos acerca de nuestra iglesia? <i><u>Have you had</u> the opportunity to talk with them about our church?</i>	32. a. tienen Uds. tenido b. han tenido c. Uds. tenido d. tenido Uds.
Sergio:	No, ellos <u>(33)</u> acerca de la religión. <i>No, <u>they haven't said anything</u> about religion.</i>	33. a. han dicho nada b. no han dicho c. han no dicho algo d. no han dicho nada
E. Owens:	Entonces, ¿cómo se interesaron en la Iglesia Mormona? <i>So how did you become interested in the Mormon Church?</i>	34. a. estuve buscando b. fue buscando c. fui buscando d. estaba buscando
Adriana:	Bueno, Sergio <u>(34)</u> una religión. <i>Well, Sergio was <u>looking for</u> a religion.</i>	
Adriana:	Él <u>(35)</u> sobre varias religiones, pero nunca encontró ninguna que fuera lo que quería. <i>He <u>had read</u> about several religions, but he never found one that was what he wanted.</i>	35. a. había leído b. tuvo leído c. ha leído d. habrá leído
Adriana:	Entonces, la semana pasada, mientras mir- <u>(36)</u> la televisión, . . . <i>Then last week while <u>he was watching</u> television, . . .</i>	36. a. -aría b. -ía c. -á d. -aba
Adriana:	. . . vio un anuncio acerca de la Iglesia Mormona y deci- <u>(37)</u> averiguar más. . . . <i>he saw an advertisement about the Mormon Church, and <u>he decided</u> to find out more.</i>	37. a. -dó b. -dé c. -dió d. -dí

Situation F In this situation, Elders King and Lyman are meeting with an investigator couple, José and María, to follow up on their Book of Mormon reading.

E. King:	¿(38) Uds. la oportunidad de leer las partes que marcamos en el Libro de Mormón? <i>Did you have the chance to read the parts that we marked in the Book of Mormon?</i>	38. a. Tenían b. Tienen c. Tendrían d. Tuvieron
José:	Desafortunadamente, no lo leímos. <i>Unfortunately, we didn't read it.</i>	39. a. Cómo b. Qué c. Cuál d. Cuándo
E. King:	Entiendo. ¿(39) fue el problema? <i>I understand. What was the problem?</i>	
José:	Pues, no tuvimos tiempo. <i>Well, we didn't have time.</i>	40. a. se sienten b. siéntense c. sentirse d. se sientan
E. Lyman:	¿Cómo (40) acerca del Libro de Mormón? <i>How do you feel about The Book of Mormon?</i>	
María:	Realmente queremos leer el libro. <i>We really do want to read the book.</i>	41. a. leen b. lean c. leyeron d. leyeran
E. Lyman:	¡Qué bien! Queremos que Uds. (41) el Libro de Mormón. <i>Good! We want you to read The Book of Mormon.</i>	
E. Lyman:	. . . porque sabemos que Uds. (42) sentir el Espíritu. <i>. . . because we know that you will feel the Spirit.</i>	42. a. van b. vayan c. van a d. va
E. King:	Yo amo el Libro de Mormón porque (43) a sentirme más cerca a Dios. <i>I love The Book of Mormon because it helps me feel closer to God.</i>	43. a. ayuda mí b. me ayuda c. lo me ayudo d. me ayudo
José:	Pueden estar seguros que leeremos esta semana. <i>You can be sure we'll read it this week.</i>	

Situation G In this situation, Sisters Sosa and Ficklin are teaching María de la Luz, a new member, that our sins are forgiven through baptism.

S. Sosa:	<p>Cuando nos bautizamos prometemos guardar los mandamientos. Dios promete perdonar nuestros pecados si cumplimos nuestra parte del convenio. <i>When we're baptized, we promise to keep the commandments. God promises to forgive our sins if we keep our part of the covenant.</i></p>	44. a. pueda b. podrá c. puedo d. puede
María:	<p>A veces yo dudo que Dios <u>(44)</u> perdonar mis pecados. <i>Sometimes I doubt that God <u>can</u> forgive my sins.</i></p>	
S. Ficklin:	<p>¿Sabe? Yo he sentido lo mismo también. Cuando yo <u>(45)</u> joven, . . . <i>You know, I've felt that way also. When I <u>was</u> a teenager. . .</i></p>	45. a. fui b. era c. fue d. estuve
S. Ficklin:	<p>. . . me había arrepentido <u>(46)</u> de algunos pecados y quería saber si Dios me había perdonado. <i>. . . I had <u>repented</u> of some sins, and I wanted to know if God had forgiven me.</i></p>	46. a. -ti b. -tiendo c. -tido d. -timiento
S. Ficklin:	<p>Una noche yo oré y le pedí a Dios que me <u>(47)</u> a saber su voluntad. <i>One night I prayed and asked God to <u>help</u> me know His will.</i></p>	47. a. ayude b. ayuda c. ayudar d. ayudara
S. Ficklin:	<p>Mientras <u>(48)</u>, sentí una gran paz. <i>While I <u>was praying</u>, I felt a great peace.</i></p>	48. a. oró b. oraba c. oré d. orar
S. Ficklin:	<p>Me di cuenta de cuánto Dios me ama. <u>(49)</u>, este conocimiento . . . <i>I realized how much God loves me. <u>To me</u>, this knowledge . . .</i></p>	49. a. Para me b. Para mi c. Para yo d. Para mí
S. Ficklin:	<p>. . . es más importante <u>(50)</u> cualquier otra cosa en mi vida. <i>. . . is more important <u>than</u> anything else in my life.</i></p>	50. a. que b. como c. entonces d. cuanto

Appendix F
Strategy Usage Questionnaire

Strategy Usage Questionnaire

Date: _____ Participant ID #: _____

1. Which of the reading or language learning strategies from the training have you used this past week?

2. Which of these have seemed most helpful?

3. What other strategies have you tried?

4. Are these additional strategies working?

5. Is what you are doing sufficient? If not, what else might you try to do?

Appendix G

Missionary Reading Self-Report

Missionary Reading Self-Report

Missionary ID# or name: _____

Elders and Sisters, as you know, outside of this study, reading the Spanish Book of Mormon was something you could do if you chose to and how you chose to. It was neither discouraged nor encouraged by those conducting the study. We would still like to understand any effect that this reading may have on the test results this week. Your responses to the questions below will therefore be very helpful.

1. Outside of the assigned 30 minutes per day, did you read the Spanish Book of Mormon? Yes_____ No_____

2. If yes, how many additional days each week did you read it? (circle one)

1 2 3 4 5 6 7

3. About how many pages did you read outside of the study (on your own) since you've been in the MTC?

4. How much time did you spend reading the Spanish Book of Mormon on your own (outside the study)?

_____ minutes per day or _____ minutes per week

5. When you were reading the Spanish Book of Mormon on your own (outside the study), what percent of time did you read aloud or silently? (put an X on the line)



Elders and Sisters, thank you again for your participation in this study. We appreciate your time and effort to help it to work. Because you will be occupied with taking the languages tests this week, the thirty minutes of study in 17M is optional for the rest of your time at the MTC. You can continue to go if you want to, but you don't have to.

During your infield language LGM on Thursday/Friday we will share with you what we have been learning from the study. Good luck with the testing.

Appendix H
Background Questionnaire

MISSIONARY BACKGROUND QUESTIONNAIRE

To help us learn more about you, please answer the following questions as accurately and completely as you can. Your responses are confidential and will not be shared with your teachers or other missionaries.

1. Missionary research ID number (4 digits) _____

2. Please check one box to indicate whether you are an elder or a sister missionary.

elder sister

3. When did you enter the Missionary Training Center? _____/_____/_____

month / day / year

4. Did you speak any Spanish before entering the MTC?

yes no

5. If you answered yes to number four, check all the boxes below which apply.

I took Spanish in high school for _____ years.

I took Spanish in college for _____ semesters.

I lived with others who speak Spanish.

I lived in a Spanish speaking country.

I studied Spanish on my own.

I learned Spanish by _____

6. If you studied Spanish in school, what was your average grade in your Spanish classes?

Average grade _____

7. Have you ever studied a language other than Spanish?

yes no

If yes, what language did you study? _____

How long did you study it? _____

What was your average grade when you studied it? _____

Appendix I

Consent to Be a Research Subject Form

Consent to be a Research Subject

As you are studying Spanish as a part of your mission call, you have been selected to participate in research at the MTC on the language learning process. Lane Steinagel, an MTC employee and a graduate student at BYU, is conducting this research project.

As a participant in this study, you will be exposed to different types of language training tools and programs during your normal MTC training schedule. You will also be asked to complete questionnaires, participate in language skill assessments, and answer questions in interviews and focus groups. Your classes and labs will also be periodically observed.

There may be minimal risks, discomforts, or benefits associated with participation in this study. Participation in this study is voluntary and you may refuse to participate or withdraw at any time without penalty. Your identity and answers will be held strictly confidential, with names replaced by control numbers.

If you have any questions regarding this research project, you may contact Lane Steinagel at 422-7242 in MTC 18M-133, or Ric Ott, Director of MTC Research and Evaluation, at 422-6999 in MTC 18M-131.

“I have read and understood the above consent, and desire of my own free will to participate in this study.”

Signature of Research Subject

Date