

A COMPARISON OF THE COMMUNICATIVE LANGUAGE TEACHING (CLT) AND TEACHING PROFICIENCY THROUGH READING AND STORYTELLING (TPRS) METHODS ON THE MOTIVATION OF THE EFL STUDENTS

¹SEFA ALSADAT ŞEKER, ²Eyyüp Yaşar kürüm

¹ SEFA ALSADAT ŞEKER, MA student, Istanbul Aydin University, Institute of Graduate Studies, English Language and Literature

²Eyyup Yasar KURUM, Asst. Prof. Istanbul Aydin University

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.7503399>

Published Date: 04-January-2023

Abstract: It has long been acknowledged that Teaching through Reading and Storytelling (TPRS) method is one of the most powerful and effective methods for language acquisition. The Communicative Language Teaching (CLT) method, which stresses the use of real materials and engaging activities, has also been used quite extensively with the claim that it is highly effective at promoting language proficiency. In this study, a comparison of TPRS and CLT methods are carried out to find out the likely effects of these methods on language learners' various motivational factors. The present study is quantitative research in which "Motivation and Language Learning with Students of English" survey is used to collect data. The motivational factor questionnaire was completed by 155 students. 78 of the participants studied English through TPRS and 77 of the participants studied English through CLT. The Google Docs forms were sent to participants' teachers and the teachers shared the documents in WhatsApp groups with their students. The first section of the questionnaire enquired about the participants' school, gender, and level grade. The second section covers questions about motivational elements including integration, instrumental, effort, valence, and expectancies. This study's findings will aid educators and language instructors in determining the most effective method for promoting motivation in EFL students and enhancing motivation for learning language and it proved That TPRS students are more motivated than CLT students across the board.

Keywords: EFL student, TPRS, CLT, motivational factors.

1. INTRODUCTION

Teachers of second languages (L2) are all well aware, based on their own experiences, that teaching students a second language in middle schools can be challenging. This problem has evolved over years as a result of changing teaching methods and increased expectations placed on students in order to advance the educational system. For the past decade, educators all over the world have been using a variety of approaches to teaching second language (L2) in order to determine which of these approaches are most effective at increasing students' motivation for learning. This study intends to investigate the Communicative Language Teaching (CLT) approach and the Teaching Proficiency through Reading and Storytelling

(TPRS) approach to see which has the greatest impact on EFL students' motivation to learn L2 at Manara International Schools and Alhuda International Schools in Istanbul. There have been many different methods of second language developed throughout the last century, one of these methods is The Grammar-Translation Method which was popular from the late 1890s till the 1930s (Gass & Selinker, 1994). It describes how language is acquired through reading comprehension, text comprehension, and vocabulary memory. In addition, it emphasizes the accuracy of linguistics and translation, and its primary objective is to enable learners to read the target language's literature through mental discipline and intellectual development (Djauhar, 2021). Also, Students were provided accessibility to dictionaries and explanations of Latin or Greek grammar rules, but there was limited chance for second-language learning with this approach.

The Cognitive code is another teaching method which introduced pupils for the first time to the four fundamental language skills: speaking, listening, writing, and reading. This method emphasis on comprehensible output, and learning the language was overemphasized too (Krashen, 1982b). Following this method, the Audio-Lingual Method, that was popular from the 1920s to the mid-1950s, concentrated on audio cassettes and oral exercises that imitated native speakers and helped the students improve their speaking abilities. The Audio-Lingual Method describes how students can master their L2 by listening, memorizing, and repeating expressions (drills), and vocabulary from a teacher-provided dialogue. Extensive memory, and repetition are the secret to the method's effectiveness, in order learners frequently saw rapid benefits (Alemi & Tavakoli, 2016). In Audio-Lingual Method, Teachers should make greater efforts to provide examples of phrases and sentences, so that learners may readily reproduce and remember them. However, the learners found it difficult to apply what they had learned in daily lives (Djauhar, 2021). Consequently, as a reaction to widely used Grammar-Translation Method of the 19th century, the Direct Method emerged as the most popular discussion topic at the turn of the twentieth century, for the use of L1 was strictly avoided (Krashen, 1995). As a result, pupils were required to acquire meaning in the target language through teachers' use of visual aids and gestures to explain vocabulary items and grammar structures. The Direct method is antithetical to the Grammar Translation Method. This method emphasizes both speaking and listening skills so that students may communicate directly in the target language. In classrooms where students are encouraged to be more involved, both teachers and learners become effective partners. In addition, the interesting activity in this method is the use of realia, images, and pantomime, which encourages learners to avoid translation. Both the Direct Method and the Audio-Lingual Method are oral-based methods, making them nearly identical (Djauhar, 2021). Between the years 1970 and 1980, the Natural Approach, which focused on acquisition-centered learning, was in use (Krahnke, 1985). This method put a lot of emphasis on what students produced in the target language and in fluency improvement. Subsequently, the Communicative Learning Teaching (CLT) method evolved; it primarily emphasized in language teaching on instructions. The major objective of the CLT in language instruction is to instruct and allows learners become fluent in their L2, focusing on the functional as well as structural features of language (Littlewood, William, & Swan, 1981). Another important teaching approach is the Total Physical Response (TPR), which was proposed by Asher in 1965 and aims to improve oral understanding at the basic level through physical exercises. However, it has been widely condemned because it is constrained by principles as well as certain grammatical structure and ignores reading skills (Oflaz, 2015). The TPR emphasizes the importance of developing comprehensible input to help pupils gain a wide comprehension of the language. Finally, the Teaching Proficiency through Reading and Storytelling (TPRS) was created in the early 1990s by Blaine Ray (Ray & Seely, 2008). It is the newest comprehension-based approach, following Total Physical Response (TPR) (Asher, 2000) as well as the Natural Approach (Krashen and Terrell, 1983). It is comparable to earlier approaches in that it emphasizes comprehensible input, moreover, it does not force pupils to speak at stages beyond their existing competency and does not engage in extensive teaching of grammar or error correction. TPRS surpasses prior approaches by focusing on tales, an appropriate method of fostering literacy and language skills (Trelease, 2006). All these methods contribute to the discipline of L2 learning but which method best supports student motivation?

Studying a second language is necessary, but each student has different motivations for doing so. Others may study an L2 in order to receive the extrinsic incentive of higher grades, while other students opt to learn a second language for the intrinsic gratification that occurs with learning a foreign language (Noels, Pelletier, Clément, & Vallerand, 2003). Students can have different language learning objectives. For example, one may desire a higher wage in the future and other to have the chance to travel overseas. Goals and motivations for language learning are fundamental themes in L2 studies (Gardner, 1985) Teachers of second language (L2) would profit greatly from discovering what motivates pupils to learn and what sorts of practices maintain that motivation. Moreover, motivation is a complex and wide-ranging topic, Teachers are less interested in learning what motivation means; rather, they really would like to know how to boost motivation in their L2 learners or precisely how to realistically execute these changes (Dörnyei, 2001). During the past several years, L2

teachers have supported the CLT method to language instruction. CLT is best characterized by its defining characteristics, which are "systematic attention to functionality in addition to structural components of the word" (Littlewood et al., 1981, p. 1). The CLT method was established in the late 1960s and "originated in the British language teaching traditions" (Jameel, 2011: 522). The second teaching Method that got attention lastly is the TPRS which is "an efficient foreign language method" (Spangler, 2009) that emphasizes storytelling, inventiveness, and spontaneous acquisition. Blaine Ray, a California-based Spanish teacher, created the TPRS method in 1990.

Both methods stress the necessity of intelligible L2 reading and listening components. Practitioners of TPRS have stated, "Teachers frequently undervalue the significance of attempting to make the lesson comprehensible" (Seely, 2004, p. 106). Lee & VanPatten had an observation according to the proponents of CLT that "for acquisition to occur the student must comprehend the majority of what the writer or speaker is saying" (1995: 26). The objective of these two teaching methodologies is language acquisition (LA), but the tactics and strategies employed in the classes are totally different. Researchers have discovered significant differences in the roles of teachers, students, classroom practices, and language output as a result of teachers' preference for one method over another (Spangler, 2009).

Statement of Research Problem.

Very few studies have been undertaken trying to compare the CLT and TPRS methods so far. Many studies have been conducted on the CLT teaching method (Cattell, 2009; Khatib & Tootkaboni, 2019; Li, 2011; Nhem, 2019) whereas the TPRS method is still relatively new and requires additional research. Several researchers have compared the TPRS method to other methods such as Bagheri, Hadian, and Vaez-Dalili (2019), Perna (2007), Watson (2009), Garczynski (2003), Dziejczak (2012) and Oliver (2012). All of these studies demonstrated that TPRS surpassed or exceeded the performance of another teaching method in a number of different variables. Other scholars have also studied the TPRS method including Rapstine (2003), Foster (2011), Varguez (2009), Dziejczak (2012) and Oliver (2012). However, many of these researchers did not provide a thorough study because they simply offered practitioner's-specific experiences rather than complete empirical data to compare TPRS and other L2 Teaching methods. Additionally, practitioners really need to know which approach improves student's motivation the most to employ it in teaching L2. Further, motivation is crucial to L2 learning because studies have shown that it can affect teaching and learning outcomes (Gardner & Lambert, 1972; Wigfield & Wentzel, 2007). In the light of the fact mentioned above, the goal of this study is to find out the likely differences in terms of the motivational factors of the students learning English through the CLT and the TPRS.

Aims and Questions of the Study

This study aims to compare the effects of the CLT and the TPRS on L2 motivation in middle-school EFL students at international schools in Istanbul. Identifying out which one of these two instructional methods has the greatest beneficial effect on students' motivation would be helpful for L2 teachers since they will have a more thorough knowledge on the impacts of these two instructional methods upon those variables. The TPRS and CLT methods are often defined as following; TPRS is a method that teaches language holistically without emphasizing grammar structure. Seely (2004) claimed that Language is taught by comprehending information in the targeted linguistic with comprehensible input but little language output. CLT on the other hand is a method utilizing real-life scenarios requiring interpersonal contact with this method, the teacher creates a hypothetical circumstance that the students could face in real world, and they discuss about it (Galloway, 1993). Finally, this study will deal with the following research questions.

1. What types of motivation do EFL students studying at an international school in general have?
2. In comparison with the TPRS (Teaching Proficiency through Reading and Storytelling) and CLT (Communicative Language Teaching) methods in which students learn English through, what differences are there between the types of the motivation that the English Language students have?
3. Does gender affect L2 students' motivation towards TPRS and CLT?
4. Does the students' grade have an impact on their motivation towards TPRS and CLT?

Significance of the Study

This research has significance for a wide range of second language (L2) practitioners. Firstly, L2 academics and teachers study language theories and approaches with enthusiasm, but they remain lost by the lack of agreement among experts in the field (Spada, 2006). Additionally, second language approaches must be converted into classroom activities

and exercises. With the goal of assisting practitioners in making informed pedagogical decisions, this study aims to contribute to the body of literature through practically evaluating the TPRS and the CLT methods with theoretical underpinnings that are quite comparable. Secondly, if there is disagreement amongst L2 experts, there might even less agreement amongst motivational theorists (Crookes & Schmidt, 1991; Gardner & Tremblay, 1994; Keller, 1983; Kleinginna & Kleinginna, 1981). According to (Maehr & Meyer, 1997) there is more left on the list throughout the research and comprehension of motivation and they recommended using the LLOS-IEA Motivation Scale, a relatively recent tool that has significant subcategories of motivation, to assess L2 motivation. The current study will enable practitioners examine empirical findings on both instructional methods and determine the differences between the types of the motivation that the English Language students have. Finally, students are the direct beneficiaries of this study as they are the main actors of interest. Teachers want to see their students become fluent in their chosen L2, as well as remain motivated during the learning process. This study will provide empirical data to enable practitioners to choose the teaching approach that is revealed to enhance students' motivation and proficiency the most. This research will also enable school administrators and state curriculum writers to make sound decisions for their schools, teachers, and students.

2. METHODOLOGY

Setting and Participants

The researcher chose two international schools, one of which used the TPRS method and the other the CLT method. After gaining permission from the Institutional Ethics Committee, the author approached the two schools' administrators to undertake the study.

The TPRS school in Istanbul, Turkey, taught 600 children from kindergarten to grade 12. Arab students from many nations are enrolled. Students were 44% male and 56% female. 15% of schoolchildren qualified for special education.

The Istanbul, Turkey school using CLT served nearly 2,500 students in grades K-12. 51.46% of students were male and 58.546% were female. The researcher questioned the department chairs of two institutions to ensure teachers used each instructional technique as intended. They discussed each approach's key points. This helped the researcher choose two L2 schools. This researcher used convenience sampling to acquire data from L2 pupils. Several researchers found that this sampling method was appropriate for the study's goals (Gall et al., 2007). Middle school EFL students (N=154), 74 female and 80 male, participated. 77 EFL students registered using CLT and TPRS. 52 5th graders, 51 6th graders, and 51 7th graders submitted forms. This study analyzed data from only one foreign language — English — to exclude several influences, as certain languages are harder to learn than others depending on the learner's English skills. This researcher couldn't discover two further scenarios where CLT and TPRS were used with non-English.

Data Collection Instruments

As I've previously described, a survey is used to collect statistics for the ongoing study, and its design includes questionnaire. The researcher based the questionnaire on Wen (1997) motivation scale as well as modified it according to the extent of the study's objectives. The questionnaire begins with a form for general (demographic) information about the participants in the international schools in Istanbul (see APPENDIX 1), which is an adapted version of Wen (1997) motivation scale. The second section of the questionnaire consists of 19 questions to collect information on the participants' degree of motivation. In this section, 17 Like-chart scale 4-point items ranging from 4 (strongly agree) to 1 (strongly disagree) are used to develop 17 items (definitely disagree). 18-19 questions are open-ended questions requiring respondents to type their responses and provide a conclusion.

Procedure

Two international schools where participants took English classes in 2022 were used to collect data. Google forms collected online data. The motivational factors survey for EFL students in foreign schools in Istanbul, Turkey, was used to collect data for the current project. The study's questionnaire required a literature review. Before administering the questionnaire, the two schools' department chairs asked approval. The survey was piloted with two participants. Two instructors from the two schools gave the amended questionnaire within two weeks of the pilot poll. Participants had 30 minutes to finish the survey. Before administering the survey, teachers from both schools explained its purpose, content, and structure. Participants were told their survey answers would be used only for research and kept private. Participants answered questions about their age, gender, number of study hours per week, number of English classes per week, and parents' English competence. In the second round of data collection, participants answered questions using Wen's (1997) Motivation Scale.

3. FINDINGS

Demographic Variables

The effects of motivation on the English learning process in connection to past learning experiences are specifically sought. The findings will just be given in the following sections. Table 1 initially displayed the socio-demographic features of the participants. including, the Gender, the Grade, and the teaching method TPRS\CLT as shown in the table below.

TABLE 1: Sociodemographic Variables

Demographic Variable	N	%
Gender		
Male	81	52%
Female	74	48%
Grade		
5th Grade	52	34%
6th Grade	51	33%
7th Grade	51	33%
School		
Alhuda International schools	78	50%
Manara International schools	77	50%

Table 2: Descriptive Statistics for Levels of Motivation Determinants for all participants

	Mean	SD
Instrumental Motivation (5 item)	3.77	1.02
Integration Motivation (5 item)	3.74	1.05
Valence (6 items)	2.92	0.84
Effort (6 item)	2.88	0.81
Expectance (6 items)	2.87	0.86
Ability (6 items)	2.87	0.84

This section compares motivation determinants by demographic moderation variables. Table 2 illustrates gender-based disparities in motivation drivers. Male subjects rated instrumental motivation as more significant than integrative motivation, despite their nearly identical standard deviations (less than 0.03 points). Instrumental motivation was 0.03 points higher than integration motivation. Regarding the remaining four categories of effort, valence, expectancy, and ability, the standard deviation values were identical, with a mean of 0.83 point. According to the mean values, they were ordered in order of significance: valence (2.88), Effort (2.87), Expectation (2.84), and ability (2.81). Female subjects rated instrumental motivation as more essential than integrative motivation, despite their nearly identical standard deviations (less than 0.01 points). Instrumental motivation was 0.03 points higher than integration motivation. Regarding the remaining four aspects of effort, valence, expectancy, and ability, the standard deviation values were identical, with a mean of 0.85 point. According to the mean values, they were rated in order of significance: valence (2.96), Ability (2.94), expectance (2.90), and Effort (2.88). As male and female participants' perceptions of motivation components are comparable, both consider instrumental motivation more important than integration motivation. Regarding the remainder of the variables, males rated effort as the most important, while females rated Valence as the most important.

Table 3: Descriptive Statistics for Levels of Motivation Determinants with gender comparison

Subscales	Male (N=81)		Female (N=74)	
	Mean	SD	Mean	SD
Integration Motivation (5 item)	3.76	1.03	3.73	1.06
Instrumental Motivation (5 item)	3.79	1.04	3.76	1.00
Effort (6 item)	2.87	0.82	2.88	0.81
Valence (6 items)	2.88	0.85	2.96	0.82
Expectance (6 items)	2.84	0.87	2.90	0.85
Ability (6 items)	2.81	0.83	2.94	0.85

Table 3 indicates that mean values vary by responder gender. In Integration motivation, the male mean value was higher than the female mean value, 3.76 and 3.73, but the Standard deviation values are near, thus the rating would be based on the mean values

Table 4: Descriptive Statistics for Levels of Motivation Determinants according to grade comparison

Subscales	Grade 5 (N=52)		Grade 6 (N=51)		Grade 7 (N=51)	
	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD
Integration Motivation (5 item)	3.82	1.00	3.67	1.09	3.75	1.04
Instrumental Motivation (5 item)	3.75	1.06	3.76	0.97	3.81	1.03
Effort (6 item)	2.83	0.81	2.87	0.81	2.93	0.81
Valence (6 items)	2.89	0.81	2.89	0.85	2.97	0.83
Expectance (6 items)	2.84	0.85	2.86	0.85	2.91	0.88
Ability (6 items)	2.84	0.82	2.86	0.88	2.92	0.83

Table 4 illustrates that mean values vary among grades and determinants. In Integration motivation, the 5th grade had the highest mean value (3.82), while the 6th grade had the lowest (3.67).

Table 5: Descriptive Statistics for Levels of Motivation Determinants with TPRS and CLT comparison

Subscales	TPRS (N=77)		CLT (N=77)	
	Mean	SD	Mean	SD
Integration Motivation (5 item)	4.33	0.89	3.16	0.84
Instrumental Motivation (5 item)	4.31	0.94	3.23	0.79
Effort (6 item)	3.31	0.72	2.44	0.62
Valence (6 items)	3.40	0.72	2.44	0.65
Expectance (6 items)	3.36	0.77	2.38	0.63
Ability (6 items)	3.32	0.78	2.43	0.64

Table 5: illustrates the changes in motivation factors based on the English learning strategy each participant uses, TPRS or not. Participants using TPRS to learn English rated integration motivation as more significant than instrumental motivation, despite the fact that their standard deviations are nearly 0.92 and 0.02 points, respectively. Instrumental motivation was 0.02 points higher than integration motivation. Regarding the other four components, effort, valence, expectancy, and ability, the standard deviation values were identical, with a mean of 0.85 point. Valence had the highest mean value (3.40), followed by Expectation (3.36), Ability (3.32), and Effort (3.31). Participants who are not using TPRS to learn English rated instrumental motivation as more essential than integration motivation, even though their standard deviations are almost 0.82 and 0.03, respectively. Instrumental motivation was 0.07 points higher than integration motivation. Regarding the remaining four aspects of effort, valence, expectancy, and ability, the standard deviation values were identical, with a mean of 0.85 point. According to mean values, they were ranked by significance: Effort and valence both scored 2.44, ability scored 2.43, and expectancy scored 2.38.

4. DISCUSSION

Discussion of Findings

RQ 1: What types of motivation do EFL students studying at an international school in general?

Intrinsic motivation is a form of drive that originates from within a person and is motivated by a desire to study for one's own delight or fulfillment. Extrinsic motivation is a desire for rewards or to avoid punishment. Instrumental motivation is using a language (L2) for work or school. Integration motivation is the desire to be part of the L2-speaking group. The study also demonstrated that L2 learners may exhibit many motivational kinds at different grade levels or in different circumstances, and that these motivations may interact and impact one another. A learner's chosen motivational tactics depend on goals, expectations, attitudes, and prior experiences. Based on the first question, several research have explored EFL students' motivation types, such as Kashefian-Naeeni, Aminlari, and Mousavi (2018), where Iranian-speaking EFL students displayed significant levels of instrumental and intrinsic motivation but only moderate levels of integrative motivation. Kang (2000) found high levels of integrative and intrinsic motivation, but low levels of

RQ 2: In the comparison with the TPRS (Teaching Proficiency through Reading and Storytelling) and CLT (Communicative Language Teaching methods in which students learn English through, what differences are there between the types of the motivation that the English Language students have?

This section compares EFL students' motivation in TPRS and CLT based on the second study question. Participants using TPRS to learn English regarded integrative motivation as more important than instrumental motivation, despite their large standard deviations. Instrumental motivation topped integration motivation by 0.02 points. The standard deviations for effort, valence, expectation, and ability were all 0.85. Valence had the highest mean value (3.40), followed by Expectation, Ability, and Effort (3.31). CLT participants assessed instrumental motivation as more important than integrative motivation, despite their large standard deviations. Instrumental motivation topped integration motivation by 0.07 points. The standard deviations for effort, valence, expectation, and ability were all 0.85. According to mean values, they were ranked in order of significance: effort and valence (2.44), ability (2.43), and expectation (2.38). Integration motivation (wanting to be a part of a community or culture that speaks the language) is more important than instrumental incentive (the desire to learn the language for practical purposes, such as academic or career advancement). This may be because TPRS emphasizes the cultural and social aspects of language learning, allowing students to feel m (Hong & Ganapathy, 2017).

RQ 3: Does gender affect L2 students' motivation towards TPRS and CLT?

Data shows gender influences motivation. Based on their shared beliefs, male and female participants both favor instrumental motivation over integration motivation. Males rated effort as the most significant characteristic and skill as the least important. Valence was the most important factor for women, while effort was the least. Gender affects L2 learners' motivation. Males are more likely to be motivated by instrumental factors (such as the desire to improve their career prospects or academic performance) than females are. Females are driven by integrative elements (such as the desire to connect with a particular community or culture). According to past research, males and females may be motivated by instrumental and integrative factors. This study is consistent with a large body of research on gender and language learning, which has generated a variety of conclusions on how gender may influence the process of learning a second language, such as Yeung, Lau, and Nie (2011) "Primary and secondary students' motivation in learning English: Grade and gender differences": This paper reviews research on gender and motivation in L2 learning and shows how gender affects language learners' goals, tactics, and motivation. Watt (2016)'s "Gender and Motivation" addresses the impact of gender in language acquisition and factors that influence male and female learning styles.

RQ 4: Does the students' grade have an impact on their motivation towards TPRS and CLT?

The student's grade level (e.g., 5th, 6th, or 7th) may alter their motivation for TPRS and CLT, resulting in different mean values and determinants. Fifth grade had the greatest mean score for Integration motivation (3.82), while sixth grade had the lowest (3.67). 5th students rated integrative motivation higher than instrumental motivation despite similar standard deviations (less than 0.03 points). Instrumental motivation topped integration motivation by 0.07 points. The standard deviation for effort, valence, expectation, and ability was 0.82 points. Valence (2.89), Expectation (2.84), and effort (2.83). 6th graders evaluated instrumental motivation higher than integration motivation despite similar standard deviations (less than 0.06 points). Instrumental was 0.09 points greater than integration. The standard deviations for effort, valence, expectation, and ability were all 0.85. First: valence with (2.89), second: effort with (2.87), and least: expectation and ability with (2.86 point). Despite similar standard deviations, 7th graders ranked instrumental motivation higher than integration motivation (less than 0.01 points). Instrumental was 0.06 points greater than integration. The standard deviations for effort, valence, expectation, and ability were all 0.83. Valence (2.97), effort (2.93), ability (2.92), and expectancy (2.92) had the highest mean values (2.91). Motivation is a complex and subtle term, and many factors might influence a student's motivation for TPRS and CLT. These aspects may include the student's own interests and objectives, the amount of difficulty and support in the classroom, and the student's overall attitude toward learning.

5. CONCLUSION

Pedagogical Implications

In general, based on the findings of the present study discussed above that younger students (e.g., those in 5th or 6th grade) are more driven by hands-on, interactive, and engaging activities, whereas older students (7th grade and beyond) are more motivated by independent and tough work. Each student is unique and driven by different things. Teachers must consider students' needs and interests when creating TPRS and CLT activities.

REFERENCES

- [1] Asher, J. (2000). *Learning Another Language Through Actions..* California: Sky Oaks Productions. *Inc. Los Gatos.*
- [2] Bagheri, M., Hadian, B., & Vaez-Dalili, M. (2019). Effects of the Vaughan Method in Comparison with the Audiolingual Method and the Communicative Language Teaching on Iranian Advanced EFL Learners' Speaking Skill. *International Journal of Instruction, 12*(2), 81-98.
- [3] Cattell, A. G. (2009). *Re-evaluating communicative language teaching: Wittgenstein and postmethod pedagogy.* University of Waterloo,
- [4] Crookes, G., & Schmidt, R. W. (1991). Motivation: Reopening the research agenda. *Language learning, 41*(4), 469-512.
- [5] Djauhar, R. (2021). The Grammar Translation Method, The Direct Method, and The Audio-Lingual Method. *Langua: Journal of Linguistics, Literature, and Language Education, 4*(1), 84-88.
- [6] Dörnyei, Z. (2001). New themes and approaches in second language motivation research. *Annual review of applied linguistics, 21*, 43-59.
- [7] Dziedzic, J. (2012). A comparison of TPRS and traditional instruction, both with SSR. *International Journal of Foreign Language Teaching, 7*(2), 4-6.
- [8] Foster, S. J. (2011). *Processing instruction and teaching proficiency through reading and storytelling: A study of input in the second language classroom:* University of North Texas.
- [9] Galloway, A. (1993). *Communicative Language Teaching: An Introduction and Sample Activities.* ERIC Digest.
- [10] Garczynski, M. (2003). *Teaching proficiency through reading and storytelling: Are TPRS students more fluent in second language acquisition than audio lingual students? :* Chapman University.
- [11] Gardner, R. C. (1985). *Social psychology and second language learning: The role of attitudes and motivation:* Arnold.
- [12] Gardner, R. C., & Lambert, W. E. (1972). Attitudes and motivation in second-language learning.
- [13] Gardner, R. C., & Tremblay, P. F. (1994). On motivation: Measurement and conceptual considerations 1. *The Modern Language Journal, 78*(4), 524-527.
- [14] Gass, S., & Selinker, L. (1994). *Second language Acquisition: An introductory course* New Jersey. *London: Lawrence Erlbaum.*
- [15] Jameel, A. (2011). Communicative Language Teaching; An Approach Rather than a Method. *Language in India, 11*(12).
- [16] Keller, J. M. (1983). Motivational design of instruction. *Instructional design theories and models: An overview of their current status, 1*(1983), 383-434.
- [17] Khatib, M., & Tootkaboni, A. A. (2019). Attitudes toward communicative language teaching: The case of efl learners and teachers. *Íkala, Revista de Lenguaje y Cultura, 24*(3).
- [18] Kleinginna, P. R., & Kleinginna, A. M. (1981). A categorized list of emotion definitions, with suggestions for a consensual definition. *Motivation and emotion, 5*(4), 345-379.
- [19] Krahnke, K. J. (1985). The natural approach: Language acquisition in the classroom. In: JSTOR.
- [20] Krashen, S. (1982). *Principles and practice in second language acquisition.*
- [21] Krashen, S. D., & Terrell, T. (1983). *Natural approach:* Pergamon New York.
- [22] Lee, J. F., & VanPatten, B. (1995). *Making Communicative Language Teaching Happen. Volume 1: Directions for Language Learning and Teaching:* ERIC.
- [23] Li, X. (2011). *Communicative language teaching in current chinese colleges and universities.* East Tennessee State University,

- [24] Littlewood, W., William, L., & Swan, M. (1981). *Communicative language teaching: An introduction*: Cambridge university press.
- [25] Maehr, M. L., & Meyer, H. A. (1997). Understanding motivation and schooling: Where we've been, where we are, and where we need to go. *Educational psychology review*, 9(4), 371-409.
- [26] Nhem, D. (2019). Language learning strategies: A Comparative study of young and adolescent Cambodian learners. *International Journal of Language and Literary Studies*, 1(2).
- [27] Noels, K. A., Pelletier, L. G., Clément, R., & Vallerand, R. J. (2003). Why are you learning a second language? Motivational orientations and self-determination theory. *Language learning*, 53(S1), 33-64.
- [28] Oflaz, A. (2015). German vocabulary teaching in traditional and alternative foreign language teaching methods. *Turkish Studies-International Periodical for the Languages, Literature and History of Turkish or Turkic*, 10(3), 695-712.
- [29] Oliver, J. (2012). Investigating storytelling methods in a beginning-level college class. *The Language Educator*, 7(2), 54-56.
- [30] Perna, M. (2007). *Effects of Total Physical Response Storytelling versus traditional, versus initial instruction with primary-, reinforced by secondary-perceptual strengths on the vocabulary-and grammar-Italian-language achievement test scores, and the attitudes of ninth and tenth graders*: St. John's University (New York).
- [31] Rapstine, A. H. (2003). *Total Physical Response Storytelling (TPRS): A practical and theoretical overview and evaluation within the framework of the national standards*: Michigan State University.
- [32] Ray, B., & Seely, C. (2008). An interactive storytelling puzzle: Building a positive environment in a second language classroom. *Networks. An Online Journal for Teacher Research*, 12(1), 1-10.
- [33] Seely, C. (2004). *Fluency Through TPR Storytelling: Achieving Real Language Acquisition in School*.
- [34] Spada, N. (2006). How language are learned.
- [35] Spangler, D. E. (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*: ERIC.
- [36] Trelease, J. (2006). *The read-aloud handbook sixth edition (Read-Aloud Handbook)*. In: New York: Penguin (Non-Classics).
- [37] Varguez, K. (2009). Traditional and TPR storytelling instruction in the beginning high school classroom. *International Journal of Foreign Language Teaching*, 5(1), 2-11.
- [38] 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), 21-24.
- [39] Wen, X. (1997). Motivation and language learning with students of Chinese 1. *Foreign language annals*, 30(2), 235-251.
- [40] Wigfield, A., & Wentzel, K. R. (2007). Introduction to motivation at school: Interventions that work. *Educational Psychologist*, 42(4), 191-196.