# RETENTION DIFFERENCES BETWEEN UNIVERSITY STUDENTS INSTRUCTED WITH STORYTELLING TECHNIQUE AS PART OF TPRS METHOD AND THOSE WITH OTHER TECHNIQUES: A NATURAL APPROACH PERSPECTIVE

**Osman Ulu**

**MASTER'S THESIS**

**DEPARTMENT OF FOREIGN LANGUAGES**

**GAZİ UNIVERSITY**

**GRADUATE SCHOOL OF EDUCATIONAL SCIENCES**

**JUNE, 2016**

# COPYRIGHT AND CONSENT TO COPY THE THESIS

**YAZARIN**

Name : Osman

Surname : Ulu

Department : English Language Teaching

Signature :

Date of Delivery :

**THESIS**

Title of the thesis in Turkish : TPRS Metodunun Hikâye Anlatımı Tekniği ile ve Diğer Yöntemlerle Eğitim Gören Üniversite Öğrencileri Arasındaki Kelimeleri Hafızada Tutma Farklılıklarının Araştırılması: Bir Doğal Yaklaşım Perspektifi.

Title of the thesis in English : Retention Differences between University Students Instructed with Storytelling Technique as part of TPRS Method and Those with Other Techniques: A Natural Approach Perspective.

# DECLARATION OF CONFORMITY TO ETHICS

I declare that I have complied with the scientific ethical principles within the process of typing the dissertation that all the citations are made in accordance with the principles of citing and that all the other sections of the study belong to me.

Name: Osman Ulu

Signature :

# THESIS APPROVAL

We certify that the thesis entitled "Retention Differences between University Students Instructed with Storytelling Technique as part of TPRS Method and Those with Other Techniques: A Natural Approach Perspective." prepared by Osman Ulu has been unanimously found satisfactory by the jury for the award degree of Master in the subject matter of English language teaching at Gazi University, Department of English Language Teaching.

**Supervisor:** Asst. Prof. Dr. Cemal Çakır

ELT Department, Gazi University　　　　　　　　…………………………

**Chairman:**

…………………………

**Member:**

…………………………

**Member:**

…………………………

**Member:**

…………………………

Date of thesis defense:

I certify that this thesis has complied with the requirements of degree of Master in subject matter of English Language Teaching.

Prof. Dr. Tahir ATICI

Director of the Graduate School of Educational Sciences　　…….…………………….

# ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I am immensely grateful to all the people who have helped me during my master's work.

First of all, I would like to thank my advisor, Asst. Prof. Dr. Cemal Çakır, whose encouragement and stimulating suggestions helped me throughout my master program and thesis work.

I also wish to extend my gratitude to the lecturers at the Gazi University English Language Teaching Department, where I finished my undergraduate and master's degree.

I also want to express my greatest thanks to my family. Your love and moral support have greatly helped finish my thesis.

# TPRS METODUNUN HİKÂYE ANLATIMI TEKNİĞİ VE DİĞER YÖNTEMLERLE EĞİTİM GÖREN ÜNİVERSİTE ÖĞRENCİLERİ ARASINDAKİ KELİMELERİ HAFIZADA TUTMA FARKLILIKLARININ ARAŞTIRILMASI: BİR DOĞAL YAKLAŞIM PERSPEKTİFİ

**(Yüksek Lisans Tezi)**

**Osman Ulu**

**GAZİ ÜNİVERSİTESİ**

**EĞİTİM BİLİMLERİ ENSTİTÜSÜ**

**Haziran, 2016**

## ÖZ

Yabancı dil öğretiminde kelime öğretimi oldukça büyük öneme sahiptir. Ders içinde zamanın kısıtlı olmasından dolayı sınıf içinde etkili bir kelime öğretim yönteminin kullanılması kelimeleri uzun süreli hafızada tutmada çok önemlidir. Bu çalışmada Hikâye Anlatımı Tekniğinin üniversite öğrencilerinin hedef kelimeleri uzun süreli hafızada tutmalarında ne kadar etkili olduğu araştırılmıştır. Öncelikle deney grubu öğrencileri Hikâye Anlatımı Tekniği ile kontrol grubu ise diğer yöntemlerle hedef kelimelere maruz bırakılmışlardır. Eğitim sonunda deney ve kontrol grubu öğrencilerine ön-test ve son-test uygulanmıştır. Test sonuçlarına göre deney grubu kontrol grubundan daha fazla kelimeyi hafızada tutsa da bu istatistiksel açıdan önemli bulunmamıştır.

Anahtar Kelimeler   : Hikâye Anlatımı Tekniği, Doğal Yaklaşım, uzun süreli hafıza
Sayfa Adedi        : 96
Danışman          : Yrd. Doç. Dr. Cemal Çakır

# RETENTION DIFFERENCES BETWEEN UNIVERSITY STUDENTS INSTRUCTED WITH STORYTELLING TECHNIQUE AS PART OF TPRS METHOD AND THOSE WITH OTHER TECHNIQUES: A NATURAL APPROACH PERSPECTIVE

## (M.A. Thesis)

**Osman Ulu**

**GAZI UNIVERSITY**

**GRADUATE SCHOOL OF EDUCATIONAL SCIENCES**

**June 2016**

## ABSTRACT

Teaching vocabulary has an important place in foreign language teaching. Since the time in class is limited, the use of an effective method of teaching vocabulary is important for the long-term retention of the words. The present study investigated how effective the Storytelling Technique was with the university students in their long-term retention of the words. Firstly, the experimental group students were taught the target vocabulary with Storytelling Technique and control group students with the other techniques. Following the instruction, experimental and control group students were given a pre-test and a post-test. According to the test results, although the experimental group students retained more words, this was not statistically significant.

# TABLE OF CONTENTS

# LIST OF TABLES

# LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS

TPRS        Teaching Proficiency through Reading and Storytelling

TPR         Total Physical Response

EFL         English as a Foreign Language

ALM         Audio Lingual Method

CLT         Communicative Language Teaching

CBI         Content-Based Instruction

NA          Natural Approach

GTM         Grammar Translation Method

OPT         Oxford Placement Test

# CHAPTER I

# INTRODUCTION

Foreign language teachers have been in search of a method that is both engaging and effective. One of the latest methods is called Teaching Proficiency through Reading and Storytelling (TPRS) Method. This method was developed in the 1980s by a Californian Spanish teacher named Blaine Ray. Although it is widely accepted as a method, there have been a few small studies on the benefits of the TPRS Method (Beal, 2011; Rapstine, 2003). This study is aimed at investigating the effects of TPRS Method on vocabulary retention and students' attitudes towards foreign language learning.

## 1.1. Statement of the problem

Vocabulary is at the heart of learning a foreign language and this is expressed by many scholars in the field of applied linguistics. Wilkins (1972) argued that although without grammar little can be conveyed, nothing can be conveyed without vocabulary. Learning vocabulary is vital to the acquisition of a language (DeCarrico, 2001). Increasing the vocabulary knowledge of learners is an important aspect of education (Nagy, 1988). To master a second language, learning vocabulary is vital (Schmitt, 2008).

To state the importance of vocabulary, the proponents of the Natural Approach, Krashen and Terrell (1983) claimed "with more vocabulary there will be more comprehension and with more comprehension there will be more acquisition". Lewis (2000) stated that it is the size of the learners' lexicon that marks the most notable difference between the higher and lower level learners, not their grammatical knowledge. For the communication to happen in a meaningful manner, learners need to master words in order to express a wide range of meanings in the L2, even though they know grammar well (McCarthy, 1990). Laufer

(1998) observed that since the most striking difference between the native speakers and foreign language learners is in the number of words they know, a gradual increase in the learners' vocabulary size is required.

It is estimated that native English speaking university graduates have a vocabulary size of about 20,000 word families (Goulden et al., 1990; D'Anna, Zechmeister, & Hall, 1991). In order to comprehend a written text in the target language, 98% of the running words in it should be known by the learner (Nation & Hu, 2000). Schmitt (2008) suggested the 98% coverage was a reasonable minimum coverage. As for the spoken discourse, Bonk (2000) suggested 95% coverage was necessary in order to comprehend a listening discourse. Nation (2001) claimed that learners need to know 15.000-20.000 words to be able to read a text in the target language with little problem from unknown words. Students learning a foreign language are faced with the challenge of learning so many words. And, since the time is limited in a foreign language classroom, an effective technique of teaching vocabulary to students is needed to be able use classroom time efficiently.

## 1.2. Significance of the Study

This study investigated the effect of Storytelling Technique as part of TPRS Method on vocabulary retention and students' attitudes towards foreign language learning in an EFL context. The number of studies on the effect of Storytelling Technique on vocabulary retention in a foreign language context is very limited; thus, most of these studies were conducted in the United States. Moreover, our study may support the findings of the other studies conducted on the effectiveness of the use of Storytelling Technique as part of TPRS Method in the classroom. In the literature, researchers studied the effectiveness of this technique mostly in primary, secondary and high schools. So, the effect of using this technique on university level students has not been studied. Besides, because it is a relatively new technique to teach a foreign language vocabulary, it has not been researched thoroughly (Beal, 2011; Rapstine, 2003). The current study could demonstrate the effectiveness of Storytelling Technique as part of TPRS Method in university level students.

## 1.3. Purpose of the Study

At the state university in Ankara where the current study is conducted, the main method with which English as a Foreign Language is taught is the Comprehension Based Methods. TPRS Method has been introduced to the teachers at the university, but the implementation of it and adoption of it by the teachers are limited. The Natural Approach and the TPRS Method are both Comprehensible Input-based methods. Beginner level students at the university in question are required to listen to recordings, read texts and watch videos on the subjects they study in their course books. However, they are not obliged to talk or write in English during the lessons except for giving short answers to the questions they are asked. As the main objective of the English lessons at the state university is to improve beginner level students' receptive vocabulary knowledge, finding the method that utilizes the classroom time most efficiently to teach target vocabulary that will be retained in the long-term memory is of utmost importance. TPRS Method, as it has been studied so far, was found to be effective in middle school students but not in high school students (Beal, 2011). The purpose of the current study is to investigate the effect of Storytelling Technique as part of TPRS method on vocabulary retention and participants' perceptions on the Storytelling Technique as part of TPRS Method in an EFL context with university students.

## 1.4. Research Questions

This study was guided mainly by the following questions:

1. Does using Storytelling Technique as part of TPRS Method in teaching vocabulary items result in long-term retention?
2. Is there a statistically significant difference between experimental and control groups' performances on test scores?
3. What are the students' attitudes on the effectiveness of the Storytelling Technique as part of TPRS Method?
4. What are the teachers' attitudes on the effectiveness of the Storytelling Technique as part of TPRS method in teaching vocabulary?

## 1.5. Limitations of the Study

The study was conducted with participants from a relatively small number of beginner level university students in a military educational institution in Ankara. The treatment period of the study was limited to two weeks. The participants were all male, so it could be said that the researcher could not investigate the effect of the Storytelling Technique as part of TPRS Method on female students. The vocabulary choices were limited to the textbook, which was also determined by the school administration.

## 1.6. Assumptions

The assumptions of the study were:

1. All participants did their best on all tests.

2. The results would be consistent and reliable because participants had the same teacher, and were of the same skill level of English.

3. The teacher's instruction was consistent for each of the sample groups.

## 1.7. Definitions of Terms

**Teaching Proficiency through Reading and Storytelling (TPRS):** A language teaching method that combines TPR method (James Asher, 1977) and the Natural Approach (Krashen & Terrell, 1983) (Ray & Seely, 2012).

**Long-Term Memory:** Permanent memory. Information in the long-term memory does not disappear completely and it can be retrieved later (Atkinson & Shiffrin, 1968).

**Short-Term Memory:** Working memory. The information entering into short-term memory disappears completely after a while (Atkinson & Shiffrin, 1968).

**Total Physical Response:** A language teaching method that was developed by James Asher in the early 1970s (Thornbury, 2006, p. 231).

**Retention:** The persistence of what is learned or experienced as a record in the central nervous system with a variable degree of permanence (Bhatia, 2009).

**Implicit Vocabulary Learning:** Learning of vocabulary as the by-product of any activity not explicitly geared to vocabulary learning (Hulstijn, 2001, p. 271).

**Explicit Vocabulary Learning:** Any activity geared at committing lexical information to memory (Hulstijn, 2001, p. 271).

**Natural Approach:** An approach to language teaching developed by Stephen Krashen and Tracy Terrell in the early 1980s (Richards and Rodgers, 2001).

# CHAPTER II

# LITERATURE REVIEW

This study aims to investigate the effect of Storytelling Technique as part of TPRS Method on vocabulary retention and students' perceptions on language learning. This chapter reviews the literature on vocabulary, long-term and short-term vocabulary retention, vocabulary learning with the methods in the history of language teaching, Natural Approach, TPR Method and Storytelling Technique as part of TPRS Method.

## 2.1. Words

### 2.1.1. Definition

Read (2000) indicates that vocabulary is a hard to define concept. On the other hand, Schmitt, Schmitt and Clapham (2001) explained that vocabulary is a vital part of language. Schmitt (2000) uses 'lexeme' instead of 'word' and he describes a lexeme as an item which functions as a single unit, irrespective of the number of words it contains. Thornbury (2006) defines a word as the smallest unit in a language that can occur on its own. The single word is widely considered as the basic unit of meaning and the main focus of study in vocabulary acquisition in second and foreign language learning (O'Keefe, McCarthy and Carter, 2007).

Nation (2001) explained four different ways of counting words:

1) Tokens: Although a word appears more than once in a text, it is counted;

2) Types: When the same word occurs more than once in a text, it is not counted again;

3) Lemmas: A lemma is composed of a root and its inflected (e.g. plural form, possessive, comparative, past tense etc.) or contracted forms (Bauer and Nation, 1993, as cited in Nation, 2001);

4) Word family: A word family consists of a head word, all of its inflections and its related derivatives.

McCarthy (1990) mentions multi-word units as being made up of fixed forms. The best example of multi-word units is idioms. He maintains that other multi-word units contain binominals (such as fish and chips) and trinominals (such as, ready, willing and able) and these are pairs and trios of words which occur in a sequence and have a fixed membership.

Read (2000) mentions two types of words: function words and content words. Function words are articles, prepositions, pronouns, conjunctions and auxiliaries. Content words are nouns, verbs, adjectives and adverbs. Function words are thought to belong to the grammar of a language and they have little or no meaning when isolated.

### 2.1.2. Vocabulary Size

According to Schmitt (2000), the size of vocabulary differs due to the differing definitions of the 'word' by researchers. Goulden, Nation and Read (1990) counted the word families in *Webster's Third New International Dictionary* (1963) and they found that the dictionary had 54.000 word families. Nation and Waring (1997), Goulden, Nation and Read, (1990) and Zechmeister, Chronis, Cull, D'Anna and Healy, (1995) estimated that a native speaker of English has an average vocabulary size of 20.000 word families. According to Nation (2000), a word family includes a head word and its inflected and closely related derivated forms.

### 2.1.3. How Many Words Should Learners Know?

Given the number of words that native English speakers know is very high, learners of English must make a choice about how many of them they should learn. Nation (2000) maintains that 2,000 highest frequency words in English are the best option for learners to go on academic study. The 2,000 highest frequency words in English cover about 80% of running words in English discourse.

Schmitt (2000) states that 20.000 word families is the average number a 20-year old university level native English speaker is expected to know. The high number of words to be learned in the target language may be discouraging to the foreign language learner. However, as Nation and Waring (1997) pointed out not all the words a native speaker knows are equally crucial. Actually, the usefulness of a word can be measured by its frequency, or the rate of its use in the normal use of the language. Nation (2001) classifies vocabulary into four types as high-frequency words, academic words, technical words and low-frequency words. He suggests that compared to the large number of words occurring only once in texts, a small amount of well-chosen high-frequency words can allow learners to do a lot. Research shows that 2.000 words account for about 80% of the words found in any text. These figures demonstrate the necessity to focus on high-frequency words in teaching English as a foreign language classes. Unlike the high-frequency words, academic words make up about 9% of the words in a text. Technical words vary according to the subject area, and account for about 5% of the words in a text. Finally, low-frequency words make up the biggest group of words in a language since there are thousands of them, and only 5% of words in a text are low-frequency words (Nation, 2001).

### 2.1.4. Knowing a Word

Because there are thousands of words in a language, it is very difficult for a learner to know everything about a word. According to Nation (2001), there are many things to know about a word and many degrees of knowing. He maintains that generally, knowing a word involves knowledge of form, meaning and use. He also underlines the issue of 'learning burden', which is described as the amount of effort that a word is required to learn it. This means that each word has a different learning burden for learners with different backgrounds. Nation (1990) explains that the more a word represents patterns and knowledge that the learners are familiar with, the lighter its learning burden. In general, knowing a word is accepted as knowing its meaning and its form. However, as Nation (1990) suggests, knowing a word implies different kinds of knowledge, as given below:

- the meaning(s) of the word

- the written form of the word

- the spoken form of the word

- the grammatical behavior of the word

- the collocations of the word

- the register of the word

- the associations of the word

- the frequency of the word

In other words, knowing a word is more than just knowing the meaning or form of it. Grammatical features, collocations and limitations on the use of a word are vital to knowing a word. Grammatical knowledge entails knowing what part of speech the word belongs to. It also necessitates knowing what patterns a word can fit into grammatically. It has recently been understood by linguists that lexical knowledge plays acrucial role in grammar (Nation, 2001).

### 2.1.5. Receptive/Productive Vocabulary Distinction

A learner may know the meaning of a word but not its form. The words that a learner uses while speaking and writing may be different from the words he uses while listening and reading (Hulstijn, 1997). According to Nation (2001), knowing and using a word receptively means that one should be able to recognize the word when he hears it and be knowledgeable about its written form when he sees it. One should know its meaning and what it means in a certain context. In addition, one should recognize its structure, know its synonyms and antonyms, and know that the same word has certain collocations. On the other hand, from the point of view of productive knowledge and use, one should be able to pronounce the word correctly with its correct intonation and spell it correctly in writing. One should know what word parts are needed to express the meaning, what word form may be used to express the meaning, and what other words one may use instead of this word.

In addition, Schmitt (2000) holds that a language learner does not need to use words receptively and productively at the same time. It is possible for us to see a student who may produce a word orally without any problems but may not recognize it in writing. In the same way, one may see students who can usually tell the meaning of a word alone but cannot use it appropriately in a context since they lack productive knowledge of collocation and register.

Nation (2001: p. 37) makes a distinction between receptive and productive aspects of vocabulary. Receptive vocabulary has the meaning of getting language input from the people around us by listening or reading. Productive vocabulary has the meaning that we use speaking and writing to convey messages to others.

The aspects of word knowledge listed by Nation (1990) are as follows:

1. The form of the word, which includes spoken form, written form and words parts

2. The meaning of the word, which includes form and meaning, concept and referents, and associations.

3. The use of the word, which includes grammatical functions, collocations, and how frequent the word is. (p. 31)

A native speaker of a language might need to know most or all of these aspects of vocabulary knowledge in his life indifferent language situations, although it is difficult for him to be able to fully command every word in his lexicon (Schmitt & Meara, 1997). Nation (1990) maintains that most native speakers cannot spell or pronounce all the words they are familiar with, and they are not certain about the meaning and use of many of them. Many words may be known receptively, but not productively, and native speakers may not have knowledge of all of the above aspects of word knowledge for the words that they know receptively.

In addition, to know a word requires familiarity with all of its aspects. In the case of learning a second language, vocabulary acquisition is a very difficult process. Thus, second language learners may need much time to master a word fully. From this perspective, vocabulary acquisition is gradual (Schmitt, 2000). In order to speed up vocabulary learning, a direct vocabulary teaching approach may be employed by instructors (Nation, 1990).

## 2.2. Vocabulary Learning

As it has become clear that learning vocabulary is important in order to learn a second or foreign language, another issue emerges: What is the best way to learn vocabulary? There are generally two strands in learning foreign language vocabulary: incidental and explicit vocabulary learning.

### 2.2.1. Incidental Vocabulary Learning

Many words may be picked up during listening and reading activities. This 'picking up', usually referred to as incidental learning, occurs when the listener or reader tries to comprehend the meaning of the language heard or read, rather than to learn new words. Incidental learning may be defined as the accidental learning of information without the intention of remembering that information (Schmidt, 1994). According to Hulstijn (2005) incidental learning means learning from experiences which are not intended to promote learning; learning is not designed or planned, and learners might not be aware that learning is occurring. Incidental learning may happen during extensive reading, listening to television and radio, and guessing from context (Nation, 1990).

Hulstijn (2001: p. 271) defined incidental vocabulary learning as the "learning of vocabulary as the by-product of any activity not explicitly geared to vocabulary learning." In incidental vocabulary learning, words are learned unconsciously and naturally (Ellis, 1994b). Nagy and Herman (1985), Huckin, Haynes and Coady (1993) described incidental learning as words learned by being exposed to them a number of times in various contexts. Learners can 'pick up' new words simply by reading and comprehending the messages in the target language (Krashen, 2004).

Many researchers believe that learners should encounter new vocabulary in meaningful contexts (Hulstijn, 1997) and they should be exposed to new vocabulary repeatedly in many different contexts. Krashen (1989) also states that learners gain a large number of words with the help of reading. It is true that incidental learning occurs, particularly through extensive reading in an input-rich environment, but at a slower rate, and acquisition while reading and growth of vocabulary knowledge through extensive reading is widely suggested (Huckin & Coady, 1999; Read, 2004). For example, as a result of her study, Laufer (2003) suggests that students learn more vocabulary by reading than through direct instruction of the vocabulary.

### 2.2.2. Explicit Vocabulary Teaching

On the other hand, the second strand, explicit vocabulary learning, focuses on isolating words from context and teaching them to students. Hulstijn (2001: p. 271) described explicit vocabulary learning as "any activity geared at committing lexical information to memory." Learners specifically focus on the new words and try to understand the meanings

of them using their mental mechanisms. Learners make use of word focused activities in this type of learning (Laufer, 2003).

Nation (2001) maintains that teachers can help learners by drawing students' attention on systematic patterns and analogies, by pointing to the connections in both the second and first language. Teachers should explain the meanings, pronunciation and spelling of the words explicitly. For example, teachers may write sentences using the target words in different contexts and students may do some exercises on the words using a dictionary. For beginner level language learners, it may be necessary to teach difficult words through explicit instruction until students learn enough vocabularyitems to start guessing the meaning of words from the context (Schmitt, 2000).

Through direct instruction, learners acquire words with their definition, translations, or in isolated sentences (Nation, 1990). Since high frequency words areimportant for using the language to communicate, these words should be learned bydirect instruction. Learners need to acquire vocabulary items in ashort time period, and then direct instruction may be preferred for the learners (Paribakht & Wesche, 1997).

## 2.3. Retention of Vocabulary

Another issue related to the acquisition of vocabulary is how to activate short and long term memories in order to ensure the retention of the words. Craik and Lockhart's (1972) seminal paper on the depth of processing argued that retention is closely related with the amount of attention given, the time available and the depth of processing (how deeply a new word is studied, e.g. surface level being structural analysis and deep level being semantic analysis) of the new word. Similarly, Craik and Tulving's (1975) study claimed that the retention of words is better enhanced by the elaborateness of the final encoding. It can be said that the deeper the new word is analyzed, the better the chances of it to be retained in the long term memory.

Laufer and Hulstijn (2001) proposed the 'involvement load hypothesis' which claims to predict that higher involvement in a word induced by the task will result in better retention of the words. The involvement load of the tasks that students do in the classroom determines the retention of the new words.

## 2.4. An Overview of Vocabulary Teaching

When we investigate the history of language acquisition, it is not surprising that grammar and rote-memorization of the words were the main focus of foreign language classrooms and thus vocabulary learning was neglected. Even recently modern methods of language teaching like Communicative Method can be said to have failed to underline the importance of vocabulary. Lewis (1993: p. 89) argued that although lexis is at the core of language input, it has always been the Cinderella in language teaching.

### 2.4.1. Grammar Translation Method

In the history of language teaching, Grammar-Translation Method presented the grammatical rules and students had to learn vocabulary on their own from bilingual lists (Schmitt, 2000: p. 12). In this method, literary texts are preferred and everyday language is neglected. Students had to find the native language equivalents for all target language words. Students are also to memorize the vocabulary in this method (Larsen-Freeman & Anderson, 2011: p. 18). New words are given by using direct translations.

### 2.4.2. Direct Method

Direct Method, on the other hand, requires the acquisition of the vocabulary naturally and it differentiates between concrete and abstract lexical teaching. The goal of Direct Method is to get the learners to communicate in the target language successfully. New words are taught using realia, pantomime or pictures and the teacher never translates the new words (Larsen-Freeman & Anderson, 2011: p. 18). Teachers communicate using the target language in the classroom and they avoid using the first language. As without vocabulary knowledge, it is impossible to communicate in the target language. Word-meaning associations are very important in this method as a result of this vocabulary is stressed.

### 2.4.3. Audio-Lingual Method

Audio-Lingual Method (ALM) puts lexical learning into background, because words are considered to be the only sources for sentences so they are to be drilled by the teacher and memorized by the learners. In this method, the emphasis is on structures and vocabulary is secondary. Vocabulary is kept to a minimum and mastery of other aspects of language is

emphasized. Vocabulary and grammatical forms are introduced through dialogues (Larsen-Freeman & Anderson, 2011: p. 45), which have to be imitated and repeated. In ALM, teachers repeat the same structures over and over in order to present new words; however, there is no direct vocabulary instruction. Every vocabulary item is memorized by the learners (Brown, 1994).

### 2.4.4. Total Physical Response Method

In Total Physical Response (TPR) Method, comprehension of vocabulary is more important than production of it and comprehension is achieved by acting out the vocabulary words. According to Asher (2000: p. 2-3), TPR Method coordinates speech and action, combines language and body movements. Actions are the means of conveying the meaning of words. Teacher gives the commands and students observe and act out the command. Richards and Rodgers (2001) observe that TPR is a language teaching method which aims to provide language teaching via physical activities. Learners can learn new words by seeing the action, even though the translation of the word into mother tongue is not provided.

### 2.4.5. Suggestopedia

Suggestopedia, developed by Lazanov, focuses on teaching of vocabulary in pairs. A new vocabulary item and its native language translation are taught together. It views language as centralized around lexis and translation of vocabulary. There are dialogues that are graded by lexis and grammar (Richards & Rodgers, 2001: p. 101). Success of the method depends on the acquisition of large number of words. Vocabulary is emphasized but grammar is minimal (Larsen-Freeman & Anderson, 2011: p. 80).

### 2.4.6. Communicative Language Learning

Communicative Language Teaching (CLT) emphasizes communication in the target language. Communicative Language Teaching encourages teachers to have a good sense of knowledge of vocabulary in learners as grammar is no longer taught explicitly. Learners acquire vocabulary of functional use, such as how to make a request or how to give directions. Language is provided through a large discourse, but no individual attention is

given to lexical learning. It is argued that practice with functional communication does not make lexical enhancement possible since best practice includes both a principled selection of vocabulary, often according to frequency lists, and an instruction methodology that encourages meaningful engagement with words over a number of recycling (Schmitt, 2000: p. 14). The meaning is derived from the communication between the speakers (Larsen-Freeman & Anderson, 2011: p. 124).

### 2.4.7. The Lexical Approach

The Lexical Approach focuses on multi-word units functioning as 'chunks' and 'collocations', regular occurrence together of words. Many lexical units such as binominals, trinominals, similes, etc. are considered to have an important role in learning and communication. Students' attention is drawn to activities that enhance the retention and use of lexical collocations. Students assume the role of the 'discoverer' type of learner. In the Lexical Approach, Krashen's teacher talk is very important. Teachers have the role of showing students how lexical phrases are used. The Lexical Approach has a structural syllabus and it has vocabulary at the center, rather than the grammatical patterns (Richards & Rodgers, 2001: p. 133-137).

### 2.4.8. The Natural Approach

In the Natural Approach the focus is on comprehensible and meaningful input. According to Krashen, comprehensible input is vital in new vocabulary learning. The Natural Approach considers vocabulary learning as a crucial part of language learning. Acquisition depends on the comprehensibility of the input. And this depends directly on learner's ability to recognize the meaning of key elements in the utterance. Thus, without vocabulary, acquisition will not take place (Krashen & Terrell, 1983: p. 155). Krashen and Terrell (1983: p. 156) focused on understanding messages and communicating in the target language. Reading is considered as the most effective way to learn vocabulary. Learners can 'pick up' new words simply by reading and comprehending the messages in the target language (Krashen, 2004). Teachers do not expect students to use words until they have heard them many times. Teachers provide students with ample amount of comprehensible input using key vocabulary items, pictures, gestures, and repetition (Richards & Rodgers, 2001: p. 187-190).

### 2.4.9. The Content-Based Instruction

Content-Based Instruction (CBI) focuses on the content or information that students are going to acquire. The language and vocabulary used in the teaching are used to present the subject-matter and students learn language as a by-product of learning about the real world content. Vocabulary is built on the subject matter during the lessons. CBI aims that students should be autonomous learners and take charge of their own learning (Richards & Rodgers, 2001: p. 205-207).

## 2.5. Teaching Proficiency through Reading and Storytelling (TPRS) Method

As one of the comprehension based teaching methods, Teaching Proficiency through Reading and Storytelling (TPRS), is a recent method compared to others. TPRS method was developed by Blaine Ray, a high school teacher of Spanish as a foreign language, in the US in the early 90s out of concern that his students could not use language effectively with Communicative Language Teaching Method. He then combined James Asher's TPR method and Krashen and Terrel's the Natural Approach and eventually developed TPRS (Ray & Seely, 2012).

### 2.5.1. TPR, the Natural Approach and TPRS

The proponents of the Natural Approach, Krashen and Terrell (1983), emphasize that language learning activities must start with activities that have lots of comprehensible input and that students should not be forced to speak. The teachers are expected to provide lots of aural comprehensible input for the learners and the comprehensibility of the input is claimed to be improved with TPR activities, visuals, repetition and paraphrasing. Hatch (1979) proposed that slower rate of speech and clear articulation, more use of high-frequency vocabulary and use of short sentences promote comprehension (as cited in Krashen, 1982). The Natural Approach, like TPR method, puts listening skills before speaking skills. Teacher talk is the main source of comprehensible input (Krashen, 1982). TPRS combines many of the techniques of Asher's classical TPR Method, with the theories of language acquisition developed by Krashen. This mix is then applied through the process of storytelling. The goal of a TPRS lesson is to provide as much fully comprehensible input as possible (Ray & Seely, 2012, p. 9). TPRS Method makes use of Krashen's ideas as its theoretical foundation. A typical TPRS lesson starts out with TPR

and continues with Storytelling. Brune (2004, p. 20) explained how TPR and Storytelling are combined as follows:

> Although the TPR method can provide a high degree of comprehensibility, it is limited in the types of words and syntactical structures that it can use. This is where the storytelling comes in. Instead of giving students commands, a TPRS teacher tells a story and uses individuals or groups of students as actors. Just as in the TPR, the language is translated into real-life with observable actions which are acted out by the students.

Both TPR and NA are fundamentally acquisitionist approaches, or approaches that focus on meaning and not form (Nunan, 2005). TPRS method, like the TPR and the Natural Approach, emphasizes comprehensible input as the leading agent for second language acquisition, describes language learning as an unconscious, intuitive process similar to the way children learn their mother tongue, and treats the learning of vocabulary as the most important task facing a learner (Alley & Overfield, 2008).

### 2.5.2. Three Steps of TPRS Method

Although there are three main steps in TPRS method, Storytelling Technique is the heart of it (Beal, 2011). TPRS method is based on providing students with lots of interesting, repeated comprehensible input during class hours with the help of highly interesting and comprehensible stories. Target language vocabulary and grammar items are combined and taught together in a relaxed atmosphere, with one hundred percent comprehensible input provided by the teacher (Ray & Seely, 2012).

As explained in Ray and Seely (2012, p. 35-46), TPRS method has three main steps:

1- Establish meaning: Meaning is established mainly through translation and TPR (gestures).

2- Storytelling (Ask the Story): A story has a problem that needs to be solved and a boy/girl tries to solve it in three different locations. In the last location the problem is solved. Stories have some established facts and some variables and these variables are asked to the students to be made facts. By asking questions about the story to the students, story is constructed as a class while strange and bizarre details are added to make the story interesting.

**3-** Reading: Books are read as a class. First, stories are translated paragraph by paragraph. Next, the facts in the stories are asked. Then, details are added to the story. Finally, a parallel story is developed about a student in the classroom.

### 2.5.3. The process of a typical TPRS lesson

TPRS teachers use the traditional TPR method especially for the first few weeks. During this introductory phase, students learn to comprehend approximately 150 words by repeating them and mimicking associated gestures. After several weeks of TPR lessons, the teacher changes to the use of mini-stories to teach new words and practice previously learned words in novel combinations. Mini-stories are stories that contain one to four new words and phrases called guide words, so named because they must be used in order for a longer story to be told successfully. Each word or phrase is linked to a hand gesture and a word association (Alley & Overfield, 2008).

In a typical TPRS lesson, the teacher prepares by choosing the vocabulary and grammar that will be used in the lesson (Baird & Johnson, 2003, as cited in Beal, 2011). The lesson builds on previous vocabulary and grammar. The vocabulary choice can be in the form of single words, lexical units, phrases or full sentences, depending on how the teacher plans to use the vocabulary in the story. The teacher chooses around five words or phrases at a time. There are three steps of a typical TPRS lesson: establishing meaning, practicing the story and reading.

### Step one: Establish meaning

The first step of a typical TPRS lesson is to establish meaning through comprehensible input (Gross, 2007a). During this step, the teacher uses gestures, assesses student understanding and uses personal questions. The questions lead to a short story that the teacher has prepared beforehand. The story is only a skeletal story, meaning that the teacher's questions and the students' responses can change the storyline during the lesson. The questions should increase in difficulty as the teacher progresses through the lesson. The questions start with yes/no questions, then one-word answer questions are asked and finally, more difficult questions are asked. This term, used by Ray and Seely (2012), is found throughout the literature about TPRS. The goal is to keep the students motivated in the story because these three qualities exist in the questions and stories.

While introducing the vocabulary, the teacher will ask questions using the vocabulary and the target grammar that lead to a short, funny and unusual story. The unusual story is intended to keep the students engaged and involved. Students are enlisted to act out the story, which also increases their attention to the story. As the teacher tells and retells the story, the teacher gradually increases the amount of output that the students are asked to create. The teacher tells the story, all the while taking a break to ask questions. This technique is intended to be gradual and non-threatening to the students. As the students hear the vocabulary in the story, they hear it modeled correctly and in context. They do not hear the vocabulary used out of context or in isolation. The grammar focus of the story is less noticeable to the students. They hear the target structure used over and over (Alley & Overfield, 2008).

### Step two: Storytelling

After the vocabulary and story basics have been introduced in the first step, the teacher moves to the story-practicing step. There are three parts in Storytelling: the teacher retell, the student retell and a point of view/perspective change. At first, the teacher retells the story with no actors. The teacher may move and have actions, but they are minimal. The teacher asks questions that require demonstration of comprehension of the vocabulary and knowledge of the story line. The teacher may make false statements, asking the students to make corrections. The teacher provides a large amount of comprehensible input (Alley & Overfield, 2008). According to Ray and Seely (2012), the story is made interesting to the students by adding unexpected details, personalizing the facts of the story and dramatizing the story. The teacher makes the language repetitive by circling questions, continually starting over, adding details, adding extra characters and adding multiple locations to the story.

After the teacher retells the story, the students retell the story in pairs or small groups. This step is short and optional, because the focus of the method is not on production (Alley & Overfield, 2008). The emphasis is on fluency and not accuracy. Because acquisition is a gradual process, it is acceptable for students to make mistakes, while telling the story. The teacher only interrupts and makes corrections when the students use the wrong word, have such poor pronunciation that it interferes with communication or have the plot line incorrect. The goal is to give students practice in speaking and build confidence.

**Step three: Reading**

The third and final step is the literacy step, during which the teacher provides a written version of the story. The story can be exactly what the teacher has just told or a similar version. Additionally, the teacher can use readers instead of self-written stories. During the literacy step, students will read the story or part of a reader and answer written or verbal questions about the story to demonstrate comprehension. The students may read the story at home for homework or during class by themselves or as a group. During class, the technique of simple translation into the native language can be used to demonstrate comprehension. Only after the story and vocabulary are comprehensible to the students does the teacher ask the students to look at the grammar of the written story. Alley & Overfield (2008) stated that this step can occur at any time in the lesson, but they recommend it at the end of the lesson.

## 2.6. Literature on the effectiveness of TPRS Method

In the literature studying the effectiveness of Storytelling Technique as part of TPRS Method, it is demonstrated to be used as an effective way of teaching a foreign language. Dziedzic (2012), for example, compared the comprehension based techniques to traditional ones and he reported significantly better achievement with the Storytelling group in speaking and writing skills and no significant difference between the experimental and control groups' achievements in listening and reading skills.

In Varguez's (2009) study, the impact of the traditional teaching methods (concept explanation and concept practice model) and TPRS Method on language learning was compared. The results of the listening and reading comprehension tests showed that TPRS group outperformed the traditional group in normal Socio Economic Status (SES) students, and it performed almost the same level as the traditional group in lower SES students.

Watson (2009) compared TPRS Method to the Traditional Method in a high school. The results of the tests on grammar, vocabulary, reading and listening parts indicated that TPRS group performed one standard deviation higher than the traditional group. Both groups had treatments in the classroom and that was all the exposure the students had in the target language.

Bustamante's (2009) study on the effectiveness of TPRS course in Spanish yielded results in favor of TPRS Method. In her study, she compared the effectiveness of TPRS to the

traditional teaching method in a treatment lasting one semester (16 weeks). According to the results, her TPRS students started from novice level and finished the semester novice-intermediate level in comprehension test and intermediate in writing assessment. Furthermore, the TPRS group students retained more words than the traditional group.

To further demonstrate the effectiveness of TPRS Method, Spangler (2009) compared the effectiveness of Communicative Language Teaching (CLT) and TPRS in terms of achievement (in reading test), fluency (in writing and speaking tests) and anxiety. The results of the tests showed no significant differences in TPRS and CLT students in achievement and in writing fluency; however, speaking fluency test indicated a statistically significant difference in favor of TPRS group. For anxiety, she found out that there was no significant difference between the two groups.

Çubukçu (2014) divided 44 sixth grade English learning students into two groups. Experimental group received vocabulary education with TPRS method for two weeks and control group students were taught vocabulary with traditional ways for two weeks. According to pre-test and post-test results TPRS group students learnt words better than the control group.

Garczynsky (2010) compared the effectiveness of two different methodologies: TPRS Method and Audio-Lingual Method. Same vocabulary was taught to two separate groups of students over a six week period using TPRS and Audio-Lingual Method. At the end of the pre-test, post-test design study, the group taught with TPRS Method performed slightly higher than the students taught with Audio-Lingual Method. She also reported that TPRS students' rate of improvement from pre-test to post-test was at a higher percentage than the Audio-Lingual group.

In a recent study, Murray (2014) studied the effectiveness of TPR and TPRS Method on students' overall success in four language skills and their attitudes towards learning French. Test scores indicated that students' language acquisition increased and their confidence towards speaking and comprehending French also developed.

Cox's (2015) study comparing the effect of speech production in two high school classrooms with two different methods resulted in statistically significant gains for both methods (TPRS Method and Context-based Optimized Language Acquisition). However, experimental group gained 1,6 words more words than the control group.

Some studies, however, did not report better achievement for TPRS compared to other methods. For example, Türkeş's (2011) study investigated the effectiveness of TPRS Technique in teaching EFL vocabulary to primary school students. His findings showed that the TPRS group achieved and progressed better than the control group, but this was not statistically significant.

Castro's (2010) study compared GTM to the TPRS Method. His findings suggest that the students treated with GTM outperformed (49%) the TPRS students (45%). Though the results are in favor of GTM, the researcher believes the reason for this is the number of attendance in GTM class, which was more than TPRS.

Similarly, Jakubowsky (2013) studied whether using visual aids in TPRS instruction was effective or not. She measured middle school students' retention of new words in short and long term memory after the instruction of TPRS Technique supported with illustrations. She found out that using illustrations in TPRS instruction was useful for short term memory, but not for long term memory.

Overall, it can be said that Storytelling Technique as part of TPRS Method is an effective method and it can be used to teach vocabulary to foreign language learners effectively. However, so far in the literature, to the knowledge of the researcher, no study has investigated the effect of Storytelling Technique on vocabulary retention at university level. Our study intends to shed more light on the effectiveness of Storytelling Technique as part of TPRS Method on vocabulary retention of university students and their perspectives on Storytelling Technique. As there are no studies comparing these techniques at university level, our study can demonstrate the effectiveness of this technique.

# CHAPTER III

# METHODOLOGY

## 3.1 Introduction

The main research question of this study was whether the implementation of Storytelling Technique as part of TPRS Method would result in long-term retention of vocabulary. In order to answer this question, mixed-methods, quasi-experimental research design has been selected. Creswell (2002) describes the mixed-methods design as a method that collects, analyzes and mixes the quantitative and qualitative data in a single study. In a similar vein, Denzin (1978) (as cited in Dörnyei, 2007: p. 43) argued that "methodological triangulation can help reduce the inherent weaknesses of individual methods by offsetting them by the strength of another, thereby both maximizing internal and external validity of research". Dörnyei (2007) also argued that a complex phenomenon can be understood better by converging numeric trends from quantitative analysis and specific details from qualitative data. He further claims that this converging produces support for the validity of the research outcomes.

In this chapter, I will talk about the methodology of the research. First, participants will be explained. Then, procedures, data collection and data analysis will be discussed.

## 3.2 Participants

This study was conducted at a state university in Ankara. The 56 students participated in the study. The participants of the study are from the same university and they are all grade one students who started university in the same academic year. This study was conducted in the second semester of the academic year. All the participants were male and they were aged 18-19, so the age gap was not significant.

According to school regulations, all new starters have to take the Oxford Placement Test (OPT) at the start of the academic year. These students took the OPT at the start of the first semester. OPT is used as a means of determining students' level of English at the start of the year. Students were then allocated to different classrooms according to the scores they get from this test. The arithmetic means of the students' OPT results revealed that there was no significant difference in the level of English among the students. According to the OPT results, all of the students were allocated to A1 level classes.

The school administration put the students in different classrooms by taking their OPT scores into consideration. Two groups were chosen from the same level (A1) student classrooms. Although the experimental group had 33 and control group 32 students at the beginning of the semester, five of them from the first group and four of them from the second group were foreign students. These foreign students had received different amount of English education before attending the Turkish university, so they were not included in the study. In each group there were 28 students. One class was the control group and the other one was the experimental group. I taught the new words to the two groups in the treatment sessions. The experimental group received instruction with TPRS Technique and the control group was taught with other techniques of vocabulary teaching like contextual guessing technique, synonyms, looking up to dictionary, contextual guessing, drawing pictures or realia.

### 3.3. Materials and Procedures

At the university where the study was conducted, the main means of teaching foreign languages are Comprehension-Based Methodologies like the Natural Approach, TPR and TPRS. The first grade students who get A0 or A1 level marks from their OPT exams are put in the same classrooms. They are taught the same curriculum. They study two textbooks in the first semester, and one in the second semester. Each week the students have 10 class hours of English instruction. Six class hours are for the main course and remaining four are for the listening course. Within one of the six or four class hours of instruction, every week these classes are taught with the Storytelling Technique by the researcher because other teachers are not using this technique. For the purpose of the study, the words chosen for this study were taught to experimental group students with Storytelling Technique, and control group students with other techniques of vocabulary teaching, like synonyms, looking up to dictionary, drawing pictures or using realia.

According to the principles of teaching foreign languages with comprehension-based methodologies, students are not forced to speak before moving on to B1 level. Students can raise their hands in the classroom and answer the questions with one or two words. They do not have to make full sentences when answering the questions.

For this study, after a detailed study of the materials, twenty words were selected from two texts (Appendix D). These materials were assigned to students to read outside the classroom in their free time. The target vocabulary items were selected in line with the A1 level students' curriculum. These words were used in the pre-test. After the pre-test, 10 words were selected and these target words were taught to the experimental group students with the Storytelling Technique and the control group students were taught with other vocabulary teaching techniques. These words were then used in the post-test to see how many of them were retained.

The experimental group students received instruction of the target vocabulary via Storytelling Technique. This technique utilizes gestures from TPR Method along with Storytelling Technique from TPRS Technique. The three steps of Storytelling Technique were applied throughout the instruction. First, the words were associated with gestures or their direct translations were given. Second, the words were used to develop a story. Stories were created with students' active participation. The teacher directed many questions to the students and two interesting and comprehensible stories were developed. Third, these stories (Appendix E) were then read by the teacher and the students. The instruction lasted two weeks. Every week one class hours was allocated for the treatment.

The control group students were taught target vocabulary with contextual guessing technique, techniques, such as using dictionaries, drawing pictures, contextual guessing and translations. Students read two texts containing the 10 target words and they learnt the meanings of the words with other techniques. During the instruction phase, students were checked by the researcher to make sure they were doing what they were supposed to be doing.

In order to reveal the students' knowledge of the selected words, a pre-test (Appendix A) was administered to 56 students one week before the treatment session. The pre-test was a recognition test in multiple choice format and the students were asked to choose the best alternative among the choices of target words. For the pre-test, multiple-choice type questions were used because it would be easy to assess and provide more practicality for later evaluation.

Three weeks after the instruction was over, a post-test (Appendix A) was given to the participating students. The post-test was the same as the pre-test and its aim was to measure how many of the words students from each group would retain.

A week after the instruction was over; students were given the Student Survey which aimed to find out about students' attitudes towards Storytelling Technique. This survey was administered only to the experimental group students. The survey provided statements which revealed their thoughts and feelings about learning foreign language vocabulary through the use of Storytelling Technique as part of TPRS Technique. Specific questions about Storytelling Technique were asked students to reveal their attitudes towards how Storytelling Technique has affected their vocabulary learning and retention. An example question from the survey was, "I think that the Storytelling Technique helps me understand the meanings of the words." The questions in the survey also sought to find out which specific Storytelling Techniques were more useful. An example of this type of question was, "I think that gesturing the words help me keep the words in long term memory." In the survey, students were asked to rate their agreement with various statements on five-point Likert scale. Students were not required to put their names on the survey papers. It was aimed, in this way, to make sure that they provided honest responses to the survey items. An example survey is provided in the Appendices section (see Appendix B).

During the process of the study, the teachers who attended the researcher's Storytelling lessons were interviewed at school. After the instruction was completed, participating teachers were interviewed by the researcher. The interview consisted of semi-structured questions and they were asked during the interview. There were 34 English teachers when the study was conducted, but only 14 of them attended the researcher's experimental group lessons and observed the Storytelling Technique applied in the classroom. Therefore, these 14 English teachers participated in the interview. The researcher prepared some questions in advance but the interviewed teachers had the chance to elaborate on the topic. The same questions were directed to all the participating teachers.

Before the interview, the participating teachers were informed that the interview was voluntary, that they did not have to answer all the questions they are asked and that they could stop the interview at any time. They were also assured that their names would not be used in the study and that they would be kept confidential. Teachers' answers to interview questions (Appendix C) were noted by the researcher but not taped because of participants' concerns.

### 3.4. Data Collection Instruments

The data were collected via both quantitative and qualitative techniques. The quantitative data were collected by a pre-test, a post-test and a student survey. The test used for collecting the data was a 20-item, multiple-choice test, and it assessed students' receptive vocabulary knowledge. Multiple-choice type tests were selected for the purpose of easy assessment. I developed both the pre-test and the post-test. The aim of the pre-test was to see how many of the selected words the students already knew and the aim of the post-test was to check how much vocabulary the students retained in long-term memory three weeks after the instruction.

The pre-test consisted of 20 multiple-choice sentence completion questions, 10 of which were the selected target vocabulary. The sentences used at the questions were developed by the researcher. The researcher explained the test to the students. All the test instructions were written in English; however, to prevent misunderstanding, the instructions were also explained in Turkish. The participants were informed that the data would be used only for the study purposes and would not affect their grades. 15 minutes were allowed to the subjects to complete the test, and they were advised that they should not leave any test items unanswered.

Three weeks after the instruction, the post-test was administered to both groups. The post-test included the same questions as the ones used in the pre-test. The aim of the post-test was to see how much vocabulary would be retained in the long-term memory in both groups. Students were not allowed to use a dictionary or look at each other during the test and they were given the freedom of guessing if they were not sure about the correct answer. After the application of the post-test, results of the both groups were compared.

The 11-item student survey was developed by the researcher. The survey items were prepared by the researcher after a comprehensive study on the literature on teaching vocabulary with TPRS Method. A 5-point Likert survey was controlled by the experienced teachers in the same department. Then, the survey was piloted with two classes and according to the results necessary changes were made. The Turkish version of the survey was used in the study in order to prevent any misunderstanding. It was given to the experimental group students after the instruction. The names of the respondents were not mentioned throughout the study.

For the qualitative data, an interview with teachers was used. Dörnyei (2007; p. 134) describes interviews as the most often used qualitative data collection instrument for its versatility. A semi-structured interview was used to collect information on teachers' attitudes on Storytelling Technique. The interviews were conducted with the teachers who work at the same university. These teachers had attended a Conference on TPRS Method one year before and they attended the researcher's Storytelling class during the study process. They know what TPRS Method is and they are also knowledgeable about the Storytelling Technique.

## 3.5. Data Analysis

A mixed-methods approach was used to gather data on the researched topic. The triangulation was achieved via gathering data both quantitatively and qualitatively from all the participants, including students and teachers.

Students' pre-test and post-test results were analyzed using statistical analysis. Test results were analyzed using a paired-samples t-test to see within group developments from the pre-test to the post-test and an independent samples t-test to see the differences of vocabulary gains between the control and the experimental groups. The results of the tests will be presented in the next chapter.

Further, in the scope of the study, students' attitudes towards learning vocabulary via Storytelling Technique were also investigated using content analysis. A student survey was administered to measure experimental students' attitudes. The test was administered after the instruction was carried out. All the participating students took the survey. Descriptive statistics of the survey results will be tabulated in the following chapter. These results will be used to explain the data gathered from the pre-and the post test.

Finally, an interview was also carried out with the participating teachers. Teachers' responses were made note of and then these notes were carefully analyzed by the researcher for emerging ideas. Teacher interviews were used to better see what aspects of Storytelling Technique helped learners achieve better results and to reveal their thoughts on the effectiveness of Storytelling Technique.

# CHAPTER IV

# RESULTS

This chapter demonstrates the results of the data from the pre-test and the post-test, the student survey and the teacher interview. The results from the tests will be tabulated and explained in detail using statistical analysis. Then, we will examine the results of the student survey. These results will be explained in detail with content analysis. Next, teacher interview results will be used to reveal teachers' views on the Storytelling Technique.

## 4.1 The Results from the Pre-test and the Post-test

One week before the instruction started, both groups were given a pre-test. There were 28 students in the experimental group and 28 students in the control group. The test which was used as the pre-test and the post-test consisted of 20 questions. It aimed to test students' receptive knowledge of the target vocabulary. For each test item answered correctly participants got one point and incorrect answers were not included in the calculations. The same test was used as a post-test to reveal how many words were retained by the students. An independent samples t-test was used to compare the mean scores of each group to see any significant differences between the groups.

First of all, a 20-item, multiple-choice test was given to the study groups as a pre-test. The goal with the pre-test was to see if there were significant differences in the vocabulary knowledge of the groups and if the students knew the target vocabulary. The results of the pre-test indicated that there was no significant difference between the groups' pre-test results as the $p$ value was *0.642* (see Table 1 below).

Table 1

*Comparison of the Pre-test Scores of the Experimental and Control Groups*

| Groups | N | Means | Std. Dev. | *p* value |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Experimental | 28 | 2.82 | 1.747 | |
| | | | | 0.642 |
| Control | 28 | 3.04 | 1.710 | |

A post-test was conducted three weeks after the instruction was over in order to test how much students retained after they were exposed to the target vocabulary items. The post-test was the same as the pre-test. A paired-sample t-test analysis was used to compare the pre-test and the post-test results of the experimental group. The following table shows the statistical difference between the two test results of the experimental group (Table 2).

Table 2

*Comparison of the Pre-Post Test Scores of the Experimental Group*

| Tests | N | Means | Std. Dev. | *p* value |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Pre-test | 28 | 2.82 | 1.747 | |
| | | | | 0.0001 |
| Post-test | 28 | 7.04 | 2.545 | |

According to Table 3, experimental group pre-test mean score was measured as 2.82 and the post-test as 7,04. Because the calculation above revealed that the *p* value was 0,0001 at 0.05 level of significance and the *p* value was lower than 0.05, there was a statistically significant difference between the pre-test and the post-test scores of the experimental group students' in the long-term retention of the target vocabulary.

The same post-test was also given to the control group students three weeks after the instruction. A paired-sample t-test analysis was used to compare the pre-test and the post-test results of the control group. Below are the results of the comparison of the pre-test and the post-test scores of the control group (Table 3).

Table 3

*Comparison of the Pre-, Post-Test Scores of the Control Group*

| Tests | N | Means | Std. Dev. | *p* value |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Pre-test | 28 | 3.04 | 1.747 | |
| | | | | 0.001 |
| Post-test | 28 | 5.89 | 2.454 | |

According to Table 4, the control group pre-test mean score was calculated as 3,04 and the post-test as 5,89. Because the calculation above revealed that the *p* value 0,001 at 0.05 level of significance was lower than 0.05, there was a statistically significant difference in the long-term retention of the target vocabulary in the control group students' test scores.

In order to investigate the effect of Storytelling Technique on vocabulary retention, the mean scores of the experimental and the control groups were compared using Independent Samples t-test calculator (see Table 4 below).

Table 4

*Comparison of the Post-test Scores of the Experimental and Control Groups*

| Groups | N | Means | Std. Dev. | *p* value |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Experimental | 28 | 7.04 | 2.545 | |
| | | | | 0.0929 |
| Control | 28 | 5.89 | 2.454 | |

According to the results from Table 5, the experimental group post-test mean score was calculated as 7,04 and control group as 5.89. The *p* value was calculated as 0.0929 at 0.05 significance level and this revealed that the *p* value was not statistically significant. Although the experimental group had a higher mean score than the control group, this was not statistically significant.

### 4.1.1. Discussion of the Results from the Pre-test and the Post-test

The results of the pre-test and the post test revealed that both the experimental and the control groups had statistically significant gains in within group analysis. However, when these two groups' post-test scores were compared, although the experimental group outperformed the control group by 1,15 mean score points, this difference was not

statistically significant. This result may be due to the fact that the participants were young-adults. Some studies yielded unfavorable results for the TPRS groups because of the old age of the participants.

For example, Beal (2011) compared the results of the middle school and high school students' academic achievement. He compared the achievement results of the students who were treated with TPRS Method and non-TPRS use group. His results suggested that middle school students treated with TPRS Method scored statistically significant scores than the non-use group; however, at the high school level (where the students were older) non-use group was more successful than the TPRS group. He concluded that using Storytelling only worked with younger students.

Similarly, Castro (2009) found no statistically significant difference between the results of the TPRS group and the Grammar Translation group. In his study, he compared the pre-test, post-test results of the 25 adult participants who took a written vocabulary test. The results indicated that the improvements in the vocabulary acquisition and retention of the Grammar Translation and TPRS groups were 49% and 45% respectively. This result also showed that when the participants are older the results of the test scores are not significant.

During the present study, the duration of the Storytelling was only one class hour for each story and this may not have been enough for the students to get enough repetitions of the target words and phrases. Similarly, Cox (2015: p. 25) reported that in her study both groups performed statistically significantly well according to within-group comparisons. However, there was not a statistically significant difference in the results of the control and experimental group students' vocabulary pre-test and post-test.

Türkeş (2011: p. 41) also reported in his study that although TPRS group students performed better in test results, this outperformance was not statistically significant. In his study, TPRS group students retained more vocabulary than the control group students. Throughout the study, the experimental group students had multiple exposures to the target words in natural contexts. The learners in this group were introduced to each word first through gestures, then in storytelling and later by answering many different and repeated questions about the story.

On the other hand, studies like Lichtman's (2012) yielded contrastive results to the ones above. Lichtman compared children and high school students in her study. In contrast with

the results stated above, which are in favor of younger learners, Lichtman found that high school students performed as well as children when treated with TPRS Method.

## 4.2. Results of the Student Survey

Experimental group students responded to a student survey one week after the instruction ended. The survey consisted of 11 items and the items were all about the use of Storytelling Technique as part of TPRS Method when teaching vocabulary. In the table below (Table 5), students' responses to the survey items are analyzed and results are described in a detailed way.

Table 5

*Frequency Table of the Student Survey*

|  | Totally Agree % | Agree % | Neutral % | Disagree % | Totally Disagree % |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1 | 57 | 25 | 0 | 7 | 11 |
| 2 | 29 | 29 | 14 | 17 | 11 |
| 3 | 32 | 32 | 8 | 11 | 17 |
| 4 | 39 | 32 | 11 | 7 | 11 |
| 5 | 46 | 25 | 17 | 7 | 5 |
| 6 | 35 | 21 | 7 | 14 | 21 |
| 7 | 21 | 35 | 18 | 14 | 10 |
| 8 | 64 | 5 | 14 | 10 | 7 |
| 9 | 39 | 21 | 18 | 7 | 14 |
| 10 | 46 | 29 | 14 | 5 | 7 |
| 11 | 50 | 32 | 7 | 7 | 5 |

**Analysis of the Item 1:** *I think that the Storytelling Technique provides a relaxed language learning atmosphere.*

One out of four students responded to this item with *agree*, and a bit more than half of them responded with *totally agree* to the first item, which is, "I think that the Storytelling Technique provides a relaxed language learning atmosphere." This result meant that totally

a bit more than four-fifths of the students demonstrated that they had a positive stance towards the Storytelling Technique. Almost one-fifth of the students *disagreed or totally disagreed* with the idea presented in the first item. It can be deduced from this result that most of the students favor the belief that Storytelling Technique provided a relaxed language learning atmosphere.

**Analysis of the Item 2:** *In Storytelling lesson, I feel myself motivated towards learning a foreign language.*

Majority of the students (a bit more than half of the students) stated that they either *agreed or totally agreed* with the statement in this item. On the other hand, a bit more than one-fourth of the students *disagreed or totally disagreed* with the idea stated in the item. Less than one-fourth of the students; however, remained *neutral* on this item. As a result, it can be said that more than half of the students showed positive attitude towards feeling motivated during Storytelling lessons.

**Analysis of the Item 3:** *I am not worried about making mistakes when I answer the questions that are asked during the Storytelling lessons.*

A striking a bit more than three-fifths of the students either *agreed* or *totally agreed* with this item which is, "*I am not worried about making mistakes when I answer the questions that are asked during the Storytelling lessons.*" Only a bit more than one fourth of the students *disagreed or totally disagreed* with the idea presented in this item. Consequently, it can be inferred that the majority of the students did not feel worried when they answered the questions that were asked during Storytelling classes.

**Analysis of the Item 4:** *I think the stories in the Storytelling lessons are interesting.*

For the fourth item, a little less than three-fourths of the students *agreed or totally agreed* with the idea presented in the item. They were mostly in favor of the idea that Storytelling lessons were interesting. However, a bit less than one-fifth of the students responded in a negative manner towards the idea in the item. They either *disagreed or totally disagreed* with this item. One-tenth of the students expressed their neutrality towards the idea in the item.

**Analysis of the Item 5:** *I think the questions that are asked in the Storytelling class are easy.*

To this item, almost half of the students responded with *totally agree*, and one-fourth with *agree.* This shows that overwhelming majority of the students favored the easiness of the questions asked during the Storytelling classes. While a bit more than one-tenth of the students either *disagreed or totally disagreed*, a bit less than one-fifth of students were *neutral* to this item.

**Analysis of the Item 6:** *I think that I can answer most of the questions that the teacher asks in Storytelling Class.*

A bit more than half of the students have responded to this question positively, which indicates that students thought that the questions the teacher asked were easy enough for them to answer. Almost one-third of the students revealed that they did not think the questions were easy. Less than one-tenth of the students were *neutral* about this statement.

**Analysis of the Item 7:** *I think that the Storytelling Technique helps me understand the meanings of the words.*

Again, for this item a bit more than half of the students expressed their positive stance towards it; however, the rate of the neutral students rose to a bit less than one-fifth of the students and those who *disagree and totally disagree* were a bit less than one-fourth. More than half of the students' belief that Storytelling Technique helps them understand the meaning of the new words can indicate that the technique really helps students understand the vocabulary. The rise in the rate of neutral students might indicate that some students may not have understood what long-term memory is.

**Analysis of the Item 8:** *I think that the bizarre stories that we do in Storytelling class help me keep the new words in long-term memory.*

Nearly the two-thirds of the students' *totally agree* and a bit less than one-tenth of the students' *agree* response to this statement shows students' positive stance towards the Storytelling Technique. This indicates more than half of the students thought that bizarre elements in stories helped them retain new words in their long-term memory. Only a little less than one-fifth of the students *disagreed or totally disagreed* with the statement.

**Analysis of the Item 9:** *I think that repeating the story many times when doing a story helps me keep the new words in long-term memory.*

Nearly as much as two-thirds of the students expressed their positive opinions towards the statement above. They stated that the repetition of the stories many times in Storytelling

classes helped them keep the new words in their long term memory. Although a little less than one-fifth of the students were *neutral* on this, one-fourth of the students expressed their displeasure with the statement above.

**Analysis of the Item 10:** *I think that gesturing the words help me keep the words in long term memory.*

The purpose of this item was to see how much students agreed with the idea that gesturing the words help them keep the words in long-term memory. Almost three-fourths of the students thought that gesturing the words helped them keep the words in their long-term memory. Only a bit more than one-tenth of the students thought it was useful. A bit less than one-sevenths of them were *neutral* about this item.

**Analysis of the Item 11:** *I think that translation of the words into Turkish helps me keep the words in long-term memory.*

With this item, the aim was to see to what extent students would agree with the usefulness of translation of new words into Turkish in helping them keep the words in long-term memory. Surprisingly, a bit more than four-fifths of the students thought positively about this statement. Only one-tenth of the students *disagreed* with the idea stated in the item. This means that big majority of the students believed in the usefulness of the translation of target words into Turkish.

### 4.2.1. Discussion of the Student Survey Results

The aim of the student survey was to see what students felt about the use of Storytelling Technique when learning vocabulary. The first two questions of the survey in the current study were about the atmosphere of the classroom and the motivation of the students. According to the survey results, for the first and second statements, majority of the students thought that the Storytelling classroom provided a relaxed atmosphere and that they were motivated to learn a foreign language in this classroom. Dukes's (2012: p. 35) study indicated that a big majority of the students felt positive towards the TPRS Method. Blanton (2015: p.4) reported that the TPRS students demonstrated statistically significantly higher levels of L2 motivation than the other group. Again, Church's (2001) study on middle school, high school and university students' motivation, anxiety and beliefs on second language learning showed that university level students had higher motivation than

high school students in learning a second language. It can be said that the results of the current study are consistent with the studies conducted previously.

The third statement in the survey was about how students felt about the questions asked by the teacher. According to Krashen (1982: p. 6) the best methods are the ones that provide "comprehensible input" in low anxiety situations. Asking difficult questions may heighten the affective filter and hinder the acquisition process. Therefore, the questions asked during the Storytelling class must not worry the students, so the words can be acquired. The third statement in the survey was about whether the students were worried when they were asked a question during Storytelling. Majority of the students responded that they were not worried when they were asked a question. Dukes (2012: p. 40) reported that the TPRS students felt comfortable participating class discussions, speaking with other students and the teacher and being involved in other activities requiring the use of target language. He also reported that TPRS Method created a comfortable atmosphere for learning a foreign language (p. 36). According to Church's (2001) study, the students who reported to have been more relaxed when speaking in the classroom were university level students, which indicates that older students feel relaxed in a TPRS classroom. The survey results from the current study on anxiety are consistent with those of the previous ones in the literature.

Another important issue with the Comprehension-based Methods is the pleasurability of the comprehensible input. Storytelling classes provide lots of comprehensible input, but what distinguishes it from other methods is that the high level of interesting stories created in the classroom. Almost all of the experimental group students thought that the stories created during the Storytelling classes were interesting. This result is in contrast with the findings of Beal's (2011: p. 47) study in which he reported that enjoyment levels of high school students were lower than that of the middle school students. This could be due to the difference in the age level and the type of story created in the classroom.

The fifth and the sixth statements in the survey were about the questions asked during the Storytelling class. The questions are the key to building a story, so students' feelings towards them were very important. Overwhelming majority of the students said the questions were easy and they felt they could answer them easily. This indicated that students understood the questions that they were asked. Dukes (2012: p. 38) reported that the questions asked about the story made students think and remember the words better.

The seventh statement was about the whole of the Storytelling Technique. According to the results from the students' response to the seventh statement, more than half of the students

participating in the study thought Storytelling Technique helped them understand the words. Arya and Paul's study (2012) on the effect of stories on learning indicate that when learning is put in a story format it is learned better. Dukes (2012: p. 38) also reported that his students thought that Storytelling made them think and reinforce the words they learnt.

The eighth, ninth, tenth and eleventh items in the survey were about the specific techniques applied during a Storytelling class. Most of the students thought that the bizarre elements in the stories, repeating the new words many times, gesturing and translation of them helped them retain new words in long-term memory. Dukes's (2012) study revealed that the participating students thought that TPRS Method makes students remember words better and helps them make connections to remember the words. It can be said that Storytelling Technique can help students retain words in their long-term memory.

Overall, it can be said that experimental group students had a positive stance towards the use of Storytelling Technique when learning new vocabulary and this result is consistent with the results in the literature.

## 4.3. Results of the Teacher Interviews

English instructors at the state university were interviewed after they watched the instructions with Storytelling Technique with the experimental group. These teachers had previously attended a conference on TPRS Method and they were also given a seminar by the researcher on how to use Storytelling Technique in class, so they already knew about the Storytelling Technique.

For the study, 14 of the 34 instructors were interviewed during the study. Because other teachers did not attend the researcher's instruction classes, they were not included in the study. These 14 teachers were interviewed to reveal their attitudes on the Storytelling Technique which was used to teach vocabulary. Their responses were made note of by the researcher, not audiotaped. Then the answers were analyzed. Participating teachers' identities will not be revealed throughout the study. The interview questions were as follows:

1. What do you think about the Storytelling Technique?
2. Were the stories used in the lesson enjoyable?
3. What do you think about the vocabulary teaching techniques used in the Storytelling Technique?

4. Do you think that the questions the teacher asked during Storytelling were difficult?

5. Do you think that Storytelling Technique is a useful technique to retain words in long-term memory? Why? Why not?

**Analysis of Question 1:** *What do you think about the Storytelling Technique?*

Most of the teachers responded to the questions in a positive manner. For the first question, most of the teachers replied that, "It is a useful technique. It gives students a lot of comprehensible input. It is also a tiresome technique for the teacher. You were very active throughout the lesson and tired." With this answer teachers revealed what they thought about the Storytelling Technique. Their answer showed that they thought this technique was a useful technique in terms of providing students with lots of comprehensible input.

**Analysis of Question 2:** *Were the stories used in the lesson enjoyable?*

Teachers mostly responded to this question positively. Some teachers thought that the story used in the classroom was not so enjoyable, but it still worked in the classroom. Most of the teachers stated that the story was interesting and students were actively joining the lesson. Some of the teachers also noted the importance of asking as many questions as possible to make the story interesting, so the use of lot of questions when constructing the story was found by some of the teachers very useful. Only two teachers thought that the element of story being interesting was not so important as long as the teacher provided enough comprehensible input.

**Analysis of Question 3:** *What do you think about the vocabulary teaching techniques used in the Storytelling lessons?*

For the third question used in the interview teachers responded with a variety of answers. First of all, most of the teachers said the techniques they observed during the instruction were very helpful in teaching vocabulary. Some of the teachers did not think some of the techniques were useful. For the gesturing technique, almost all of the teachers thought it was hugely helpful for learning and understanding the meaning of new words. Only two teachers thought it was a waste of time and it would not yield positive results in terms of learning vocabulary. For the translation technique, all the teachers thought it was the most efficient way to convey the meaning of the new word and it conveyed the meaning 100% accurately without any misunderstanding. For Storytelling Technique, some teachers

thought it was actually very hard for a new teacher to apply, but it was a useful one. They also thought new vocabulary was practiced with this technique after introducing them with gestures and translation. Some teachers; however, thought the otherwise. They stated that the Storytelling Technique was useful, but it cannot be used as a stand-alone technique.

**Analysis of Question 4:** *Do you think that the questions the teacher asked during Storytelling were difficult?*

All the teachers responded to this question with a 'no'. This response was important in that it showed that the questions were understood by the students. Teachers also expressed their view that the questions asked during the instruction were important and they gave the teacher a lot of opportunities to provide students with comprehensible input. Some teachers also observed that the easiness of the questions encouraged students to answer them. Some teachers also stated that starting the questions with 'yes', 'no' questions and gradually increasing the difficulty might contribute to the overall understanding of the story.

**Analysis of Question 5:** *Do you think that Storytelling Technique is a useful technique to help students retain new words in long-term memory?*

About this question teachers were more divided in their answers than they were on the previous questions. Although more than half of the teachers believed that Storytelling Technique could help students retain words in their long-term memory, four of the teachers were not so sure of this. The researcher asked another question (*Why?* and *Why not?)* to clarify the teachers' views. The teachers who were not so sure stated that there were other things also involved in the long-term retention of the words. They observed that although repetition of the words, gestures, translations and Storytelling could contribute to the retention of the words, for long term retention these words need to be repeated another time to really commit these words to long-term memory. Although this sounds like a negative side of Storytelling Technique, these words are actually repeated before the next lesson starts.

### 4.3.1. Discussion of the Results of the Teacher Interviews

Overall, this analysis of the teacher interview answers has shown that almost all of the teachers believe in the effectiveness of Storytelling Technique in teaching new vocabulary to students and the techniques used contributed to this a lot.

Most of the teachers who observed the researcher's Storytelling lesson thought that the Storytelling Technique was a useful technique because it provided students with lots of comprehensible input. According to Krashen (1983), comprehensible input is vital for the acquisition of the new language to take place.

For the second question in the interview, majority of the teachers responded positively. They thought that stories were enjoyable and the questions that the teacher asked during the storytelling phase actually contributed to the pleasurability of the stories. The two teachers who thought that it was not important to have pleasurable stories believed this because they said comprehensible input was the only important element in a classroom. According to Ray and Seely (2012: p. 27-28) without comprehension of the story there will not be any interest and class interest is provided by asking questions and adding unexpected details to the story.

The techniques used in the Storytelling Technique were also questioned in the teacher interview. First of all, overwhelming majority of the teachers thought that gesturing the words was a useful technique in teaching vocabulary. Only two teachers responded negatively to this question. Surprisingly, translation of the target words in Turkish was regarded by all the teachers as the most efficient way to get across the meaning of the words and they also stated that by translation the meaning of the word is conveyed 100% correctly without misunderstanding. Although most teachers thought that Storytelling was an efficient way to teach vocabulary, some teachers thought that this technique could be hard for new teachers to apply. However, these teachers also stated that Storytelling Technique provides a lot of repetition of the target words which were previously introduced in the gesturing and translation phases. It is also interesting; however, that some teachers also thought that Storytelling Technique could not be used alone to teach vocabulary. Ray and Seely (2012:p. 9) maintain that repetition and a quick translation of the words were the main means of keeping the class totally comprehensible. Seely and Romijn (2006) assert that gesturing of the words (TPRS) can be used to teach most of the words to internalize them and practice them.

Teachers' negative response to the fourth question indicated that the questions asked during storytelling were not difficult. The teachers also added that the easiness of the questions encouraged the students to participate and answer the questions that are asked by the teacher. Teachers' mentioning of the levels of questions asked during the class was also very important.

Majority of the teachers who answered interview questions stated that Storytelling Technique could be effective in helping students retain the words in long-term memory. However, four of the teachers thought Storytelling Technique, alone, was not enough to commit the words in long-term memory. Because they responded negatively, the researcher wanted to clarify their answer, so they were asked further questions: *why? and why not?* These teachers thought that long-term retention of the words could not be achieved in only one class. They said long-term retention come from more repetition of the words in the coming days and weeks. Ray and Seely (2012: p. 32) state that long-term retention of the words is the main aim of TPRS Method and this is achieved by the practice of the target vocabulary and structures until students are able to produce them.

## 4.4. General Discussion

In the current study, the experimental and the control group students' retention of the vocabulary words was investigated. The experimental group was treated with Storytelling Technique as part of TPRS Method, and the control group was treated with other ways of teaching vocabulary. A pre-test and a post-test were used to measure long-term retention of the target vocabulary items. Later, a student survey was used to reveal students' attitudes towards Storytelling Technique, and an interview with teachers was conducted to see how teachers felt with the use of Storytelling Technique.

TPRS Method utilizes Storytelling Technique as its central element of teaching a foreign language. In Storytelling, teacher and students cooperate on the creation of the stories, which present grammatical and lexical items in contexts and serve as the basis for speaking, listening, reading and writing activities (Alley & Overfield, 2008).

For the current study, the experimental group students were taught new vocabulary with Storytelling Technique, and the control group students were taught with other techniques. The Storytelling Technique was used with the experimental group and the main vehicle of teaching vocabulary was a story which was co-created with the teacher and students. From pre-test to post-test, students in both groups had statistically significant gains in vocabulary according to within group comparisons. This means that the techniques employed in both experimental and control groups were beneficial. However, when between-group post-test results were compared to see which group performed better in terms of vocabulary gains, it appeared that experimental group students outperformed the control group students, but

this outperformance was not statistically significant. Mean scores of the post-test for experimental group was 7,04, and 5,89 for control group students. This shows that experimental group students retained more words at the end of the study. Although the test scores showed favorable results for Storytelling Technique, the control group students had also performed well.

The test results from the current study are in line with the ones on the effectiveness of TPRS Method with adult learners. However, although repetitions helped students retain words in long-term memory, they may not have been enough in the current study due to the limitation on time. As the interviewed teachers pointed out, repetition of the words in one class hour may not be enough. As Baddeley (1999: p. 66) indicated the amount of time spent on learning yields better learning, which means if you spend more time on learning you learn better. For the current study, it could be said that if the target words had been repeated one or two weeks later in another story, the result of the post-test could have been different.

Repetition of the new vocabulary items might have contributed to the higher score of the Storytelling students in the current study, because when doing the stories, target vocabulary items were repeated many times in the context of a story. When the repetition of the words is put in a context, students can deal with the new words better (Richards & Rodgers, 2001). Ray and Seely (2012) hold that through the repetition of the basic grammatical features of the language, students acquire them and fluency develops and frequent repetition of the words and quick translation of them keep a lesson comprehensible.

A student survey was given to experimental group students after the instruction ended. The survey had 11 statements, each questioning one aspect of Storytelling Technique. The first four statements in the survey were aimed at revealing students' attitudes towards the Storytelling Technique in general. Student responses to these questions revealed that they enjoyed Storytelling classes, they were motivated to learn the language, they did not have anxiety during the lesson and that they found the stories interesting. Although time spent on the stories was limited, the story itself was interesting to students. This might be due to the different way of teaching a language that Storytelling Technique uses. Normal English lessons at the university are very much like any other school subjects being taught there. However, Storytelling classroom was different from other English classes and school subjects. First of all, in a Storytelling class students do not use books, nor are they required

to write anything. All they are required to do is to try to comprehend the story and participate in the building of the story as much as possible. This difference in the nature of Storytelling class might have made students feel positive towards Storytelling Technique.

Cantoni (2005) found that stories help students a lot because they make use of a lot of comprehensible input and they lower affective filter. As Ray and Seely (2012) maintain, with Storytelling Technique a lot of comprehensible input is given and the input is interesting as it is about students themselves and their friends. More than four-fifths of the students responding to the survey in the current study stated that the storytelling class environment was relaxing.

Statements five, six and seven were aimed at revealing what students felt about their overall success with the technique. Their responses showed that they felt positive about their success levels with this technique. Constant repetition of the target vocabulary items helped students understand the message in the story; therefore, students might have felt successful throughout the lesson.

The last four questions of the survey had specific questions aimed at revealing how students felt with the specific techniques used in Storytelling Technique. Students favored the use of strange stories and their contribution to their long- term retention of vocabulary. They also felt that the specific techniques of repetition, gesturing of words and translation of new words into Turkish had a positive impact on their long-term retention of the words. All the sub-techniques used in Storytelling class provided novelty to the lesson. This novelty in activities could have contributed to the long-term retention of the words.

It could be said that the amount of teacher talk in the classroom could also have contributed to students' retention of the vocabulary. Nunan (1991) and Cook (2000) underline that teacher talk is vital to language learning and that it is a big source of comprehensible input for students. The interview with the participating teachers showed that they believed Storytelling Technique is a useful technique because it provides students with a lot of comprehensible input. Teachers also felt that the storytelling lesson was enjoyable, which meant that another pre-requisite for long-term retention of vocabulary, interesting input, was met. Most of the teachers felt that the specific techniques used in Storytelling Technique were useful and helpful for learning and understanding the meanings of new words. Because Storytelling Technique hugely depends on teacher asking questions and students answering them, the fourth interview question was important. Teachers responded to this question positively. They thought that the questions asked

during storytelling were not difficult. For the last question in the interview, most of the teachers said Storytelling Technique could be helpful in long-term retention of new words.

Overall, the results of the study revealed that Storytelling Technique was beneficial in teaching vocabulary, and both teachers and students had favorable opinion of this technique.

# CHAPTER V

# CONCLUSION AND SUGGESTIONS

## 5.1. Summary of the Literature

Michael Lewis (1993) observed that, "language consists of grammaticalised lexis not lexicalised grammar." Many other scholars maintained that learning vocabulary is very important when learning a language (DeCarrico 2001; Krashen and Terrell 1983; Nagy 1988; Schmitt 2008; Wilkins 1972).

As it is clear that learning target language vocabulary is vital to learn a language, it is important for foreign language teachers that they use classroom time efficiently (Ray & Seely, 2012).

In order to teach languages many methods have been used in language classrooms. Recently, communicative approaches gained significance, and more recently the methods that had their origins in the second language acquisition theory like James Asher's TPR Method, Krashen and Terrell's the Natural Approach and Ray's TPRS Method gained significance.

TPRS Method was developed by Blaine Ray who was dissatisfied with the ineffectiveness of Communicative Method in his classes. Many studies have shown that TPRS Method helps to increase students' comprehension in listening, speaking, reading and writing (McKay, 2000).

In the literature on the effectiveness of TPRS Method we see plenty of favorable results for TPRS Method. There are reasons why this method might be working. Taulbee (2008: p. 1) reported that teachers that use this method find it to be very effective because students are exposed to the language in a fun way. She further claimed that the strengths of TPRS Method are long-term retention of vocabulary, enhanced listening and speaking skills.

The studies conducted on the effectiveness of TPRS Method are consistently showing that the researchers have found that TPRS Method either matches other methods of instruction or outperforms them (Beal, 2011; Bustamante, 2009; Cox, 2015; Çubukçu 2014; Dziedzic, 2012; Jakubowsky, 2013; Spangler, 2009; Varguez, 2009; Watson, 2009).

## 5.2. Summary of the Current Research

The purpose of the current study was to investigate the retention differences between university students instructed with Storytelling Technique as part of TPRS Method and those with other techniques.

This study was conducted at a state university in Ankara. 56 students participated in the study. All the participants were first grade A1 level learners of English. These participants were divided into two groups: experimental and control groups. As part of the study, 10 of the 20 target words were selected from the students' assigned readings and these were taught to experimental group students with Storytelling Technique as part of TPRS Method, and control group students were instructed with other vocabulary teaching techniques. Treatment session lasted two weeks. Before the treatment session a pre-test was given and three weeks after the treatment session a post-test was given to the students to see if Storytelling Technique made any retention differences of the new words compared to other techniques. The results revealed that experimental group outperformed the control group by 1,15 mean score points, but this difference was not statistically significant.

Students' opinions and attitudes towards Storytelling Technique were also taken into consideration during the study. In order to gather data on students' attitudes, a student survey was given to students after the treatment. The results of the survey indicated that students felt relaxed and motivated during Storytelling class. They also thought the Storytelling Technique with its sub-techniques helped them retain target words in their long-term memory.

As part of the study, teachers who attended researcher's Storytelling classes were interviewed to capture their attitudes towards this technique. They observed that Storytelling Technique was a useful technique to teach vocabulary. They also thought that this technique could be used to help students retain the words in long-term memory. Some teachers observed that for long-term retention of vocabulary to take place, more repetitions are necessary.

## 5.3. Suggestions for Effective Use of TPRS

TPRS Method in general and the Storytelling Technique in particular, with all its sub-techniques may contribute to the classroom level vocabulary teaching greatly in teaching English as a foreign language.

First of all, Storytelling Technique is a comprehensible input based technique and it aims to provide students with a lot of messages in the target language. The stories produced in the classroom are not difficult. Because the target vocabulary words are used in a story context which is both engaging and comprehensible, they are retained in the long-term memory.

Secondly, in a Storytelling classroom the lessons do not contain high-anxiety activities, so students learn vocabulary in a relaxed atmosphere. Stories created in the classroom are about students themselves, so students do not feel worried during a Storytelling class. When the anxiety level of the lesson is low, students are more encouraged to participate in the classroom activities and they answer the questions asked by the teacher.

Thirdly, there is a constant interaction between the teacher and the students in a Storytelling class. The teacher always looks at the students in the eye and checks their comprehension level of the story at all times. The teacher also asks as many questions as he can about the story they are doing in the lesson and thus engaging all the students in the story and keeping them active. The students have the chance to practice what they have learnt during normal English classes. The students who may not have a chance to participate in classroom activities join the telling of a story by answering the questions the teacher asks.

Fourthly, the various sub-techniques employed by the teacher in a Storytelling class help students learn and commit vocabulary to long-term memory. The gesturing of a word, associating a word to a gesture that students come up with, translating it into Turkish, Storytelling, using bizarre and personalized elements in a story and repeating the words many times can commit target words to long-term memory. The variety in the techniques used in a Storytelling class can also contribute to students overall understanding of the story.

Although Storytelling Technique is useful in teaching vocabulary in English, teachers are the ones that implement the technique in the classroom. Therefore, in order for the language teachers to get the best out of Storytelling Technique there are a few things they

need to do because Storytelling classes are usually different from the other language classes. Students should be told beforehand that they should relax, listen carefully and just answer the questions they are asked with one word. Teachers should always be watchful of the pace of the lessons as there are always slow learners. Setting the pace of the class to the pace of the slowest learner ensures the comprehensibility of the stories. Finally, teachers should also check comprehension of the stories by constantly asking questions about the story.

## 5.4. Suggestions for Further Research

As one of the TPRS Method, production vocabulary levels of the university level students could also be measured. The current study measured the receptive vocabulary gains of the students. A further study can compare the results from the receptive and productive vocabulary gains of the students and this can reveal which part of the vocabulary instruction is TPRS Method is more successful at.

More studies comparing the effectiveness of the TPRS Method to Communicative Method are needed, because Communicative Method is the most dominant method of foreign language instruction and TPRS Method can challenge this. With this study, vocabulary teaching techniques of both methods could be studied and results could help identify which method is more useful.

The current study was conducted with the university grade one, A1 level students, so further study is needed with other grade and language levels in order to reveal the effectiveness of TPRS Method with those levels.

An aspect of language teaching that can affect vocabulary learning is students' beliefs and attitudes towards TPRS Method. A qualitative study only comparing students' perceptions towards TPRS Method and Communicative Method, and exploring teachers' opinions on both methods can contribute greatly to quantitative studies that have been done so far.

Another study, maybe a more important one, can be conducted on language teachers' beliefs, and attitudes towards TPRS Method. This study may explore the reasons why language teachers want or do not want to adopt TPRS Method into their classroom applications. As the literature on the effectiveness of TPRS Method is a favorable one, this method should also be promoted all over Turkey, not as a stand-alone method, but as a main supporting method along with Communicative Method.

Another research topic could be the effect of possible use of TPRS Method to teach subject matter vocabulary. In Turkey and all over the world, subject matter vocabulary is taught with traditional techniques; however, interesting stories created with the subject matter vocabulary could be used to teach those words.

# REFERENCES

Alley, D., & Overfield, D. (2008). *An analysis of the Teaching Proficiency Through Reading and Storytelling (TPRS) Method*. An article presented at Southern Conference on Language Teaching (SCOLT), South Carolina.

Arya, D. J. & Maul, A. (2012). The role of the scientific discovery narrative in middle school science education: An experimental study. *Journal of Educational Psychology, 104* (4), 1022-1032

Atkinson, R. C., & Shiffrin, R. M. (1968). Human memory: A proposed system and its control processes. *The Psychology of Learning and Motivation, 2.*

Baddeley, A. K. (1999). *Essentials of human memory*. East Sussex, Psychology.

Beal, K. D. (2011). *The correlates of storytelling from the Teaching Proficiency through Reading and Storytelling (TPRS) Method of foreign language instruction on anxiety, continued enrollment and academic success in middle and high school students.* Doctoral Dissertation, University of Kansas.

Bhatia, J. P. (2009). *Dictionary of Psychology & Allied Sciences.* New Delhi: New Age.

Blanton, M. (2015). *The effect of two foreign language approaches, communicative language teaching and teaching proficiency through reading and storytelling on motivation and proficiency for Spanish III high school students.* Dissertation for the Doctor of Education degree, Liberty University, Virginia.

Bonk, W. J. (2000). Second language lexical knowledge and listening comprehension. *International Journal of Listening, 14,* 14-31.

Brown, H. D. (1994). *Teaching by principles: An interactive approach to language pedagogy.* NJ: Prentice Hall Regents.

Brune, M. K. (2004*). Teaching proficiency through reading and storytelling: An analysis and application*. Bachelor of Arts Thesis in Germanic Languages and Literature in University of Oregon.

Bustamente, M. C. (2009). *Measuring the effectiveness of a TPRS pilot study at the 100 college level.* Master of Arts Thesis in Education, Graduate School of Modern Languages Department and the Faculty of Graduate College University of Nebraska, Nebraska.

Cantoni, G. (2005). Using TPR-storytelling to develop fluency and literacy in native American languages. In J. Reyhner, G. Cantoni, R. St. Clair & E. P. Yazzie (Eds.) *Revitalizing Indigenous Languages,* (53-58). Flagstaff: University of Arizona.

Castro, R. (2010). *A pilot study comparing Total Physical Response Storytelling™ with the Grammar-Translation Teaching Strategy to determine their effectiveness in vocabulary acquisition among English as a second language adult learners*. Master of Science Thesis in Education, School of Education and Counseling Psychology, Dominican University of California, California.

Church, K. (2001). *Effective oral communication in the foreign language classroom*. M.A. Thesis in Germanic Studies in the Graduate School of the University of Colorado, Colorado.

Cook, V. (2000). *Second language learning and language teaching (2nd Edition).* Beijing: Foreign Language Teaching and Research Press.

Cox, S. B. (2015). *The effect of dialog in the comprehensible input Spanish classroom.* Thesis in Master of Arts, Faculty of the Graduate School, University of Colorado, Colorado.

Craik, F. I. M., & Lockhart, R. S. (1972). Levels of processing: A framework for memory research. *Journal of Verbal Learning and Verbal Behavior, 11*, 671-684.

Craik, F. I. M., & Tulving, E. (1975). Depth of processing and the retention of words in episodic memory. *Journal of Experimental Psychology, 104*, (3), 268-    294.

Creswell, J. W. (2002*). Research design: Qualitative, quantitative and mixed methods approaches (2nd Ed.).* California: Sage.

Çubukcu, F. (2014). A synergy between storytelling and vocabulary teaching through TPRS. Retrieved from *http://www. udead.org.tr/journal*

D'Anna, C. A., Zechmeister, E. B., & Hall, J. W. (1991). Toward a meaningful definition of vocabulary size. *Journal of Reading Behavior, 23,* 109-122.

Dörnyei, Z. (2007). *Research Methods in Applied Linguistics.* Spain: Oxford University Press.

Dukes, C. (2012). *Students' perceptions of total physical response storytelling as a stand-alone foreign language learning methodology.* Thesis in Master of Education, Utah Valley University, Utah.

Dziedzic, J. (2012). A Comparison of TPRS and traditional instruction, both with SSR. *The International Journal of Foreign Language Teaching, Vol 7*, (2), 4-6.

Ellis, N. C. (1994b). "Introduction: Implicit and explicit language learning – an overview". In Ellis, Nick (ed.). *Implicit and explicit learning of languages* (pp. 1-31). London: Academic Press.

Fraser, C. (1999). Lexical processing strategy use and vocabulary learning through reading. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition, 21*, 225-241.

Goulden, R., Nation, P., & Read, J. (1990). How large can a receptive vocabulary be? *Applied Linguistics 11*, 358–359.

Garczynsky, M. (2010). *Teaching Proficiency through Reading and Storytelling: Are TPRS students more fluent in second language acquisition than Audio Lingual students?* Master of Arts Thesis, Chapman University, Orange, California.

Gross, S. (2007a). *The 3 steps of TPR storytelling.* Retrieved from http://susangrosstprs.com/articles/THREESTEPS.pdf

Harmer, J. (1993). *The Practise of English Language teaching.* Edinburgh Gate: Pearson Education Ltd.

Hu, M. & Nation, P. (2000). Unknown vocabulary density and reading comprehension. *Reading in a Foreign Language,13* (1).

Huckin, T. N., Haynes, N., & Coady, J. (1993). *Second language reading and vocabulary learning*. New Jersey: Ablex.

Hulstijn, J. H. (1997). Mnemonic methods in foreign language vocabulary learning: Theoretical considerations and pedagogical implications. In J. Coady & T. Huckin

(Eds.), *Second language vocabulary acquisition* (pp. 203-224). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Hulstijn, J. H. (2001). Intentional and incidental second language vocabulary learning:   a reappraisal of picture explanation, rehearsal and automaticity. In P. Robinson (ed.), *Cognition and second language instruction* (pp. 258–86). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Hulstijn, J. H., & Laufer, B. (2001). Incidental vocabulary acquisition in a second language: the construct of task-induced involvement. *Applied Linguistics, 22,*(1), 1-26.

Hulstijn, J. (2005). Theoretical and empirical issues in the study of implicit second language learning. *SSLA: Studies in Second Language Acquisition27,* 129-140.

Jakubowsky, A. (2013). *Using visual aids in the secondary language classroom: an action research study on the use of illustrations during TPRS instruction*. Master of Arts Thesis in Education, Graduate Faculty of the University of Toledo, Ohio.

Joe, A. (1998). *What effect do text-based task promoting generation have on incidental vocabulary acquisition?* Applied Linguistics, *19* (3), 357-377.

Krashen, S. D. & Terrell, T. (1983). *The natural approach: Language acquisition in the classroom*. Oxford: Pergamon.

Krashen, S. D. (1989). We acquire vocabulary and spelling by reading: Additional evidence for the input hypothesis. *Modern Language Journal, 73(4)*, 440- 464.

Krashen, S. D. (2004). *The power of reading: Insights from research*. Connecticut: Libraries Unlimited.

Larsen-Freeman, D., & Anderson, M. (2011). *Techniques and principles in language teaching*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Laufer, B. (2003). Vocabulary acquisition in a second language: Do learners really acquire most vocabulary by reading? Some empirical evidence. *The Canadian Modern Language Review*, *59*, 567-587.

Lewis, M. (2000). *Teaching collocations*. England: Thomson & Heinle.

Lichtman, K. M. (2012). *Child-adult differences in implicit and explicit second language learning*. Doctoral Dissertation in Linguistics in the Graduate College of the University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign.

McCarthy, M. (1990). *Vocabulary*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Murray, C. (2014). *Does the introduction of a TPR and a TPRS teaching method into a French 1classroom positively affect students' language acquisition and student appreciation of the language?* Master of Arts Thesis, Graduate School of Caldwell College, New Jersey.

Nagy, W. E. & Herman, P. A. (1985). Learning words from context. *Educational Perspectives*, *23*, (1), 16-21.

Nagy, W. E. (1988). *Vocabulary instruction and reading comprehension*. Illinois: Center for the Study of Reading, University of Illinois.

Nation, I.S.P. (1990). *Teaching and learning vocabulary*. New York: Newbury House,

Nation, I. S. P. & Waring, R. (1997). Vocabulary size, text coverage and word lists. N. Schmitt & M. McCarthy (Eds). In *Vocabulary: Description, acquisition and pedagogy* (6- 19). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Nation, I. S. P. (2001). *Learning vocabulary in another language.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Nunan, D. (1991). *Language teaching methodology: a textbook for teachers.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Nunan, D. (2005). *Practical English Language Teaching: Grammar*. New York: McGraw Hill.

O'Keefe, A., McCarthy, M., & Carter, R. (2007). *From corpus to classroom: Language use and language teaching.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Paribakht, S. T., & Wesche, M. (1997). Vocabulary enhancement activities and reading for meaning in second language vocabulary acquisition. In J. Coady & T. Huckin (Eds.), *Second language vocabulary acquisition* (pp. 174-202). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Paribakht, T. S., & Wesche, M. (1999). Reading and 'Incidental' L2 Vocabulary Acquisition. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition, 21*, 195-229.

Pigada, M., & Schmitt, N. (2006). Vocabulary acquisition from extensive reading: A case study. *Reading in a Foreign Language, 18*, 539-578.

Rapstine, A. H. (2003). *Total physical response storytelling (TPRS): a practical and theoretical overview and evaluation within the framework of the national standards.* Master of Arts Thesis, Michigan State University, Department of Linguistics , Michigan.

Ray, B. & Seely, C. (2012). *Fluency through TPR Storytelling*. California, Command Performance Language Institute.

Read, J. (2000). *Assessing vocabulary*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Read, J. (2004). Research in teaching vocabulary. *Annual Review of Applied Linguistics, 24,* 146-161.

Richards, J. C., & Rodgers, T. S. (2001). *Approaches and methods in language teaching* (2nd Ed.). New York, Cambridge University Press.

Seely, C. & Romijn, E.K. (2006). *TPR is more than commands-at all levels.* California, Command Performance Language Institute.

Schmidt, R. (1994). Deconstructing consciousness in search of useful definitions for applied linguistics. In Hulstijn, J.H., & Schmidt, R. (Eds.) *Consciousness and second language learning: Conceptual, methodological and practical issues in language learning and teaching.* Thematic issue of AILA Review - Revue de l'AILA, 11, 11-26.

Schmitt, N., & Meara, P. (1997). Researching vocabulary through a word knowledge framework: Word associations and verbal suffixes. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, *19* (1), 17-36.

Schmitt, N. (2000). *Vocabulary in language teaching.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Schmitt, N., Schmitt, D., & Clapham, C. (2001). Developing and exploring the behavior of two new versions of the Vocabulary Levels Test. *Language Testing, 1*(18), 55-88.

Schmitt, N. (2008). Instructed second language vocabulary learning. *Language Teaching Research 12*, (3); 329–363.

Spangler, D. (2009). *Effects of two foreign language methodologies, communicative language teaching and teaching proficiency through reading and storytelling, on beginning-level students' achievement, fluency, and anxiety.* Doctoral Dissertation on Teacher Leadership, Walden University, Minneapolis.

Spodark, E. (2010). Structuring a language course to respond to millennial generation workplace characteristics. *The Language Educator. 5* (4), 39-42.

Stern, H. H. (1983). *Fundamental concepts of language teaching*. England: Oxford University Press.

Taulbee, A. M. (2008). *Twenty teaching proficiency through reading and storytelling (TPRS) lessons for the Spanish 1 classroom.* Master of Arts Thesis, Graduate School of the University of Arkansas in Littlerock, Arkansas.

Thornbury, S. (2006). *An A-Z of ELT*. Oxford: McMillan Education.

Türkeş, D. (2011). *The role of TPRS Technique in teaching vocabulary to the 5th grade primary EFL students.* Master of Arts Thesis, Çukurova University, Institute of Social Sciences, ELT Department, Adana.

Varguez, K. Z. (2009). Traditional and TPR storytelling instruction in the beginning high school Spanish classroom. *International Journal of Foreign Language Teaching, 5*, (1), 2-12.

Watson, B. J. (2009). A comparison of TPRS and traditional foreign language instruction at the high school level. *International Journal of Foreign Language Teaching, 5*, (1), 21-24.

# APPENDICES

### 7.1. APPENDIX A: A 1 Level Pre-and Post-Test

**Choose the best alternative for each sentence below.**

1) Scientists traditionally ……………oceans into areas.
a. respect      b. divide           c. attract           d. influence      e. like

2) The smart people usually ………….. other people's weaknesses.
a. eat out      b. decided        c. fed up with   d. take advantage of   e. drive through

3) The ads people see on TV …………. their shopping behavior.
a. attract        b. influence     c. rely on           d. refuse           e. be afraid of

4) Some people had to ……the difficult conditions because they had nowhere else to go.
a. believe in            b. depend on      c. put up with     d. familiar with      e. take care of

5) There are some things in life that are …………..seeing and knowing about.
a. sociable    b. enjoyable    c. eager           d. willing          e. worth

6) The ………surface of the country was hard to explore.
a. rugged      b. beautiful     c. nominal        d. attractive     e. muscular

7) The houses and gardens………….. everywhere around the city.
a. sink          b. spoil           c. refuse           d. spread         e. visit

8) The natural…………….. of a country determines its economic richness.
a. beauty      b. environment           c. phenomena          d. world          e. resources

9) People who …………..in hard professions live a better life in the future.
a. take care  b. make a living  c. lose sight       d. make a mess        e. look after

10) If you are……………give up smoking, then you will be promoted.
a. interested in        b. frustrated with        c. willing to   d. sad about   e. due to

11) There are 300 …….. species around the world now. Their number is going down every day.
a. highly      b. respectful   c. endangered           d. amazing      e. populated

12) Tigers are becoming ………….. . They are protected in wildlife refuges.
a. extinct     b. forgotten    c. indistinct    d. dangerous   e. criminal

13) The boss could not put the………….. on anybody for the accident in the factory.
a. blame       b. ashamed     c. restriction   d. protection   e. solution

14) The food prices are ………. everything is cheaper these days.
a. increasing            b. expensive     c. declining   d. determining           e. envying

15) Some people are too……….. . You cannot force them to do things they don't want.

a. nervous   b. noisy        c. exhaustive           d. stubborn     e. easygoing

16) Jack is very……with the books he reads. He only reads only a few types of novel.

a. picky      b. tenacious   c. humorous      d. humility      e. pressed

17) People in some African countries ………… to death.

a. starve     b. reconnoiter   c. protrude           d. occupy        e. resurrect

18) Some forms of bacteria can be ……… for the human body.

a. beneficial   b. rudimentary        c. perplexing    d. adamant       e. mouth-watering

19) It can be ………… if a human doesn't get enough nutrients.

a. benevolent       b. detrimental       c. coalescing    d. prohibited    e. unnerving

20) The city was slowly ………….. after the huge snow storm.

a. reducing          b. recovering           c. clinching    d. harrowing   e. bursting

**7.2. APPENDIX B : Student Survey**

**Perceptions of the Students on Storytelling Technique as Part of TPRS Method**

**Please complete the entire survey with what you feel is the best response.**

Rank the following statements accordingly.

1 Totally Agree      2 Agree      3 Neutral      4 Disagree     5 Totally Disagree

1) I think that the Storytelling Technique provides a relaxed language learning atmosphere.

Response:……………..

2) In Storytelling lesson I feel myself motivated towards learning a foreign language.

Response:……………..

3) I am not worried about making mistakes when I answer the questions that are asked during the Storytelling lessons.

Response:……………..

4) I think the stories in the Storytelling lessons are interesting.

Response:……………..

5) I think the questions that are asked in the Storytelling class are easy.

Response:……………..

6) I think that I can answer most of the questions that the teacher asks in Storytelling Class.''

Response:……………..

7) I think that the Storytelling Technique helps me understand the meanings of the words.

Response:……………..

8) I think that the bizarre stories that we do in Storytelling Class help me keep the new words in long-term memory.

Response:……………..

9) I think that repeating the story many times when doing a story help me keep the new words in long-term memory.

Response:……………..

10) I think that gesturing the words help me keep the words in long term memory.

Response:……………..

11) I think that translation of the words into Turkish help me keep the words in long-term memory.

Response:……………..

## 7.3. APPENDIX C: Teacher Interview Questions

1. What do you think about the Storytelling Technique?
2. Were the stories used in the lesson enjoyable?
3. What do you think about the vocabulary teaching techniques used in the Storytelling Technique?
4. Do you think that the questions the teacher asked during Storytelling were difficult?
5. Do you think that Storytelling Technique is a useful technique to retain words in long-term memory? Why? Why not?

**7.4. APPENDIX D**

**7.4.1. D1 Control Group Reading Texts Used in Treatment Session**

**Competing for Resources**

The resources of any one environment are limited. Depending on which plants and animals share the environment, there may not be enough of everything to go around. All organisms need water, food and shelter to stay alive. These resources are beneficial, which means they are good for the organisms. When an environment is low on any of these things, organisms must compete for them. Those who get to the resources first have the best chance of survival. Being without water, food or shelter for very long is detrimental, which means it is harmful to organisms. The resources in an area determine how big the plant and animal populations can be. Sometimes there are too many living things in an area. The weakest of the populations will not be able to get the resources they need. As the weak die out, the populations get smaller. Finally, the area's resources recover and can support them again. Sometimes people will capture members of large animal populations and move them. They take them to another location with less competition. This helps them the animals survive. Sometimes the government will allow hunting of large animal populations. Deer and rabbits can be a good food source for people. When there are too many of these animals in an area, they sometimes come into the cities looking for food. They often cause trouble. Hunting keeps the number of animals under control.

**7.4. APPENDIX D**

**7.4.2. D2 Control Group Reading Texts Used in Treatment Session**

### In Danger of Extinction

A species is the name for a group of animals that are alike, such as lions and tigers. If a species is endangered it means there are very few of those animals left in the world. If all the animals in a species die, the species becomes extinct. Those animals are gone forever. Many species are protected. A protected species means governments have made laws against killing the animals. The koala is close to being an endangered species. Interestingly, the koala is partly to blame for its decline. Koalas are too stubborn for their own good! When you were younger, were you a picky eater? Did your parents have to force you to eat things that were good for you? Hopefully you listened to what they taught you and ate your dinner. Koalas are picky eaters. They live in tall eucalyptus trees. Many of these trees are also called gum trees. Koalas eat the leaves of those trees. Since there are over 600 different types of eucalyptus trees, the koala should have no trouble finding food.

But koalas are picky! They only want certain eucalyptus tree leaves to eat. Out of the 600 varieties of trees, koalas will only eat the leaves of about 120 kinds of eucalyptus tree. Some are even pickier than that. The koalas of a specific area will only eat about four or five kinds of eucalyptus leaves. They would rather starve than eat the other kinds. Now that's stubborn! The biggest problem for koalas now is that the brush land in Australia is being cut down. Towns and cities are pushing farther into the brush. Since many koalas live there, they are losing their tree homes and the trees leaves that feed them.

**7.5. APPENDIX E**

**7.5.1. Experimental Group Storytelling Lesson Plan-1**

**Lesson:** Storytelling

**Age of Students:** 18-19

**Level of Students:** A-1

**Class duration:** 1 class hour

**Language Skills:** Listening, speaking and reading

**Language Objectives:** Students will be able to comprehend the story, answer the questions and act it out.

**Revision of the Previous Lesson:**

Teacher quickly revises the previous lesson vocabulary items and the story with students by asking them a lot of questions. The questions asked are as follows:

➢ Do you remember last week's story?

➢ Who had an issue with his girlfriend?

➢ Did Aziz have an issue with his car or his girlfriend?

➢ Where did he have an issue with his girlfriend?

➢ When did he have an issue with his girlfriend?

➢ Who did he talk to for some suggestions?

➢ Who provided Aziz with suggestions?

➢ What did Fikret suggest Aziz to do?

➢ Did Aziz like the suggestions?

➢ Who did he go next for more suggestions?

➢ What did Mario suggest Aziz to do?

➢ Did Aziz like his suggestions?

➢ Was he happy or unhappy at the end?

**Storytelling Step One: Establish Meaning**

**Target vocabulary:**

- **take advantage of**
- **divide**
- **influence**
- **put up with**
- **is worth seeing**

**Lesson procedures:**

➤ Teacher wrote that lesson's target vocabulary items/phrases on the board with their Turkish translations above them.

➤ Then, the teacher slowly said the words or phrases and pointed to the phrase/word he was saying.

➤ After saying the words a few times, teacher asked the students to come up with a gesture to represent the word/phrase written on the board.

➤ After a gesture is associated with a word/phrase on the board, teacher modeled the gesture and students did exactly the same as the model. This TPR session continued for a few minutes. When the teacher is satisfied that all the students can do the gestures without much hesitation, he started asking questions and then building the story.

**Step Two: Storytelling**

**Questions asked during Storytelling**

➤ Who takes advantage of other people?

➤ Does Mehmet take advantage of other people?

➤ Does Mehmet or Suattake advantage of other people?

➤ Where does he take advantage of other people?

➤ Does he take advantage of other people in Ankara, İstanbul, İzmir or Manhattan?

➤ When does he take advantage of other people?

➤ What time does he take advantage of other people?

➤ What does he wear when he takes advantage of other people?

➤ How does he take advantage of other people?

➤ Does he take advantage of other people alone or with another person?

- How does he influence the people he takes advantage of?
- Does he influence them with a special machine?
- Does he have super powers to influence other people?
- Where does he influence the people?
- Who divides the people that he takes advantage of?
- Why does Mehmet divide the people?
- Does he divide the people or the money he steals?
- When does he divide the money?
- Who does he divide the money with?
- What about the people? Do they have to put up with Mehmet?
- Why do they have to put up with Mehmet?
- What did they want to do one day?
- What is worth seeing?
- Which spacecraft is worth seeing?
- Why is it worth seeing?
- What did they do with the spacecraft which is worth seeing?
- How did Mehmet react to this?
- Did Mehmet influence other people anymore?
- Did people have to put up with Mehmet anymore?
- Are the people happy now?

---

**The Story-Escape from Slavery**

Mehmet takes advantage of other people. Mehmet is a bad man. He takes advantage of other people in Manhattan. He takes advantage of people every day. He takes advantage of people every day at exactly 11:15 p.m. He wears a blue t-shirt, dark blue trousers, white sneakers, a yellow cap and a long jacket when he takes advantage of other people. He makes people work for him in terrible conditions. He takes advantage of other people alone. He influences the people by giving them very little money. He gives them very little amount of salary. He pays them only 50 cents every day. He also influences people with a sonic brain wave machine. He has some superpowers as well. He can influence people with his brain power. He influences people in a clothes factory in Manhattan.

Mehmet divides the people that he takes advantage of. He also divides the money he steals. He divides the money with a student from our university. The people don't like Mehmet, but they have to put up with him because Mehmet gives them little salary. One day they wanted to see a spacecraft. The spacecraft was worth seeing because it was the first spacecraft. They stole the spacecraft that was worth seeing. Mehmet did not like it when the people stole the spacecraft that was worth seeing. The people escaped from Manhattan on the spacecraft and Mehmet could not influence other people anymore. People did not have to put up with Mehmet anymore. They are happy now.

- The story was acted out with the participation of the students. Students took the roles of the characters in the story, "Escape from Slavery."
- Teacher spoke slowly and always checked comprehension of the story via asking the questions. Whenever needed, he repeated the questions he asked.
- Teacher made students exaggerate their roles, voices and feelings.
- When actors did not feel relaxed, the teacher voiced the characters in the story. The actor only moved his lips and gestured.

**Step Three: Reading**

- After the story was completed, all the students read the story. Teacher read and left blanks in the story and students completed the gaps in the story.

**7.5.2. Experimental Group Storytelling Lesson Plan-2**

**Lesson:**                    Storytelling

**Age of Students:**           18-19

**Level of Students:**         A-1

**Class duration:**            1 class hour

**Language Skills:**           Listening, speaking and reading

**Language Objectives:**       Students will be able to comprehend the story, answer the questions about it and act it out.

**Step One: Establish Meaning**

**Target vocabulary:**

- **made a living**
- **natural resources**
- **spread everywhere**
- **rugged surface**
- **am/is/are willing to**

➢ Teacher wrote the lesson's target vocabulary items/phrases on the board with their Turkish translations above them.

➢ Then, the teacher slowly said the words or phrases and pointed to the phrase/word he was saying.

➢ After saying the words a few times, teacher asked the students to come up with a gesture to represent the word/phrase written on the board.

➢ After a gesture is associated with a word/phrase on the board, teacher modeled the gesture and students did exactly the same as the model. This TPR session continued for a few minutes. When the teacher is satisfied that all the students can do the gestures without much hesitation, he started asking questions and then building the story.

**Step Two: Storytelling**

**Questions asked during Storytelling**

- ➢ Who made a living from natural resources?
- ➢ When did Bruce make a living from natural resources?
- ➢ Did Bruce make a living from natural resources or Veli make a living from natural resources?
- ➢ Where did he make a living from natural resources?
- ➢ How did he make a living a living from natural resources?
- ➢ Did he sell the natural resources or did he produce the natural resources?
- ➢ What natural resources did he sell?
- ➢ Where did he sell the natural resources?
- ➢ Who was willing to buy his natural resources?
- ➢ Why was Veli willing to buy the natural resources?
- ➢ How much did he pay for the resources?
- ➢ Was he willing to buy the natural resources because he liked them or because he wanted to spread them?
- ➢ Did Veli want to spread the natural resources everywhere?
- ➢ How did he plan to spread the natural resources?
- ➢ Did he use a plane or a TofaşŞahin to spread the natural resources?
- ➢ How much natural resources did he spread?
- ➢ Did he spread the natural resources on a rugged surface or a flat surface?
- ➢ Where was the rugged surface?
- ➢ Was it on the moon or on earth?
- ➢ How did Veli travel from the earth to the moon?
- ➢ Was he willing to travel to the moon?
- ➢ Did Veli make a living from spreading natural resources?
- ➢ Was he willing to give up his job?
- ➢ What happened at the end?

**Natural Resources**

Bruce Willis made a living from natural resources last year. He made a living from natural resources in a small café in Tokat, Erbaa. He sold the natural resources to make a living. He sold borax, gold and some clay in a small café in Tokat, Erbaa. He looked for a buyer for his natural resources. Veli from the moon was willing to buy Bruce's natural resources. Veli was willing to buy Bruce's natural resources because the moon needed borax, gold and clay. He paid 100.372 dollars and 53 cents for the resources. Veli needed to buy the resources because he wanted to spread them on the moon.

The moon vegetables needed these resources to grow. Veli did not want to spread them everywhere, but he wanted to spread them on a rugged surface on the moon. He wanted to spread the resources from his Tofaş Şahin. Tofaş Şahin was a special model that could fly. He spread 752 kilograms 542 grams of natural resources on a rugged surface on the moon. He traveled from the earth to the moon by his Tofaş Şahin, which could fly. Veli was willing to travel to the moon. He made a living from spreading natural resources on the moon and he was not willing to give up his job. He spread the resources on the rugged surface of the moon and vegetables grew on the moon. Moon people loved the vegetables from these resources.

> ➢ The story was acted out with the participation of the students. Students took the roles of the characters in the story, "The Natural Resources."
> ➢ Teacher spoke slowly and always checked comprehension of the story via asking the questions. Whenever needed, he repeated the questions he asked.
> ➢ Teacher made students exaggerate their roles, voices and feelings.
> ➢ When actors did not feel relaxed, the teacher voiced the characters in the story. The actor only moved his lips and gestured.

**Step Three: Reading**

> ➢ After the story is completed, all the students read the story. Teacher read and left blanks in the story and students completed the gaps in the story.

**7.6. APPENDIX F: Teacher Interviews**

**Samples from Teacher Interviews**

**Researcher:** What do you think about the Storytelling Technique?

**Teacher 1:** This technique could be very effective in teaching vocabulary.

**Researcher:** Were the stories used in the lesson enjoyable?

**Teacher 1:** Yes. Asking a lot of questions helped them become interesting.


**Researcher:** Were the stories used in the lesson enjoyable?

**Teacher 2:** Yes, and the questions made students participate in the lesson, so it was not boring.

**Researcher:** What do you think about the vocabulary teaching techniques used in the Storytelling Technique?

**Teacher 2:** In terms of repetitions, there were a lot of repetitions. I think this was helpful. In the storytelling part, students were very active and translation of the new words was,I think, very clear.


**Researcher:** Do you think that the questions the teacher asked during Storytelling were difficult?

**Teacher 3:** No. I think these questions gave you the opportunity to give a lot of comprehensible input.

**Researcher:** Do you think that Storytelling Technique is a useful technique to retain words in long-term memory? Why? Why not?

**Teacher 3:** Yes, but I don't think it is possible to retain the words in one class session. There should be more repetitions of the same words in the coming lessons.


**Researcher:** What do you think about the Storytelling Technique?

**Teacher 4:** I think it is a fun technique in terms of getting students engaged in the lesson. It is a bit difficult for the teacher to implement.

**Researcher:** Do you think that the questions the teacher asked during Storytelling were difficult?

**Teacher 4:** No. Most of the students were able to answer the questions.

**Researcher:** What do you think about the vocabulary teaching techniques used in the Storytelling Technique?

**Teacher 4:** Repetition and gestures were good. They were not difficult for students to understand. In CI-based instruction these techniques are required. Storytelling Technique is a little bit difficult for the teacher.

**Researcher:** Were the stories used in the lesson enjoyable?

**Teacher 4:** Yes, they were. Students looked at you with full attention and they sometimes laughed.

**Researcher:** Do you think that the Storytelling Technique is a useful technique to retain words in long-term memory? Why? Why not?

**Teacher 4:** Yes. Because there were a lot of repetitions of the target vocabulary, students could retain the words in long-term memory.


**Researcher:** What do you think about the Storytelling Technique?
**Teacher 5:** I think it is a useful technique and it is not boring.

**Researcher:** Do you think that the questions the teacher asked during Storytelling were difficult?

**Teacher 5:** No, they were easy.

**Researcher:** What do you think about the vocabulary teaching techniques used in the Storytelling Technique?

**Teacher 5:** Repetition was very effective. Even I would not forget those words after that many repetitions. Storytelling technique provided students with a clear context.

**Researcher:** Were the stories used in the lesson enjoyable?

**Teacher 5:** Yes, I think they were.

**Researcher:** Do you think that the Storytelling Technique is a useful technique to retain words in long-term memory? Why? Why not?

**Teacher 5:** Of course. However, some students may require more repetitions of the target words in order to retain them.


**Researcher:** What do you think about the Storytelling Technique?

**Teacher 6:** I think this is a beneficial technique to teach vocabulary.

**Researcher:** Do you think that the questions the teacher asked during Storytelling were difficult?

**Teacher 6:** No, they were not difficult.

**Researcher:** What do you think about the vocabulary teaching techniques used in the Storytelling Technique?

**Teacher 6:** They are very useful in teaching vocabulary. For example, gestures and translations are the best techniques to teach foreign language vocabulary. Stories can be used to get more repetitions of the words in a context.

**Researcher:** Were the stories used in the lesson enjoyable?

**Teacher 6:** Yes. Students liked them and they were engaged throughout the lesson.

**Researcher:** Do you think that the Storytelling Technique is a useful technique to retain words in long-term memory? Why? Why not?

**Teacher 6:** Yes. Because it has a variety of techniques it uses when teaching vocabulary.


**Researcher:** What do you think about the Storytelling Technique?
**Teacher 7**: It is a useful technique, but it can be very tiring for the teacher.

**Researcher:** Do you think that the questions the teacher asked during Storytelling were difficult?

**Teacher 7:** Not all of them. Only a few of them were difficult.

**Researcher:** What do you think about the vocabulary teaching techniques used in the Storytelling Technique?

**Teacher 7:** Repetitions, gestures and the story are a good combination of techniques.

**Researcher:** Were the stories used in the lesson enjoyable?

**Teacher 7:** Yes, they were.

**Researcher:** Do you think that the Storytelling Technique is a useful technique to retain words in long-term memory? Why? Why not?

**Teacher 7:** Yes. It can be very useful, but I don't think it is enough on its own.


**Researcher:** What do you think about the Storytelling Technique?

**Teacher 8:** It is enjoyable for the students, but exhausting for the teacher.

**Researcher:** Do you think that the questions the teacher asked during Storytelling were difficult?

**Teacher 8:** No. Most of the students were able to answer them with ease.

**Researcher:** What do you think about the vocabulary teaching techniques used in the Storytelling Technique?

**Teacher 8:** Gestures are very effective because I use TPR myself in my classes. Repetitions are also very effective.

**Researcher:** Were the stories used in the lesson enjoyable?

**Teacher 8:** Yes, they were.

**Researcher:** Do you think that the Storytelling Technique is a useful technique to retain words in long-term memory? Why? Why not?

**Teacher 8:** Although it is hard to implement, I think it is a useful technique in committing new vocabulary to LTM, but it may not be enough on its own.


**Researcher:** What do you think about the Storytelling Technique?

**Teacher 9:** I think it is a good technique to teach a foreign language.

**Researcher:** Do you think that the questions the teacher asked during Storytelling were difficult?

**Teacher 9:** No.

**Researcher:** What do you think about the vocabulary teaching techniques used in the Storytelling Technique?

**Teacher 9:** There were so many repetitions and gestures, so they are good techniques. Story is acted out, so acting out is also good.

**Researcher:** Were the stories used in the lesson enjoyable?

**Teacher 9:** Yes, because students had fun during the storytelling lesson.

**Researcher:** Do you think that the Storytelling Technique is a useful technique to retain words in long-term memory? Why? Why not?

**Teacher 9:** Yes. I think students and the teacher co-created the story, so this shows this technique is useful.

**Researcher:** What do you think about the Storytelling Technique?

**Teacher 10:** I think it is a useful technique, but also tiring.

**Researcher:** Were the stories used in the lesson enjoyable?

**Teacher 10:** Yes. However, as long as the teacher provides comprehensible input by asking a lot of questions, I don't think that the story being enjoyable or not matters.

**Researcher:** What do you think about the vocabulary teaching techniques used in the Storytelling Technique?

**Teacher 10**: Repetition technique is okay, but gesturing won't work. I think gesturing is a waste of time. Translation is also good because it gives a clear definition of the word. Storytelling can be useful, but it is difficult new teachers.

**Researcher:** Do you think that the questions the teacher asked during Storytelling were difficult?

**Teacher 10:** No. These questions helped you to give more comprehensible input and I also loved the way the questions were asked from easy ones to more difficult ones. This way, students were not intimidated by the difficult questions and were eager to answer them.

**Researcher:** Do you think that the Storytelling Technique is a useful technique to retain words in long-term memory? Why? Why not?

**Teacher 10:** Yes, it can be useful with its sub-techniques, but I don't think it is enough to commit the new words to long-term memory. Because, these words must be repeated at a later time, maybe another lesson for long-term learning to happen,

**Researcher:** What do you think about the Storytelling Technique?

**Teacher 11:** I think it provides students with lots of comprehensible input, so it is useful.

**Researcher:** Were the stories used in the lesson enjoyable?

**Teacher 11:** No, but they worked because students participated in the process. Asking a lot of questions made the stories interesting because students gave interesting answers.

**Researcher:** What do you think about the vocabulary teaching techniques used in the Storytelling Technique?

**Teacher 11:** I think all of them are useful. Repetitions were good, but I did not like gesturing much. It was a waste of time. Translation technique always works. Storytelling Technique is useful but it should not be used as a stand-alone technique. It should be used along with another major method.

**Researcher:** Do you think that the questions the teacher asked during Storytelling were difficult?

**Teacher 11:** No. They increased students' overall comprehension of the story.

**Researcher:** Do you think that the Storytelling Technique is a useful technique to retain words in long-term memory? Why? Why not?

**Teacher 11:** Yes, but Storytelling is not enough for long-term retention to occur. They have to be repeated another time.


**Researcher:** What do you think about the Storytelling Technique?

**Teacher 12:** I think it is a useful technique.

**Researcher:** Were the stories used in the lesson enjoyable?

**Teacher 12:** Yes, they were and the questions made students be active all the time.

**Researcher:** What do you think about the vocabulary teaching techniques used in the Storytelling Technique?

**Teacher 12:** I think that these techniques were useful. Gestures, repetitions and translations were great. Storytelling was a little hard for me.

**Researcher:** Do you think that the questions the teacher asked during Storytelling were difficult?

**Teacher 12:** No. These questions gave the teacher the chance to give a lot of comprehensible input.

**Researcher:** Do you think that the Storytelling Technique is a useful technique to retain words in long-term memory? Why? Why not?

**Teacher 12:** Yes, it can be useful. The techniques like gesturing, translating and repeating the words can contribute retention of the words.

**Researcher:** What do you think about the Storytelling Technique?
**Teacher 13:** It is a useful technique.

**Researcher:** Were the stories used in the lesson enjoyable?

**Teacher 13:** Yes, but I think if you give comprehensible input, then it is enough.

**Researcher:** What do you think about the vocabulary teaching techniques used in the Storytelling Technique?

**Teacher 13:** All the techniques used in the lesson seemed to be working well. I think they are useful. Storytelling Technique is the most difficult one though.

**Researcher:** Do you think that the questions the teacher asked during Storytelling were difficult?

**Teacher 13:** I don't think so. They were quite easy and students were able to answer them.

**Researcher:** Do you think that the Storytelling Technique is a useful technique to retain words in long-term memory? Why? Why not?

**Teacher 13:** It could be a useful technique to retain words in LTM. Considering the number of repetitions the students get, it can be helpful to learn new words.

**Researcher:** What do you think about the Storytelling Technique?

**Teacher 14:** I think it is a good technique, but difficult for you.

**Researcher:** Were the stories used in the lesson enjoyable?

**Teacher 14:** Yes.

**Researcher:** What do you think about the vocabulary teaching techniques used in the Storytelling Technique?

**Teacher 14:** I think most of them are useful but Storytelling is not easy.

**Researcher:** Do you think that the questions the teacher asked during Storytelling were difficult?

**Teacher 14:** No. Students answered them easily.

**Researcher:** Do you think that the Storytelling Technique is a useful technique to retain words in long-term memory? Why? Why not?

**Teacher 14:** Yes. It could be helpful in retaining the words as there are a lot of repetitions and gestures.