

UC Berkeley

The CATESOL Journal

Title

Adult ESL Learners' Attitudes Toward Movement (TPR) and Drama (TPR Storytelling) in the Classroom

Permalink

<https://escholarship.org/uc/item/49m1p6xx>

Journal

The CATESOL Journal, 18(1)

ISSN

1535-0517

Author

Braunstein, Lauren

Publication Date

2007

DOI

10.5070/B5.36309

Copyright Information

This work is made available under the terms of a Creative Commons Attribution License, available at

<https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/>

Peer reviewed

LAUREN BRAUNSTEIN
Partners for ESL, Philadelphia

Adult ESL Learners' Attitudes Toward Movement (TPR) and Drama (TPR Storytelling) in the Classroom

■ **In this study, I investigated how adult Latino ESL students reacted to two alternative methods of instruction: Total Physical Response (TPR) and Total Physical Response Storytelling (TPRS). The research regarding adult Latino attitudes suggests that this population expects a grammar-driven and “traditional” classroom atmosphere (Gault, 2003, 2004). The TPR and TPRS methods deviate from what is considered a “traditional classroom” because of their implicit and kinesthetic nature. I, therefore, researched the students’ expectations as well as their affective reactions to the kinesthetic class. I first collected a survey to find out the students’ learning preferences. Then, the students experienced a total of five hours of teaching, which consisted of a combination of TPR and TPRS. The students’ attitudes were collected through questionnaires, video recording, and professional observation. The data revealed that the students showed overwhelmingly positive attitudes toward these two methods, despite the fact that the students had more “traditional” expectations of English class. Although further research is necessary, teachers could use the findings of this study as an impetus to use alternative methods**

in their adult classes and to encourage teachers to conduct action research as a means to assess students’ attitudes toward various teaching methodologies.

Introduction

As a practicum student, I had the opportunity to observe and teach a low-beginner ESL class at the Salinas Adult School. My cooperating teacher welcomed me into the classroom and was open to my bringing alternative methods, such as Total Physical Response (TPR) and Total Physical Response Storytelling (TPRS or TPR Storytelling), into my lesson plans. The students had never been exposed to such methods. I conducted this experimental/action research study from the perspective of a teacher, observer, and researcher. The impetus for this study stemmed from my professional career, in which I have used these two methods to teach Spanish at the elementary school level. I observed that my students became enthusiastic about learning language, that these methods contributed to a positive classroom atmosphere, and that the students displayed positive attitudes toward their language learning. Since I have observed positive affective outcomes from children, I was interested to investigate whether adults would display similar attitudes in response to these methods. Therefore, using my previous teaching experience with these highly energetic and kinesthetic methods, I wished to explore if the adult learners would show a similar enthusiasm.

Literature Review

In this literature review, I will describe the theoretical framework for the methods that are used in the study—Total Physical Response and the expansion of this method called Total Physical Response Storytelling. After this discussion, I draw from the work of Gault (2003, 2004) to place my study within the research that he has conducted on the adult Hispanic population and its expectations of an ESL class.

Total Physical Response is a method that was created by James Asher in 1966. The method is designed to provide students with comprehensible input in a low-anxiety and highly kinesthetic atmosphere. The method moves away from a grammatical syllabus, where grammar is taught explicitly, to a completely implicit way of teaching the language. When using TPR, the teacher provides input for the students and then the students physically respond to the directions of the teacher (Asher, 2000). The method aligns with the hypotheses found in Krashen's (1982) monitor model. For one, students are exposed to input that is made comprehensible by the physical gestures. Under Krashen's model, language learners are thought to be in a "silent period," in which they are not ready to produce the language. With TPR, the students are not required to produce any speech, but rather, they show their comprehension by physically acting out the language that they hear. In addition, Krashen advocates a learning situation in which the students' "affective filters" are low; that is, if the students are not under any type of emotional stress, then the new language will be more accessible. These same principles are evident in the expansion of the TPR method, TPR Storytelling.

TPR Storytelling was designed as an expansion of TPR by Blaine Ray in the 1980s. Ray (2002) noticed the lexical and grammatical limitations of traditional TPR and created a storytelling element in which the teacher (or another student) tells a story while members of the class create a dramatic representation of the story. According to Ray, this method can lead to fluency in a language because the method addresses the student's number one interest, which is "to be able to speak and understand" (p.xxi). He also explains that learning *about* the language through explicit grammatical methodologies is "peripheral" for the students. In other words, from Ray's pedagogical perspective, students accomplish their objective of being able to speak and understand the language not by gaining an explicit understanding of the language's rules but rather by being exposed to the language

input and implicitly gaining an awareness of the rules of the language. Therefore, Ray posits the notion that language students do not desire to learn language with a grammatical focus. This opinion, however, is contrary to the opinions that were revealed in Gault's (2003, 2004) studies, which will be discussed in the following section.

Gault (2003, 2004) has focused his research on the adult Hispanic community and its members' attitudes toward their ESL classes and what they consider to be "good teaching in ESL" (2004). The population on which he has focused his research is directly comparable to the population in this present study. The results from Gault (2003) showed that the participants expressed a preference for a "traditional classroom," where there is explicit grammar instruction, error correction, and a transfer of information from teacher to student. Another of Gault's (2004) studies also revealed that this population prefers an explicit, direct, grammar-driven classroom structure.

Gault attributes this tendency to the fact that adult Hispanic English learners need to make adjustments to a new culture and the ESL classroom may bring the realization that they do not speak the dominant language. Students may seek friendships with people who speak their L1. Students also may have trouble adapting to a classroom atmosphere where there is a new school culture and teachers are "easygoing" (p. 58). As a result, students feel more comfortable in a seemingly rigid class that has strict routines and selective input in the L1. Gault explains that the students may prefer a type of class with "first-language lecture on English syntax, rather than a CI class with such seemingly lazy techniques as TPR and fairy tales" (p. 58). Gault (2004) explains this gap that exists between the expectations of the students and the methods that have been proven to be the most effective for language acquisition. Whereas Gault ascertains that language learning occurs through communicative and implicit approaches, the students do not associate these methods as indications of good teach-

ing. He explains, “thus, these students are pre-disposed against the methods that work the best” (p. 125). Gault’s studies also provide suggestions that teachers could use for helping students understand the value of more communicative approaches to language teaching, which may be a necessary step in the process of implementing alternative methods, such as TPR and TPR Storytelling. Proponents of these methods make claims that students’ interest and enthusiasm will naturally be elevated by methods such as TPR and TPR Storytelling. For example, McQuillan and Tse (1998) write, “individuals’ natural interest and familiarity with narratives, then, make storytelling a powerful vehicle for supplying target language input and capturing student interest” (p.19).

These claims that the TPR advocates make do not match the results of the Gault (2003, 2004) studies, which demonstrated that the adult Hispanic population does *not* prefer such “alternative methods,” but rather that students expect to learn English with explicit grammatical rules in a teacher-fronted classroom. Therefore, there is a missing link in the literature, which this study could potentially fill. My study will test several claims made in the above literature. This study takes a “snapshot” of what types of activities a class of Hispanic adult ESL learners prefer. Since the populations are comparable, the results could potentially align with the results found in the Gault studies, which were that this population prefers explicit grammar instruction. I will also see how this group of students affectively reacts to the methods TPR and TPR Storytelling, which will test the claims made by the proponents of TPR and TPR Storytelling.

Research Question

In light of my personal interest and of the research that has been done, my research question reads as follows:

How do the kinesthetic teaching methods Total Physical Response and Total Physical Response Storytelling affect Hispanic adult ESL learners’ attitudes about learning English?

In this study, the independent variables are the two methods, TPR and TPR Storytelling, and the dependent variable is the students’ attitudes toward learning English as measured by the various data collection instruments that are discussed in the Instruments section. The learning preferences of the students is considered to be a moderator variable in the study to prevent their preferences from confounding the results. My hypothesis was that the methods would have a positive effect on learners’ attitudes. My experience using these methods with children had rendered positive results, and I apply this experience to that of adult learners and believe that the methods will positively affect their attitudes.

Methods

Participants

My participants consisted of 15 adult low-beginner ESL learners at the Salinas Adult School. The class I worked with was a low-beginner ESL class that meets from 1:30 p.m. to 4 p.m. Monday through Friday. The ages of the students ranged from 19 to 70 years old and the years of English study ranged from 2 months to 2 years. All of the students were of Mexican origin and all share the same L1 of Spanish. The school has an open-enrollment system, which results in a constantly changing student population. From day to day, there is no guarantee that the class will consist of the same group of students, but there is consistently an average of 12 to 15 students in the class. During the span of my study, there was not a consistent population, which resulted in students’ participating in different parts of the study.

Instruments

Various data collection instruments were used in the study. Since the class is at the beginning level, the surveys and questionnaires were provided in Spanish. I used a preliminary survey to find out the participants’ learning preferences and classroom expectations (Appendix A). I also used this survey to

find out demographic information about the participants such as name, age, native country, and the number of years that they have studied English as well as the types of activities the students prefer to learn English with. I administered an affective reaction survey (Appendix B) twice during the study, once after the TPR lesson and once after the TPR Storytelling lesson. In this survey, the students demonstrated how they felt during the lessons by circling the appropriate emotion. After the two lessons, I also administered a Likert scale questionnaire to discover the students' attitudes in response to the teaching methods (Appendix C). In this questionnaire, students were to agree or disagree with statements about the class and the methods. In addition, there were three observers in the class on Day 2 of the study, my practicum instructor, my cooperating teacher, and a peer observer. I provided focused observation forms (Appendix D) to the observers to get systematic responses from my observers. The third observer also videotaped an hour of the class on Day 2, which allowed for real-time documentation of the class. Finally, as the teacher, I used reflective journal writing (Appendix E) after each class session, in which I described my perceptions of the students' responses to the classroom methodology. I provided observational narration followed by my personal inferences.

Procedure

It was important that the students first become familiar with me and my presence in the classroom. Before the start of the study, I spent a total of 5 hours in the classroom as a participant and nonparticipant observer. During this time, I engaged with the students, assisted with activities, and even corrected some of the students' written work.

My teaching for the study took 5 hours, consisting of 2 days of classes that ran from 1:30 p.m. until 4:00 p.m. The first piece of information that I solicited from the students was their learning preferences. I administered this survey during the first 15 minutes of Day

1 of the study. On the same day, I introduced TPR by teaching the body parts. Since this class coincided with the Mexican holiday Día de los Muertos, I brought a life-sized skeleton into the class to aid in my demonstration of the body parts. From 1:45 until 3:30, I used a combination of TPR and TPR Storytelling exercises and stories to teach body-part vocabulary. During the final 30 minutes of this class, the students provided their reactions by taking the affective reaction survey. On Day 2, I planned the entire class around a picture sequence taken from a TPR Storytelling picture book. After the class, the students filled out another affective reaction survey as well as the final Likert-scale reaction questionnaire.

Additional methods of data collection were applied during various times in the study. For example, after each class period, I wrote a reflective journal, which included my perceptions of the students' attitudes toward the methods. Also, one of the two class sessions was videotaped, and this provided me, as the teacher and researcher, an opportunity to reflect upon and observe the class in a more intensive manner. Also, on Day 2, I had my practicum instructor, cooperating teacher, and peer observer use a set of preestablished criteria from which to observe my classes, and these criteria focused on affective aspects of the class.

Analysis

Upon the conclusion of the study, I had collected data in numerous forms. I have included a list of all the sources of data collection:

- Learning preference surveys (Appendix A)
- Postmethod affective reaction surveys (Appendix B)
- Poststudy Likert-scale reaction questionnaire (Appendix C)
- Peer/practicum teacher observation form (Appendix D)
- Teacher reflection journal (Appendix E)
- Videotape of Day 2

Once the data were collected, I reviewed the information in a systematic manner. I first examined the learning preference survey and counted the number of responses each activity received. The activity that was circled the most was taken to indicate the activity that the students preferred the most. I then collected the affective reaction surveys and counted the number of responses each emotion received. Again, the emotion that was circled the most was taken as an indication of how the majority of the students felt during the activity. I read the attitude surveys and extracted any patterns that may exist among them by making a frequency table. From the observation reports, I recorded the percentages and looked for patterns in the qualitative, open-ended sections. Finally, my reflective journal entries were considered to account for my perspective as the teacher. After reviewing all the data, I assessed whether conclusions could be drawn regarding the affective reactions of this particular group of students.

Findings

As mentioned in the Instruments section, I used four data collection instruments to collect the data. I will present the findings in the following order: learning preferences, reactions to the methods, observation reports, and reflective teacher journaling.

In the learning preferences survey, I solicited information regarding the types of activities the students prefer when learning English. I included a wide range of options, from grammatical exercises to songs and drama. The students were permitted to circle more than one activity when filling out the survey. As indicated in Table 1, the two most selected activities were *grammar exercises* and *written work*, followed by *lecture*. As will be noted in the Discussion section, these learning activities can be considered more “traditional” and “explicit.” *Movement*, which is a primary characteristic of TPR, was chosen five times, and *Listen to stories*, which is an essential element of TPR Storytelling, was chosen only two times.

Table 1
Learning Preferences

	<i>Number of responses</i>
Grammar exercises	11
Group conversation	5
Games	3
Songs	7
Drama	6
Listen with pictures	5
Lecture	10
Written work	11
Movement	5
Listen to stories	2

According to these findings, the preferences of the students may yield a hypothesis that they would not react positively to TPR and TPR Storytelling since these students prefer explicit grammatical instruction, lecture, and written work. Table 2 indicates the first round of reactions to the Day 1 TPR activity.

Table 2
Reaction Questionnaire
(Day 1 TPR Activity)

	<i>Number of responses</i>
Happiness	5
Interest	12
Shyness	1
Confusion	4
Embarrassment	0
Enthusiasm	9
Bored	0
Nervous	2
Stupid	0
Fear	1

Students were permitted to circle more than one emotion, as they did in the learning preference survey. As indicated in Table 2, the most selected emotion was *interest*, with 12 responses. After *interest*, *enthusiasm* was chosen 9 times, followed by *happiness*, which was chosen 5 times. Also, none of the students felt *embarrassed*, *nervous*, or *stupid* after the TPR lesson.

Table 3
Reaction Questionnaire
(Day 2 TPR Storytelling Activity)

	<i>Number of responses</i>
Happiness	7
Interest	9
Shyness	2
Confusion	1
Embarrassment	1
Enthusiasm	6
Bored	0
Nervous	2
Stupid	0
Fear	0

The students' reactions to the TPR Storytelling lesson on Day 2 were consistent with their reactions on Day 1. Again, the most selected emotions were *interest*, *happiness*, and *enthusiasm*, nine, seven, and six times respectively. There were two responses of both *shyness* and *nervous*. *Confusion* and *embarrassment* were both chosen only once, and none of the students indicated that they felt stupid or fearful during the TPR Storytelling sequence.

After the students experienced both TPR and TPR Storytelling, I administered the Likert-scale questionnaire, which consisted of four possible responses to each of six questions. The possible responses were:

1. *Estoy completamente de acuerdo.* (I completely agree.)
2. *Estoy de acuerdo.* (I agree.)
3. *No estoy de acuerdo.* (I disagree.)
4. *Estoy completamente en desacuerdo.* (I completely disagree.)

I have listed the six questions followed by the responses to each question; 10 students were present to take the questionnaire. The results will be described further after the sixth question.

1. *Esta clase me ayudó aprender verbos y sustantivos.*

(This class helped me learn nouns and verbs.)

Table 4
Likert Question 1 Results

<i>Possible responses</i>	<i>Number of responses (out of 10)</i>
1 (completely agree)	9
2 (agree)	1
3 (disagree)	0
4 (completely disagree)	0

2. *Esta clase me ayudó con la comprensión al escuchar.*
 (This class helped me with listening comprehension.)

Table 5
Likert Question 2 Results

<i>Possible responses</i>	<i>Number of responses (out of 10)</i>
1 (completely agree)	9
2 (agree)	1
3 (disagree)	0
4 (completely disagree)	0

3. *Estuvo más fácil entender un verbo cuando lo actué.*
 (It was easy to understand a verb when I acted it out.)

Table 6
Likert Question 3 Results

<i>Possible responses</i>	<i>Number of responses (out of 10)</i>
1 (completely agree)	9
2 (agree)	1
3 (disagree)	0
4 (completely disagree)	0

4. *Estuvo más fácil entender el cuento cuando miré a mis compañeros de clase lo actuando.*
 (It was easier to understand the story when I watched my classmates act it out.)

Table 7
Likert Question 4 Results

<i>Possible responses</i>	<i>Number of responses (out of 10)</i>
1 (completely agree)	8
2 (agree)	2
3 (disagree)	0
4 (completely disagree)	0

5. *Fue divertido actuar el cuento.*
(It was fun to act out the story.)

Table 8
Likert Question 5 Results

<i>Possible responses</i>	<i>Number of responses (out of 10)</i>
1 (completely agree)	9
2 (agree)	1
3 (disagree)	0
4 (completely disagree)	0

6. *Fue divertido mirar a los dibujos y escuchar al cuento.*
(It was fun to look at pictures and listen to the story.)

Table 9
Likert Question 6 Results

<i>Possible responses</i>	<i>Number of responses (out of 10)</i>
1 (completely agree)	9
2 (agree)	1
3 (disagree)	0
4 (completely disagree)	0

According to these results, the vast majority of the class was completely in agreement with the statements found in the questionnaire. For five out of the six questions, one, or at the most, two students were only *in agreement*. None of the students *disagreed* or *completely disagreed* with any of the statements. Therefore, as seen in Tables 4 through 9, the vast majority of the students believed that the

class helped them learn nouns and verbs, helped them with listening comprehension, that it was easy to understand a verb when they acted it out, that it was easier to understand the story when they watched their classmates act it out, that it was fun to act out the story, and finally that it was fun to look at pictures and listen to the story.

The following are the results from the three observation reports (Appendix C), which were administered on Day 2 of the study. I have listed the questions and then the responses that each of the three observers circled. The results will be described further after the display.

1. Volunteer responses/answers: Approximately what percentage of the class did you observe students volunteering their own responses, questions, or comments?
Observer 1: 75-100%
Observer 2: 75-100%
Observer 3: 50-75%
2. Laughter/smiles: Approximately what percentage of the class did you find the students to be smiling and/or laughing?
Observer 1: 50-75%
Observer 2: 50-75%
Observer 3: 25-50%
3. On-task behavior: Approximately what percentage of the class did you observe the students on task?
Observer 1: 75-100%
Observer 2: 75-100%
Observer 3: 75-100%
4. Eye contact: When the teacher was speaking, approximately what percentage of the time did you observe the students making eye contact with the teacher?
Observer 1: 75-100%
Observer 2: 75-100%
Observer 3: 25-50%

Apart from question 4, the observers

showed interobserver consistency. In question 1, observers 1 and 2 believed that the students volunteered to participate for the majority of the class, whereas observer 3 perceived this behavior half to three-quarters of the class time. In question 2, the first two observers believed that the students displayed laughter and smiles about half of the class time, whereas observer 3 thought that the students displayed this behavior 25-50% of the time. In question 3, all three observers perceived that the students were on task the majority of the class time. Finally, on question 4, observers 1 and 2 agreed that the students made eye contact with the teacher the majority of the time, but observer 3 believed that this behavior was demonstrated only one-quarter to half of the time. In three out of the four questions in the observation forms, the third observer's responses did not align with the other two observers' responses. One possible explanation for this discrepancy could be that this observer also was in charge of videotaping the class, which could have skewed his perception of the events in the class.

In addition to the quantitative feedback that the observers provided, they also described the affective qualities of the class in response to open-ended questions. Overall, their descriptions aligned with their responses to the percentage questions in part 1. The following are some selected quotes from the observers' descriptions. The first set of quotes comes from the practicum instructor (11/04/05):

- "Students displayed sustained engagement from beginning to end (despite siesta time on a Friday!)"
- "The students' happy facial expressions was one of the first things that I noticed."
- "For a lesson that was almost exclusively teacher-led, students showed an impressive level of attention, engagement, and participation."

The second set of quotes comes from the peer observer (11/04/05):

- "Some students appeared very interested, engaged—eyes on handouts and/or on teacher... Overall students seemed interested and happy to be in class."

Finally, excerpts from my reflective teaching journals can be found in Appendix E. The final result that I have to report is a quote from one of the students in the class, Rosa, a 65-year-old woman who has limited literacy in her L1 and no literacy in English. After the second class session, Rosa called me over to her table and said, "*Teacher, es que no sé leer ni escribir y en esta clase podía entender todo... gracias, gracias teacher.*" ("Teacher, it's that I don't know how to read or write, but in this class I could understand everything... thank you, thank you teacher.") (Rosa, personal communication, 11/04/05).

Discussion

Upon analyzing the results from the learning preference surveys, it became evident that the students do, in fact, prefer more "traditional" classroom activities, such as grammatical exercises, lecture, and written work. These findings are similar to those in the studies conducted by Gault (2003, 2004). Gault (2003), for example, writes that his participants "showed a strong preference for various features of a traditional classroom, particularly grammar instruction, error correction, tests, and 'making sure that I understand everything'" (p. 101). These are the types of activities that these students seem to expect when entering a language class. This expectation may stem from previous educational experience or the need to have a rigid controlled atmosphere since the assimilation process may feel out of control. The students may also be accustomed to a "traditional" class, and therefore this familiarity creates the preference. Such is the case with the class in my study. Furthermore, the cooperating teacher typically teaches grammar explicitly rather than in communicative ways, which may have contributed to the students' responding the way that they did in the learn-

ing preference survey. It would be useful to investigate further what motivates the students' preferences for certain activities.

However, although the students preferred the more "traditional" activities, they overwhelmingly responded positively to TPR and TPR Storytelling. They reported in the affective reaction survey that they felt "interest," "enthusiasm," and "happiness" at higher frequencies than emotions such as "fear," "boredom," and "embarrassment." These results support the claims made by McQuillan and Tse (1998), who discuss the "natural interest" that methods such as storytelling evoke in language learners. Furthermore, the students were all in agreement with many of the positive statements in the reaction questionnaire regarding their learning via such activities. The observation reports and videotape provided additional support for the findings that this population of students demonstrated enthusiasm, excitement, and engagement with the material.

The inconsistency between the learning preferences of the students and their reaction to the methods leads to a need for a discussion of how to inform the students of the utility of methods that they may not necessarily expect or prefer, but nonetheless that they react positively to as methodologies. In the case of my participants, students should be informed of the language-learning benefits of such methods. This type of knowledge could provoke the students to gain more respect for such methods. Gault (2004) provides recommendations for how to educate students on the language methodology and practice because even though students may be enthusiastic about the class events, this does not mean that they perceive the class as contributing to their learning. Gault explains that students should be introduced to language-learning theory. Lee (as cited in Gault, 2004) states, "Many students felt that this [a session introducing language-acquisition theory] was the first time that their teacher regarded them as 'as grown-up learner who deserved the right to know "why we are doing this"'" (p. 121). Determining whether or not the pop-

ulation in my present study deems methods such as TPR and TPR Storytelling as useful for language learning is an important inquiry for future research.

It's important that Rosa, as mentioned in the Findings section, was grateful that she could understand everything in the class. Normally, Rosa is quite lost in the class because the teacher uses written language to conduct the class. It is not surprising that students who have literacy problems in their L1 and are illiterate in English will struggle in a more traditional class. Gault (2004) writes, "These students often have trouble with the way literate teachers use writing" (p. 48). Rosa most likely expressed her excitement about the TPR Storytelling class because, even though the written story was provided, reading was not an essential skill to comprehend the story. Rosa had various sources to use to interpret the story. Rosa thrived in this class because she matched what she heard with the picture sequence, the physical actions of the teacher, the classmates, and her own use of the gestures.

Validity and Reliability

The design of this study was meant to gain insight into the attitudes of one adult ESL class. I believe I have created a strong and reliable study through my use of six different data-collection methods, which provides triangulation of my data. Johnstone (2000) refers to this research style as "diversity of method" (p.61). Johnstone comments on how the diversity in perspectives has the potential to provide a great deal of insight, and that diversity of method is important to ensure reliability. In addition, I collected data during two classroom sessions rather than one. I took this approach because the student population may vary from day to day in the adult school setting. In addition, during the first session, students may be adjusting to the novelty of the method. This adjustment period may yield results that do not accurately reflect their attitudes.

I acknowledge that there are also possible

drawbacks to the research design. In further studies, I would rewrite some of the open-ended questions in the student questionnaires. Many of the students were unsure of what I was asking, and as a result, I had to discard these data, for example. The external validity, or generalizability, of the study is admittedly limited because of the fact that it is only one small group of students. Also, there is a potential Halo Effect, which, according to Brown (1988), “addresses the tendency among human beings to respond positively to a person they like” (p.33). The students’ attitudes may be influenced by their desire to please the teacher. It was evident that the students enjoyed my presence in the class as indicated by the positive student-evaluation forms. Also, students may react positively because of the “newness” of the methods, whereas after a period of time, students’ attitudes could change. For this reason, it would be useful to conduct a longitudinal study, and after a period of time elapses, to conduct a parallel study. It is important to remember that this study is considered a “snapshot” into the attitudes of a small group of students, and therefore conclusions can be drawn from the study but in an admittedly limited way.

Conclusion

I hope that this study can inspire teachers to experiment with different methods in their classrooms, and that it can also serve as model for how to conduct small-scale action-research studies in the classroom. If this were my actual class, I would use the results to inform my future lesson planning. My cooperating teacher has asked me to supply him with some resources about these methods because he observed the positive affective outcomes. It is not to say that the entire class should consist of TPR and TPR Storytelling, but these are methods that may be appropriate to integrate into a teacher’s toolbox of teaching practices. It is also important for teachers to inquire into the learning styles and preferences of their students as well as to investigate the possible sources of such pref-

erences. Students’ preferences and expectations may not necessarily match what their reactions are to the methods, as was the case with this study. Therefore, it may be necessary to inform the students on the usefulness of methods that are distinct from what the students prefer.

Acknowledgments

I wish to thank my cooperating teacher, Peter Hicks, for welcoming me into his classroom and supporting me through the research project. I also would like to thank my peer observer, Aaron Sikes, for his observation and videotaping skills. Finally, I would like to thank my practicum instructor, John Hedgcock, for his amazing insights and guidance.

Author

Lauren Braunstein, originally from Atlantic City, NJ, recently completed a master’s degree in TESOL from the Monterey Institute of International Studies. Upon her return to the East Coast, she taught at Drexel University and is now the assistant director of an adult ESL program in South Philadelphia.

References

- Asher, J. (2000). *Learning another language through actions* (6th ed.). Los Gatos, CA: Sky Oaks Productions.
- Brown, J. (1988). *Understanding research in second language learning*. Cambridge, England: Cambridge University Press.
- Gault, T. R., III. (2003). Adult immigrant Latinas’ attitudes toward ESL classes. *Review of Applied Linguistics*, 139-140, 101-128.
- Gault, T. R., III. (2004). Adult Hispanic immigrants’ assumptions regarding “good teaching” in ESL (Doctoral dissertation, University of Southern California, 2004). *Dissertations Abstracts International*, 65, 5.
- Johnstone, B. (2000). *Qualitative methods in sociolinguistics*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Krashen, S. (1982). *Principles and practices of second language acquisition*. Oxford,

England: Pergamon Press.
McQuillan, J., & Tse, L. (1998). What's the story? Using the narrative approach in beginning language classrooms. *TESOL*

Journal, 7, 18-23.
Ray, B. (2002). *Fluency through TPR storytelling* (3rd ed.) Berkeley, CA: Command Performance Language Institute.

Appendix A Learning Preference Survey

Nombre _____
Edad _____
País del origen _____
¿Cuántos años ha estudiado inglés? _____

I. ¿Encierra con un círculo las actividades en que prefieres hacer en las clases de inglés?

Ejercicios de gramática	Conversación en grupos
Juegos (ej. Bingo)	Canciones
Drama	Mirar dibujos y escuchar
Lectura	Escuchar a cuentos
Trabajo escrito	Movimiento para aprender

II. ¿Qué son tus expectativas en una clase de inglés?

1) ¿Qué son tus expectativas del profesor en una clase de inglés?

2) ¿Qué son tus expectativas de los compañeros de clase?

3) ¿Qué es tu expectativa de usted, como estudiante, debe hacer en una clase?

Appendix B Postmethod Affective Reaction Survey

Name _____

Por favor encierra con un círculo las emociones que mejor describen como te sentías durante esta actividad. Puedes marcar más de una emoción.

Actividad #1 TPR (Day 1)

Felicidad	Confusión	Aburrido	Tonto
Interesado	Vergüenza	Nervioso	Temor
Tímido	Entusiasmo	Otra: _____	

Name _____

Por favor encierra con un círculo las emociones que mejor describen como te sentías durante esta actividad. Puedes marcar más de una emoción.

Actividad #1 TPR Storytelling (Day 2)

Felicidad	Confusión	Aburrido	Tonto
Interesado	Vergüenza	Nervioso	Temor
Tímido	Entusiasmo	Otra: _____	

Appendix C Poststudy Likert-Scale Reaction Questionnaire

Quiero saber tu opinión sobre esta clase. Por favor encierra con un círculo donde tu creas correcto.

- 1 - Estoy completamente de acuerdo
- 2 - Estoy de acuerdo
- 3 - No estoy de acuerdo
- 4 - Estoy completamente en desacuerdo.

1) Esta clase me ayudó aprender verbos y sustantivos.

1 2 3 4

2) Esta clase me ayudó con la comprensión al escuchar.

1 2 3 4

3) Estuvo más fácil entender un verbo cuando lo actué.

1 2 3 4

4) Estuvo más fácil entender el cuento cuando miré a mis compañeros de clase lo actuando.

1 2 3 4

5) Fue divertido actuar el cuento.

1 2 3 4

6) Fue divertido mirar a los dibujos y escuchar al cuento.

1 2 3 4

Appendix D
Peer/Practicum Teacher Observation Form

• • • Observation Form • • •

Applied Linguistics Research: Ss attitudes towards “alternative” teaching methods.
Lauren Braunstein

Observer Name: _____

Date: _____

Please answer the following questions to the best of your ability regarding the affective qualities of the class. For additional comments, there is additional space on the back of this paper.

1) **Volunteer Responses/Answers:** Approximately what percentage of the class did you observe students volunteering their own responses, questions or comments?

0-25% 25-50% 50-75% 75-100%

2) **Laughter/Smiles:** Approximately what percentage of the class did you find the students to be smiling and/or laughing?

0-25% 25-50% 50-75% 75-100%

3) **On-Task Behavior:** Approximately what percentage of the class did you observe the students on-task?

0-25% 25-50% 50-75% 75-100%

4) **Eye Contact:** When the teacher was speaker, approximately what percentage of the time did you observe the students making eye contact with the teacher?

0-25% 25-50% 50-75% 75-100%

5) **Students’ Postures:** In your own words, please generally describe the physical postures of the students during the class. (Example, *Some students were slouched in their chairs.*)

6) **General Affective Qualities:** In your own words, please describe the attitudes of the students during this classroom. Please focus on affective qualities.

7) **Other:** Please comment on anything else that you feel was relevant to classroom atmosphere and student attitude.

Appendix E Teacher Reflection Journal

From Day 1

“I also used the labeling activity to inform me about what parts of the body the students knew, like a quick needs assessment. I discovered that the students knew almost all the parts of the body. After the students labeled the skeleton, I conducted a TPR sequence, where the students touched body parts that I said. All the students willingly and attentively participated. The students had a sense of humor about their mistakes, which encouraged them to take risks. Then, I led the TPR sequence, where only the ladies participated. Then, I switched to the men. This created a light competition in the class, and seemed to build classroom community. I, then, stood on the chair, and had the students tell me what part of my body I was touching. In chorus, the entire class responded. I had all their attention, and overall, I could sense a feeling of confidence and accomplishment from the students.”

From Day 2

“We continued through the picture sequence, and due to the large participation level, I led the students in a choral description of the pictures. Then, I solicited individual students to describe subsequent pictures. It was interesting that some students were acting out the story without the instruction to do so. This informs me that some students comprehend the material better if they connect their bodies to it, and therefore it is necessary to set up a classroom atmosphere where it is acceptable to interact with the language in this kinesthetic way. I, then, had the whole class act out the story, and everybody was engaged. The students appeared active and engaged. I felt energized to be the conductor of such an active class.”