



***Primary School Indonesian Teachers'
Perception of the Benefits of Teaching
Proficiency through Reading and
Storytelling (TPRS)***

Penny Ellin 2019

Statement of Originality

I hereby declare that this submission is my own work and to the best of my knowledge, it contains no materials previously published or written by another person, or substantial proportions of material which have been accepted for the award of any other degree or diploma at Flinders University or any other educational institution, except where due acknowledgement is made in the thesis. Any contribution made to the research by others, with whom I have worked at Flinders University or elsewhere, is explicitly acknowledged in the thesis. I also declare that the intellectual content of this thesis is the product of my own work, except to the extent that assistance from others in the research project's design and conception or in style, presentation and linguistic expression is acknowledged.'

Acknowledgements

In this acknowledgement, I wish to express my heartfelt thanks and deep appreciation to many people for whom I have incurred an immense debt for their support and guidance. I would like to firstly thank my family for putting up with me being chained to my computer during the conduct of the research and the writing of this thesis. Many hours that I have spent on designing the research, collecting the data and writing the thesis should have been spent with them. Their patience and love have been well acknowledged and deeply appreciated.

I would also like to thank my participating teachers without whom, the collection of the rich data on their perceptions of the Teaching Proficiency by Reading and Story Telling (TPRS) for the research and the writing of this written thesis would have been far more difficult and virtually impossible.

I am also grateful to Dr. Michelle Kohler, who worked with me on the initial project idea and has provided me with her academic research advice, excellent literature suggestions and informative discussions that helped shape this research. I would also like to thank too, my colleagues, who have also supported me by critically listening to, reading and reflecting on my research findings reported in this thesis. I would also like to express appreciations to all professional librarians at Flinders University's library for their great library support during my literature search.

Finally, special thanks would go to my supervisor, Dr. Mai Ngo, who stepped in and helped me wholeheartedly and endlessly in shaping this very final thesis. Her critical questioning, guiding, encouraging and constant reminding me of the meaningful analogies of cooking and writing a thesis have really helped me get through the tough challenges throughout this academic journey towards my completion of this thesis.

Table of Contents

Statement of Originality	2
Acknowledgements.....	3
List of Abbreviations	7
ABSTRACT	9
1. CHAPTER 1: INTRODUCTION	10
1.1 Overview of Chapter 1	10
1.2 The Context of the Study	11
1.2.1 A Brief Historical Overview of Language Policies and Language Programs in Australia Since 1987 ..	11
1.2.2 Current Languages Programs in Australian Primary schools	12
1.2.2.1 The Current Australian Curriculum – Languages	12
1.2.2.2 Language as a Non Instruction Time (NIT) Subject in South Australia	12
1.2.2.3 The Research Problem Statement	13
1.3 The Rationale of the Study	13
1.3.1 South Australian Primary School’s Indonesian Languages Programs in Focus	13
1.3.2 Teaching Proficiency through Reading and Storytelling (TPRS) in Focus	14
1.3.3 Indonesian Teachers' Perceptions over TPRS in Focus	15
1.4 Definitions of Key Guiding Concepts	15
1.4.1 The Concept of Teacher Perceptions	15
1.4.2 The Concept of TPRS and its Brief History	16
1.5 Research Aim and Research Questions	18
1.5.1 Research Aim	18
1.5.2 Research Questions	18
1.6 The Scope of the Study	19
1.7 Summary of Chapter 1	19
2. CHAPTER 2: LITERATURE REVIEW	20
2.1 Overview of Chapter 2	20
2.2 Second Language Acquisition (SLA) and Second Language Learning (SLL)	21
2.2.1 Second Language Acquisition (SLA)	21
2.2.2 Second Language Learning (SLL)	22
2.2.3 Differences Between SLA and SLL	23
2.3 Second Language Teaching (SLT)	23
2.3.1 Comparing Other SLT Methods with the TPRS	23
2.4 Teaching Proficiency through Reading and Storytelling (TPRS)	26
2.4.1 The Global Uses of TPRS in Various Settings	26
2.4.2 The Global Uses of TPRS in Primary School Settings	27
2.4.3 The Local Uses of TPRS in Australia and Uses of TPRS to Teach Indonesian as a World Language ... 30	
2.5 Summary of Chapter 2	31
3. CHAPTER 3: METHODOLOGY	32
3.1 Overview of Chapter 3	32
3.2 Methodological Consideration	32
3.3 Qualitative Research Design Justification	32
3.4 Research Participants	33
3.5 Interview Data Collection	34
3.5.1 Ethics Approval Considerations	34

3.5.2	<i>One-to-one Semi-structured Interviews</i>	35
3.5.3	<i>The Interview Questions</i>	36
3.5.4	<i>Recordings and Transcriptions of Interviews</i>	36
3.6	<i>Analyses of Interview Data</i>	37
3.6.1	<i>Initial Analyses of Data</i>	37
3.6.2	<i>More Comprehensive Subsequent Analyses of Data</i>	37
3.6.3	<i>Interpretation of Analytical Data</i>	37
3.7	<i>Methodological Limitations of the Study</i>	38
3.8	<i>Summary of Chapter 3</i>	38
4.	CHAPTER 4: DATA ANALYSES & DISCUSSION OF FINDINGS	40
4.1	<i>Overview of Chapter 4 and A Brief Description of Interview Data Collected</i>	40
	<i>Table 4.1: A Description of 05 Participating Teachers</i>	41
4.2	<i>Analyses of Interview Data In Response to Research Question 1a & 1b</i>	42
4.2.1	<i>Research Question 1a What are South Australian primary school teachers' perceptions of the benefits of using TPRS to teach the Indonesian language?</i>	42
4.2.2	<i>Question 1b: How have South Australian primary school teachers made use of their perceived benefits, if any, in their primary Indonesian language classrooms?</i>	45
4.3	<i>Analyses of Interview Data in Response to Research Question 2</i>	48
4.3.1	<i>Question 2a: What are South Australian primary school teachers' perceptions of the shortcomings of using TPRS to teach the Indonesian language?</i>	48
4.3.2	<i>Question 2b: How have South Australian Primary School teachers addressed the perceived shortcomings of TPRS, if any, in their Primary Indonesian language classroom</i>	51
4.4	<i>Analyses of other Relevant Emerging Interview Data</i>	53
4.4.1	<i>Student-centeredness and Teachers' Roles in TPRS Classrooms</i>	54
4.4.2	<i>Inquiry -based Learning In TPRS Classrooms</i>	55
4.4.3	<i>Authentic Texts & Tasks in TPRS Classrooms</i>	55
4.5	<i>A Summary of Data Analyses</i>	56
4.5.1	<i>Key Findings - Participating Teachers' Perceived Benefits and Shortcomings of TPRS</i>	56
4.5.3	<i>A Summary of Major Findings from Data Analyses</i>	58
4.6	<i>Discussion of Findings</i>	58
4.6.1	<i>Discussion of Key Findings in Light of the Research Aims and Questions</i>	58
4.6.2	<i>Discussion of Key Findings in Light of Literature Review</i>	59
4.7	<i>Summary of Chapter 4</i>	62
5.	CHAPTER 5: MAJOR FINDINGS AND CONCLUSION	63
5.1	<i>Overview of Chapter 5</i>	63
5.2	<i>A Brief Summary of Major Findings</i>	63
5.2.1	<i>Major Findings as Revealed from the Literature Review</i>	63
5.2.2	<i>Major Findings as Revealed from Data Analyses in Response to Research Questions</i>	63
5.3	<i>Recommendations for Key Stakeholders -Where to From here?</i>	64
5.3.1	<i>Recommendations for South Australian Primary Schools' Indonesian Language Teachers</i>	64
5.3.2	<i>Recommendations for South Australian Primary Schools' Indonesian Language Program Administrators</i>	65
5.4	<i>Limitations of the Study</i>	65
5.5	<i>Significance of the Study</i>	66
5.6	<i>Implications of the Study</i>	66
5.6.1	<i>Implications for Further Practice</i>	66
5.6.2	<i>Implications for Further Research</i>	67

5.7 Summary of Chapter 5 and Concluding Remarks	67
References	68
Appendix 1 Ethics Approval Notice	75
Appendix 2 Participation Request, Project Information and Consent for Participants	78
Appendix 3 Letter of Consent from Participant Line Manager	85
Appendix 4: A Tabulated Review of Relevant Studies	86
Appendix 5: A Review of SLT Methods Proceeding or Having Direct Relevance to the TPRS Evolution.....	95
Appendix 6: Reviewed Studies Comparing TPRS and Other SLT Methods	97
Appendix 7: Methodological Considerations of 03 Main Research Types.....	97
Appendix 8: 03 Main Interview Types for Consideration in This Research.....	100
Appendix 9: The Interview Questions	101
Appendix 10 Syntheses of Interview Data	104
Appendix 11 A Synthesis of How the Perceived Shortcomings could be Addressed.....	111
Appendix 12 Emerging Themes.....	113

List of Abbreviations

AC	Australian Curriculum
CI	Comprehensible Input
CLT	Communicative Language Teaching
CO	Comprehensible Output
COLA	Context based Optimised Language Acquisition
DECD	Department of Education and Child Development
DECS	Department of Education and Children’s Services
DfE	Department for Education
ESL	English as a Second Language
FL	First Language
FLA	First Language Acquisition
ILR	Interagency Language Roundtable Scale
INTAN	Indonesian Teacher’s Association of South Australia
KLA	Key Language Area
L1	First language
L2	Second language
LAD	Language Acquisition Device
LDAM	Learning Design, Assessment and Moderation
LOTE	Language Other Than English
NAPLAN	National Assessment Program - Literacy and Numeracy
NIT	Non Instruction Time
PAT-R	Progressive Assessment Tests in Reading
SA	South Australia
SLA	Second Language Acquisition
SLL	Second Language Learning
TCI	Teaching with Comprehensible Input
TfEL	Teaching for Effective Learning
TL	Target Language
TPR	Total Physical Response
TPRS	Teaching Proficiency through Reading and Storytelling

UG	Universal Grammar
USA	United States of America
WL	World Languages

Primary School Indonesian Teachers' Perception of the Benefits of Teaching Proficiency through Reading and Storytelling (TPRS)

ABSTRACT

The Teaching Proficiency through Reading and Storytelling (TPRS) Method was created in the 1990s by Blaine Ray, an American high school Spanish teacher and has been used by second language teachers worldwide to teach languages ever since. The TPRS method is currently being used by some South Australian primary school teachers in classroom practices to teach Indonesian as a second language. However, the current literature is dominated by studies on the use of the TPRS to teach English or Spanish in secondary and tertiary education contexts outside Australia and there is thus a lack of research on the use of the TPRS in primary school contexts in Australia, particularly in South Australia. This current research was therefore conducted to explore the perceptions of five (5) Indonesian language teachers about their perceived benefits and shortcomings, if any, of using TPRS in their primary schools' Indonesian language classrooms in South Australia. Based on analyses of the data collected from one-to-one semi-structured interviews with five Indonesian language teachers from five different primary schools in South Australia, the findings reveal that TPRS is positively perceived by participating teachers as being beneficial for developing students' vocabulary and language retention, increasing their reading ability as well as improving their engagement in Indonesian language learning. These findings confirmed what the literature has suggested so far and helped build primary school teachers' confidence in using the TPRS method more frequently and more effectively to teach their students Indonesian and/or any other second language(s). However, interview data analyses reveal that the participating teachers perceived both pedagogical and contextual challenges in using TPRS to teach Indonesian, to which this current study made recommendations to address. Despite this current study's limited scopes and methodological limitations, its findings are significant as they contribute to both the second language teaching practice and the literature on the use of TPRS in South Australian primary school contexts to teach Indonesian as a second language. Further research into the use of TPRS in other school contexts outside South Australia would help provide more insights into how best to implement the TPRS into Indonesian language classrooms in South Australia and beyond.

1. CHAPTER 1: INTRODUCTION

The challenge for a language teacher is to prepare good quality teaching contents and to select appropriate teaching methods that meet the requirements of individual learners, the language program, the school, and of the education system. As language teachers in Australia do not have access to formal assessment data from national assessment programs like Progressive Achievement Test in Reading (PAT-R¹) and NAPLAN², they need to design language tasks that allow their students to demonstrate their understanding of the language and concepts taught. Limited time frames, large cohorts of students, limited resources and lack of support from colleagues and parents have all impacted on their students' achievement of language learning outcomes and teachers' perceptions of what a successful language program is.

In addition to these external and seemingly uncontrollable concerns, teachers are also left asking themselves how they can engage students in language lessons while still allowing students to acquire and become proficient in the target language. Second Language Acquisition (SLA) theories are numerous, for example, Hymes's Communicative Competence, Krashen's Input Hypothesis and Chomsky's Universal Grammar, all make different claims about learners' second language acquisition and therefore suggest different ways of how to best acquire the second language in the classroom. Second language teachers can read and try to comprehend a myriad of methodological information in the literature about how languages can be learnt and taught. The challenge for them, however, is still to select a method, approach or theory of second language learning that best suits their cohort of language students.

1.1 Overview of Chapter 1

This introductory chapter introduces the research project and consists of seven main parts. *First*, it starts with an overview of Chapter 1. *Second*, it provides a description of the context of the study by referring to the brief history of language policies and language programs in Australia since 1987, and the current situation of language programs in Australian primary school contexts. *Third*, this chapter then provides a rationale for the study by explaining why the research project chose to focus on the teaching of the Indonesian language in South

¹ PAT-R or Progressive Achievement Tests in Reading assess students' reading comprehension skills, vocabulary knowledge and spelling. In South Australia, students in year 3 until year 10 take these tests each year

² NAPLAN or National Assessment Program - literacy and numeracy is nationally administered to students in Year 3, Year 5, Year 7 and Year 9 each year. These tests cover reading, writing, language conventions (grammar, punctuation and spelling) and numeracy

Australia's primary school language programs and why it has put under the spotlight teachers' perceptions of the Teaching Proficiency through Reading and Storytelling (TPRS) method. *Fourth*, the chapter provides definitions of three relevant key guiding concepts of (1) teacher perception; (2) of language teaching method and methodology; and (3) of the TPRS and the brief history of language teaching programs and theories that led to its creation in the 1990s. *Fifth*, this chapter then defines the research aim and research questions that guide the whole research project. *Sixth*, the scope of this current proposed study is also defined in the chapter. *Finally*, this chapter concludes with a summary of Chapter 1, laying the foundation of and the direction for the conduct of the research project on the TPRS method.

1.2 The Context of the Study

1.2.1 A Brief Historical Overview of Language Policies and Language Programs in Australia Since 1987

In 1987, the National Policy on Languages (Lo Bianco, 1987) was responsible for the introduction of primary language programs across Australia. In 1989, the *Hobart Declaration* attempted to unify the states and Commonwealth Government by discussing and clarifying the purpose of schooling and to produce agreed goals for education in Australia. Languages other than English were to be studied by all students of the compulsory schooling age. A decade later, the goals for languages were again re-addressed in the 1999 *Adelaide Declaration* and acknowledged in the Declaration as a Key Learning Area (KLA). However, in what Lo Bianco points out is the '*chopping and changing*' of languages policy in Australia, where policy is adjusted or discarded before the aims and objectives are achieved, the *Adelaide Declaration* was then succeeded in 2008 by the *Melbourne Declaration*, which again stated that that one of the KLA would be languages, particularly, Asian languages. However, the responsibility of how schools and each State or Territory system would implement these learning areas was not addressed in the Melbourne Declaration; rather, it would be site and system driven.

More recently, despite an abundance of language policies in Australia (Lo Bianco & Gvozdenko, 2006), language programs in Australian schools and student numbers, according to the 2016 Australian Census, unfortunately continue to decline, due to lack of qualified language teachers and lack of opportunities to study languages in senior secondary schools. In South Australia, in particular, this declining trend is due to the changes in the senior secondary certificate, with the introduction of Year 12 students selecting only four subjects and a research project to complete their schooling (Kohler & Curnow, 2014). All these reasons can be attributed to the declining numbers of students studying a language to Year 12 in South Australia, even though languages have been one of the curriculum areas in South Australian primary schools since the 1980s (South Australian Government, 1981). While there has been continued support for languages from the Government policy making into the 2000s

(Liberal Party of South Australia, 2018), languages continue to struggle to maintain their importance in everyday school timetabling in South Australia.

1.2.2 Current Languages Programs in Australian Primary schools

1.2.2.1 The Current Australian Curriculum – Languages

In the Australian Curriculum (AC), language learning is currently one of the eight key learning areas and has been designed to offer students the opportunity to study an additional language as well as English. The broad aims of the curriculum include allowing students to develop the knowledge and skills needed to communicate in the Target Language (TL) in addition to understanding the target language, culture, and exploring how they are interwoven to help build students' intercultural understanding. These language curriculum aims are underpinned by the key ideas of Language and Culture and how students compare and contrast both the TL and their own to reflect on how language and culture are inter-related (Liddicoat, Papademetre, Scarino, & Kohler, 2003; Moloney, 2007).

The key capabilities of the AC are defined as the knowledge, skills, disposition and behaviours that are desirable for successful global citizens. Intercultural understanding is also recognized as one of the general capabilities of the AC and has an important role in AC language classes. Intercultural understanding is characterised as valuing one's own culture, language and beliefs while also respecting and valuing those of others with empathy, curiosity and respect (Perry & Southwell, 2011). Intercultural understanding is not just learning about another culture. Rather, it is exploring how and why we all do things a certain way and respecting both similarities and differences between cultures (Hill, 2006). This understanding can then be taken out into the wider population to promote community respect and understanding. This concept currently has a high profile in Language Professional Learning Program in South Australia and therefore is included in the context of this study.

1.2.2.2 Language as a Non Instruction Time (NIT) Subject in South Australia

In South Australia, since the 1980s Languages Other Than English (LOTE) has been part of the Non-Instruction Time (NIT) program, under the Enterprise Agreement that sets out workplace conditions. NIT is the time that a teacher is allocated during school hours to allow them to undertake lesson preparation, assess student work, complete Departmental forms, write reports and undertake curriculum development. With a class teacher on NIT, many primary schools in South Australia offer a language program in which students are taught by a language teacher, either in a language classroom or a learning space or in the student's own classroom, depending upon the school's availability of learning areas. Language classes' duration can range from 30 minutes to over 100

minutes of learners' exposure to the Target Language (TL), depending on each school's arrangements. Some primary schools in South Australia offer two lessons of language learning per week while others offer only one. As a result of these varying contexts, language teachers in South Australian primary schools were reported to feel frustrated with their students' lacks of progress in language learning due to their limited exposure to the TL, according to the Report titled *Attitudes Towards the Study of Languages in Australian Schools* for Australian Council of State School Organisations and the Australian Parents Council (2007).

1.2.2.3 The Research Problem Statement

South Australian primary school NIT language teachers' frustration over their students' lacks of Indonesian language acquisition and usage has been well acknowledged in both literature and in practice. Language teachers have been experimenting with various methods of second language teaching to better teach and engage their students in Indonesian language learning. One of them is the TPRS method. However, many have still hesitated to use TPRS to teach Indonesian in their classrooms because of their concerns over the benefits and shortcomings of using TPRS to teach Indonesian.

1.3 The Rationale of the Study

In recent years, there have been research papers and articles on how TPRS can successfully help students acquire another language. The existing literature often focuses on European languages, particularly Spanish or English as a Second language (ESL) taught mainly to either secondary or college students. However, what is missing in the existing literature are theses or articles on TPRS in Australian primary schools' language classrooms and specifically, on the use of TPRS to teach Indonesian to South Australian primary school students, which justifies a rationale for the conduct of this proposed study.

1.3.1 South Australian Primary School's Indonesian Languages Programs in Focus

Over the years, the Australian language programs have been given support through government policy documents and initiatives, for example, the National Asian Languages and Studies in Schools Programs (2008-2012). However, there is still no mandated allocation of time on task for language teaching and primary school programs thus tend to be subjected to the schools' availability of language teaching staff and the support of school leadership to run their language program.

Being a Primary School's specialist language teacher since 1991 and teaching across several school sites, I am familiar with and interested in the role of an NIT specialist Indonesian language teacher. Like other specialist language teachers, I have been constantly looking for ways to inspire students in Indonesian language study. Generally, as NIT specialist teachers usually teach across the primary school and see over 100 students per day, they require language teaching strategies and methods suitable for junior primary to primary students. Though teaching every child a language in addition to English in a school can be very rewarding, it also requires language teachers' wide knowledge of learners' needs and abilities. In such a context, it is always important for language teachers to examine and explore various methodologies that other language teachers are using to engage their students.

Notably, Indonesian language has been selected for this study because the Indonesian language uses the same alphabet as English making it more accessible, according to the Matthew Absalom, President of the Australian Federation of Modern Language Teachers Associations (2012), and it has been found to require less time to gain a level of Indonesian proficiency (Foreign Service Institute). Being a neighbour of Australia, Indonesia can claim its language to be an important regional language to Australia (Lo Bianco, 2009) and therefore, the Indonesian language is one of the languages Australian schools, including primary ones, should offer in addition to English classes (LoBianco, 2009). Indonesian has been taught in Australian schools since the 1950s and Australia is considered a world leader in the Indonesian language education (Australian Curriculum, 2017). It is also the language taught by the researcher for many years in South Australia.

This study has chosen to focus on South Australian primary schools' Indonesian language programs because on the one hand, in South Australia, the primary school sector has the greatest number of students learning Indonesian as a second language with the numbers continuing beyond Year 6 dropping substantially, and Indonesian language education has been identified as an area of concern (Kohler & Mahnken, 2010). A study in relation to Indonesian language could thus have significant impacts on South Australia's second language education. On the other hand, the South Australian primary schools' Indonesian language programs are those that the researcher is most familiar with and passionate about, as a specialist Indonesian language teacher.

1.3.2 Teaching Proficiency through Reading and Storytelling (TPRS) in Focus

This study focused on TPRS as a second language teaching method because it has gained its increased popularity among Indonesian language teachers on the Fleurieu Peninsula in South Australia, as evidenced by the teachers of four local Government schools using the TPRS method. Furthermore, the Fleurieu Peninsula's group of three primary school Indonesian language teachers have promoted the benefits of TPRS at Indonesian Teachers

Association of South Australia (INTAN) conference and written blogs about how they have been using and achieving results with TPRS. Their Indonesian language classrooms have also been showcased in the media by visits by the then Minister of Education, Department of Education and Child Development, Susan Close (June 2017). However, there is still a lack of research on TPRS conducted by Indonesian language teachers themselves to keep their peers better informed of this popular TPRS method.

1.3.3 Indonesian Teachers' Perceptions over TPRS in Focus

This study focused on Indonesian languages teachers' perceptions of TPRS because most of the available literature seems to focus on either students' perceptions or researchers' perceptions of TPRS or those who intended to simply advocate for the use of TPRS. It is of importance to consider perceptions of teachers who are decision makers and implementers of SLT methods in their Indonesian language classrooms. Therefore, research on Indonesian language teachers' perceptions is needed to provide a more complete picture of the benefits of TPRS by keeping Indonesian language teachers knowledgeable about their peers' perceptions of the benefits of the TPRS. See Sections 1.4.1 and 1.4.2 below for further elaboration on the key guiding concepts of Teacher Perception and of TPRS respectively.

To sum up, on all the above-mentioned grounds, the rationales for the chosen focus on South Australian primary schools' perceptions of using TPRS to teach Indonesian are well justified.

1.4 Definitions of Key Guiding Concepts

As TPRS is the chosen focus of this research project, it is important to explore the relevant key guiding concepts that have repeatedly been referred to in the TPRS research, including those that have heavily influenced the TPRS method. Commonly, the work of Stephen Krashen, his Comprehensible Input Theory (1977) and James Asher's (1968) Total Physical Response (TPR) are often mentioned in conjunction with the TPRS method. The two key guiding concepts that need defining and clarifying at the beginning of this study are namely (1) the concept of teacher perception and (2) the concept of TPRS and its brief history.

1.4.1 The Concept of Teacher Perceptions

The value of teachers' perceptions has been well demonstrated and acknowledged in the literature (e.g., Bracey, 2016). Teacher perceptions can provide a reliable image of a teaching method and/or of the learning

environment, as teachers are constantly making observations in their classrooms to assess student understanding (Brown, 2007). Teachers' perceptions are their views of the events occurring in the classroom and how they understand them. Their perceptions are not convictions but may influence their beliefs, which are generally a set of consciously or unconsciously held hypotheses or assumptions (e.g., Borg, 2001; Bracey, 2016).

In this current study, teacher perceptions are defined as the individual thoughts or mental images that the participating teachers have had of their own professional activities and the Indonesian language learning of their students, specifically, about their perceived benefits of using TPRS to teach their primary school students Indonesian. Teacher perceptions being analysed in this study are those around their perceived benefits of using TPRS to teach Indonesian to their South Australian primary schools' students.

1.4.2 The Concept of TPRS and its Brief History

Teaching Proficiency through Reading and Storytelling (TPRS), according to Ray and Seely (2018), is a teaching method with explicit examples of how to set up, introduce and use reading and storytelling for teaching a language. The concept of TPRS as a language teaching method implies its three key features. The *first* key feature is that it is a language instruction method designed to engage language learners and improve language acquisition through reading and creating stories with a focus on repetitions of high frequency vocabulary (Ray, 1997). The *second* feature is that students being exposed to TPRS method are not expected to speak the TL until they are really ready. Personalization of stories and humor is therefore used to positively promote students' speaking in the TPRS class (Slavic, 2012). The *third* key feature is that TPRS could help create a safe environment conducive for second language learning. This third feature is also related to the concept of the Affective Filter coined by Krashen (1987) who advocates it as an obstacle to language acquisition.

The Affective Filter was described by Krashen (1987) as a wall or screen that is manipulated by a learner's emotions and is activated by many different emotions including self-confidence, anxiety and stress; it can prevent input from reaching the acquisition part of the brain. Therefore, it is important for language teachers to use an effective teaching method that could help create a safe and welcoming learning environment, where students feel safe to take risks and make mistakes. According to the Affective Filter Hypothesis, students who are feeling relaxed and comfortable and not pressured to speak until they are ready, are more likely to acquire the language in class. TPRS is a language teaching method that claims its ability to help remove the Affective Filter (Slavic, 2012).

As far as the history of the TPRS is concerned, TPRS was first developed by Blaine Ray, an American high school Spanish teacher in 1990 (Ray & Seely, 2018). Ray had become disillusioned with the amount of language his students were able to use at the end of their Spanish learning lessons and began exploring the work of James Asher (1968) and Total Physical Response (TPR) and Krashen's comprehensible input theories (1977). Total Physical Response (TPR) involves learners' language acquisition through movement and gestures to help consolidate learned vocabulary. Though Ray could see the benefits of both TPR and comprehensible input (CI), Ray felt that TPR was limited as it did not allow students to learn concepts other than those where students could respond with physical movement and its primary focus was on listening and subsequently on speaking.

TPR is a form of Communicative Language Teaching (CLT) and was believed to only develop basic speaking skills and thus needed to be complemented with other language learning methods to ensure that students were exposed to other language skills (Ray, 1997). Therefore, Ray began to experiment various language learning strategies to develop a new method of language teaching that is now known as the TPRS method.

It is also important to note that TPRS uses the concepts inherent in the concept of Teaching with Comprehensible Input (TCI) using a variety of techniques, strategies and approaches to deliver the TL in a way that all learners are able to understand what is being presented. TCI is based on Krashen's Input hypothesis (1981) which explains how learners acquire a second language. Teachers using the TCI method rely on making the presented language compelling as well as comprehensible. These teachers place little focus on grammatical structures; instead they opt for repetition as a means of language learning. Students listen to or read the meaningful language inputs that they understand. Krashen advocates that people learn second languages through reading (Krashen, 1989) and understanding what people are saying. According to Krashen's theory, a learner receives 'input' that is slightly beyond the learner's own proficiency or language competence level and is able to comprehend what is being said through context and other linguistic cues; language acquisition is thus enhanced. In his words, Krashen (1982, p.21) stated, "we acquire by understanding language that contains structure a bit beyond our current level of competence ($i + 1$). This is done with the help of context or extra-linguistic information."

Comprehensible input (CI) involves processing of information received by the individual learner and then the learner constructs meaning along a continuum of proficiency. Comprehension is one of the three pillars of TPRS and the language input in class must be 100% comprehensible (Ray & Seely, 1997). Polat describes CI "as a complex, self-adaptive and dynamic communication affordance" that owes its existence to the mediated languaging processes of social interactions that give rise to its construction" (Polat, 2016, p. 214). The language that students hear and see in the classroom needs to be compelling and repeated and just a little bit above the their current level, so there should be a few unknown words. TPRS also uses concepts based on TCI when

personalising content, introducing the new vocabulary with visual aids and asking a story using familiar characters to the learners.

To sum up, the history of TPRS indicates that the TPRS method evolved from Asher's study on TPR, where learners were concerned with listening and following instructions; it was revealed that when students tried to listen to and speak a second language, their comprehension decreased (Asher, 1968). Ray combined both Asher's TPR method and Krashen's CI theory to create the method currently known as TPRS.

1.5 Research Aim and Research Questions

1.5.1 Research Aim

The aim of this study is to investigate into primary school Indonesian teachers' perceptions of the possible benefits and shortcomings of using TPRS to teach Indonesian. An exploration of perceived successful programs, primary Indonesian language teachers' perceived benefits and potential shortcomings of using TPRS to teach Indonesian could assist with further directions and recommendations for teacher training and programs set up for South Australian primary school second language teachers in general and Indonesian language teachers in particular.

1.5.2 Research Questions

Towards achieving that aim, this study seeks answers to the four following questions:

Question 1a: What are South Australian primary school Indonesian language teachers' perceptions of *the benefits* of using Teaching Proficiency through Reading and Storytelling (TPRS) to teach Indonesian?

Question 1b: How have they made use of the perceived benefits, if any, in their Indonesian language classrooms?

Question 2a: What are South Australian primary school Indonesian language teachers' perceptions of *the shortcomings* of using Teaching Proficiency through Reading and Storytelling (TPRS) to teach Indonesian?

Question 2b: How have they addressed the perceived shortcomings of TPRS, if any, in their Indonesian language classrooms?

While the first set of questions (i.e. Questions 1a and 1b) targets at South Australian primary school Indonesian language teachers' perceptions of the benefits of the TPRS and how to make use of them, the second set of questions (i.e. Questions 2a and 2b) targets at their perceptions of the shortcomings of the TPRS and how to address them. By asking these research questions in relation to both perceived benefits and shortcomings of the TPRS, the researcher believes that the research would be conducted with a more neutral and objective position.

1.6 The Scope of the Study

Given the time constraints, this study has its limited scopes. *First*, the scope of the study is limited to South Australian primary school contexts only. *Second*, it is limited to Indonesian language teachers' perceptions only. *Third*, the study focuses on investigating Indonesian language teachers' perceptions of the TPRS method only. *Fourth*, its research methodology has its limited scope with a small sample size of research participants (see Section 3.4) participating in a qualitative research design. Though limited, these scopes were well defined right at the beginning of the research project and have kept the current study focused on achieving its research aim and answering the set of four research questions.

1.7 Summary of Chapter 1

To sum up, this chapter provides the rationales for the current study by providing a brief description of the local South Australian context as well as definitions of two key concepts of teacher perceptions and of TPRS providing guidance and direction for the study. This introductory chapter highlights a need for an investigation into the South Australian primary school Indonesian language teachers' perceptions of the benefits of using TPRS to teach Indonesian. The following chapter (*Chapter 2 - the Literature Review Chapter*) will examine the relevant literature related to the use of TPRS worldwide and in Australia.

2. CHAPTER 2: LITERATURE REVIEW

2.1 Overview of Chapter 2

This chapter reviews the literature that is relevant for the current study on Primary School Indonesian language teachers' perceptions of the benefits of using Teaching Proficiency through Reading and Storytelling (TPRS) to teach Indonesian. The literature review covers selected studies published in a variety of sources, namely, books, theses, dissertations, journal articles and relevant blog posts directly related to TPRS. The key search terms for the literature review included teacher perceptions of TPRS, TCI and comprehensible input, intercultural understanding (culture), Indonesian language studies and primary school /elementary students which are all relevant key words for this current study.

Using those key search terms, the researcher has found many sources and selected the most relevant and recent ones for the review (see Appendix 4: *A Tabulated Review of Relevant Studies* which presents an overview of relevant studies which are the outcomes of the relevant literature search and chosen for the review. The reviewed studies listed in Appendix 4 were synthesized and arranged according to four (4) overarching themes which are common among the reviewed studies, namely (1) Second Language Acquisition (SLA); (2) Second Language Learning (SLL); (3) Second Language Teaching (SLT); and (4) the TPRS method. These four themes have been identified by many researchers in the literature (e.g., Krashen, 1983, Ray & Seely, 1997) as pivotal in the evolution of TCI and the subsequent TPRS method of language teaching and were thus selected for their relevance to this current study. Key findings of each reviewed study and its relevance for the current study were also presented in Appendix 4.

The scope of this Literature Review is limited to those studies that focused on second language acquisition approaches and methods preceding and succeeding the establishment of the TPRS method. This Review is guided by the focused review question of *“What does the existing literature on TPRS reveal, in relation to any possible benefits and shortcomings of the TPRS in second language classroom?”*

This chapter is thematically structured into four main parts, representing four themes under review, starting with a review of studies on the *first* general overarching theme of Second Language Acquisition (SLA) approaches and methods and the *second* theme of Second Language Learning (SLL), followed by the *third* theme of Second Language Teaching (SLT), and most relevantly, the *fourth and final* specific theme of TPRS which is the main focus of the current research.

2.2 Second Language Acquisition (SLA) and Second Language Learning (SLL)

2.2.1 Second Language Acquisition (SLA)

Second Language Acquisition (SLA) involves a subconscious and informal process in which language is acquired through real meaningful activities and interaction with other people. SLA focuses on using the language to communicate meaning. SLA research illuminates second language pedagogy. There is a controversial debate in SLA research over whether a second language is acquired through comprehensible Inputs (CI) (e.g., Chomsky, 1972; Krashen, 1985), or through Comprehensible Outputs (CO) (e.g., Ellis, 1997; Swain, 1985).

The comprehensible inputs that SLA learners receive, according to Chomsky (1972) and Krashen (1985), are extremely important, whether inputs are reading or listening to the language. Chomsky (1972) explained how children learnt a language, introduced the Language Acquisition Device (LAD) theory and believed that some language ability is instinctive. According to Chomsky, all children possess and have access to their own LAD which they use to acquire their language. Being inspired by Chomsky's LAD theory, Krashen (1982) argued that language acquisition takes place through comprehension and comprehensible inputs are all that learners need for acquisition. According to Krashen (1982), the way learners acquire their second and subsequent languages are similar to the way that they learnt their first language.

However, in the same debate, other researchers (e.g. Ellis, 1997; Liu, 2015; McLaughlin, 1987; Swain 1985, 2000; White 1987) have questioned these comprehensible input theories, queried Krashen's evidence and definitions of comprehensible inputs, laying claims that the theory is superficial and lacks in precision. They have thus challenged comprehensible input hypotheses, argued for comprehensible outputs instead and supported the idea that opportunities to produce and practice the language in communicative situations were important for language acquisition.

In such a controversial debate, it is Krashen's Comprehensible Input (CI) and Affective Filter Monitor Hypothesis that has heavily influenced the TPRS method (Hedstrom, 2018; Slavic, 2016). CI hypothesis espoused that learners only acquire knowledge when they are able to connect it to their prior knowledge. In addition, because students are not expected to produce output until they are ready, their affective filter is low, thus making them feel more secure and able to take in what is being presented. Comprehensible Input (CI) is highly valued by teachers using the TPRS method as it involves exposing learners to a reduced vocabulary based on stories about characters the learners have already known (Baker, 2017; Ray & Seely, 2018).

The SLA research conducted by Stephen Krashen is often used by TPRS proponents to support their use of the TPRS method. Krashen's hypothesis about SLA had a profound influence on Blaine Ray, the founder of TPRS and is often cited by TPRS teachers when referring to the second language acquisition. Krashen noted that language acquisition is a subconscious event and that learners pick up language, not by being taught rules of grammar, but through what the learner thinks sound or feels correct. Krashen's two hypotheses of SLA, namely the Input Hypothesis and Affective filter Hypothesis, are accepted by many TPRS teachers as the reasonable explanation of SLA.

Although TPRS champions CI and only encourages outputs when learners feel they are really ready, it is important to consider Comprehensible Output (Swain, 1985; Swain and Lapkin, 1995; 2000). CO theorists claim that learners using an L2 will notice a gap in their ability or knowledge of the L2 and begin the process of narrowing down this gap through comprehensible outputs. Krashen (1982) conceded that output contributes to acquisition because "the more you talk; the more people will talk to you." It is through experimentation that language is acquired.

This debate of Comprehensible Inputs (CI) vs. Comprehensible Outputs (CO) is referred to as a "war of two theories" (Krashen, 1982). It is asserted that SLA is such a complicated field and no one theory can possibly account for all factors involved (Liu, 2015); in other words, no theory wins in such a war.

2.2.2 Second Language Learning (SLL)

Unlike SLA, Second Language Learning (SLL) is conscious learning via a formal process in classrooms and often involves instruction of the grammatical rules of the target language. Learners are taught the rules which they are supposed to master and be able to use (Ellis, 1989). Krashen (2002) compared second language acquisition (SLA) and second language learning (SLL) and stated that SLA is similar to the way that children learn their first language, but that learning involved gaining knowledge about a language (e.g grammar). However, Dulay and Burt (1974, p. 225) studied whether or not psycholinguistic mechanisms in SLA were basically the same as or different from those in first language acquisition (FLA) and concluded three important differences in terms of 1) age; 2) cognitive development; and 3) language learning experience, which when combined influence the differences in learning process and strategies used in L1 and L2 acquisition.

2.2.3 Differences Between SLA and SLL

The difference between SLL and SLA is that SLL is a conscious process whereas SLA is a sub-conscious one. In addition, SLL involves learners' active participation and efforts in order to learn a language. SLL generally takes place in a formal institution (e.g. classroom) where students are taught the structures and grammar of the target language. SLA, however, normally takes place in real life interactions and natural environments. According to Krashen (1988), SLA occurs naturally, however, SLL is more the study of grammar and vocabulary in contrived settings like schools and colleges. A second language is often taught and learned in such school settings, rather than naturally acquired.

2.3 Second Language Teaching (SLT)

Second Language Teaching (SLT) is what happens in classroom settings that help make SLL happen. SLT emphasizes the importance of application of SLA research to language teaching. In relation to SLT, Nunan (2006) defines the differences between a SLT approach and a SLT method by highlighting that a SLT method is a set of instructions or procedures that a teacher can follow, whereas, a SLT approach provides the philosophical and general theoretical overview of SLA (Brown, 2001). An investigation into the SLT methods, including activity types, teacher's and learner's roles and resources, clarifies some of the strategies of various SLT methods preceding or having direct relevance to the TPRS method (See Appendix 5).

According to Appendix 5 on *A Review of SLT Methods Proceeding or Having Direct Relevance to the TPRS Evolution*, there are similarities between the TPRS method and other methods. The role of the learners in the TPRS classroom is similar to those studying in audio-lingual classrooms, where students are asked to mimic the language presented. Both TPRS and the Natural Approach favour fully comprehensible texts; and, like CLT and CLL, they do not use textbooks. Whereas in the CLT and CLL classrooms, the teacher is considered a facilitator of students' learning. In the TPRS classroom the teacher creates the comprehensible inputs and uses questions to allow students to learn words and structures.

2.3.1 Comparing Other SLT Methods with the TPRS

The literature review revealed that TPRS is not discussed in comparison with all of the six SLT methods listed in Appendix 5. Rather it is often discussed and compared in relation to only four following SLT methods of Grammar Translation Method, Direct Method, Audio-lingual (Berlitz), and Communicative Language Teaching (CLT), each of which will be hereinafter presented in detail.

Grammar Translation Method vs. the TPRS

In the Grammar Translation method, students are often taught the grammar rules of the TL and spend most of their learning time applying those grammar rules while translating sentences or texts from the TL. The classes are conducted in the students' native language and there is a focus on reading and writing rather than speaking the TL. Several recent research papers on TPRS (e.g., Castro 2010; De Costa 2015) have investigated the benefits of TPRS on student achievement when comparing the TPRS with the Grammar Translation method. Castro (2010) found that after 3 days of using both methods, the resulting data showed that although the students had preferred using the TPRS, the amount of unknown words learnt were the same for both methods (*Refer to Appendix 6*).

Similarly, the findings of De Costa (2015) found that when comparing these two methods, neither was better and concluded that the traditional method, like grammar translation benefited students by explicitly allowing them to learn and use grammar rules, while TPRS allowed teachers and students to interact creatively and therefore encouraged ongoing assessments of student understanding and acquisition. The greater benefits of TPRS over the Grammar Translation Method, according to Castro (2010), are thus not necessarily reflected in student results, but in engagement and interaction between teacher and students.

Direct Method vs. the TPRS

As a way of teaching a second language, the Direct method shares some similarities with the Audio-lingual method as both methods advocate that the best way to learn a language is to use it (Kirch, 1967). With both methods, learners are immersed in the TL and students' usage of their native language is discouraged. In the classroom, both methods make use of visual aids, realia and gestures or demonstrations. There is an equal emphasis on listening and the TL is used for all instructions in both methods. Like the Direct Method, TL is supposed to be used as much as possible in the TPRS classroom and usually teachers aim to make 90% of the input in TL comprehensible (Baker, 2017).

Audio-lingual vs. the TPRS

Audio-lingual lessons often take place in language labs. Students are expected to repeat phrases and sentences presented by the teacher. In the 2003 film "*Love Actually*", Colin Firth's character is seen in a language lab along with many other language students, individually repeating the recorded sentences and phrases they hear through their head-phones (<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=wcQ3J921j44>). In this method, the teacher drills students until they are correctly pronouncing a sentence or phrase and until the TL comes automatically. The method relies on repetition, replacement of single words and restatement or rephrasing, which is similar to the repetition strategies used by teachers who use the TPRS method.

Interestingly, Garczynski (2003) found that after using both TPRS and the Audio-lingual methods for 6 weeks, there was no real difference in students' results. Again, although the students overwhelmingly preferred the TPRS method, the score data on their reading and listening comprehension texts showed the same achievement level for both methods (See *Appendix 6*).

Communicative Language Teaching (CLT) vs. the TPRS

The theory behind the CLT Approach is that students learn best when they actually use the TL to communicate (produce outputs). Lessons focus on practicing asking questions of classmates to communicate information. The lessons are more student-directed and often involve the use of realia and authentic texts. In this approach, students' learning focuses on reading, writing, listening and speaking. Activities used in this approach include games, problem-solving tasks, role-plays, information gap, jigsaw and barrier activities focusing on fluency (Richards, 2006). A mindset of 'having a go' is encouraged with lots of interaction with others through group or paired activities (Richards, 2006). While TPRS differs significantly from CLT regarding its focus on asking and responding to questions, some of the activities, like role play, that are used in CLT, can also be employed when teaching languages using TPRS (Baker, 2017).

Both Spangler (2009) and Blanton (2015) compared TPRS's with CLT's learner data (See *Appendix 6*). Spangler found that both methods produced similar student results in reading and writing sections of publicly examined students learning Spanish at the Middle/High School level. The Spangler study also reported that TPRS significantly outscored the CLT students in oral examinations. Yet Blanton (2015) found that CLT students received higher levels of achievement in reading, writing and listening and suggested that further studies into the 'success' of TPRS be conducted, using national standardized tests. While these studies showed little statistical difference in speaking scores, the students taught languages using TPRS positively recorded a higher level of motivation.

To sum up, *Appendix 6* highlights that although TPRS is often perceived as a better method to help students learn a second language over other traditional methods, learner achievements did not support this positive perception.

2.4 Teaching Proficiency through Reading and Storytelling (TPRS)

2.4.1 The Global Uses of TPRS in Various Settings

With reference to the global uses of TPRS in such countries as the United States, Malaysia and Canada, during 1997 – 2018, Ray and Seely's book titled *'Fluency through TPR Storytelling'* with its numerous editions is a key literature on how TPRS has been used in those countries from Asia to America. Research findings and theses presented in this book highlight the successes of TPRS in language classrooms in the US, Malaysia and Canada.

Apart from Ray and Seely, other authors have also been influencing the way TPRS is used in the classrooms in the USA and Canada. For example, Ben Slavic, a creator of TCI and an author of many TPRS books, wrote the Book titled *'Stepping Stones to Storytelling'* (Slavic, 2014) to assist SL teachers from the USA and Canada who had attended a TPRS conference or workshop on the use of TPRS in the USA, but still did not feel ready to begin to implement TPRS storytelling in their L2 classrooms. In his book, Slavic (2014) reflects on the strategies and skills he trailed in L2 classrooms in the USA and Canada and suggested the use of comprehensible inputs in TPRS classrooms. Slavic's contributions are consonant with his own research-based perceptions of the benefits of using TPRS to teach second language proficiency.

With the reference to the United States and the Netherlands, a notable publication on TPRS was made by Lichtman (2015), who is a TPRS teacher and Assistant Professor of Spanish at Northern Illinois University, and has completed studies into TPRS storytelling in various regions in the USA and the Netherlands (Lichtman, 2015, 2019). Lichtman mainly reviewed those articles and papers that promoted TPRS favourably, for example, the research conducted by Spangler (2009), who found that TPRS students outperformed non-TPRS students on the speaking tests and by Numpaque and Rojas (2010), who emphasized that TPRS was a student-centred method and also good for recall and language accuracy. In her summary, Lichtman suggested that future research into TPRS successes in the elementary and college classrooms be explored, while asserting the effectiveness of the TPRS method for second language teaching and learning at all levels from elementary to tertiary, on the grounds of the latest research findings.

Another stalwart of the TPRS method is Terry Waltz, who is an established TCI/TPRS teacher, author and innovator. Her book titled *'TPRS with Chinese Characters'* (Waltz, 2015) has influenced many TPRS teachers globally. Her work includes using comprehensible input and TPRS methods to teach Chinese and the strategies she perceived as beneficial for learners' language proficiency and she is the author of TPRS method readers for

Chinese language students. In her posts and youtube clips, Waltz tried to counteract some of the 'voices' querying the validity of TCI and TPRS.

However, regarding the shortcomings of the global uses of the TPRS method, Richard J Baker's (2017) study of high school teachers teaching Years 9-12 in various states in the USA using TPRS, provided useful information related to their perceptions on such obstacles to TPRS as time constraints, resistance of colleagues/administrators, lack of language teachers' confidence and persistence in using TPRS. To overcome those obstacles, Baker (2017) made recommendations for TPRS teachers/users by suggesting, among others, the extended uses of technology in the TPRS classroom. What is notable about this study is that it offered not only high school teachers' positive perceptions of the TPRS, including its being theoretically informed and effective to teach second languages at all levels, but also their perceived obstacles to TPRS, including insufficient teacher training, lacks of appropriate materials and time demand.

While most of these studies highlight the global uses of TPRS method for teaching second languages successfully in language classrooms, especially in the United States and Spanish language classrooms despite some unavoidable obstacles, there are still some disagreements among authors and researchers over the inclusion of cultural aspects in TPRS lessons. Baker (2017) highlights the need to ensure that students achieve cultural understanding when reading a text in the TPRS classroom. This need is supported by *Alley and Overfield (2008)* who criticised TPRS lessons for language learners' lack of cultural content exposure. In this regard, Slavic and Waltz on their TPRS blogs, insist that culture and cultural norms are already taught via TPRS culture 'pop ups', which are similar to the way that grammar is dealt with in the TPRS lessons. It is important to specify and clarify whether culture refers to folktales or festivals or something else. In the light of this literature review, language teachers' perceptions of what aspects of culture to be taught using the TPRS also need further investigation.

2.4.2 The Global Uses of TPRS in Primary School Settings

Regarding the global uses of TPRS in primary school settings, the Literature Review reveals that there were studies conducted on the use of the TPRS method to teach English as a Second or Foreign Language in the elementary or primary school. Six notable studies under review are those chronologically conducted by, namely, Armstrong (2008), Safdarian (2012), Demir and Çubukçu (2014), Sutijono (2014), Campbell (2016) and most recently by Ray and Seely (2018). The reasons for choosing these six studies for review were because though they were conducted in different national contexts outside Australia, they are most related to the current proposed study on the global uses of TPRS in primary school settings.

First, with a focus on fluency and fun in the Elementary Middle School, Armstrong (2008) conducted a study on elementary students in USA before leaving for Columbia. This research is relevant to the current study as it deals with teacher perceptions as well as student perceptions of the success of using TPRS for teaching Spanish. Armstrong found that elementary middle school students being exposed to TPRS remembered more vocabulary when using gestures, pictures and TL (comprehensible input) and they positively perceived themselves as speakers of another language.

A few years later, in a research conducted in Iran, Sardarian (2012) investigated the effectiveness of stories on the proficiency and motivation of young learners (i.e. 12-year-olds) in their foreign language learning. The young learners involved in the study were equivalent to Year 6 students in South Australia. Although much of the data in this study supported the use of storytelling and reading, the researcher did identify time as an obstacle and questioned the performance of TPRS students in standardized tests. Concerns over text authenticity were also raised, with the researcher reiterating the importance of stories being relevant to the interests and age of the learners.

Demir and Çubukçu (2014) later conducted a research project on two groups of 6-year-old students learning English in Turkey. In the study, they proved that the TPRS method has an impact on the lexical competence of young learners. They highlighted the three pillars of TPRS of 'comprehension, interesting and repetitive' (Demir and Çubukçu, 2014). Accordingly, the findings of the study suggest storytelling and reading aloud should be essential when teaching language to preschoolers. However, the authors recommended combining other activities, for example information gap activities favoured by the Communicative Approach, to improve language learning. This finding was later echoed in other studies (e.g. De Costa, 2015) advocating that one method of teaching is not sufficient; rather a combination of SLT methods should be employed.

In the same year, Sutijono (2014) examined how teaching using TPRS to Year 3 students learning English in Indonesia could be compared with teaching them using wordlists. In this study, Sutijono was the English language teacher conducting the TPRS lessons; therefore, the findings might probably be subjective and biased. In addition, the research was conducted over a limited number of four TPRS lessons. According to Sutijono, teaching using TPRS was more beneficial for Year 3 learners. Again, the researcher suggested varying teaching techniques, as did Demir and Çubukçu (2014), and made mention of classroom management as a key consideration when using TPRS.

In a similar primary school context in Carolina, USA, Campbell (2016) then conducted a relatively short study of three weeks only to explore how TPRS can be used to engage Year 3 boys in Spanish classrooms and found that as long as the boys were interested in the storyline, TPRS did help with the learner engagement in language learning. This study included an investigation into teacher perceptions around TPRS and the benefits for participating students. In this study, the Spanish teachers initially reflected on their perceptions of student engagement and academic achievement in their classrooms via a diary and later, they wrote about whether they thought TPRS had enhanced the engagement and academic achievement of the Year 3 boys in their classes. They also pointed, though indirectly, to teacher perceptions of the benefits and/or shortcomings of TPRS as a SLT method. As these studies were conducted over very short time frames, longitudinal research over longer time periods is needed to verify its findings.

Most recently, in the latest edition, Ray and Seely's (2018) book promoted ways to use TPRS in the elementary school years contributed by Jason Fritze - a teacher of Spanish at various elementary schools in California, by Leslie Davison - a cross age teacher of Spanish from Colorado, and by Lucy Williams - an elementary and middle school French and Spanish teacher in Oklahoma City. These language teachers concluded that there were two main differences when using TPRS with younger students. These differences are namely, the amount of time allocated to learning another language in elementary schools and the learners' age. The contributors to Ray's latest book edition reached a consensus that TPRS would still benefit young learners and their language acquisition regardless of how much time learners are exposed to the TL.

To sum up, these six reviewed studies all put under the spotlight students of primary school ages being exposed to TPRS, though in different national contexts outside Australia and provided useful insights for this current study targeted at South Australia's primary school settings. The convergence among these six reviewed studies highlights positive perceptions of both students and teachers of the TPRS method, however, there seems to be a controversy over whether TPRS alone is the most effective way to teach languages. It is worth mentioning that although these papers' findings support the use of TPRS in elementary or preschool classrooms, they neither touched on the Indonesian language teaching/learning nor the NIT contexts in South Australia, revealing an evident gap in the literature which justifies a need for further researching into Indonesian language teachers' perceived benefits, if any, of using TPRS to teach Indonesian in South Australian primary school NIT contexts to see whether the findings are consistent or not.

2.4.3 The Local Uses of TPRS in Australia and Uses of TPRS to Teach Indonesian as a World Language

A thorough search for the literature has so far not yielded any relevant formal research or articles published specifically about the use of TPRS for teaching second languages or the Indonesian language in Australia, even though the researcher sought help from a professional librarian service of Flinders University where the researcher studied. The professional librarians used various key search words and searched thoroughly and professionally several databases for information about TPRS in Australia, including Google Scholar, Linguistics and Language Behaviour Abstracts, Informit Education Database Collection and ProQuest Education Database Collection. However, searches in these databases yielded limited results in the search strings of “Teaching Proficiency through Reading and Storytelling”, “TPR Storytelling”, “Comprehensible Input”, “Total Physical Response”, “Total Physical Response Storytelling” and “Australia”. Much of the research has come out of the United States’ Spanish speaking classrooms or English as a Second Language (ESL) classes, which is not surprising, given that Ray is an American High School Spanish teacher.

Despite this lack of published research on the local use of TPRS in Australia published in articles or research paper forms, there are evidently Australian school teachers using TPRS, including those who are writing blogs about their perceptions of TPRS in their classrooms. A notable blog available from this link <https://bucathydotcom.wordpress.com/> has been written by Bu Cathy who is a South Australian Indonesian language teacher using TPRS in her classroom at Port Elliot Primary School. In this blog, Bu Cathy explored TPRS and reflected on both her own TPRS journey and her students’ Indonesian language learning and engagement in her classrooms. These are teacher perceptions but limited to the perceptions of one single blog author only and neither specific empirical research nor any statistical data has been undertaken to conclusively prove whether these seemingly subjective perceptions are true and applicable for other primary school teachers in South Australia. To the best of the researcher’s knowledge, this blog is the only one written evidence available of an Indonesian language teacher’s perceptions of the benefits of TPRS in her Indonesian classrooms in her primary school at Port Elliot. Hence, this again justifies a strong need for further empirical research into South Australian primary school teachers’ perceptions of the benefits of using TPRS to teach Indonesian in the classroom.

Apart from the blog posted by Bu Cathy, presenters of the TPRS method in Australia have been showcased at national conferences run by Modern Language Teacher of Queensland (MLTQ) in 2017 and 2018, where Terry Waltz, the author of the Book titled *‘TPRS with Chinese characters, Making Students Fluent through Comprehensible Input’* (Waltz, 2015) was invited to be a keynote speaker. In 2019, the inaugural SA TPRS Conference held in Victor Harbor in South Australia successfully invited Blaine Ray to be a key note speaker and reached its registration capacity, indicating that high levels of teachers’ and researchers’ keen interest in the TPRS

method continues to be shown in Australia in general and in South Australia in particular and that further research into Indonesian language teachers' perceptions of their learner benefits as well as potential challenges would be useful for future Indonesian language teacher education and research.

2.5 Summary of Chapter 2

In this chapter, the relevant literature was critically reviewed to tell the story of TPRS that begins with SLA theories and of how it has evolved and been influenced by other language teaching methods or theories. The thread of the story highlights that although there is now a great deal of literature available about the use of TPRS to teach English and Spanish in secondary and tertiary education contexts, there is very little literature available about primary school language teachers' perceptions of using TPRS to teach the Indonesian language in South Australia. This chapter provides the rationale for the current proposed study on Indonesian teachers' perceptions of the possible benefits and shortcomings of using TPRS to teach Indonesian in South Australian primary schools.

3. CHAPTER 3: METHODOLOGY

3.1 Overview of Chapter 3

This chapter is structured into five main parts. In the *first* part, it provides an overview of the Chapter, followed by the *second* part on considerations of existing research methodologies in relation to language teaching and learning. In the *third* part, it argues for the chosen qualitative research design that fits for the purpose of this study, which is to investigate primary school teacher's perceptions of the benefits of using TPRS to teach Indonesian. In its *fourth* part, this chapter also presents the chosen data collection instruments for gathering and analysing data in relation to South Australian primary school teacher perceptions of the benefits of using TPRS to teach Indonesian. In the final (*fifth*) part, the chapter presents the methodological limitations of the research study and highlights the suitability of the selected methodology that fits with research purposes and research questions, despite its limitations.

3.2 Methodological Consideration

There were three main types of research methods of namely, qualitative research, quantitative research and mixed method research considered for this research project. The advantages and disadvantages of each of the three research types were considered and weighed up before choosing the appropriate design for this current study in the light of its research questions and research aim, which was to explore the perceptions of primary school teachers of the benefits of using TPRS to teach Indonesian. *Appendix 7* presents the aims, features, benefits and shortcomings of each research type, which facilitated the researcher's methodological decision. In this study, to fit for the current research's aim and questions, qualitative research design was chosen and its detailed justification is hereinafter presented.

3.3 Qualitative Research Design Justification

In this research project, with careful consideration of each research type's aims, features, benefits and shortcomings presented in *Appendix 7*, the qualitative research design was chosen for the following reasons. *First*, it fits for the aim of the study, which is to examine teacher perceptions of the benefits of using TPRS to teach Indonesian in the primary Indonesian classrooms. *Second*, qualitative research design, though with some limitations, also enables the researcher to examine and understand both the experiences of individual participating teachers and their contextual differences and complexities. According to Denzin and Lincoln (1994,

p. 2), “qualitative research is multi-method in focus, involving an interpretive, naturalistic approach to its subject matter.”

Qualitative research also offered the researcher a myriad of data collection instruments, including but not exclusively, interviews, biographies, diaries, annotations and more. Because of its limited time frame and other participant pressures, this research will not draw from a large number of participants nor use all those data collection instruments that might have been useful for further clarification of the information from participants. For example, observation of classroom practices would be desirable to observe and verify what participants say they are doing and seeing are actually what is happening (Corbin & Strauss, 2012) as well as collection of student work samples. However, unfortunately, due to the difficulties in gaining ethics approval from Flinders University’s relevant Ethics Approval Committee within a limited research time frame, observation and student work samples, though initially considered, could not be used for data collection in this study.

In the final research plan that was granted the official ethics approval notice (*See Appendix 1*), participating teachers teaching in similar contexts, particularly in primary schools’ NIT Indonesian language classrooms, were invited for interviews. Therefore, only interview data were collected and analysed in this research project. A narrative inquiry methodology (Clandinin & Huber, 2006) was adopted by asking the participants the same set of semi-structured interview questions and allowing them to share their personal stories of their TPRS journey, with the researcher taking notes during the semi structured interviews.

3.4 Research Participants

When selecting participants for the research project, it is important that the researcher started with clear selection criteria. In the broad sense, these participants must be selected on the grounds that they will be able to help fulfill the purpose of the research project (Trochim, 2006), which is to share their perceptions of the possible benefits and/or shortcomings of using the TPRS method to teach Indonesian. The selection criteria are as follows: (1) they must be Indonesian language teachers teaching at a primary school in South Australia for at least one year; (2) they have had some experiences in using the TPRS to teach Indonesian; (3) they are in the NIT specialist roles in South Australian Government primary schools; and (4) they must consent to participate in the current research project voluntarily.

Based on these selection criteria, six (06) TPRS teachers from 06 different primary schools in South Australia were approached via email based on their online presence and TPRS blogging and invited to participate in the research

project and were coded as Teacher A, B, C, D, E and F. A few of them, namely, Teacher E and F were approached, based on the recommendation and introduction of other contacted teachers, namely, Teacher A, B and C. Their ages varied from the late twenties to late fifties and their language teaching duration also varied (Refer to *Table 4.1 Research Participants*). Consent forms (See Appendix 2) were sent to all 06 contacted teachers. Only five teachers, namely Teacher A, Teacher B, Teacher C, Teacher D and Teacher E, who finally consented to participate in this study, were interviewed and recorded in the interview venues of mutual convenience for both the interviewer/the researcher and the interviewees/the participating teachers.

3.5 Interview Data Collection

The proposed research design, as mentioned above is a qualitative research design that adopted a narrative inquiry methodology and featured semi-structured interviews as the main data source. As the research questions are investigating perceptions of South Australian primary school teachers, interviewing them could help provide answers to those research questions. All participating teachers were asked the same set of semi-structured interview questions to reflect and share their own TPRS journey and perceptions on TPRS; their reflections were noted by the researcher during interviews and recorded for later transcriptions.

3.5.1 Ethics Approval Considerations

Because this research involves human subjects, in this case primary school teachers in South Australia, the researcher submitted a carefully considered ethics application to the relevant ethics committee as soon as its research design was shaped and finalized. This research project was officially granted an ethics approval notice (Project Number 8346) by Flinders University's Social and Behavioural Research Ethics Committee (SBREC) on June 26th 2019 (See *Appendix 1*).

Upon receipt of the ethics approval notice, the researcher contacted all the potential research participants via email and telephone, utilising contact details received from the Languages team (Department for Education), as well as from known languages colleagues and from the current TPRS blogs. Participating teachers were provided with relevant information regarding the aims of the research project, interview data collection processes (*Appendix 2*), and interview questions (*Appendix 9*) before being invited to participate voluntarily in the interviews. Participants were able to withdraw from the research project at any time and all of the contributions and personal information of each participating teacher would be kept confidential.

3.5.2 One-to-one Semi-structured Interviews

Interviews are the most prominent data collection tools in qualitative research. They are strong and powerful research instruments which are an effective way to gather information about individuals (Cohen, 2007), and in this case, about individual teachers' contexts, experiences and their perceptions of using TPRS to teach Indonesian. During an interview, the researcher is able to ask and clarify information from each interviewed teacher, allowing the researcher to get important (detailed and rich) data for in-depth analyses.

As shown in *Appendix 8*, there are three main types of interviews, namely, the structured interviews, semi-structured and unstructured interviews. In this project, after carefully considering the pros and cons of each of the three interview types, semi-structured interviews were finally selected to gather information about participating teachers' perceptions of the use of TPRS to teach Indonesian. Structured interviews are more formal while unstructured ones are informal; semi-structured interviews are in-between and more balanced. Unlike structured and un-structured interviews, semi-structured interviews consist of both open and closed ended interview questions that are regularly followed by clarifying questions pertaining to how and why, allowing interviewees, in this case participating teachers, to express ideas while keeping the interviews structured.

In this research project, each participant will be involved in three 20-minute-long semi-structured interviews to be conducted at a negotiable time convenient for each participant, rather than one 60-minute long interview which might be too long and too tiring for both interviewers and interviewees. By conducting three short interviews of 20 minute long each for each participating teacher, the researcher could ensure some time gap of 10—14 days between each interview.(Refer *Appendix 9* for interview structure) Fatigue was thus avoided for both interviewers and interviewees while the researcher could transcribe interviews one after another, take detailed notes of each interview and seek clarification of information at subsequent interviews, if necessary. Participants were also asked to review the transcripts of the interviews for authentication and verification of transcribed information. The total estimated time for each participant's involvement is approximately 2 hours, including their interview transcripts checking.

After consultation with the very first participating teachers (Teacher A, Teacher B and Teacher C), other teacher names (Teacher D, Teacher E and Teacher F) were put forward as relevant contacts. Both beginning and experienced TPRS teachers who are both male and female ones were invited to participate voluntarily in the research. Due to other commitments and leave, only five teachers finally consented to participate voluntarily in the interviews. All these five participants were asked the same semi-structured interview questions (see *Appendix 9*) because the information from each interviewed participant needed to be reviewed and synthesised

with the information of the previous interviews (Holliday, 2010). Before being interviewed, all participating teachers were well informed of the same set of pre-formulated interview questions which were later asked all the participants. This allowed for convenient syntheses of collected data. The semi-structured interviews were audio-recorded, with participants' consent, and were later transcribed for data analyses.

3.5.3 The Interview Questions

To explore the study on "*Primary School Indonesian Teachers' Perception of the Benefits of Teaching Proficiency through Reading and Storytelling (TPRS)*", the researcher developed interview questions to get the perspectives of each interviewed participant of using the TPRS method to teach Indonesian. A variety of interview questions were developed, including initial sensitizing questions (Corbin & Strauss, 2012) aiming to find out what is happening in the classrooms and how this may be perceived. In addition to initial sensitizing questions, specific follow-up interview questions (Gillespie, 2014) were also formulated to guide the participant's responses in the direction of the study. Participants' responses to these specific follow-up questions could help provide answers to the research questions (See *Section 1.5.2*). Notably, interview questions were drafted and finalized on the grounds that they are relevant for the research aim and research questions.

The interview questions, as can be seen from *Appendix 9*, consist of 4 main structured questions and 6 semi-structured questions designed to elicit the participant's perceptions of using the TPRS method to teach Indonesian in their primary school settings. Each of the 6 semi-structured questions comprises of a set of 4 to 8 sub-questions listed as hints for interviews to help stimulate interviewees' supplementary information more detailed discussion.

3.5.4 Recordings and Transcriptions of Interviews

In order to avoid data loss or distortion, the researcher ensured that all the interviews were recorded and transcribed verbatim. Although transcribing is an extremely important part of the interview and research process, Cohen (2007) also advises that the interviewer/researcher also need to make notes of participants' non-verbal languages, including their gestures, tone, volume and pitch. Following Cohen's (2007) advice, the researcher recorded each interview, using a voice recorder app on an ipad and made supplementary notes of unrecordable but observable non-verbal languages for each interview. Immediately after each recorded interview, a manual transcription of the recordings was made. All interviewed teachers were sent a copy of their interview transcripts for cross-checking and confirmation of transcribed information. Audio files, participant

transcripts and any other resulting documentation have also been securely stored electronically before being deleted from the original recording device.

3.6 Analyses of Interview Data

3.6.1 Initial Analyses of Data

Raw data in the forms of transcripts of recorded interviews, in addition to the researcher's supplementary written notes, was initially skimmed and analysed by the researcher. Data collected from five participating teachers was organized into five data sets coded as Teacher A, Teacher B, Teacher C, Teacher D and Teacher E, each of which represents data collected from each of the five participating teachers. Once an interview was conducted, the researcher began transcribing; tabulating and analysing the commonalities between participants using a data collection table (see *Table 4.1 below*). It is important that the researcher put aside any of her own experiences with languages teaching and subjective perspectives of the TPRS when analysing the data, in order to get the most neutral, unbiased and objective interpretation of the collected data. Therefore, for the initial data exploration and analyses, the researcher skimmed through interview transcripts and supplementary notes to get a general overview picture of each data set and to identify common themes as well different ones, as revealed from data sets before more comprehensive subsequent analyses of data.

3.6.2 More Comprehensive Subsequent Analyses of Data

Following the first stage of initial data analyses, more comprehensive analyses of each data set were subsequently conducted by reading carefully each data set and annotating the relevant data that is directly related to each interview question. Annotated information was then collated, reviewed and analyzed for key emerging themes to provide answers to the relevant research questions. The researcher could then summarize the findings revealed from the interviews, looking for common patterns and relationships among participants (Cohen, 2007).

3.6.3 Interpretation of Analytical Data

When interpreting the analytical data, the researcher carefully considered the identified themes which emerged from the interviews, any further insights, comments and reflections were noted. Further interpretation of the data was undertaken by continuing to categorise and code the interview data. Whilst interpreting the data, the researcher did take into account the background of the participating teachers, including their teaching experience, qualifications and their own teaching contexts, and the relevant themes to gain better understanding

of the participants' perceptions and motivations which may help explain why they said what they said in the interviews.

3.7 Methodological Limitations of the Study

This study has two methodological limitations. The first methodological limitation of the study was concerned with the qualitative research design with a small sample size of the group of five participating teachers being interviewed. The researcher interviewed only five (5) participating teachers of Indonesian language from South Australian Government primary schools teaching in an R-7 NIT program, due to the researcher's limited research time and limited availability of Indonesian language teachers from participating primary schools. While the small sample size of five teachers involved may not be a statistically valid for a study, the study is still worthwhile as its qualitative data collected from semi-structured interviews does help investigate the perceptions of the five participating teachers and its findings will contribute to narrowing down the gap in the literature on teachers' perceptions of using TPRS to teach Indonesian in South Australian primary school language classrooms. The small size of participants means that it would be difficult to generalise the findings across populations and languages, which is not the researcher's original intention. The researcher's original intention is to provide insights into South Australian primary school Indonesian language teachers' perceptions of the benefits of using TPRS to teach Indonesian.

Another methodological limitation is its chosen focus on one group of Indonesian language teachers from five different primary schools in South Australia. However, by focusing on one particular group of teachers teaching the same primary Indonesian language and program context (F-7 NIT programs) from five different primary school settings, some comparisons can be made among teaching contexts while the reliability and validity of the findings can also be ensured. Reliability, according to Nunan (1992, p. 14), "refers to the consistency of the results obtained from a piece of research". In this study, the ways in which the data was collected and analyzed were consistent for all participants. Validity refers to "the extent to which a piece of research actually investigates what the researcher purports to investigate" (Nunan, 1992, p. 14); in this study, interviews help investigate the participating teachers' perceptions of using the TPRS to teach Indonesian, which is what the researcher aims to achieve.

3.8 Summary of Chapter 3

This chapter has outlined different possible methodological options and justified its selection of a qualitative research design, which best fits for the purpose of this research despite some unavoidable methodological limitations. This chapter also highlights that semi-structured interviews among participating teachers are

appropriate data collection instruments to provide answers to the research questions in relation to Indonesian language teachers' perceptions of the possible benefits and shortcomings of using TPRS to teach Indonesian in South Australian primary schools. In the next chapter, the data collected will be analysed and its findings will be discussed.

4. CHAPTER 4: DATA ANALYSES & DISCUSSION OF FINDINGS

4.1 Overview of Chapter 4 and A Brief Description of Interview Data Collected

This chapter reports the analyses of the interview data collected by the researcher from 15 semi structured interviews with 05 participating Indonesian teachers (i.e. Teacher A, Teacher B, Teacher C and Teacher D; and Teacher E; each teacher was interviewed in three 20 minute interviews) from 05 South Australian Government primary schools who consented to participate voluntarily in the interviews to share their past and current Indonesian language teaching experiences and their perceptions in relation to the use of TPRS method to teach Indonesian which is the chosen focus of this study.

This chapter is structured into four main parts. It *first* starts with a brief description of the collected data. It then analyses the interview data from tabulated interview data (See *Appendix 10 - Syntheses of Interview Data*) in response to research questions (1a, 1b, 2a & 2b), followed by analyses of other additional, relevant emerging interview data before summarizing the key findings. The Chapter concludes with a discussion of the key findings of the research in light of research aim, research questions and the relevant literature review.

A Brief Description of Interview Data Collected

As mentioned in Chapter 3, according to the original data collection schedule, six (6) Indonesian language teachers from 6 South Australian primary schools were contacted and invited to voluntarily participate in semi-structured interviews for this study. Among these six contacted teachers, only four (4) teachers consented to be interviewed face-to-face and coded as Teacher A, B, C and D, whereas only one teacher (Teacher E) consented to email interviews in which Teacher E responded to interview questions via email exchanges due to geographical distance and time constraints. The remaining teacher, Teacher F, was unable to participate in this study due to work and family commitments and being on leave. Therefore, the final total number of consented participating teachers were 05 teachers representing 05 different primary schools coded as School T, U, V, W and X. It is important to note that whether the participating teachers were interviewed face-to-face or via email exchanges, they were all asked the same set of interview questions (*Appendix 9*). For Teacher A, B, C, and D, each of them was interviewed three times; each time lasts 20 minutes; for Teacher E, three email exchanges were conducted, making a total of 15 semi-structured interviews (x 20 minute long each).

The following Table (Table 4.1) provides a brief description of five participating teachers. As can be seen from Table 4.1, four out of five participating teachers (80%) are females and 100% of them are non-native speaker

teachers of Indonesian. For a detailed display of syntheses of interview data collected, see Appendix 11 Tabulated data from Interviews.

Table 4.1: A Description of 05 Participating Teachers

05 Consented Participating Teachers	Primary School(s)	Gender	Native or Non Native Speaker Teacher of Indonesian	(Indonesian) Language Education Background	Indonesian Language Teaching Experience	Current Indonesian Teaching Schedule
Teacher A	School T	Female	Non-native	-Year 11-12 SACE through Open Access College (2014-2015)	- Indonesian teacher since 2015 - Worked previously as a literacy teacher	- Part time in R-12 context (NIT) - 1x 90 minute (Yr 3-6) - 1x 45 minutes (Yr R-3)
Teacher B	School U	Female	Non-native	-Majored in Indonesian at University (Mature age entry)	Language re-trainee Indonesian since 1999	-Part time in R-7 primary school context (NIT) -1x 50 lesson per week

Teacher C	School V	Female	Non-native	- Studied Indonesian in high school and continued at University - Taught in Indonesia (Ex-pat)	- Began teaching Indonesian in 2002 (previously classroom teacher in NT)	Currently on study leave
Teacher D	School W	Female	Non-native	- Learnt French at High School - Indonesian exchange for 1 year (Yr 11- 12) - Majored in Indonesian at University	Having taught Indonesian since 1999	-R-7 Primary context (NIT) -2x 50 minute lesson per week
Teacher E	School X	Male	Non-native	- Briefly learnt Indonesian in Yr 6/7 at primary school - Majored in Indonesian at University	Began teaching in 2017	-R-7 Primary context (NIT) -2x 50 minute lesson

4.2 Analyses of Interview Data In Response to Research Question 1a & 1b

4.2.1 Research Question 1a What are South Australian primary school teachers' perceptions of the benefits of using TPRS to teach the Indonesian language?

Research question 1a aims to explore the South Australian primary school teachers' perceptions of the benefits of using TPRS to teach the Indonesian language. The analyses and syntheses of the collected interview data (See *Appendix 10 Syntheses of Interview Data*) revealed two relevant themes of, namely, (1) all the 05 participating teachers' positive perceptions of the benefits of using TPRS to teach Indonesian (see Section 4.2.1.1 below); and (2) their positive perceptions of the benefits of combining the TPRS with other teaching methods in their

Indonesian language classrooms (See Section 4.2.1.2 below), which both help provide answers to Research Question 1a.

4.2.1.1 Participating Teachers' Positive Perceptions of the Benefits of Using TPRS to Teach Indonesian.

According to the Indonesian language teachers interviewed in this study, TPRS is generally perceived to be a beneficial method to teach Indonesian as the second language. They all clearly perceived that overall the TPRS benefited their students' Indonesian language learning. There was a shared perception among the 05 interviewed teachers that by teaching repetitive and comprehensible inputs, reducing vocabulary presented through co-creating high interest stories and use of personalised or humorous questioning, their Indonesian language students with direct exposure to the TPRS method were reportedly engaged. They were able to retain more of the Indonesian language being taught, while emotionally feeling less worried about their Indonesian speaking and writing skills in classrooms. For example, Teacher D referred to the benefits of using TPRS to get students exposed to inputs and lower their students' affective filters and helping them get ready to produce language outputs while noting their anxiety if they are pushed to do outputs, as follows:

"If kids are pushed to do output, whether speaking or writing, then their affective filter goes up and they are anxious about what they have to do and so not paying attention. That means they are not getting the learning ...when [they are] ready to give output, they can do on their own terms and they like it because they won't be forced to do something they don't want to do" (Teacher D)

With this shared perception, Teacher D highlighted students' readiness to give language output on their own when speaking and writing because TPRS does not force them to do what they don't want to.

Similarly, other participating teachers like Teacher B, Teacher C, and Teacher E perceived that their students are learning more in TPRS classrooms as they feel safer and are more engaged in co-creating stories using comprehensible vocabulary (See Appendix 10 Syntheses of Interview Data). There was less pressure on students, as perceived by interviewed teachers in their classrooms, to produce outputs, thus they also perceived benefits for their students' Indonesian language learning. These teachers also felt that they were finally able to laugh with their students and enjoy the co-creating of stories. Interestingly, this perceived improvement in their students' Indonesian language learning might be due to Teachers B's, Teacher C's and Teacher D's shared decisions, as revealed from the interviews, to shift from other alternative traditional non – TPRS methods of teaching Indonesian with a focus on units of work based mainly around parts of speech like nouns, towards the TPRS method using high interest stories containing familiar characters from the children's lives, for example, Darth Vader, Sponge Bob or their own class teachers.

Another interpretation explaining their Indonesian language students' perceived improvement might also be because by exposing their students to less language in the TPRS classroom, they might have less to remember and therefore are able to regurgitate the oft-repeated words. It is also fair to assume that newly recruited language teachers like Teacher A and E who have just taught Indonesian language by using the TPRS method only, have relied solely on the evidence of their own students' current ability to produce the language inside and outside the TPRS classroom and were thus not able to compare it with their students' previous outputs.

4.2.1.2 Participating Teachers' Positive Perceptions of the Benefits of Combining TPRS with Other Language Teaching Methods

Analyses of the interview data collected also suggest that all the 05 interviewed teachers have the positive perceptions that the TPRS method most benefits Indonesian language learners when it is not used in isolation; rather it benefits them most when combined with other language teaching methods. All of the interviewed teachers reported that it was necessary to integrate into the TPRS lesson other classroom activities which could be either communicative games, brain breaks or with different activity types that moved their focus away from listening and speaking. A notable evidence of this was when Teacher C shared in the interview the following perceptions: "It is incredibly rigorous. Their brains need a break after 5-10 minutes, so we have to have brain breaks. The rigour is insane..." Such brain breaks refer to the need to combine the TPRS based activities with other supplementary ones. With a similar tone, Teacher E remarked that it was necessary to move away from TPRS activities at times to break up the time allocation (*Appendix 10 Syntheses of Interview Data*).

As revealed from the interviews, the combined methods that the participating teachers selected to supplement the TPRS method actually differed, depending on their teaching contexts. For instance, those teachers (e.g., Teacher A and Teacher E) with longer teaching sessions scheduled once a week shared that their teaching sessions were often broken up with more cultural activities and games that allowed more students to ask and respond to questions and were less teacher directed. Whereas those teachers (e.g., Teacher C and Teacher D) with two teaching sessions a week not only used brain breaks, but also employed other 'fun' activities that were not found in the TPRS method to maintain students' interests. Again, these perceived benefits of combining TPRS with other methods could also explain the perceived heightened engagement of learners in class and learners' better language retention, as perceived by interviewed teachers. It could indicate that by changing how they are presenting the language, the participating teachers are accommodating different learning styles, which may not be possible through the sole use of TPRS and therefore learning is enhanced.

4.2.2 Question 1b: How have South Australian primary school teachers made use of their perceived benefits, if any, in their primary Indonesian language classrooms?

Research question 1b aims to explore how South Australian primary school teachers have made use of their perceived benefits, if any, of using the TPRS method in their classrooms to teach Indonesian. The analyses and syntheses of the collected interview data (*Appendix 10 Syntheses of Interview Data*) revealed three (03) relevant themes of, specifically, all the 05 participating teachers' use of the perceived benefits of TPRS (1) for teaching vocabulary and language retention (see *Section 4.2.2.1*); (2) for developing students' reading abilities (see *Section 4.2.2.2*) and finally (3) for student engagement (see *Section 4.2.2.3*), which all help provide answers to the Research Question 1b. All these three themes represent three (03) different but complementary uses of the perceived benefits of using TPRS to teach Indonesian, each of the three uses will be presented hereinafter with supporting data evidence.

4.2.2.1 Participating Teachers' Use of Their Perceived Benefits of TPRS for Teaching Vocabulary and Language Retention

According to the Indonesian language teachers interviewed in this study, TPRS was generally perceived to be a beneficial method that could be used to teach vocabulary and for improved language retention in Indonesian language classrooms in South Australia's participating primary schools. There was a shared perception among the 05 interviewed teachers that because the TPRS method uses only a limited number of mainly high frequency verbs presented through the co-creation of high interest stories, students were able to learn vocabulary more successfully and retained Indonesian better. The interviewed teachers all commented that using lots of repetition of 'sheltered' (limited) vocabulary through a humorous story, coupled with personalized questioning were perceived to have benefited their students' vocabulary and language retention. This shared perception has particularly influenced the lesson planning conducted by Teachers B, C and D, as revealed in the interviews. The participating teachers planned their lessons that present limited vocabulary, consisting mainly of verbs, allowing for students to add the nouns (i.e., characters and places) and pre-teach two to three new words at a time. These interviewed teachers had traditionally worked in topics or units of work with large vocabulary lists that consisted mainly of nouns. In conjunction with this change, Teacher C and Teacher D reported that by using Indonesian language for the majority of TPRS class time, their students were exposed to more instructional language than ever before, again adding to their learnt vocabulary. A repetition of the vocabulary was also cited in the interviews as benefitting their students' vocabulary and language retention. For example, Teacher C spoke

about the need for using post-story activities that allowed for lots of repetition of the vocabulary presented and use of personalized questions, again allowing for a repetition of the selected vocabulary, as follows:

"Post-story activities are all about getting more 'reps' (repetitions)...our focus is getting reps and that leads to assessment....a very slow progression to assessment through lots of repetition of the language" (Teacher C).

Repetition, usually through use of questioning, is seen to be very beneficial to the teaching and retention of the students' Indonesian vocabulary. The interviewed teachers have made changes to their programs based on the need to provide their students with repetitive exposure to the 'sheltered' (limited) vocabulary presented in the stories.

While repetitively exposing students to less vocabulary may lead to higher retention of those words, it could be argued that this might limit students' ability to engage with diverse texts as they might recognise only a small number of words. Using the TPRS method, students are only exposed to a limited amount of high frequency vocabulary, however, it is also important that all students can learn vocabulary relevant to themselves and their lives.

4.2.2.2 Participating Teachers' Use of Their Perceived Benefits of TPRS for Developing Their Students' Reading Abilities

Analyses of the interview data also suggest all the interviewed teachers perceived that the TPRS method could be used for developing their students' reading abilities. The TPRS method is based around the reading of high interest stories. Teacher B, for example, advocated that reading was a great way to receive language input. In Teacher B's lesson planning, reading has become an important part of the learning process, with students co-creating the stories, retelling the read stories, dramatizing, writing parallel stories and sharing their own stories for publications. In addition, according to Teacher E, TPRS also provides opportunities for his Indonesian language students to read more stories, learn how to self-correct, minimise mistakes made and predict various words' pronunciation, as noted below:

"... I am often surprised by students as they read out something in the L2 with minimal mistakes and use of self-correction" (Teacher E).

This meaningful observation by Teacher E refers to the perceived benefits of using TPRS stories for presenting vocabulary and their students' subsequent improvement in reading abilities thanks to their participation in story retelling, questioning and dramatization, all being used in Teacher E's TPRS classroom. Likewise, Teachers A, C and D also highlighted the importance of the stories and reading stories to expose their learners to the targeted vocabulary. They felt that this assisted in learner recognition of Indonesian words, thus developing their reading abilities.

Notably, the use of stories has been promoted in literacy learning programs for many years in primary schools in South Australia and is not something solely used in the TPRS classrooms. Junior Primary teachers in South Australia have used stories and big books (oversized books) to help motivate students to learn to read and spell for many years. Past literacy programs in Australia like the Accelerated Literacy pedagogy (also known as Scaffolded Literacy) developed by Gray and Cowley in the 1990s, also made use of learners' age appropriate texts to assist their improvement in reading abilities. Using stories to help learn language is not something exclusively tied to the TPRS method; rather it is part of the many literacy programs.

4.2.2.3 Participating Teachers' Use of the Perceived Benefits of TPRS for Student Engagement

TPRS also benefits student engagement, according to the 05 interviewed teachers. For instance, Teacher D referred to the TPRS being fun and successful for those students participating in the TPRS classroom. Teacher D perceived that there were fewer noticeable behavioral issues as her students were engaged in communication about themselves and their world via the stories in the TPRS classroom. Such engagement, according to Teacher D, together with visual power points and gestures used to present the language, as well as personalised questions and answers (PQA) all helped make learning Indonesian fun. This in turn resulted in much higher learner engagement. Furthermore, to keep students even more engaged, Teacher D auditioned students for sound effect parts. Once a student has won a sound effect role (e.g., a dog) each time, for the entire year, that "dog" word was read or mentioned so that students must make their sound effects. Teacher D's students were perceived to be so engaged that they thought they were learning the language without doing any actual work, as Teacher D shared her observation in the interview:

"It's all about fun and games and then kids go, 'we didn't do any work today' ...I like them to think they are not doing any work" (Teacher D).

By allowing students to participate in activities based around pre-taught vocabulary, Teacher D's students felt they were not doing any work and were simply having fun.

Another engagement strategy that 4 out of the 5 interviewed teachers, namely Teacher A, Teacher B, Teacher C and Teacher D, referred to in the interviews was to get their students involved in the TPRS lessons by assigning specific 'jobs' (e.g., secretary and observer) for them to do in each lesson. This also helped keep their students on task and focusing on listening. Selected students were assigned roles of timing how long the class remained speaking Indonesian without speaking English or recording who made a suggestion for stories and looking for the 'best' participators in the question/answer part of the lesson. This gave those students another reason to participate, listen and watch. Teacher A, in addition to these jobs, had classes compete for '*pesta* (party) points'

- which were awarded for minutes spent in using Indonesian without any English being spoken; the winning class for the term would have a class party in Week 1 of the following term. Whereas Teacher C maintained that her student engagement was enhanced because of the humor included in the stories about people and characters that the students knew or chose. Similarly, Teacher C was perceived to be able to have fun with the students and asserted that her students were more engaged because they felt valued and the whole class was student-focused. In this regard, Teacher C noted the following:

"We create really deep relationships.... safe environment with humor and kids contribute to stories. [It is] so student focused - valuing the students...students have input into what happens in the lessons and they are all led by students" (Teacher C).

With this shared perception, Teacher C highlighted why student engagement was enhanced using the TPRS method through student participation in the creation of humorous stories and the relationships established from using TPRS to teach Indonesian in an environment where students felt safer to contribute.

4.3 Analyses of Interview Data in Response to Research Question 2

4.3.1 Question 2a: What are South Australian primary school teachers' perceptions of the shortcomings of using TPRS to teach the Indonesian language?

Research question 2a aims to explore the South Australian primary school teachers' perceptions of the shortcomings, if any, of using TPRS to teach the Indonesian language. The analyses and syntheses of the collected interview data (*See Appendix 10 Syntheses of Interview Data*) revealed three relevant themes, being, (1) participating teachers' perceived lack of student motivation when using the TPRS method (see *Section 4.3.1.1* below);(2) their perceived lack of teacher professional development (see *Section 4.3.1.2* below); and (3) their perceived inadequacy of program administration (see *Section 4.3.1.3* below), which will all help provide direct answers to Research Question 2a. Each of these three shortcomings will be presented below.

4.3.1.1 Perceived Lack of Student Motivation When Using the TPRS Method

Of the 05 interviewed teachers, three teachers, namely, Teacher A, Teacher B and Teacher E cited the perceived lack of student motivation as a perceived shortcoming of using TPRS to teach Indonesian in a primary school. There was a shared perception among them that as for teaching Indonesian through stories using 'sheltered'(limited) vocabulary, students' lack of motivation was perceived to be an issue for students of some year levels, specifically older students. Through an email exchange with the researcher, Teacher E stressed that the time spent on some stories was an issue with these older students who felt the stories were too simple and they wanted more details in the storyline. Responses from Teacher A and Teacher B collaborated Teacher E's perceptions, suggesting that time on task, either too much in a once a week lesson (Teacher A) or too little

(Teacher B) was an issue when motivating students to engage in learning the Indonesian language presented. For example, with reference to the perceived lacks of students' motivation, Teacher A noted as follows;

"Having a 90 minute block once a week makes it hard to keep the kids motivated and concentrating on the language being covered in the story. They get tired of the questions and are only saying 'Ya' or 'Tidak' or doing the thumbs. [Therefore] I break up the lesson and spend the second half doing more cultural activities" (Teacher A).

Teacher A perceived that in the longer sessions the students lost motivation and did not put their required efforts into their answers, therefore, Teacher A found it necessary to do other activities such as breaking the lesson up and spending the second half of the lesson doing more cultural activities, though not TPRS based, in order to make the best use of language learning time in classrooms.

Although Teacher C and Teacher D did not specifically and directly mention the perceived lack of student motivation as their perceived shortcoming of using the TPRS method, they both said in their respective interviews that it was necessary to give brain breaks due to the rigor of the lessons and to ensure continued participation in learning activities. It could be conceived that these brain breaks may also be needed to break up the repetitive use of the 'sheltered' vocabulary and at the same time to motivate learners.

4.3.1.2 Perceived Lack of Teacher Professional Development when Using the TPRS Method

All of the 05 interviewed teachers perceived their own lack of teaching professional development as a shortcoming of using the TPRS method to teach Indonesian. As the TPRS method relies heavily on the professional skills of the presenting teachers and their knowledge of both the TL and TPRS techniques, professional development is imperative. Limited teacher professional development (with a focus on the TPRS method) particularly for primary school teachers in Australia was acknowledged in the interviews. Most of the training attended by the interviewed teachers was sourced mostly outside Australia, as perceived by Teacher B, Teacher C and Teacher D. Specifically, Teacher D mentioned that it was difficult to find opportunities for specific professional development in TCI/TPRS methods for junior primary students, as the majority of resources and TPRS teachers were secondary or tertiary based. Likewise, both Teacher A and Teacher E disclosed that without the necessary skills for applying the TPRS method, it would be very difficult to maintain student interests as well as adequately present the vocabulary with the repetition required by the TPRS method. Teacher A and E were worried that because of their minimal access to professional learning in the TPRS method, they might not get their students exposed to adequate amounts of the target language and making a full use of the TPRS for the utmost benefits seemed out of reach. As Teacher E shared in the interview,

"I find that TPRS can be difficult to do on an ongoing basis without it seeming repetitive and boring. The skill involved in making it more interesting can sometimes seem out of reach." (Teacher E)

As professional development was difficult to access, Teacher E was concerned that he may not be able to best represent the TPRS method to his students.

It is fair to say that perceived lack of professional development are not solely a shortcoming of TPRS method. Unfortunately, quality language professional development in language teacher education is usually difficult to access as professional training days generally aim at addressing classroom teacher needs. On the one hand, language teaching professional development is scarce. On the other hand, when it is available, it can be vague, repetitive and mostly presented by professional developers who have not been teaching in a language classroom for years and thus lack practical teaching experience or have their own agenda.

4.3.1.3 Perceived Inadequacy of Program Administration When Using the TPRS

Four out of the five interviewed teachers highlighted the inadequacy of program administration as a shortcoming of using the TPRS method to teach Indonesian. Particularly, Teacher A, Teacher B, Teacher C and Teacher D all mentioned about the issues over the way Indonesian language lessons were timetabled. As revealed from the interviews, each of the interviewed teachers had a different classroom teaching time allocation. For example, Teacher D also highlighted the perceived shortcoming of the initial amounts of time required when planning lessons. At first, according to Teacher D, the planning of lessons was time consuming, due to her perceived lack of experience in using the TPRS method. Much time was spent writing notes and scripts for Teacher D to feel confident in vocabulary teaching. Similarly, Teacher C suggested that time was also an issue, as the TPRS method required the learners to hear lots of repetitions of the vocabulary. Without adequate time allocation, according to Teacher C, students were exposed to less repetitions and their retention of language was lower. This concern was also echoed by Teacher E, who was anxious that the language structures covered in class may not be complex enough to allow for participation in conversations.

Again, it is reasonable to say that time allocation and timetabling is an issue facing most of the primary school language teachers, not just those teaching Indonesian language. In the Australian Curriculum, there is recommended time allocation, however, as it is not mandated, many school sites do not still follow it, or in case they do, the time is offered in one block which is not considered the best practice for learning a second language.

4.3.2 Question 2b: How have South Australian Primary School teachers addressed the perceived shortcomings of TPRS, if any, in their Primary Indonesian language classroom

Research question 2b aims to explore how South Australian primary school teachers have addressed the perceived shortcomings (as reported above in *Section 4.3.1*) of using the TPRS method in their classrooms to teach Indonesian.

Appendix 11 *A Synthesis of How the Perceived Shortcomings Could be Addressed* shows how each of the interviewed teachers revealed in the interviews how they could address each of the three perceived shortcomings with regard to particularly, (1) addressing perceived lacks of student motivation; (2) addressing perceived lacks of professional development; and finally (3) addressing perceived inadequacies of program administration, which were all presented above in *Section 4.3.1*.

The following sections analyze, synthesize and elaborate in detail as to how the 05 participating teachers have made attempts in response to each of three perceived shortcomings, as to (1) how to better enhance student motivation for Indonesian language learning (see *Section 4.3.2.1*); (2) how to better promote professional development for Indonesian language teachers see *Section 4.3.2.2*); and (3) how to better administer Indonesian language programs (see *Section 4.3.2.3*).

4.3.2.1 How to Better Enhance Student Motivation for Indonesian Language Learning

In order to address the perceived lacks of students' motivation in Indonesian language learning, participating teachers have flexibly adjusted their approaches to Indonesian language teaching in different ways. They all perceived that addressing students' lack of motivation, which caused poor student engagement, is very important for student success in Indonesian language learning. Understanding that repetition can lead to boredom, Teacher A and E dealt with the issue by changing the activities and moving away from TPRS specific activities, allowing students to do a different type of activities to break up the intensity of answering a myriad of questions about a picture or story. Teachers C and D, while not explicitly admitting that their students lacked motivation, noted that the rigor involved in the TCI/TPRS classroom meant that students needed to be given brain breaks, where they are able to move around. An example of a brain break might be a game of "Simon says" in the TL or a quick dance to a popular TL song. This adjustment, according to Teacher C and Teacher D, got their students off the floor or out of chairs and moving, but still thinking in the TL.

For those students who were more proficient, Teacher C and D made use of 'Free Writing' allowing the students to write in Indonesian for 10 minutes. Whether it was a story, random sentences or even just words, it allows all students to participate and kept motivated at their own level and experience success. Allowing students to be part of the story, as sound effects for specific words has also helped Teacher D motivate and engage the learners

in her classes. Teacher B tried to use authentic but simple YouTube clips from Indonesia, whether it is a clip from "Indonesia Idol" or a folktale, to motivate learners, as revealed in the interview B2.

"...I could do it [Intercultural understanding] on YouTube with a song that is just showing Indonesian classrooms... asking questions about what notice that is similar...., a clip that gives you the opportunity of talking about uniforms or talking about this...you know, what they see."(Teacher B)

Teacher B used YouTube clips from Indonesia to enhance student motivation as well as raise their awareness of intercultural similarities and differences in everyday routines.

4.3.2.2 How to Promote Teachers' Professional Development

In response to the perceived lack of professional development when using the TPRS method, the 05 interviewed teachers all sought professional development outside the DfE's allocated training days, as revealed from the interviews. They all realised that professional development is important for their teaching profession. In fact, it is extremely important when teaching languages using any pedagogy, including the use of TPRS. Although all the participants perceived accessing professional development as an issue, all the participants were actively researching TCI, TPRS and reflecting continuously on whether it was successful for their cohorts of students. Teacher C and Teacher D were responsible for organising two TCI/TPRS conferences in South Australia and are active members of the local hub network where they share their TPRS experiences with others. Teacher B, Teacher C and Teacher D all made use of the online TPRS community to access professional development, as did Teacher E (Refer to *Appendix 11*).

4.3.2.3 How to Better Administer Indonesian Language Teaching Programs

Teaching time was perceived to be an issue for all participants. Whether it was due to a lack of contact with classes, having only one 45 -50 minute lesson a week with some classes or one 90-100 minute lesson, or the fact that having multiple classes coming in and out of the language classroom each day can reduce learning time by 5-10 minutes each time as students arrive late from other classes or there is a conflict of scheduling and students miss certain parts of or all of a lesson due to other special learning programs.

Participants shared how they are addressing some of the program scheduling shortcomings. As time to practice is paramount, Teachers C and D incorporated intercultural understanding through pop ups and TPRS activities like 'Picture talk' that allowed for discussions of cultural events through the lens of target language questioning. Teacher A, having 90 minute blocks once a week, was experimenting with choice boards, where

students selected from several activities, the learning activity that they felt would best suit them as a learner as well as using the second part of the lesson to focus on cultural activities related to the presented vocabulary. Teacher B used the information gained through student reflection to make the necessary adjustments to the learning program as guided by student response, e.g, changing activities or pacing of presentation.

Teacher C and D both perceived the use of the TPRS method and the Australia Curriculum as an administrative issue. Teacher D believed that there was an inconsistency between the content required in each learning achievement band and the time allocated to languages programs in most schools. Teacher D referred to the aim of the Australian language curriculum which is to;

'communicate in TL, understand language, culture and learning and their relationship and thereby develop an intercultural capability in communication, understand themselves as communicators' (Australian Curriculum, 2010).

Teacher C concurred and added that instead of being a content-based curriculum, it would be better suited to be skills based, similar to the Interagency Language Roundtable scale (ILR) which rates a user's proficiency from Level 0 (no proficiency) to Level 5 (native or bilingual proficiency). Both these teachers also expressed frustration over the timetabling of languages in the feeder high school, arguing that their students were not being given the opportunities to truly continue their language studies as the timetabling of languages at the high school was minimal and language programs did not consider students' prior exposure to Indonesian at primary school.

It is realistic to say that program administration issues are not only problems for Indonesian language teachers using the TPRS method alone. These shortcomings that relate to all specialist teachers are, among others, time on task and exposure to curriculum content, curriculum that doesn't match with the current practice and assessment that doesn't support learner development and continuity of programs across levels.

4.4 Analyses of other Relevant Emerging Interview Data

In addition to the data that were directly related to the research questions, notably, there were three emerging themes in relation to how to better use TPRS in language learning classrooms, as revealed from datasets, namely, (1) student-centeredness of the TPRS method; (2) limitation of TPRS and Inquiry-based learning; and (3) TPRS and a lack of authentic texts and tasks. These emerging themes were common across the data, however, were not necessarily viewed as a shortcoming of the TPRS method. Each of these three emerging themes will be further analyzed below (Refer to *Appendix 12: Emerging Themes from Interviews*)

4.4.1 Student-centeredness and Teachers' Roles in TPRS Classrooms

According to Teacher A and Teacher E, their TPRS lessons were perceived to be very teacher directed. They both expressed their concerns over the amount of time the students were actually listening to inputs, with limited amount of output, for example, using gestures (to represent a word or indicate understanding) or responding to 'yes' 'no' questions about the text. Teacher A particularly indicated that the amount of teacher talk was an issue that she was hoping to address and noted:

".... there is a lot of teacher talk with the TPRS method. I am asking the class questions and sometimes all they do is put their thumbs up or down and answer 'Ya' or 'Tidak'...I probably need to make them practice answering in sentences as I seem to be doing all the talking."(Teacher A)

Teacher A recognised that the teacher's voice is the main one heard in the TPRS lessons and acknowledged the need for more student talk and less teacher talk. In other words, student-centeredness, rather than teacher - directedness could ensure the better use of TPRS towards the ultimate goal of helping learners become users of the TL.

The need for student voice or student-centeredness was echoed in interviews with 04 participating teachers (i.e. Teacher A, Teacher B, Teacher C and Teacher D) who all believed that they were providing adequate student voice in their TPRS classrooms by assigning student roles. They all perceived that by assigning students with their special roles like secretary or sound effect persons, they did put students in the center and maximized their students' use of the TL. They also believed that this gave students ownership over the running of the lessons, in addition to the existing opportunities to contribute to stories and create parallel stories sufficiently covered the provision of student talk in their classes. In this regard, the Gonski report (2018) recommended that schools should engage students as partners in learning. It has been suggested that this could be done through student voice, teachers' feedback, student involvement in decision making or by granting students some autonomy over what and how they learn.

In relation to student-centeredness, a related concern is over teachers' roles. All the participants, as revealed from the interviews, perceived that the role of the teacher is very prominent in the TPRS classroom. As discussed by Teacher D in the interviews, the TPRS method was perceived to be exhausting for the teacher as it required a lot of commitment and energy from the teacher to make the lessons a success. The teacher was required to use the TL around 90 % of the class time to ensure maximum exposure to the presented vocabulary and subsequent language. Teacher D perceived that the amount of energy required of the teacher was far greater than that of a more traditional language teacher and can be one of the reasons explaining why teachers stopping using TPRS. In her words, Teacher D noted:

'It is so much easier to talk at students for 15mins and then give them an activity. However with CI and TPRS, even when the students are doing an activity, the teacher is often still talking because the aim is to provide quality input in the target language to students.'(Teacher D)

According to Teacher D, using TPRS is far more demanding and takes a lot of commitment and energy to provide the input learners require. This again supported more student-centeredness in TPRS lesson.

4.4.2 Inquiry -based Learning In TPRS Classrooms

Another emerging theme from the interviews is inquiry-based learning. The participating teachers highlighted the need for learning that should be specific and targeted, using teacher selected vocabulary. Teacher C, for example, referred to students' actively listening to repetitious input from teacher led stories and questioning, which according to her could make the lesson more interactive and more meaningful. Though students' questioning, as observed by Teacher C, is often closed questioning due to the TPRS lesson's focus on the repetition and student retention of the presented vocabulary. With a similar tone, Teacher A shared that the questioning used in her TPRS classroom can often be closed questions which could be simply answered with 'yes/no' or single word responses. Such a closed question as "Is the tiger wearing red shoes?" is humorous and far-fetched but does not promote inquiry thinking. Whereas, in an inquiry-based learning classrooms, the role of the teacher is to develop students' higher order thinking skills (Lee, 2014) while being the facilitator of learning; helping students discover and make meaningful connections. To make the better use of TPRS. teachers should provide students with opportunities to pose questions, investigate, interpret, discuss, reflect and connect throughout the lesson.

4.4.3 Authentic Texts & Tasks in TPRS Classrooms

An additional emerging theme is related to the use of authentic texts in TPRS classrooms. Teacher B highlighted the lack of authentic reading texts as a perceived shortcoming of TPRS and language teaching in general. Teacher D cited a lack of age appropriate resources for young learners as a major issue around students' access to authentic texts. Authentic texts from Indonesia often contain language that is not frequently used or, if the language is simple enough, can contain stereotypical images of the Indonesian community – which did not reflect the diverse and dynamic communities of Indonesia. Teacher A, C, D and E all discussed using Indonesian folktales and including parts of Indonesian culture in their stories to support intercultural learning. For example, Teacher E shared how he helped students make meaningful connections to address the lack of authentic texts:

"[... to address the lack of authentic intercultural texts], I use a story about a character who travels to Komodo island to find some durians with an orangutan, but this is only one example. I will use pictures of Indonesian people and locations as often as possible when creating slideshows that support the meaning visually" (Teacher E).

Teacher E believes that he is addressing the lack of authentic texts and supporting the development of his students intercultural learning by inserting cultural references in the TPRS stories. However, these are not authentic and can inadvertently present a stereotypical Indonesia.

It is well acknowledged that reading is an important component of any language program. Providing learners with access to suitable authentic texts allows intercultural connections. Authentic texts are texts that are created for purposes other than to teach a language (Morrow, 1977). They are real life messages intended for a real audience. By using teacher created or generic stories based around a set of vocabulary, it would be difficult for TPRS stories to provide learners with any insight into other cultures or support intercultural capabilities where students can make connections between their own culture and that of others through authentic texts.

To put authentic texts into use in the TPRS classroom, teachers would need to use texts other than stories to teach vocabulary. An authentic task using authentic texts is one that asks the learner to use the target language to complete a task that would occur in everyday life (Nunan, 1991), e.g planning a holiday for their friends. In the primary schools' TPRS classrooms, they are not the tasks used. The tasks are based around characters and stories created by the teacher and learners, making use of high frequency language that would be used in some situations in cloze activities or tasks where students make repetitive use of the language presented.

4.5 A Summary of Data Analyses

4.5.1 Key Findings - Participating Teachers' Perceived Benefits and Shortcomings of TPRS

Analyses of interview data indicate that all the 05 participating teachers perceived there are benefits of using the TPRS method to teach Indonesian in their South Australian primary school settings. These perceived benefits are specifically, (1) for teaching vocabulary and language retention; (2) for developing students' reading abilities and (3) for student engagement. Students feel valued because of their inputs into stories and feel safe as they are not expected to speak the TL until they really feel ready. However, four of the five participating teachers all perceived that there were also some shortcomings of using the TPRS method to teach Indonesian in their South Australian

primary school settings. These perceived shortcomings include their perceived lacks of student motivation, perceived lacks of professional development for teachers and perceived inadequacy of program administration.

4.5.2 Key Findings – Participating Teachers’ Perceived Ways to Maximize Their Perceived Benefits and Minimize Their Perceived Shortcomings

4.5.2.1 Student Engagement

In order to maximize student engagement, Teacher A, B, C, D and E all used high interest stories with characters familiar to their students. Teacher D spoke about how students were having ‘fun’ and were often unaware that they were learning the TL. In order to maintain this perceived student engagement, Teacher D shared;

‘[Students are engaged because I am] using visual tools such as labels, pictures and gestures; using one-word images; storytelling; reading; listening activities; the special chair; and personalised questions and answers. These are just a few of many ways that I try to use comprehensible input and TPRS in my classroom to engage learners’ (Teacher D)

Teacher D perceived that TPRS better engaged learners, therefore she used a variety of TPRS activities to harness this engagement. Teacher D also believed that students were better engaged because they felt safe as they were not expected to speak the TL until they really felt ready.

On the contrary, Teacher A and Teacher E mentioned that students could become disengaged when exposed to the TPRS storytelling and question activities for too long. Teacher E stated that the TPRS method worked well for students aged between 7 and 10 years, with older students becoming bored with the simplicity of the stories. Teacher A and E minimized this perceived lack of student engagement by diversifying the activities or offering students more culture-based learning.

4.5.2.2 Teacher’s Pedagogical Approaches and Professional Development

Professional development and challenges to the participating teachers’ pedagogical approaches were minimized by the teachers in a variety of ways. All 05 teachers were continuously making changes to their pedagogy in order to meet student needs. Teacher D noted that when initially beginning with the TPRS method, it was exhausting because she needed to write long scripts and notes in order to effectively present the vocabulary. Teacher A and E also expressed concerns with the teaching skills and practices required to maintain student learning. In order to

minimize the perceived lacks of Professional Development, Teacher B, C and D got their own professional development organized by attending well known TPRS conferences and workshops in Agen France, as well as organizing two TCI/TPRS conferences in South Australia. All the participating teachers were members of online TPRS communities and local network hubs that support teachers using the TPRS method and were involved in student work sample moderation to ensure consistency of teacher judgment in assessment.

4.5.2.3 Program Administrators' Management

Time allocation and time on task was a perceived shortcoming of using TPRS to teach Indonesian in the primary classroom. Teacher B spoke about the challenges of seeing a class once a week for a 50-minute block and its impacts on learner achievement. Teacher A also perceived time on task as a shortcoming, having a 90-minute block once a week and trying to maximise learning time while maintaining student engagement. As the participating teachers knew their cohort of learners, the teachers were working with their respective sites leadership and all manipulated the lessons and the TPRS activities to make the best use of the available time.

4.5.3 A Summary of Major Findings from Data Analyses

To sum up, analyses of interview data suggest that to maximise their perceived benefits of the TPRS, participating teachers engaged their students by co-creating humorous stories with classes, using comprehensible inputs as much as possible and reading. At the same time, to minimise their perceived shortcomings, they were addressing their perceived lacks of student motivation by combining TPRS with other teaching methods and activities, proactively seeking relevant professional development opportunities as well as participating in local network support groups. With regard to program administration, the participating teachers were working with their respective site leadership, changing activities and breaking up time allocations to best meet the needs of the learners in terms of language learning.

4.6 Discussion of Findings

4.6.1 Discussion of Key Findings in Light of the Research Aims and Questions

The aim of this research project, according to Section 1.5, was to investigate South Australian Primary School Indonesian teachers' perception of the benefits of teaching proficiency through reading and storytelling (TPRS). To achieve this aim, the five participating teachers teaching Indonesian language in five primary schools in South Australia were interviewed to share their perceptions of both the benefits as well as any perceived shortcomings

of using TPRS to teach Indonesian. In semi-structured interviews, the participating teachers were also asked to expand on how to make use of the perceived benefits to teach Indonesian as well as how to address their perceived shortcomings.

The perceived benefits of using TPRS to teach primary school students Indonesian were almost similar across the interview data collected from five participating teachers, with perceived vocabulary and retention increases, perceived improvements in student reading ability and perceived increases in student engagement. Interestingly, the findings reveal that, the 05 participating teachers were generally making use of these perceived benefits in similar ways, through the common uses of humorous stories about well known characters that are familiar to the learners in the participating teachers' classes.

However, the perceived shortcomings of using TPRS to teach Indonesian in South Australian primary schools fell into three categories of namely, (1) Perceived lacks of student motivation; (2) Perceived lacks of Professional Development; and (3) Perceived inadequacies of program administration, including the content of the Australian Curriculum-Languages. Notably, how they were addressed varied slightly across the participating teachers' data, depending on the context of the participating teacher's school site.

Each of these perceived benefits and shortcomings will be discussed below with supporting empirical interview data and in light of the literature review.

4.6.2 Discussion of Key Findings in Light of Literature Review

4.6.2.1 Use of TPRS for Students' Increased Vocabulary Learning and Retention

The finding of the study revealed the 05 participating teachers' positive perceptions that using TPRS to teach Indonesian benefits their students' vocabulary learning and retention. This finding is well supported by the relevant recent research conducted by Muzzamil and Andy's (2015), Nuraengingsih and Rusiana (2016), and Safdarian (2012) all showing that student vocabulary and retention increased when students were taught through stories. Muzzamil and Andy's (2015) research also indicated that students themselves perceived that their vocabulary increased using TPRS and that they perceived TPRS helped them remember the English vocabulary. The students in this study were, in addition to pre and post-tests, given 2 questionnaires: one closed ended and the other open ended. In the open questionnaire students described their TPRS experience in their own words; using words like 'fun', "amazing", and "awesome"

4.6.2.2 Use of TPRS for Students' Improvement of Reading Ability

This study revealed participating teachers' positive perception that student's reading ability improved when they learnt vocabulary through the TPRS method. This finding is consistent with what was suggested in the literature, for example, the study by Demir and Çubukçu (2014) explored TPRS being used to teach English to 6-year olds and found that TPRS did improve the students' lexical competence. Similarly, Lichtman's (2015) study supports this finding with her own research, noting that TPRS could improve students' skills, including reading skills and/or at least could help students keep up with, or surpass traditionally taught students on a variety of texts. However, Blanton (2015) found that when comparing students taught using TPRS with students taught using CLT, the CLT students actually outperformed the TPRS taught students in the reading category. Blanton advocated that using reading material with vocabulary that was well known to the learners did not provide enough of Krashen's (1977) "+1" input hypothesis and doesn't actually encourage students to move to the next level of reading proficiency. Safdarian (2012) and Campbell (2016) also found that stories being read must be relevant to learner interest and age in order to be successful, with Campbell suggesting that stories had to contain sufficient new language to develop reading ability and to hold learner interest.

4.6.2.3 Use of TPRS for Increased Student Engagement

All the 05 participating teachers positively perceived the improvement in their student engagement. In their classrooms, students were engaged in co creating stories, answering questions and acting out stories because they were allowed to listen and comprehend without being expected to speak and write, their affective filter remained low. This positive perception of the use of the TPRS for increased student engagement was consistent with the findings revealed from research conducted by Blanton (2015), Krashen (1998; 2008), Muzzammil and Andy (2015) and most recently by Printer (2019). For example, Nuraeningsih and Rusiana (2016) found in their research that 100% of the students involved in their research project liked learning stories (in English) and 87.5% generally enjoyed stories. Similarly, Printer's (2019) recent research into student perception of the motivation factors of TPRS also supported the five participating teachers' positive perceptions of their students' increased engagement. According to Printer (2019), students were engaged and motivated because they were able to contribute to the stories, rather than be told the story and the interviewed students enjoyed the humor of the stories. In Armstrong's (2008) research into '*Fun and Fluency in Spanish*', she reported that by learning Spanish using TPRS, the learners involved in the study not only enjoyed learning the language, but also saw themselves as language speakers,

However, a word of caution came from Canhnmann -Taylor and Coda (2018, p 19) who warned language teachers of the ways of new meaning making in the second language and noted as follows:

‘World language teachers, especially those using unscripted curriculum approaches such as TPRS, must be vigilant of the ways in which new meaning-making in the second language brings students to question or reinforce dominant assumptions and norms’.

When trying to engage students using TPRS stories, it is important that second language teachers must be aware of inadvertently reinforcing stereotypes when trying to create humorous stories.

4.6.2.4 Use of TPRS in Combination with Other Second Language Teaching Methods

The perception among the participating teachers reveal that TPRS was most beneficial for learning Indonesian when combined with other second language teaching methods. The participating teachers revealed in the interviews their use of activities and techniques that developed from other teaching pedagogies. This finding is also supported by other reviewed studies conducted by *Alley and Overfield (2008)*, *Baker (2017)*, *Blanton (2015)*, *Demir. and Çubukçu(2014)*, *De Costa (2015)* and *Sutijono(2014)* who all suggested that TPRS can be better used in combination with other second language teaching methods as no one single method could really meet the needs of all language learners and TPRS alone could become monotonous.

4.6.2.5 Addressing Teachers’ Perceived Lacks of Professional Development

Inadequate training or lacks of professional development was mentioned by the participating teachers of this research study and featured as a topic of discussion in the relevant literature review presented in Chapter 2. *Baker (2017)* and *Blanton (2015)* pinpointed a lack of teacher training and authentic resources as a flaw with TPRS, as did *Espinoza (2015)*, who found that a lack of teacher support, resources and training were the reasons why some of the participants of their studies struggled with using TPRS to teach their TL.

4.6.2.6 Addressing Teachers’ Perceived Inadequate Program Administration and Management

Inadequate program administration and management were perceived by all the 05 participating teachers who highlighted the challenges facing them, in relation to time allocated to language classes, particularly, time needed for teachers to prepare lessons, for learners to be on task to have sufficient exposure to the targeted language. In the literature, *Cox (2015)* also discussed how a lack of time to prepare lessons could affect a teacher’s confidence and ability to best present the language, which ultimately affects the learners. Time was also identified as an obstacle facing teachers in the research conducted by *Espinoza (2015)* in which teachers felt that they did not have sufficient time to adequately prepare for classes. Another study by *Blanton’s (2015)* also cited participating teachers’ lack of sufficient time for all class activities.

4.7 Summary of Chapter 4

This chapter presented the analyses and interpretation of the interview data collected from the 05 participating teachers representing five different primary schools in South Australia, delving into their perceived benefits and shortcomings of using TPRS to teach Indonesian which are the focus of this research project. The data analytical result reveals that the perceived benefits are related to namely, (1) perceived increases in students' vocabulary and language retention; (2) perceived improvement of students' reading ability; and (3) perceived betterment of student engagement. Whereas, the shortcomings of using TPRS to teach Indonesian in Australian primary schools fell into three categories of namely, (1) perceived lacks of student motivation; (2) perceived lacks of professional development; and (3) perceived inadequacies of program administration. These findings were also discussed in light of the research aim, research questions and the literature review in this Chapter. The following Chapter (Chapter 5), which is a concluding chapter, will summarize the major findings, make recommendations and concludes the study.

5. CHAPTER 5: MAJOR FINDINGS AND CONCLUSION

5.1 Overview of Chapter 5

The purpose of this research was to investigate primary school Indonesian teachers' perceptions of the benefits of using the TPRS method to teach Indonesian. This chapter starts with a summary of the major findings, followed by recommendations for key stakeholders of primary schools' language program, a presentation of limitations, significance of the research, and implications for future research. The Chapter concludes with a summary of the chapter and concluding remarks.

5.2 A Brief Summary of Major Findings

5.2.1 Major Findings as Revealed from the Literature Review

One major finding as revealed from the review of the previous and existing literature was that TPRS was perceived to be a beneficial method of teaching languages, particularly in secondary and tertiary contexts. The literature review also highlighted that at the time of review, there was a great deal of the relevant literature about TPRS outside Australia, however, there was very little available literature on the use of the TPRS method in Australia or its use to teaching Indonesian in South Australian primary schools. The literature review highlighted that students in secondary and tertiary contexts often preferred learning a language using the TPRS method and that generally students enjoyed their language learning with TPRS. The review also suggested that TPRS should be better used in conjunction with other teaching methods for the benefits of the language learners. All these findings revealed from the literature review are consistent with the findings revealed from the analyses of the data collected in this current study from five participating teachers from five different primary school contexts in South Australia.

5.2.2 Major Findings as Revealed from Data Analyses in Response to Research Questions

The major findings, as revealed from the data analyses in response to research questions were also consistent with the findings of the literature review. The interview data revealed participating teachers' perceived benefits and shortcomings of using TPRS to teach Indonesian in South Australian primary schools. These interview data revealed that the perceived benefits of using TPRS to teach Indonesian are 1) increased vocabulary and language retention 2) student engagement and 3) that combining the TPRS method with other methods was beneficial to learners (Cox, 2015; Muzzamil & Andy, 2015; Sutijono, 2014).

However, the data analyses also revealed participating teachers' perceived shortcomings, namely, their perceived lack of student motivation to learn the TL, perceived lack of teachers' access to professional development as well as perceived inadequacy of language programs and administration, which was also reflected in studies reviewed in Chapter 2 (e.g., Baker, 2017; Safdarian, 2012). Although the findings of this current research are consistent with what was suggested in the literature review, what is original and significant from this current research is that its findings were based on the perceptions of South Australian primary schools' Indonesian language teachers, while the research reported in the previous and existing literature was conducted among students and teachers of languages other than Indonesian outside Australia and mostly in secondary and tertiary contexts. The findings of this current study confirms the benefits of using TPRS to teach a second language, in this case, the Indonesian language in primary schools in South Australia while suggesting ways to address its perceived shortcomings.

5.3 Recommendations for Key Stakeholders -Where to From here?

This study attempts to provide recommendations for two groups of key stakeholders, namely, Indonesian language teachers and program administrators, in relation to the use of TPRS to teach Indonesian in primary schools in South Australia.

5.3.1 Recommendations for South Australian Primary Schools' Indonesian Language Teachers

Participating teachers interviewed in this research program perceive that using TPRS to focus on students' listening and reading comprehensible inputs is useful for Indonesian language teaching. The combination of humorous, co-created stories together with the provision of a safe learning environment where the learners' affective filter is low is a recommended approach to Indonesian language teaching. This recommendation by the participating teachers was not established in the reviewed literature, as none of the studies addressed the teaching of Indonesian language in a local NIT context.

Both the analytical data from participating teachers and the reviewed studies indicate that using TPRS to teach a second language does support students' learning. However, it is highly recommended that primary school language teachers should use TPRS in combination with other methods (Demir & Çubukçu' 2014; Sutijono, 2014) to ensure differentiation and access for all learners and learning style and use additional resources relevant to younger learners, for example high interest topic readers, humor stories and authentic texts to engage and motivate language learners.

5.3.2 Recommendations for South Australian Primary Schools' Indonesian Language Program Administrators

It is recommended that administrators provide adequate and timely support for language teachers to maximise their perceived benefits and minimise those perceived shortcomings. In order for primary Indonesian teachers to network effectively and for collaboration to occur regularly, all sites in the same region should administer their language programs in such a way that offers students the same amount of language learning across the district, whether that be 3 x 50 minute lessons per week or the equivalent of 150 minutes (Australian Curriculum, 2010) spreading evenly across the study week. It is recommended Australian Language programs and administrators should take on the recommendations which are well supported by researchers like Liddicoat, Scarino and Kohler (2018) who advocate that it is school leaders who are best able to address the limitations of the existing structures like timetabling and staffing and make the changes required to provide students with the opportunity to successfully learn a second language. TPRS teachers should be listened to when having their teaching schedules/timetable arranged.

5.4 Limitations of the Study

Like any study, this study is not without limitations. *First*, it has its limited scope due to time restrictions. The study was conducted within a time frame of one year only, including months needed for ethics approval application. *Second*, the literature reviewed in this study is limited to a limited number of studies and to its focused guiding review questions on the use of TPRS in different school contexts. *Third*, this study has its methodological limitation due to its chosen qualitative research design in which semi-structured interviews were the only instruments chosen for data collection. The current research was conducted by one researcher with only a small sample size of five Indonesian primary teachers who consented to be voluntarily interviewed and thus did not represent all the primary schools' Indonesian teachers in South Australia. One researcher may mean that the analyses and interpretation of the data might be subjective despite efforts made to be as objective as possible and to best counteract its methodological limitations by cross referencing information with other TPRS and language teachers as well as having regular consultation with the researcher's academic supervisor.

It is also noted that there is no measurement or assessment of students' Indonesian language proficiency and if/how it improved as a result of being taught through the TPRS method. These limitations are acknowledged (by the researcher) and accepted, given the nature and the time frame of the research project.

5.5 Significance of the Study

Despite its limitations, this study has its significance for both Indonesian language teaching practice and the literature. For language education practice, the findings of this research keep primary Indonesian teachers in Australia and in South Australia in particular, better informed of and more knowledgeable about their peers' perceptions of the benefits and shortcomings of using the TPRS to teach Indonesian. Such deeper and more informative knowledge could help build their confidence in putting TPRS into classroom practice. This study may also facilitate Indonesian language teachers' exploration of their peers' perceptions of any other specific language teaching methods in addition to TPRS. Indonesian language teachers' better knowledge of second language teaching methods including the TPRS could help significantly address the problem of declining numbers of language students in Australia that was highlighted at the beginning of the study.

In addition, the research also contributes to the current literature of TPRS as it helps provide information with supporting empirical data about using the TPRS method to teach Indonesian language in the new contexts of South Australian primary schools, narrowing the gap in the existing literature seemingly dominated by the use of TPRS to teach English and/or Spanish in secondary or tertiary contexts. The findings of the study in primary school contexts also echoes and therefore supports the findings of other TPRS research, which advocates for the use of TPRS and combining TPRS with other second language teaching methods.

5.6 Implications of the Study

5.6.1 Implications for Further Practice

The exploration of the five perceived successful programs in this research study may be useful for teachers contemplating how best to pedagogically fulfill a primary Indonesian language teacher's core business of teaching students Indonesian as a second language. This research may allow them to weigh up their peer teachers' perceived benefits and potential shortcomings of the TPRS method to teach Indonesian while self-reflecting on their own perceptions to their cohort of learners in their own primary school contexts.

For future Indonesian language teaching practice, primary Indonesian teachers need to consider the implications of the research findings for their own teaching contexts by exposing their Indonesian learners to less vocabulary and ensuring that students received only comprehensible inputs. Teachers would need to consider if this method pedagogically suits both their teaching styles and their current learners' needs in light the requirements of the Australian Curriculum and the expectations of Indonesian language teachers and learners.

5.6.2 Implications for Further Research

Future research into the perceived benefits and shortcomings of teaching primary Indonesian using TPRS could broaden the scope of the research to include teachers from other primary school contexts outside South Australia. In addition to semi-structured interviews, the research methodology could also be expanded to include other qualitative data collection instruments such as observations of classrooms, annotation of student work samples as well as be a collaborative research project involving more than one researcher. To supplement qualitative data, quantitative data could also be collected through student testing using cooperatively designed quizzes and tests to gather quantitative pre- and post- TPRS teaching data.

Further research into whether culture referring to folktales or festivals or something else in the TPRS classroom may be beneficial for second language learners. Indonesian teachers' perceptions of what culture is and the extent to which TPRS could help enhance intercultural understanding also need further investigation.

5.7 Summary of Chapter 5 and Concluding Remarks

In this chapter, the major findings of the research, the recommendations for Indonesian language teachers and program administrators, the limitations, the significance and implications of the research project have been revealed. The data in this research shows that Indonesian language teachers in South Australian primary schools can be confident that teaching a second language in general the Indonesian language in particular using the TPRS method can be beneficial to their learners' improved language proficiency though the TPRS method must be used with caution over learners' different learning styles, as well as the inclusion of culture, stereotyping and intercultural capabilities and therefore should be combined with other teaching pedagogies.

This research study aimed to investigate the perceptions of primary school Indonesian teacher's perceptions of the benefits of teaching proficiency through TPRS. Teacher perceptions impact their teaching, learner development guide and interactions with their learners. It is these perceptions that are both positive and negative ones of the TPRS that help Indonesian teachers develop curriculum and influence lesson planning. Through the literature review and analytical data collected from semi-structured interviews, the research question has been answered. Whether TPRS is a method that others will also perceive as beneficial, when taking all of the above into consideration, remains to be seen.

References

- Adams, W. (2015). *Conducting Semi-Structured Interviews*. 10.1002/9781119171386 .ch19.
- Alley, D. & Overfield, D. (2008). An Analysis of the Teaching Proficiency Through Reading and Storytelling (TPRS) Method. *Dimension*, 2008, 13-25.
- Amitage, C. (2012) Teachers know drip fed languages fail to take hold *Sydney Morning Herald* www.smh.com
- Anderson, S (2004) *Connecting language and culture through storytelling*
http://digitalcollections.sit.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=1141&context=ipp_collection
- Ariyanti Sutijono, A. (2014): The effect of Total Physical Response Storytelling (TPRS) on the Vocabulary Achievement of Elementary School Students. Bachelor's of Education thesis. English department faculty of teacher training and education Widya Mandala Catholic University Surabaya, Indonesia.
- Armstrong A (2008) Fun and fluency in Spanish through TPRS. *UW-L Journal of Undergraduate Research XI*.
- Asher, J. (1965). The Total Physical Response approach to second language learning. *The Modern Language Journal*, 53(1), 3-17.
- Atkinson, et al (ed.)(2001). *Handbook of Ethnography*. Sage Publications
- Australian Curriculum and Assessment Reporting Authority. (2010). Foundation to Year 10 Curriculum Retrieved from <http://www.australiancurriculum.edu.au>
- Baker, R. (2017) *Teachers' experiences with the TPRS method of language instruction: a qualitative study using quasi-phenomenological approach* ProQuest 10646025 ProQuest LLC
- Blanton, M. (2015). *The effect of two foreign language teaching approaches, communicative language teaching and teaching proficiency through reading and storytelling, on motivation and proficiency for Spanish III students in high school*. (Doctoral Dissertation. Liberty University, Lynchburg, Virginia.)
- Borg, M. (2001). Key Concepts in TLT: Teachers' Beliefs. *ELT Journal*. Vol. 55/2. Oxford University
- Bickman, L & Rog, D.(2009) *Applied Social research methods*. SAGE publications (2nd ed.) In Lipsey and Hurley chapter 2
- Bracey, P. (2016). 'Shaping the Future', Black History and diversity: Teacher perceptions and implications for curriculum development. *Education 3-13*, 44(1), 101-112.

- Brown, D. H. (2007) *Teaching by Principles: An Interactive Approach to Language Pedagogy*. Longman/ Pearson Education, White Plains, New York, 3rd edition
- Bryman, A. (2012). *Social research methods*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Byram M, Wagner, M. (2018) *Making a difference: Language teaching for intercultural and international dialogue*. *Foreign Language Annals*. 2018; 51:140–151.
- Campbell C. (2016). *Teacher perceptions of fostering student engagement through the use of the TPRS world language instructional method* (Doctoral dissertation). Available from ProQuest Dissertations and Theses database. (UMI No.10127070)
- Cahnmann-Taylor, M. & Coda, J. (2018): Troubling normal in world language education, *Critical Inquiry in Language Studies*, DOI: 10.1080/15427587.2018.1450632
- Castro, R. (2010): TPRS for Adults in the ESL Classroom: 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's thesis. Dominican University of California, San Rafael, California.)
- Cohen, Manion and Morrison. (2007) *Research methods in Education*. 6th Edition Routledge NY
- Chomsky N. *Language and the Mind*. 3rd edition 2006 Cambridge University Press
- Creswell J. W. (2013). *Research design: Qualitative, quantitative, and mixed methods approaches*. Sage Publications, Incorporated.
- Creswell, J. (2014). *Educational research: Planning, conducting, and evaluating quantitative and qualitative research* (4th ed.) Pearson new international ed., Pearson custom library).
- Curtis, R., Kenworthy, D., Bevan, T., Fellner, E., Rickman, A., Nighy, B., Firth, C., ... DNA Films. (2004). *Love actually*.
- Dulay, H., & Burt, M. (1974). Natural Sequences in Child Second Language Acquisition. *Language Learning*, Language Learning, 1974.
- Demir, Ş. and Çubukçu, F.: (2014): To have or not to have TPRS for preschoolers (TPRS DİL ÖĞRETİM METODU OKUL ÖNCESİ ÖĞRENCİLERİNE UYGULANMALI MI UYGULANMAMALI MI). *Asya Öğretim Dergisi [Asian Journal of Instruction]*, 2(1(ÖZEL),2014-2, 186-197.
- Denzin, N. K., & Lincoln, Y. S. (Eds.). (1994). *Handbook of qualitative research*. Thousand Oaks, CA, US: Sage Publishing

Education Department of South Australia (1981) *Into the 80s. Our schools and their purposes*

Ellis, R. (1989). Second Language Learning and Second Language Learners: Growth and Diversity. *TESL Canada Journal*, 7(1), 74-94.

Espinoza, P.L. (2015): Three teachers' experiences developing and implementing Teaching Proficiency through Reading and Storytelling (TPRS) curriculum in their World Language classes. (Thesis. Chapman University,,USA) retrieved from <https://www.brycehedstrom.com/wp-content/uploads/DISS-7.25.2017-Baker-TPRS.pdf>

Gall, M. D., Borg, W. R., Gall, J. P. (2003). *Educational research: An introduction*. (7th ed). White Plains, New York: Longman.

Garczinsky, M. (2010): Teaching proficiency through reading and storytelling: Are TPRS students more fluent in second language acquisition than audio lingual students? (Thesis. Chapman University, Orange, California.) (Proquest)

Gillespie, Alex and Cornish, Flora (2014) *Sensitizing questions: a method to facilitate analyzing the meaning of an utterance*. Integrative Psychological and Behavioral Science . ISSN 1932-4502

Hedstrom, B (2018) retrieved from <https://www.brycehedstrom.com/2018/the-affective-filter-krashens-hypotheses-series>

Hill, I. (2006). Student types, school types and their combined influence on the development of intercultural understanding. *Journal of Research in International Education* 5, no. 1: 5–33

Holliday, A. (2010). *Doing and writing qualitative research* (2nd ed). London, United Kingdom: SAGE Publications Inc.

Howatt, A.P.R & Smith, R (2014) *The History of Teaching English as a Foreign Language*, from a British and European Perspective, *Language & History*, 57:1, 75-95, DOI: 10.1179/1759753614Z.00000000028

Khorasgani, Amir Toghyani; Khanehgir, Mansour (2007) – *International Journal of Evaluation and Research in Education*

Khorasgani, A. T. & Khanehgir, M. (2017) Teaching New Vocabulary to Young Learners: Using two methods Total Physical Response and Keyword method. *International Journal of Evaluation and Research in Education (IJERE)* Vol.6, No.2, June 2017, pp. 150~156 ISSN: 2252-8822

Kirch, M. (1967) Direct Method and the Audio-Lingual Approach. *The French Review*, 41(3), 383-385. Retrieved from <http://www.jstor.org/stable/385169>

- Klein, F., and Walker, C. (2004) *Culture in the Foreign Language Classroom: Teachers' Beliefs, Opportunities and Practice*: ProQuest Dissertations and Theses. Web
- Kohler, M and Mahnken, P (2010) *The current state of Indonesian language education in Australian schools* Canberra, ACT Dept. Education, Employment and Workplace Relations
- Kohler, M., & Curnow, T. J. (2014). Policy and literature review (Attachment 1 of the Senior Secondary Languages Education Research Project by the Asia Education Foundation). University of South Australia
- Kraemer, H. C., & Thiemann, S. (1987). *How many subjects? Statistical power analysis in research*. Thousand Oaks, CA, US: Sage Publications, Inc.
- Krashen, S. (1981). *Second language acquisition and second language learning* (1st ed). Oxford, UK: Pergamon Press. Retrieved from www.sdkrashen.com
- Krashen, S. (1982). *Principles and Practice in Second Language Acquisition*. Oxford: Pergamon.
- Krashen S. (2002). *Second language acquisition and second language learning* (1st internet ed.).
- Krivokapic-Skoko, B., & O'Neill, G. (2014). Beyond the qualitative–quantitative distinction: Some innovative methods for business and management research. *International Journal of Multiple Research Approaches*. 5. 290-300. 10.5172/mra.2011.5.3.290.
- Kruger, D. J. (2003). Integrating quantitative and qualitative methods in community research. *The Community Psychologist*, 36, 18-19.
- Lichtman, K. Appendix C: Research on TPR Storytelling. Northern Illinois University. Found in the book: Ray, B. and Seeley, C. *Fluency through TPR Storytelling: Achieving Real Language Acquisition in School, Seventh Edition*. Command Performance Language Institute, 2015. Retrieved from <http://forlangs.niu.edu/~klichtman/tprs.html>.
- Liddicoat, A & Kohler, M (2012). Teaching Asian languages from an intercultural perspective: Building bridges for and with students of Indonesian. 10.1017/UPO9781922064318.005.
- Liddicoat, A.J., Scarino, A. & Kohler, M. *Curric Perspect* (2018) 38: 3. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s41297-017-0021-y>
- Lightbown, P and Spada, N. (2013). *How languages are learned* (4th ed.). Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press.
- Lipsey, M. W., and Hurley, S. M. *Design Sensitivity: Statistical Power for Applied Experimental Research*. ... Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage, 2009.

- Liu, D (2015) A Critical Review of Krashen's Input Hypothesis: Three Major Arguments *Journal of Education and Human Development* December 2015, Vol. 4, No. 4, pp. 139-146 ISSN: 2334-296X (Print), 2334-2978 (Online)
- LoBianco, J (1987) *National policy on languages*. Canberra: AGPS.
- Lo Bianco, J., & Gvozdenko, I. (2006). *Collaboration and Innovation in the Provision of Languages Other Than English in Australian Universities*. Melbourne Faculty of Education ,University of Melbourne. Retrieved from http://www.dassh.edu.au/publications/CASR_ARCHIVAL_REVIEW.pdf.
- Lo Bianco, J (2009) 'An investment that speaks for itself' *The Australian*, 8 July.
- Maxwell, J. A. (2012). *Qualitative research design: An interactive approach*. London: Sage.
- McLaughlin, B. (1987). *Theories of second-language learning* (Vol. 81). London: Edward Arnold.
- Merinnage De Costa, R.S. (2015) : Traditional methods versus TPRS: Effects on introductory French students at a medium-sized public university in the Midwestern United States. All Theses, Dissertations and Other Capstone Projects. Paper 513. Master's thesis. Minnesota State University, Mankato, Minnesota.
- Morrow, K. (1977). "Authentic Texts and ESP." In Holden, S. (ed.). *English for Specific Purposes*. Modern English Publications.
- Nunan, D. (1991). *Language teacher methodology: a handbook for teachers*. Prentice Hall
- Nunan, D. (1992) *Research methods in Language learning* Cambridge University Press
- Nunan, D. (1999). *Second language teaching and learning*. Boston: Heinle & Heinle Publishers
- Nunan, D. (2004). *Task based language teaching* Cambridge. University Press
- Nuraeningsih, N., & Rusiana, R. (2016). Improving Students' Vocabulary Mastery through TPR Storytelling. *Indonesian Journal of English Language Teaching and Applied Linguistics*, 1(1), 49-61.
- Palmer, H. and Palmer, D. (1925) *Teaching English through Actions* Institute for research into teaching English Tokyo
- Perry, Laura & Southwell, Leonie. (2011). Developing Intercultural Understanding and Skills: Models and Approaches. *Intercultural Education*. 22. 453-466. 10.1080/14675986.2011.644948.
- Piaget, J. (1951). Egocentric thought and sociocentric thought. *J. Piaget, Sociological studies*, 270-286.

Pippins, D. and Krashen, S. (2016). How Well do TPRS Students do on the AP? *International Journal of Foreign Language Teaching*, 11:1, (May 2016), pp. 25-30. WWW.IJFLT.COM.

Polat, N. (2016) *L2 learning, teaching and Assessment* Multilingual matters UK

Printer, Li. (2018). Student perceptions on the motivational pull of Teaching Proficiency through Reading and Storytelling: a Self-Determination Theory perspective. Retrieved from <https://www.researchgate.net> › University of Bath › Department of Education

Ray, B. (2013). New developments in the evolution of TPRS. *The International Journal of Foreign Language Teaching*, 8(1), 41-42.

Ray, B., & Seely, C. (2015). *Fluency through TPR storytelling: Achieving real language acquisition in school* (7th ed.). Eagle Mountain, UT: Blaine Ray Workshops.

Richards, J C. (2006). *Communicative Language Teaching today*. United States of America Cambridge University Press

Richards, J C.(2017) *Curriculum Development in Language teaching* (2nd ed.) Cambridge University Press

Richards, J. C., & Rodgers T. S. (2011). *Approaches and methods in language teaching: A description and analysis* (2nd ed.). New York, NY: Cambridge.

Safdarian, Z. (2012): The Effect of Stories on Young Learners' Proficiency and Motivation in Foreign Language Learning.(Master's thesis. Kharazmi University Foreign Language Department, Tehran, Iran.) Published in *International Journal of English and Education* ISSN: 2278-4012, 2:3, (July 2013), pp. 200-248.

Selinker, L. (1972). Interlanguage. Product Information International Review of Applied Linguistics in Language Teaching, 10,209-241. Retrieved from <http://dx.doi.org/10.1515/iral.1972.10.1-4.209>

Skinner B.F. Verbal behavior. New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts; 1957a. [[Google Scholar](#)]

Skinner B.F. 1957b, April 3. [Letter to the editors of *Science*]. Harvard University Archives (Papers of Burrhus Frederic Skinner, 1928–1979, Call HUG(FP) 60.10, Box 2, Folder 1956–1957), Cambridge, MA. [[Google Scholar](#)]

Slavic, B. (2014) *Stepping stones to stories! Ben's system of starting the year with comprehensible input*. Littleton Co (2nd edi) retrieved from www.benslavic.com

Spada, N. (2007) Communicative Language Teaching. In: Cummins J., Davison C. (eds) *International Handbook of English Language Teaching*. Springer International Handbooks of Education, vol 15. Springer, Boston, MA

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*. (Doctorial Study, Walden University)

Swain, M. and Lapkin, S. (1995). Problems in output and the cognitive processes they generate: A step towards second language learning. *Applied Linguistics* 16: 371-391, p. 371.

Swain, M. (2000). The Output Hypothesis and beyond: Mediating Acquisition through Collaborative Dialogue. In J. P. Lantolf, (Ed.), *Sociocultural Theory and Second Language Learning* (pp. 97-114). Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Vygotsky, L. S. (1978). *Mind in society: The development of higher psychological processes*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press

Waltz, T. (2015) *TPR with Chinese characteristics* Published by Squid for brains

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

White L. (1987). Against comprehensible Input: the Input Hypothesis and the Development of Second language competence. *Applied Linguistics*, Volume 8, Issue 2, Summer 1987, Pages 95-110 <https://doi.org/10.1093/applin/8.2.95>

Wignell P (1999) *Double Power: English literacy in indigenous schooling*. Melbourne: Languages Australia

William M.K. Trochim (2006). *Web Centre for Research Methods - sampling*. Qualitative Inquiry Volume 12 Number 3 June 2006 480-500 © 2006 Sage Publications

Appendix 1 Ethics Approval Notice

APPROVAL NOTICE

Project No.: **8346**

Project Title: Primary school Indonesian language teachers' perceptions of the benefits of TPRS methodology

Principal Researcher: Mrs Penelope Ellin

Email: penny.ellin246@schools.sa.edu.au

Approval Date:	26 June 2019	Ethics Approval Expiry Date:	21 December 2020
----------------	--------------	------------------------------	------------------

The above proposed project has been **approved** on the basis of the information contained in the application, its attachments and the information subsequently provided with the addition of the following comments:

Additional comments:

Please ensure that copies of the correspondence granting permission to conduct the research from [schools participating in this research study](#) are submitted to the Committee *on receipt*. Please ensure that the SBREC project number is included in the subject line of any permission emails forwarded to the Committee. Please note that data collection should not commence until the researcher has received the relevant permissions (item D8).

RESPONSIBILITIES OF RESEARCHERS AND SUPERVISORS

- 1. Participant Documentation** Please note that it is the responsibility of researchers and supervisors, in the case of student projects, to ensure that:

- all participant documents are checked for spelling, grammatical, numbering and formatting errors. The Committee does not accept any responsibility for the above mentioned errors.
- the Flinders University logo is included on all participant documentation (e.g., letters of Introduction, information Sheets, consent forms, debriefing information and questionnaires – with the exception of purchased research tools) and the current Flinders University letterhead is included in the header of all letters of introduction. The Flinders University international logo/letterhead should be used and documentation should contain international dialling codes for all telephone and fax numbers listed for all research to be conducted overseas.
- the SBREC contact details, listed below, are included in the footer of all letters of introduction and information sheets. *This research project has been approved by the Flinders University Social and Behavioural Research Ethics Committee (Project Number 'INSERT PROJECT No. here following approval'). For more information regarding ethics approval of the project the Executive Officer of the Committee can be contacted by telephone on 8201 3116, by fax on 8201 2035 or by email human.researchethics@flinders.edu.au.*

2. Annual Progress / Final Reports In order to comply with the monitoring requirements of the *National Statement on Ethical Conduct in Human Research 2007 (updated 2018)* an annual progress report must be submitted each year on the **26 June** (approval anniversary date) for the duration of the ethics approval using the report template available from the [Managing Your Ethics Approval](#) web page. **Please note** that no data collection can be undertaken after the ethics approval expiry date listed at the top of this notice. If data is collected after expiry, it will not be covered in terms of ethics. It is the responsibility of the researcher to ensure that annual progress reports are submitted on time; and that no data is collected after ethics has expired. If the project is completed *before* ethics approval has expired please ensure a final report is submitted immediately. If ethics approval for your project expires please either submit (1) a final report; or (2) an extension of time request (using the modification request form).

First Report due date:

26 June 2020

Final Report due date:

21 December 2020

Student Projects

For student projects, the SBREC recommends that current ethics approval is maintained until a student's thesis has been submitted, assessed and finalised. This is to protect the student in the event that reviewers recommend that additional data be collected from participants.

3. Modifications to Project

Modifications to the project must not proceed until approval has been obtained

from the Ethics Committee. Such proposed changes / modifications include:

- change of project title;
- change to research team (e.g., additions, removals, researchers and supervisors)
- changes to research objectives;
- changes to research protocol;
- changes to participant recruitment methods;
- changes / additions to source(s) of participants;
- changes of procedures used to seek informed consent;
- changes to reimbursements provided to participants;
- changes to information / documents to be given to potential participants;
- changes to research tools (e.g., survey, interview questions, focus group questions etc);
- extensions of time (i.e. to extend the period of ethics approval past current expiry date).

To notify the Committee of any proposed modifications to the project please submit a Modification Request Form available from the [Managing Your Ethics Approval_SBREC](#) web page. Download the form from the website every time a new modification request is submitted to ensure that the most recent form is used. Please note that extension of time requests should be submitted prior to the Ethics Approval Expiry Date listed on this notice.

Change of Contact Details If the contact details of researchers, listed in the approved application, change please notify the Committee so that the details can be updated in our system. A modification request is not required to change your contact details; but would be if a new researcher needs to be added on to the research / supervisory team.

4. Adverse Events and/or Complaints

Researchers should advise the Executive Officer of the Ethics Committee on 08 8201-3116 or human.researchethics@flinders.edu.au immediately if:

- any complaints regarding the research are received;
- a serious or unexpected adverse event occurs that effects participants;
- an unforeseen event occurs that may affect the ethical acceptability of the project.

Appendix 2 Participation Request, Project Information and Consent for Participants



College of Humanities, Arts and Social Sciences
Social Sciences North (397)
GPO Box 2100
Adelaide SA 5001
Tel: 61 8 82013086
Social Sciences North (397)
CRICOS Provider No. 00114A

July 2019

Dear colleague,

I am writing to you to request your participation in the research study *Primary School Indonesian teachers' perception of the benefits of Teaching Proficiency through Reading and Storytelling (TPRS)* that has been approved by Flinders University's Social and Behavioural Research Committee (Project number 8346)

The first stage of the study has involved a review of literature around TPRS and TCI. The next stage will involve interviewing primary school Indonesian teachers who use the TPRS methodology in their classrooms. In this stage, interviewees will participate in 3 x 20 minute semi structured interviews at a convenient time as arranged at a later date. These interviews will be transcribed and the transcription will be returned to you for authentication.

Please consider the following attached questions which will form the basis of the semi structured interview. All participants have been provided with the same series of questions that will guide the interview process. See Appendix A

I would appreciate you indicating your willingness to be involved in this research project by email by (Date to be added)

Should you have any questions or prefer to provide comment by phone, please contact me via the details below.

Yours sincerely



College of Humanities, Arts and Social Sciences
Social Sciences North (397)
GPO Box 2100
Adelaide SA 5001
Tel: 61 8 82013086
Social Sciences North (397)
CRICOS Provider No. 00114A

CONSENT FORM FOR PARTICIPATION IN RESEARCH BY INTERVIEW

Ibeing over the age of 18 years hereby consent to participate as requested in the interview (written/oral) for the research project

Primary School Indonesian teachers' perception of the benefits of Teaching Proficiency through Reading and Storytelling (TPRS) I have read the information provided.

1. Details of procedures and any risks have been explained to my satisfaction.
2. I agree to noting of my information and participation.
4. I am aware that I should retain a copy of the Information Sheet and Consent Form for future reference.
5. I understand that:
 - I may not directly benefit from taking part in this research.
 - I am free to withdraw from the project at any time and am free to decline to answer particular questions.
 - While the information gained in this study will be published as explained, my participation will not be anonymous; however any information I provide will remain confidential.

Participant's signature.....Date.....

I certify that I have explained the study to the participant and consider that she/he understands what is involved and freely consents to participation.

Researcher's name: Penny Ellin

Researcher's signature..... Date...

Primary School Indonesian teachers' perception of the benefits of Teaching Proficiency through Reading and Storytelling (TPRS)

Project Information

Why do I do this project?

Research into language teaching and learning in Australian schools is significant at the moment with the South Australian Government releasing a "Languages in Schools" initiative (2018) outlining a series of actions and priorities for the learning area of Languages. According to the 2016 census, fewer Australian students are learning a Language other than English to Year 12 than were in 1960 (Australian Census 2016), despite the need for our students to become successful global citizens.

In South Australia, Languages learning has been compulsory from Foundation/Reception to year 10 since the 1990s; however Languages student numbers into senior classes continue to decline. Research into Languages programs, looking at how a group of primary Indonesian teachers are adapting TPRS into their classrooms and sharing the resulting data may be useful when providing direction for future Languages Education, both in terms of student engagement and at University teacher training level.

How will the project be carried out?

After an initial review of relevant literature, semi-structured interviews will be used to gather information about teachers' perceptions in relation to their teaching practices. During a semi-structured interview, participants will be asked pre seen questions. Interviews allow the researcher to ask and clarify information from the primary source, to ask follow up questions and to adapt to the responses provided by the participants. The same questions will initially be asked of all participants. This will allow for some synthesis of data collected. The interviews will be audio-recorded, with participants' consent, and used to develop transcripts for analysis.

Who is involved and what is required of me?

Participants will be involved in 3 x 20 minute semi-structured interviews to be conducted at a time to be negotiated with each participant. Participants will be asked to review the resulting transcripts of the interviews for authentication. The total estimated time for involvement is approximately 2 hours.

Will I be identified? Confidentiality/anonymity

No specific individual will be named or identified in the data or any publications arising from the study. The data will be used to prepare a research article for Masters of Languages Studies. The data will be securely stored on the Flinders University file server which is password protected and to which only the researcher has access.

This research project has been approved by the Flinders University Social and Behavioural Research Ethics Committee (Project Number 8346). For more information regarding ethical approval of the project the Executive Officer of the Committee can be contacted by telephone on 8201 3116, by fax on 8201 2035 or by email human.researchethics@flinders.edu.au.

Should you have any questions in relation to this project, please contact me on this email address elli448@flinders.edu.au or via mobile 0428818675.

Alternatively, you can contact my supervisor at Flinders University:

Mai Tuyet Ngo (Dr.)

Lecturer in TESOL and Applied Linguistics

College of Humanities, Arts and Social Sciences

Sturt Road, Bedford Park South Australia 5042 GPO Box 2100 Adelaide SA 5001

P: +61 8 8201 3086

E: mai.ngo@flinders.edu.au

Appendix A

These questions will be provided to participants for consideration prior to the semi structured interview. The questions will be used in 3 20 minute interviews.

INTERVIEW QUESTIONS

Interview Part 1 (introductory part)

1a. Briefly describe your background of teaching Indonesian

Hints for interviewees:

How did you become involved in it?

What are your qualifications?

How long have you been teaching Indonesian?

How long have you been teaching Indonesian in the current primary school in South Australia?

Do you undertake any further studies in Indonesian specifically and in languages pedagogy/methodology generally? If so, what and what have you found useful?

During your time as an Indonesian languages specialist, how would you describe your teaching pedagogy?

1b. What are your personal beliefs about effective second language learning?

Hints for interviewees:

What, in your belief, make second language learning effective?

What, in your belief, make second language teaching effective?

What are your views about what works/doesn't work for second language learners and why/why not?

Interview Part 2 (main part)

2a. What do you know about TPRS?

Hints for interviewees

When did you first hear about TPRS?

How would you describe what TPRS is and what does it claim to provide for language learning in general and Indonesian language learning in particular?

Have you ever used TPRS in your Indonesian language teaching in real-life classrooms? How and why?

What initially attracted you to TPRS? What particularly appealed to you?

How have you implemented TPRS in classrooms?

What are the noticeable outcomes of TPRS in your classrooms?

Where is it apparent in your teaching practice e.g. programming, teaching and learning, classroom management, assessing?

2b. What do you think are the main benefits of TPRS?

Hints for interviewees

Do you find TPRS effective for your learners? If so, what is it effective for? How?

If you find it effective, how do you know that TPRS is working in your classroom?

Give some examples of evidence of effective use of TPRS in your classroom

2c. What do you think are the main shortcomings of TPRS?

Hints for interviewees

If you find it ineffective, how do you know that TPRS is not working in your classroom?

Give some examples of evidence of ineffective use of TPRS in your classroom?

What are your challenges in implementing TPRS?

What have you done to address those shortcomings and challenges?

How are you incorporating the Intercultural understanding capability within the TPRS method i your classroom?

Interview Part 3 (concluding part)

3a. What do you wish to know more about TPRS? Any other comment?

THANK YOU FOR YOUR PARTICIPATING IN THIS INTERVIEW

his research project has been approved by the Flinders University Social and Behavioural Research Ethics Committee (Project Number8346). For more information regarding ethics approval of the project the Executive Officer of the Committee can be contacted by telephone on 8201 3116, by fax on 8201 2035 or by email human.researchethics@flinders.edu.a

Appendix 3 Letter of Consent from Participant Line Manager



College of Humanities, Arts and Social Sciences
Social Sciences North (387)
GPO Box 2100
Adelaide SA 5001
Tel: 81 8 82013086
Social Sciences North (387)
0800 894666 (0900)

CONSENT FORM FOR PARTICIPATION IN RESEARCH BY STAFF MEMBER TO PARTICIPATE IN INTERVIEW

Ibeing over the age of 18 years hereby consent to the participation of (name of staff member) as requested to be involved in the interview (written/oral) for the research project
Primary School Indonesian teachers' perception of the benefits of Teaching Proficiency through Reading and Storytelling (TPRS)

I have read the information provided.

1. Details of procedures and any risks have been explained to my satisfaction.
2. I am aware that I should retain a copy of the Information Sheet and Consent Form for future reference.
3. I understand that:
 - I may not directly benefit from my staff member taking part in this research.
 - (Teacher name) is free to withdraw from the project at any time and is free to decline to answer particular questions.
 - Although the information will be treated in the strictest confidence by the researcher, given the sample population pool from which participants will be drawn, participant anonymity can not be guaranteed.

Line Manager signature.....Date.....

Researcher's name: Penny Ellin

Researcher's signature..... Date...

This research project has been approved by the Flinders University Social and Behavioural Research Ethics Committee (Project Number 8346). For more information regarding ethics approval of the project the Executive Officer of the Committee can be contacted by telephone on 8201 3116, by fax on 8201 2035 or by email human.researchethics@flinders.edu.au

Appendix 4: A Tabulated Review of Relevant Studies

General Overarching Themes of Relevant Studies	Specific Sub-Themes in Focus	Authors and publishing date	Research Aims/Objectives & Questions	Language Teaching Theories/Hypotheses/ Methods in Focus	Findings/ Conclusion	Relevance for this Proposed Research Project
	How children learn language	Chomsky (1972)	Is the LAD account for the speed that children learn language	Innatist perspective	Children born with the ability to find out the rules of language for selves by using sources exposed	Argues that language is innate implications for CI theory
Theme #1:	Against comprehensible input: the Input hypothesis and Development of second language competence	White (1987)	What are the problems of Krashen's input theory	Second Language acquisition theory	4 ways Krashen's theory misleading Providing input in form of grammar should occur Argues need for more specific and explicit input theory	TPRS is based on Krashen's input and affective filter hypothesis
Second Language Acquisition (SLA)	Second Language acquisition and second language learning	Krashen (1991)	Subconscious language acquisition and conscious language learning	Monitor theory	When undershoot, acquisition activities = boredom, overshoot = frustration Over correction = student defensive (heightened affective filter)	Comprehensible input a founding pillar of TPRS
and	Anxiety is good for you	Krashen (2008)	Role of anxiety in SLA Anxiety in language classrooms	Comprehension Hypothesis	Respect anxiety don't struggle to overcome it Anxiety is useful Anxiety means that we use lang that will invite comprehensible input Learn from reading and interacting with people can understand	Supports TPRS listening to story method and reading. Not expecting students to speak straight away Limited comprehensible input
Theme # 2	'Periods' of Language learning methods	Howatt and Smith (2014)	How English is learnt as a foreign language	CLT Oral Situational Natural Berlitz/Audio-Lingual Grammar - Translation Classic Direct	Teachers need to know they are engaging students in practice to cope with demands of communication in foreign language Old methods continue to be used for the parts that are still useful eg value of structural syllabus and situational presentation	CLT is often referred to in TPRS research papers Write about how should highlight similarities between methods, not only differences Parts of many methods still used
Second Language Learning (SLL)						

					Replacing 'method' for 'period' when looking at SLA teaching	successfully today
	A critical review of Krashen's Input hypothesis	Liu (2015)	Presents 3 arguments against	Krashen's input hypothesis	Excessive claims Lack of evidence Invalid theory	TPRS bases pillar of comprehension on Krashen's input hypothesis
Focus on form through collaborative dialogue: Exploring task effects	Swain and Lapkin (2000)	Explore communicative tasks with similar content but different format	Immersion	Canadian study (French) Jigsaw vs dictogloss tasks Hypothesised that dictogloss would focus on form (did not eventuate equal focus on form)	Jigsaw task sequencing story lead to greater vocabulary use	TPR predecessor TPRS book by Ray and Seely similar in prescriptive texts for teachers to use
	Total Physical Response Method for second language learning	Asher (1968)	Accelerate comprehension of foreign language	Total Physical Response	Research found an improvement in listening comprehension Acting and movement assisted retention of vocabulary	Ray uses Asher's TPR as part of TPRS Use of verbs (action words) eg sit, stand, walk, run etc as vocabulary taught
	The Natural Approach-Language Acquisition in the classroom	Krashen and Terrell (1983)	Theories and implications of SLA	Natural approach	Designed to develop basic personal communication – oral and written Units organised into topics and situations Not a grammar syllabus Goal to produce "monitor users" (monitor when appropriate to provide grammar input) Natural approach needs to be introduced and justified to students eg give students idea of what to expect will be able to do	Some parts of Natural approach like TPRS eg grammar not major component, rather necessary grammar is provided in comprehensible input Uses some TPR activities in early stages Reading as comprehensible input part of TPRS and Natural approach
	Language teaching methodology	Nunan (1991)	Key areas of language teaching methodology Relates theory and research to classroom practice	Communicative Approaches	Encourages more interaction between learners Demonstrates how theory relates to what happens in the classroom	Starts with listening as first skill discussed then speaking and reading Listening focus in TPRS
	Principles of Language Learning and Teaching	Brown (2000)	Schools of thought in SLA	Constructivism Rationalism and Cognitive Psychology Structuralism and Behaviourism	Constructivism: interactive discourse between sociocultural variables cooperative group learning	TPRS shares components of different schools eg Naturalist approach/Input hypothesis

					interlanguage variability interactionist hypotheses Structuralism/Behaviourism description, observable performance, empirical, conditioning, reinforcement Cognitive/Rationalism universal grammar, deep structure, generative linguistics acquisition	and TPRS speaking will occur once student has enough comprehensible input
Focus on form through collaborative dialogue: Exploring task effects	Swain and Lapkin (2000)	Explore communicative tasks with similar content but different format	Immersion	Canadian study (French) Jigsaw vs dictogloss tasks Hypothesised that dictogloss would focus on form (did not eventuate equal focus on form)	Jigsaw task sequencing story lead to greater vocabulary use	
Approaches and Methods in Language Teaching	Richards and Rodgers (2001)	Description and analysis of language methods and approaches	Oral and situational Audio ling CLT TPR Silent way Community Lang Learning Natural Suggestopedia	Comparing and evaluating methods: consider descriptive, observational, effective and comparative data Need integrated approach to evaluation. Rigorous Defining approach and method	Analyses methods leading to introduction of TPRS method Definition of method vs approach (TPRS is a method)	
Student performance	Kasumi (2015)	Impact of CLT on student performance	CLT	CLT productive	CLT results used as comparison in some TPRS documents	
Teaching New Vocabulary to Young Learners: Using Two Methods Total Physical Response and Keyword Method	Khorasgani, Amir Toghiani; Khanehgir, Mansour (2017)	Assessing the efficiency of teaching vocabulary	Total Physical response Keyword method Picture/pronunciation	Iranian study - 34 students (6-7 yr olds) taught English via methods No significant improvement using TPR although game "entertaining" Results found KWM significantly increased learning performance	TPRS has combined TPR with the learning strategies of the pictorial method and also uses some of the ideas of word association of KWM by incorporating gestures to represent certain words.	
Make any student the most interesting	Hedstrom B Brycehedstrom.com	Building community in classrooms with	TPRS	There is something interesting about every student – find	Carnegie's How to win friends and influence	

Theme #4: The TPRS method	in the room		ongoing personal interviews		it by asking questions Teachers need to step back and make students the stars Comprehensible input that is personalized, repeated, interesting and meaningful Focus on student – talk to them and about them	people changed Blaine Ray's life as a teacher and TPRS uses strategies from book to find student interests by asking questions
	Connecting language and culture through storytelling	Anderson (2004)	Is it possible to use folktales using TPRS method	TPRS	TPRS stories too juvenile for secondary - nothing binding stories together Culture - what the words mean eg 2 Spanish words for you (history) Finding the right authentic story Culture - done by mini stories (pulling out the lang from authentic cultural story) leading up to full authentic story mini stories Students see how Language and Culture are linked	Researcher is a TPRS teacher Perception of authentic text use in TPRS Engagement of learners using TPRS
	Culture in the Foreign Language Classroom : Teachers' Beliefs, Opportunities and Practice	Klein and Walker (2004)	Teacher beliefs about culture in the language classroom	TPRS and other methods	4 teachers involved - Limitations of information approach to teaching culture - focus limited to how things are - limits opportunity for exploration of culture beyond, own cultural identity and hidden assumptions and prejudices Practice not integrated into the larger theory will fail	Discussion of culture and language learning Teacher beliefs around culture in the classroom relevant to TPRS /culture in classroom
	Analysis of the current status of TPRS	Alley and Overfield (2008)	Investigates current status of TPRS and reviews the method in light of recent SLA findings	TPRS	Claims TPRS closer to traditional methods of Direct Teaching, Audio Lingual and Grammar translation to modern SLA theories Concludes that culture, comparisons, connections,	Lack of culture perceived shortcoming of TPRS TPRS and non-authentic texts Discusses

					communities and to a degree content are secondary to development of listening comprehension and oral proficiency Recent research into SLA = emphasis on role of learner and social/cultural contexts	
Fun and Fluency in Spanish	Armstrong (2008)	Survey students to investigate enjoyment and vocabulary retention when being taught using TPRS method	TPRS	Students saw themselves as language speakers Students enjoyed learning using TPRS Students learnt more words when paired with gestures	Researcher is a TPRS teacher Perception of authentic text use in TPRS Engagement of learners using TPRS	
Comparing TPRS with Grammar Translation Method	Castro (2010)	Pilot study to determine effectiveness in Vocabulary Acquisition Among ESL Adult Learners.	TPRS vs Grammar translation	Grammar translation did 4% better on post tests Some confusion of similar sounding words 4 vs 3 students thought TPRS more effective	No real difference in learner achievement 9 vs 1 students enjoyed learning with TPRS	
Comparing TPRS with traditional teaching approach	Watson (2009)	TPRS vs traditional language teaching	TPRS Traditional method - as described in text	TPRS - natural approach combination of TPRS used Watson TPRS teacher Found that TPRS had better results in final test and oral examinations	Supports teacher perception that TPRS is an effective way to teach languages	
The Culture Club	Waltz (2011)	Culture is what you think is normal	TPRS	Culture best taught through TPRS pop up Asks how much culture is enough - if has to be taught in Eng not TL then takes time from acquisition. If limited time, how much should be spent teaching about festivals etc	Addressing the criticism that TPRS does not teach culture. Waltz argues that culture is in the little things eg dinner time, the 'normal' way to greet people, what is considered ok and what is taboo.	
Effect of stories on young learners	Safdarian (2012)	Investigate effect of stories on motivation	TPRS and traditional method (control group)	States TPRS adheres to most of CLT principles Shortcoming monotonous choice of techniques countered with use of 8 types of intelligences	Supports perceived shortcomings of TPRS Study conducted in Iran with 'young'	

					Obstacles - time, question results of TPRS taught students in standardized tests, text authenticity Stories must be relevant to learner interests and age	(approx 12 yrs old) ESL students Younger learner - equivalent of yr 6 students in South Australia (primary)
To have or not to have TPRS for preschoolers	Demir and Çubukçu (2014)	If TPRS has impact on lexical competence of preschool learners	TPRS and Communicative approach	2 groups of 6 yr olds learning English Suggests combining information gap activities of the Communicative Approach with TPRS Compared TPRS (in Turkey) and students were learning English as a foreign Language	Storytelling and reading aloud essential in language teaching program for preschoolers which supports TPRS methodology. Support combining TPRS with other methods	
Effect on vocabulary achievement - comparing 2 methods	Sutijono (2014)	Comparing TPRS with wordlists Learning English as a second Language rather than Indonesian.	TPRS vs learning using wordlists	Group 1 TPRS and Group 2- word lists TPRS more effective in this study Suggest varying teaching techniques Classroom management considerations Researcher was also the teacher - suggests possible bias Short time frame - only 4 lessons	Yr 3 students - learning English Primary school aged students	
Using comprehensible input and stories	Slavic (2014)	How to teach TPRS	TPRS	How to implement a TPRS program using comprehensible input Classroom dynamics	Slavic is a well-known TPRS teacher and presenter	
TPRS can be used to teach any language	Waltz (2015)	Using TPRS to teach Chinese	TPRS	Focus on classroom practice Showcases effective strategies for teaching using TPRS	Wlatz is a well know TPRS teacher and presenter. This book was mentioned by participants of this study	
TPRS contributions, controversies, problems and new frontiers	Krashen (2015)	Innovations that have changed second language education	TPRS Natural Approach	Pop up grammar TPRS taking reading for pleasure seriously Transparent input vs comprehensible Transparent if understand each word Problems with timed writing - should it be used as test or for therapy	addresses some of the criticisms of the TPRS method. TPRS heavily reliant on the teacher's skill as compelling storyteller looks at how technology can be adapted in	

					(see what know = feel good) Future directions/considerations discussed	the TPRS classroom
	Research on TPRS method	Lichtman (2015)	Examining the studies into TPRS as an effective method to teach modern languages	TPRS vs other teaching methods	Discussion of studies comparing TPRS with other language teaching methods Suggests that more research needs to be done with younger learners more research into the difference between TPRS and traditional teaching	shows that TPRS is effective and benefits learner vocabulary retention as supported by literature reviewed Lichtman is a TPRS teacher/presenter
	Effect of 2 foreign language approaches of student motivation and proficiency	Blanton (2015)	Which teaching approach has best effect on L2 motivation and proficiency	CLT and TPRS	Motivation higher with TPRS CLT higher proficiency in reading, writing and listening Finding teaching approach should be concerned with reality and connect students with reality No one ultimate choice of teaching approach	Compares 2 methods Motivation and perceived proficiency relevant to results of interviewed teachers Supports combining methods
	Student engagement using TPRS	Campbell (2016)	Does TPRS increase engagement of male language learners	TPRS	Males better learning with visuals and kinaesthetic learning Humour important to male learners Teachers of this project favourable perception of TPRS for (male) student engagement how TPRS can engage male Year 3 elementary students Class sizes - 9 students(4 boys), 19 students(10 boys) and 16 students (6 boys)	Researches teacher perception of TPRS re engaging (male) students
	TPRS as a way to foster students' speaking skill	Muzzamil & Andy (2015)	Investigate differences between using and not using TPRS to develop speaking performance	TPRS	Focus on TPRS steps: showing, Telling and Reading TPRS meshes with Natural Approach	Supports teacher perception re Reading
	Improving student's vocabulary mastery using TPRS	Rusiana (2016)	Influence of stories on student vocabulary	TPRS	Student response positive to learning using TPRS Concludes TPRS can improve student	Research conducted on year 2 students learning English

					vocabulary retention Researcher trained the teachers prior to the observed lessons	Supports perception of interviewed teachers
	Teachers experiences of using TPRS for language instruction	Baker (2017)	Teacher experience using TPRS	TPRS	Research using 3 groups - one group dissatisfied with TPRS and reasons given (lack of support from colleagues/admin/time) Lictman (TPRS presenter) on sign off committee	Teacher perceptions and experiences Dissatisfaction group have similar experiences re this study and perceived shortcomings of TPRS Baker TPRS teacher
	Fluency through TPR story telling	Ray and Seely (2018)	Achieving language acquisition in schools	TPRS	TPRS effective for teaching languages to students Language and skills to present in classes Effective TPRS methods How to	Ray is the founder of the TPRS movement and this book is the suggested handbook for TPRS teachers
	Student perceptions of the motivational pull of TPRS using self determination theory	Printer (2018)	Exploring student feelings about TPRS	TPRS	Printer is TPRS conference presenter Activities are seen as fun, different and interesting Students liked being part of story creation Active learning appeals Important to have relaxed pleasant atmosphere for learning	Perceptions of students on motivation relates to teacher perceptions

	<p>Troubling normal in world language education</p>	<p>Cahnmann-Taylor and Coda (2018)</p>	<p>Investigating how some methods may be upholding traditional norms How might TPRS practice be deepened</p>	<p>TPRS</p>	<p>Improvisation around stories can lead to stereotyping Promoting stereotypes through humour eg boys don't wear dresses English has he/she, many languages use the same word for both eg Chinese, Indonesian</p>	<p>Use of stories fun but can be stereotypical</p>
--	---	--	--	-------------	---	--

Appendix 5: A Review of SLT Methods Proceeding or Having Direct Relevance to the TPRS Evolution

SLA Methods	Activity types	Role(s) of Teacher	Role(s) of Learners	Resources Required
Grammar-translation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Translation of classic texts • Memorization of rules and vocabulary • Vocab exercises 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Central teacher role • Speaks mainly in mother tongue 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Translate lengthy texts in TL • Learn rules of grammar • Memorize lists 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Grammar books • Dictionary • Large vocabulary lists • Exams
Audio-lingual	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Dialogue • Repetitive pattern drills 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Drill students • Correct pronunciation • Teach sequences and structures of TL 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Mimic • Memorise • 'over learn' to speak with no errors 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Tapes • Visual aids • Use of language labs • Non authentic texts
TPR	Imperative drills to get actions	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Role as 'stage director' of student actors • Active and direct role in content presented 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Listen and perform • Has little interaction /say in content 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No basic text. Initially voice, gesture then action • Materials/ media later with reading
CLT	Authentic language use situation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Facilitator • Guide 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Use the language in 'real' interaction • Construct meaning 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Authentic texts
CLL	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Translation • Group work • Reflecting • Observing • Listening • Free conversation 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Provider of a safe environment • Guide for learners 	Collaborate as part of learning team	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No textbook • Materials are developed as the course goes on

Natural approach	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Meaning not form • Allow comprehensible input (here and now) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Primary source of comprehension • Provide low stress , positive environment • Provide a mix of class activities 	Get involved in activities that have meaningful communication	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Realia • No textbooks
TPRS	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Fully comprehensible • Reading and story telling • Teacher questioning 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Make content fully comprehensible • Create and tell stories • Question 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Listen • Mimic/ repeat • Perform • Create using model 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Stories created by teacher with some class input • Visual aids

Appendix 6: Reviewed Studies Comparing TPRS and Other SLT Methods

SLT Methods Being Directly Compared with TPRS	Reviewed Studies' Author Names and Publishing Year	Key findings of Comparative Research in relation to Second Language Learner Achievement
<i>TPRS vs Traditional Foreign Language Instruction</i>	Watson (2009)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Used Krashen's modified "TPRS/Natural Approach" to include grammar TPRS Method out-performed traditional instruction on language learners' final and oral exams
<i>TPRS vs Grammar-Translation Method</i>	Castro (2010)	No real difference in language learner achievement
<i>TPRS vs Audio-lingual Method</i>	Garczynski (2003)	No real difference in language learner achievement
<i>TPRS vs CLT</i>	Spangler (2009)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Similar results in reading and writing TPRS shows better results in language learners' oral achievement
	Blanton (2015)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> CLT results in language learners' higher achievements in reading, writing and listening. Little difference in language learners' speaking results

Appendix 7: Methodological Considerations of 03 Main Research Types

3 Research Types	Aims and Features	Benefits	Shortcomings
1. QUALITATIVE RESEARCH	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Explore experiences or the perspective of research participants and examine the behaviours, perspectives and feelings of people and discover what is 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Broader open focus Gather data from the participants that may appear outside the initial interview questions Allow for comparative analysis 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Difficult to make systematic comparisons as responses Widely different and are

	<p>central to their existence. (Bryman, 2001)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Be often transcribed into a story or theory based on the information gained through in-depth interviews with a small sample size of participants 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • More flexible as a method of research (Maxwell, 2012) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • subjective • Time consuming and it often relies on a small sample size to be efficient in terms of both resources and time • Difficult to generalize results, as numbers are too small to usefully be converted to percentages. • Researcher bias could affect the objectivity of data leading to generalisations/omitted information as research decides on what to pursue
<p>2. QUANTITATIVE RESEARCH</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Collecting numerical data information (Bryman, 2012) • Narrower and through randomised sampling produces measurable results that can be replicated. (Bryman, 2001) • Gather statistical data (Borg, 2010) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Allow information from considerable sources to be summarized across categories (Kruger, 2003) • Allow the researcher to maintain a distance from the research and therefore eliminates some of the issues involving researcher bias 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Need for controlled conditions, like a laboratory, as results need to be reproducible every time which can make the data superficial • Only represents a moment in time and may not truly represent

			the true situation or how participants feel, as the preset answers may only allow for the closest match.
3. MIXED METHOD RESEARCH	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Mixture of both quantitative and qualitative research (Creswell, 2013) • Counteract limitations by allowing the researcher to investigate the statistical information (Quantitative) as well dealing with exploring the gained understandings uncovered (Qualitative) with qualitative research 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Eliminate some of the bias of the researcher by providing both numerical and written information • Researchers are also able to test grounded theories 	<p>difficulty of carrying out research by one person</p> <p>the amount of time, money and special skills needed for the collection and analyses of mixed data,</p>

Appendix 8: 03 Main Interview Types for Consideration in This Research

03 Types of Interview	Features	Pros	Cons
(1) Structured Interviews	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Formal questions and content are predetermined (Cohen, 2007) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Get the same information from participants Easy to replicate Faster to conduct can obtain larger sample Easy to test for reliability 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Leaving the interviewer with little room for modification usually generate quantitative data
(2) Semi -structured Interviews	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Closed and open-ended question types 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Questions are regularly followed by clarifying questions pertaining to how and why (Adams, 2015) interviewees can express ideas 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Should be kept short (no longer than 1 hour) to avoid fatigue Require good interviewing skills from the researcher Time consuming and resource intensive
(3) Un- structured Interviews	No specific questions	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Flows like a conversation Allows interviewee to share more (leads to qualitative data) Increased validity 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Time consuming May not get information needed for comparison Gather large amount of data which may be difficult to analyse.

(Source - Cohen, L., Manion, L. & Morrison. K (2007) "*Research Methods in Education*" 6th Edition Routledge New York, NY 10016)

Appendix 9: The Interview Questions

JUSTIFICATION OF THE RELEVANCE OF INTERVIEW QUESTIONS (WHY I ASKED WHAT QUESTIONS IN THE INTERVIEWS FOR THIS RESEARCH?)		
<p>Interview Questions</p>	<p>Relevance of each interview questions for the specific part(s) of the research project and its 2 following research questions?</p> <p>- Question 1a. What are South Australian primary school teachers' perceptions of the benefits of using Teaching Proficiency through Reading and Storytelling (TPRS) to teach the Indonesian language?</p> <p>- Question 1b. How have they made use of the perceived benefit, if any, in their Indonesian language classrooms?</p> <p>- Question 2a: What are South Australian primary school teachers' perceptions of the shortcomings of using Teaching Proficiency through Reading and Storytelling (TPRS) to teach the Indonesian language?</p> <p>- Question 2b: How have they addressed the perceived shortcomings of TPRS, if any, in their Indonesian language classrooms?</p>	<p>Any Special Notes for Penny/the researcher</p>
<p>1a. Briefly describe your background in teaching Indonesian</p>	<p>This information will help the researcher gain insights into participants' backgrounds.</p>	<p>This information will be reported for Chapter 3 (3.4 Participants)</p>
<p>1b. What are your beliefs about effective second language learning?</p>	<p>This information will be used to gather data about what the participants perceive as effective language teaching methods Commonalities between participants</p>	<p>This information will be reported in chapter 4 Data analysis and chapter 5 Discussion</p>
<p>2a. When did you first hear about TPRS?</p>	<p>This information might help answer the Research question 1a above</p>	<p>Information for Chapter 3 3.4 participants</p>
<p>2b What are the main benefits of using TPRS in your classroom?</p>	<p>This information will assist the researcher answer Research question 1b</p>	<p>Chapter 4</p>
<p>2c What do you see as the main shortcomings of the TPRS method?</p>	<p>Information will assist to answer question 2a and find any commonalities between participants</p>	<p>Chapter 4 and Chapter 5</p>

3a What more do you wish to know about TPRS? Any other comments?	Information for summary and possible future direction of further research	Chapter 5 discussion of findings and chapter 6 summary
---	---	--

LIST OF ACTUAL INTERVIEW QUESTIONS

Interview Part 1 (introductory part)

1a. Briefly describe your background of teaching Indonesian

Hints for interviewees:

How did you become involved in it?

What are your qualifications?

How long have you been teaching Indonesian?

How long have you been teaching Indonesian in the current primary school in South Australia?

Do you undertake any further studies in Indonesian specifically and in languages pedagogy/methodology generally? If so, what and what have you found useful?

During your time as an Indonesian languages specialist, how would you describe your teaching pedagogy?

1b. What are your personal beliefs about effective second language learning?

Hints for interviewees:

What, in your belief, make second language learning effective?

What, in your belief, make second language teaching effective?

What are your views about what works/doesn't work for second language learners and why/why not?

Interview Part 2 (main part)

2a. What do you know about TPRS?

Hints for interviewees

When did you first hear about TPRS?

How would you describe what TPRS is and what does it claim to provide for language learning in general and Indonesian language learning in particular?

Have you ever used TPRS in your Indonesian language teaching in real-life classrooms? How and why?

What initially attracted you to TPRS? What particularly appealed to you?

How have you implemented TPRS in classrooms?

What are the noticeable outcomes of TPRS in your classrooms?

Where is it apparent in your teaching practice e.g. programming, teaching and learning, classroom management, assessing?

2b. What do you think are the main benefits of TPRS?

Hints for interviewees

Do you find TPRS effective for your learners? If so, what is it effective for? How?

If you find it effective, how do you know that TPRS is working in your classroom?

Give some examples of evidence of effective use of TPRS in your classroom?

2c. What do you think are the main shortcomings of TPRS?

Hints for interviewees

If you find it ineffective, how do you know that TPRS is not working in your classroom?

Give some examples of evidence of ineffective use of TPRS in your classroom?

What are your challenges in implementing TPRS?

What have you done to address those shortcomings and challenges?

How are you incorporating the Intercultural understanding capability within the TPRS method in your classroom?

Interview Part 3 (concluding part)

3a. What do you wish to know more about TPRS? Any other comment?

Appendix 10 Syntheses of Interview Data

Question 1a

Teachers	<p>Question 1a What are South Australia primary school teachers' perceptions of the benefits of using TPRS to teach the Indonesian language?</p> <p>What are your personal beliefs about effective second language learning?</p>
Teacher A	<p>Helps students see the relevance of L2 to literacy in L1. Focus on the learning. It is not just learning a lot of words, but being able to use them.</p> <p>Headset of Accelerated Literacy (AL)– unpacking texts</p> <p>Having high expectations and helping students see the connections between languages</p> <p>Using student prior knowledge and building on it</p> <p>Students are able to participate at own level</p>
Teacher B	<p>all students can participate and acquire language and enjoy.</p> <p>Teaching is effective when the principles of how we acquire our first language to guide our teaching methods are utilised</p> <p>Students have the language skills to talk around a topic, in order to be able to communicate</p>
Teacher C	<p>Teaching as much as necessary in L2</p> <p>100% comprehensible and personalised</p> <p>Student success through participation</p> <p>Student centred</p> <p>“narrow and deep” using high frequency vocabulary (verbs not nouns)</p>
Teacher D	<p>Should be fun and look easy</p> <p>Allows for success for all if willing to participate</p> <p>Look engaging</p> <p>Comprehensible</p>
Teacher E	<p>Many programs focus on a very basic overview of culture</p> <p>There is perhaps too much teaching done on topics eg numbers, colour, shopping etc</p> <p>SLT needs high expectations and lead to proficiency in being able to communicate in L2</p> <p>Spending huge amounts of time learning ‘about’ a language does not lead to ability to communicate in a L2</p> <p>Speaking must follow listening but interaction while listening is imperative</p>

Coding:

Green – providing comprehensible input

Yellow – participation and teacher expectations

Blue – prior knowledge and personalisation

Question 1b

Teachers	Question 1b How have they made use of the perceived benefit, if any, in their Indonesian language classrooms?
Teacher A	students contribute to story to cocreate students need to feel confident before being challenged for output. Strong focus on building language to create opportunities for students to communicate in the TL
Teacher B	Use the stories to provide more sheltered vocabulary and only bring in things as required bring in only the most basic verbs and what will work with those most basic verbs. Eg want, like less written work – focus on listening and speaking – students need to hear many repetitions of the language/vocab reading stories
Teacher C	Using lots of repetition of top 10 words (high frequency) so students recognise and use word Introducing 2/3 words at time using visual powerpoints, stuffed toys/puppets Questions and answers PQA – personalised questions and answers with lots of repetition eg lihat buaya. Buaya kecil? Buaya besar? Etc Students engaging in communication about themselves and their world (intercultural) Not about speaking – about evidence of acquired language Use of Auslan, but if doesn't support the meaning, ask class for suggestion. Use of same gesture for all classes. Humour and relationships. The affective filter is really important. We create really deep relationships and a safe environment. Using humour and allowing kids to contribute to the stories means they are focussed. TCI and TPRS values students. There is lots of student input (not told what doing and copy from the board) Lessons are all led by students.
Teacher D	Decide on vocabulary – Top 10 high frequency words Find / design story that uses a couple of the Top 10 words Preteach the vocabulary – 2 or 3 words at a time Tell/ ask a story using lots of repetition Students able to use vocabulary from past term, year, or even year before Totally comprehensible – use of stop signal if word not comprehensible Gestures can be suggested by students or use of Auslan dictionary (in consultation with other Language teacher at site) Fun things help. Promoting a safe environment where kids feel comfortable – if kids are pushed too much to do output, whether writing or speaking, their affective filter goes up and too anxious about what have to do to pay attention. Having a safe encouraging environment where everyone feels ok. Kids like it because they can do it on their own terms.

Teacher E	<p>tried to ensure student are receiving the most amount of time using TPRS/similar method to receive comprehensible input. Beneficial to pronunciation and reading ability of students.</p> <p>Students ‘absorb’ pronunciation rules fairly well</p> <p>Students read out something in L2 with minimal mistakes and are able to self-correct</p> <p>Predictability of the stories, although seem repetitive, allows students to gain better comprehension</p> <p>Differentiation by interest and difficulty, depending on the expertise of the teacher and they way they question</p> <p>trying to make the stories engaging for the students by including things that come from the students culture to make the stories interesting to them.</p>
-----------	---

Coding:

Red – student confidence

Green – student contribution to learning environment

Yellow – vocabulary selection

Pink – use of Auslan/ signals

Blue – strategy of repetition

Question 2a

Teachers	<p>Question 2a: What are South Australian primary school teachers’ perceptions of the shortcomings of using Teaching Proficiency through Reading and Storytelling (TPRS) to teach the Indonesian language?</p>
Teacher A	<p>TPRS is very teacher directed and relies on the story asking skills of the teacher. These lessons, whilst fun and engaging, are very teacher directed ie the students need to hear many repetitions of the language/vocab. Wonder if students are getting broad enough vocabulary. Some students are answering with “Ya (yes)” or “Tidak (No)” so do they really understand how to reproduce the questions? When using TPRS activities like “Kursi Luar biasa” (Awesome chair) only one student is getting the opportunity to respond to questions – others are hopefully listening...Some students get tired of the same stories</p>
Teacher B	<p>Getting enough training, support and opportunities for observation. Language teaching in general have significant challenges eg language competence of teacher, lack of support for language teachers with a pedagogy or lack of pedagogy.</p> <p>The challenges for language teaching whatever teaching pedagogy are time on task frequency of lessons (eg two lessons at different times during the week is better than a double lesson), difficulty developing relationships if classes are one class and once a week. Less than the minimum teaching time recommended by ACARA – makes it difficult to</p>

	<p>achieve outcomes. Lack of readers are a challenge to any language program.</p> <p>Intercultural understanding is an issue all teachers need to wrestle with no matter what teaching pedagogy. Only with specific examples being given to myself and two other teachers did the clear intention of intercultural understanding become clear. Needs to be more work done with teachers around this capability too.</p>
Teacher C	<p>The rigour is insane. It is incredibly rigorous and student brains are exhausted in 5/10 minutes so have to have lots of brain breaks. ACARA being content based is a problem when using TCI/TPRS. It should be skills based and students assessed on levels of proficiency eg novice...AC is about content and assesses on content. Providing open ended opportunities for A and B students is also difficult – you want students to feel successful. It is all about the student. There is a very slow progression down to assessment using lots of activities that are about repetition. It is all about getting reps of the vocabulary. It can be hard if you have limited time.</p>
Teacher D	<p>Open ended tasks for students to get the As and Bs are difficult to provide. You have to provide them for those students, but assessment is mainly closed.</p> <p>It can be difficult trying to vary the post story activities as some are more effective than others.</p> <p>Hard to target Junior Primary resources as more are late primary or secondary based</p>
Teacher E	<p>TPRS can be difficult to do on an ongoing basis without it seeming repetitive and boring. The skill involved in making it more interesting can sometimes seem out of reach.</p> <p>In trying to make the stories interesting for the students often forget intercultural information and just talk about the things that come from the students' culture just to make the stories interesting to them.</p> <p>The biggest issue is how long they are doing TPRS for, this is a constant battle. They get sick of it and become very bored and unenthusiastic, doing it but half-heartedly, which means ultimately the effect is not having a positive result, if the subject is not engaging and exciting then the language will not be as memorable and will not be absorbed as well. am yet to cover many really complicated language structures as the language has had to remain very simple, I am always questioning whether we are progressing as far as we should be vs whether maybe the students need challenging more.</p>

Red – intercultural considerations

Green – language complexity, progression

Yellow – open ended tasks

Pink – time as an issue

Blue – Professional development, language proficiency of teacher

Research Question 2b

Teachers	Question 2b: How have they addressed the perceived shortcomings of TPRS, if any, in their Indonesian language classrooms?
Teacher A	<p>Including more language games that allow for all students to participate (also play, so can use as observation assessment)</p> <p>Focus on intercultural through exploration of similarities and differences for example the traditional Indonesian homes versus the early Australian homes</p> <p>Strong focus on making connections with writing eg structures and features the same full stops, capitals, conjunctions</p>
Teacher B	<p>By using videos that are from the country, using a variety of in country examples to students. Discuss the similarities differences between ourselves as inhabitants of Australia as well as those between people from different places</p> <p>Deep questioning to students. Regular open-ended questioning to students. It may be only a 5 min discussion. Topics could be uniforms, poverty, family etc.</p> <p>Creating quality student written readers – for use in future.</p>
Teacher C	<p>Because of the rigour, include regular ‘break breaks’ (from internet-examples links available on blog.)</p> <p>Providing free writes (open book) where students are encouraged to write own stories. It is really up to the students and when using a free write, part of the instruction is that they can write whatever you want. This could be random sentences or words that aren’t connected. That is fine. These free writes demonstrate what they can use.</p> <p>Picture talk is a great way to look at intercultural understanding – discuss the picture: Where do you think they are? Why do you think they are doing that? This is all in Indonesian.</p> <p>“pop ups” (‘short succinct explanation of why doing something then moving on’) are useful for discussing culture as well . Intercultural understanding is not just about the Indonesian language classroom – about all cultures. Recognising that while Indonesia may be different, there are people in our own community that are different to us as well. TCI is fantastic for local and global similarities and differences.</p>
Teacher D	<p>Use cultural images when pre teaching words – eg when teaching ‘sekolah’ we look at schools in Australia, Indonesia and around the world and talk about similarities and differences. Intercultural connections does rely on people’s personal experiences.</p> <p>Attending TCI conference in France in July</p> <p>Keeping it fun helps – things like giving students the job of sound effect for a word eg anjing, so for whole year, whenever anjing said, that student makes dog barking sound effect. We auditioned for parts.</p> <p>If you have students from different cultural backgrounds, you want them to feel valued. Perfect time for them to shine. Eg We have warung in the Phillipines but they are called...” It makes kids feel important and that they can be the expert.</p>

	<p>Use Picture talk – create a kind of story using the image - who is it? How old are they? Where do you think they are?</p> <p>Sometimes use ‘pop ups’ but sometimes is trying to include some sort of cultural component in the story eg sekolah/ warung what they look like/ fancy schools, rural schools/ Australian city and rural schools etc. It comes up naturally.</p> <p>I use Free writes from year 4 (teacher decision not TPRS mandate) and encourage students to think about using words correctly – to think of writing their story not as a Year 4 English student, but as a second language learner. So free writes or free tells allow students to extend themselves, and provide opportunity for As and Bs. Free writes are open book, so have support.</p>
Teacher E	<p>Keep practicing skills of asking, circling etc in order to be more skilful need to change activities in order to break up the time allocation, for example use whiteboards to write down a sentence and translate rather than directly asking.</p> <p>address the intercultural understanding by giving standalone lessons OR incorporating it into the stories where possible and giving little popup explanations where they fit. Eg use a story about a character who travels to Komodo island to find some durians with an orangutan</p> <p>Use pictures of Indonesian people and locations as often as possible when creating slideshows that support the meaning visually.</p>

Red – intercultural learning

Green – maintaining student motivation/engagement

Yellow – use of free writes as a learning task

Blue – teacher training/ professional development

Question 3

Teachers	Question 3 What do you wish to know more about TPRS? Any other comment?
Teacher A	<p>Concerns over local Area School dropping Indonesian as specialist language teacher moved</p> <p>Would like to do more language proficiency (Indonesian)</p> <p>Involving native speakers – maintaining relationships with Sister Schools</p>
Teacher B	<p>DfE Languages team should put out video of what Intercultural looks like in primary context</p> <p>Access to native speakers difficult</p>
Teacher C	<p>Language teachers need to be adequately trained and have in-country experiences to share intercultural</p> <p>Student prior learning not recognized at High school</p> <p>AC needs to use system that rates proficiency/fluency eg Interagency Language Roundtable Scale</p>

	AC too content driven – too much vocabulary and not enough time to achieve fluency
Teacher D	Miss match between AC aims and learner band content Need to address pathways for learners into High school
Teacher E	Professional Development

Appendix 11 A Synthesis of How the Perceived Shortcomings could be Addressed

Participating Teachers	How each of the perceived shortcomings could be addressed by each interviewed teacher?		
	In Response to Perceived Lacks of Student motivation	In Response to Perceived Lacks of Professional Development	In response to Perceived Inadequacy of Program administration
<i>Teacher A</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Changing activities - using more games and cultural focus activities Student 'jobs' and TL use points Use of IT eg blogs and online games Free writes for students 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Local hub group network meetings TCI conference VH 2019 Online reading Read Terry Waltz book 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Break up 90-minute block with cultural activities Ask and respond games to allow for more interaction Use of choice board to allow student choice in learning activities
<i>Teacher B</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Less writing Student 'jobs' and TL use points and reward Students take roll Use of open-ended questions 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Agen, France TPRS course Access online mentor Online TPRS community Local hub group network meetings Attended TCI local conference Read TPRS books 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No desks in classroom Use of authentic Indonesian Youtube due to lack of time on task Worked with leadership to gain a second Indonesian lesson for some classes
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Student jobs and reward points for use of TL 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Independent research 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Brain breaks

<p>Teacher C</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Dojo points • Students can provide gestures for vocabulary • Use of 'Picture talk' TPRS activity to discuss similarities and differences • Free writes for students to demonstrate higher ability 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Accessed TPRS mentor and met online regularly • Member of TPRS online communities • Co-organiser of TCI conferences • Local hub network group • Read TPRS books 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Use folktales as TPRS stories for intercultural • Provide follow up activities that allow maximum repetition of covered language in time allocated
<p>Teacher D</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Student jobs and rewards • Dojo points • Sound effect roles for students • Students asked to create gestures for vocabulary • Encourages sharing of local (other countries) knowledge eg warung type places in Thailand • Free writes for students to allow for A and B students 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Agen, France TPRS course • Co organised TCI conferences • Access online mentors(skype) • Member of TPRS online communities • Local hub group network meeting • Read TPRS books 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Brain breaks • Moderation of work samples - need for more annotated work samples • Use engaging games to allow for repeated exposure to language eg "chocolate" translation game
<p>Teacher E</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Changes activities to break up TPRS eg small whiteboards to write answers 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Reading • Member of TPRS online community • Attended TCI conference in VH 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Specifically programming for intercultural understanding through stories

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Use of pop ups to explain intercultural and grammar 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 2019 and purchased resources Read Terry Waltz book 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Some standalone cultural lessons
--	---	---	--

Appendix 12 Emerging Themes

Teachers	Student centred-ness and teacher role	Inquiry based learning	Authentic texts
Teacher A	Try to allow student voice through classroom roles Some students not doing much more than Ya / Tidak lot of teacher talk	Some inquiry based learning in questions for cultural eg what you think houses might have been made of? What would be similar material used here?	Adi menonton televisi has simple text but images are a bit dated (old television set) Can be stereotypical Native speaker visiting in term 4
Teacher B	Teacher directed Lots of questioning Classroom jobs		Youtube Folktales and Indonesian artwork
Teacher C	Very student centred, students focused Students valued and part of creating story Demanding on teacher because always providing input Student roles eg secretary Student created gesture for vocabulary Checking for comprehension via hand signals	Picture Talk – students asked questions about picture. Repetition of words through questions (usually closed due to CI focus)	Sister School in Indonesia difficult to maintain contact Use own images from Indonesia when presenting vocabulary
Teacher D	Stories are engaging because they are about characters kids know Students create gestures for words Student roles and sound effects	Closed questions because focus is on presentation of the limited vocabulary Repetition important	Use authentic pictures when presenting vocabulary Lack of resources for JP students Have had relationships with sister schools in Indonesia. Technology there limited
Teacher E	Humour helps Lot of teacher talk Change activities away from listening and responding	Older students become bored – want more details in the stories	Write own stories and tries to add culture via character and food eg orangutan