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CHAPTER I
INTRODUCTION

This research study used using quantitative and qualitative means to document students’ English proficiency in speaking and listening through developmentally appropriate practices (DAP) in teaching kindergarten students. This chapter explains the background of the study, statement of the problem, research questions, research objectives, research hypotheses, theoretical framework, conceptual framework, scope of the study, limitations of the study, definition of terms, and the importance of the study. The following section explains the background of the study.

Background of the Study

Teaching young children can be a rigorous routine that requires creativity, discipline, and understanding on the part of the teacher. At the same time it is also a rewarding experience to anyone who has been positively impacted by teaching young children (Millburn, 2016). The young children are excited to learn new things. The world is fresh and new for them and any learning experience can be a joy to the young child, but to teach a child a different language from their mother tongue in a foreign land can be a tedious task for a teacher (Perry, 2001). In this study, the young students’ were from Japan, while the kindergarten they attended taught them to speak, read, and write in English.

The school for this study was Kirakira Kids International Kindergarten located in Sukumvit 61. Only Japanese students attended the school, all did not speak English at home. Furthermore, their families resided in Bangkok, Thailand where English is not the mother tongue.

The school has five levels of early childhood education, ranging from Pre-Nursery (called Tamago class), Nursery (called Hiyoko class), Kindergarten one
(called Ahiru), Kindergarten two (called Koala), and Kindergarten three (called Panda). The focus of this research is on kindergarten three. For the purpose of this research study, kindergarten three was mentioned as K3.

In the school of this research, the Supertots 3 (Krause & Nagashima, 2002) is used in K3. The Supertots 3 curriculum uses various activities to excite interests in young students ranging from songs, chants, games, and total physical response (TPR) activities. All of the activities designed in the curriculum fall under the guidelines of Developmentally Appropriate Practices (DAP), which means that the activities address the students' developmental needs and advances at their stage (Copple & Bredekamp, 2006). Suprtots 3 was used in this study as the teaching tool for the researcher.

The activities and lessons detailed in the Supertots 3 Teacher Guide (Krause & Nagashima, 2002) was used in the instruction of the K3 class. In the curriculum the students have an Activity Book and a Student Book. Other teaching materials include flashcards, a teacher's guide, and a CD containing songs, chants, and dialogues.

As activities in Supertots 3 follow DAP guidelines, the teachers of the school teach the students using DAP. All classes in Kirakira Kids International Kindergarten teach the previous curriculums of Supertots 3 (Supertots 1 and 2) following DAP guidelines. By the time the students reach K3, almost have of the students have a basic understanding of dialogues and vocabulary words used in everyday English conversation.

**Statement of the Problem**

The problem of this research was that all of the students in K3 do not speak English other than when they are taught or told, and there had been no definite way of determining the students' progress in listening and speaking to make sure there were
really understanding what was said to them or if they could really speak in English. The following sections discuss the research questions, objectives, and hypotheses that will help the researcher investigate and address the issue further.

Research Questions
There were four research questions the researcher used to address the problem. They are namely:

1. What are the students’ demographic data (age, amount of years spent in the school previously, and background in English) at Kirakira Kids International Kindergarten?
2. What is the progressive scores of the students’ English listening proficiency at Kirakira Kids International Kindergarten?
3. What is the progressive scores of the students’ English speaking proficiency at Kirakira Kids International Kindergarten?
4. What is the difference between the students’ proficiency in English listening and speaking at Kirakira Kids International Kindergarten.

Research Objectives
From the research questions, four research objectives are formed and become the focus of this study. The four research questions are presented below.

1. To identify the students’ demographic data (age, amount of years spent in the school previously, and background in English) at Kirakira Kids International Kindergarten.
2. To determine the progressive scores of the students’ English listening proficiency at Kirakira Kids International Kindergarten.
3. To determine the progressive scores of the students’ English speaking proficiency at Kirakira Kids International Kindergarten.

4. To compare the difference between the students’ proficiency in English listening and speaking at Kirakira Kids International Kindergarten.

**Research Hypothesis**

There will be a significant difference between the English listening proficiency and the English speaking proficiency in the student’s progressive reports.

**Theoretical Framework**

The two theories of the theoretical framework for this research study are Piaget’s Stages of Cognitive Development Theory (Santrock, 2009) and Krashen’s Theory of Second Language Acquisition (Krashen, 2009). Piaget’s Stages of Cognitive Development Theory formed the theoretical framework of this research study because nature of this study included the education of young children. Also, the study was about teaching the young students a foreign language to them, English. In that regard Krashen’s Theory of Second Language Acquisition hypotheses formed the theoretic basis of this study. They are summarized in the sections below.

**Piaget’s Stages of Cognitive Development Theory**

Piaget’s Stages of Development theory is widely referred to among many others in early childhood education (Genishi & Dyson, 2009; Sylva & Lunt, 1994). It is also used a basis for this study. Piaget’s research led him to believe that children develop intellectually, physically, socially, and emotionally in natural progressive stages he called the Stages of Development (Santrock, 2009). The stages are:
sensorimotor, pre-operational, concrete-operational, and formal operational (Huitt & Hummel, 2003).

Piaget's theory also had an important role in the DAP guidelines which the school followed and which the researcher followed for this research. One of the major guidelines of DAP was to teach the student at a level of understanding that was appropriate to their developmental level (Copple & Bredekamp, 2006). However, some have also criticized Piaget's work for not showing the full picture of how a child's mind actually develops. More about Piaget's theory was discussed in Chapter 2, the literature review.

Krashen's Theory of Second Language Acquisition

Krashen's Theory of Second Language Acquisition was also important in this research study. Krashen's theory had six hypotheses that were discussed in Chapter 2, but the main idea of his theory was that learners of a second language acquire the language naturally much like the way they acquire their first language. The six hypotheses were the acquisition-learning, monitor, input, natural order, affective filter, and reading. His theory was that teaching to communicate significant messages in a second language built on what students already know. According to the theory, students should be in an environment where they feel motivated with less anxiety to be able to acquire the language better. (Krashen, 2009)

Although Krashen's theory mainly focused on adult learners, the researcher could relate his theory DAP guidelines of teaching in kindergarten. Creating a caring environment, challenging the students based on previous knowledge, and encouragement are similar DAP guidelines presented in this study. Krashen's theory will be discussed further in chapter 2.
As DAP in teaching English is the basis of this study, the two theories showed the researcher the framework of using best practice for teaching English listening and speaking proficiency to young students. Developmentally appropriate practices draw from many different theories about how young children learn and develop (in physical, social, emotional, and cognitive areas). Piaget's theories on a child's cognitive development proved helpful in understanding how the young students at Kirakira Kids would understand the lesson activities and content. Furthermore, Krashen's theory's hypotheses were helpful in providing a guideline on how the researcher would teach the lesson.

The research instrument for this study was also related to these theories. The progress report details the items of the English listening and speaking proficiency for ages five to six as detailed in Appendix A. These items were based on best practice the researcher used with the knowledge of the student development and capabilities, both individually and as a whole. The following section describes and explains the conceptual framework for this study.

**Conceptual Framework**

The conceptual framework is presented in the diagram in Figure 1. The first box shows the population of the research study that was split into two groups. For this study, the researcher obtained the demographic data needed from the school records. This box shows that it was done for the two groups. The middle box is labeled *Developmentally Appropriate Practices*. This represents the lessons taught from Supertots 3 that involved DAP from April 27 to May 31, 2015; June 2015; and July 2015. It also represents the developmentally appropriate method of observing the students during these periods. The researcher took observational notes of the students with his team-teacher during these periods. The last two boxes are labeled *English*
Listening Proficiency and English Speaking Proficiency represents the progressive scores from the progress reports that were based on the observational notes taken by the researcher. The observational notes were taken by the researcher and team-teacher who followed the DAP guidelines in observing the students. The observational scores were discussed between the researcher and team-teacher to control the bias in the research.

Group A
Demographic Data

Developmentally Appropriate Practices

Group B
Demographic Data

English Listening Proficiency

English Speaking Proficiency

Figure 1. The conceptual framework of the research study. This figure shows the process of the research study.

Scope of the Study

This study was conducted in the Kirakira Kids International Kindergarten with the K3 class. There were 40 students whose progressive scores were used in the research study. The research was also conducted within the confines of the K3 English classroom.

The theoretical scope of the study was Piaget's stages of cognitive development and Krashen's theory of second language acquisition. As this research study used DAP, both theories mentioned previously relate to DAP. The researcher used DAP to teach English to young students.

Furthermore, the study was conducted by what was taught from the Supertots 3 curriculum written by Krause and Nagashima (2002). The focus of this
research was the development of the students’ English listening proficiency and speaking proficiency. Only the Supertots 3 lesson activities, which are DAP, was taught to the K3 class for the research of this study.

Limitations of the Study

As the research was conducted there were some limitations that the researcher faced. The limitations were as follows:

The first limitation the researcher faced was the students’ schedule. There were some days when the students that were scheduled for observation were absent. The researcher addressed this by shifting the student to another date or by adding them to the observation with other students on their scheduled day. The second limitation to the study was the students’ mood and behaviors. On some of the days, the student being observed might have fallen sick or were in a bad mood. This had an effect on the students’ learning hence it also had an effect on their observation. The third limitation that the researcher faced was the team-teacher. The team-teacher did not always observed the same details as the researcher although she understood what was to be observed according to the progress report. There were times when the researcher and the team-teacher disagreed about the observation of the students. In these times, the researcher and team-teacher read the observational notes and tried to recall the incidents that proved the students’ high mark or low mark. When both the researcher and team-teacher agreed upon the observation and recollection, they were able to mark the students’ progress report.

Definitions of Terms

For clarity of the research, terms from the study’s title as well as other important terms will be defined in the following section. The terms are defined
explain the details of what the terms “developmentally appropriate practice”, “progress report”, “English listening proficiency”, “English speaking proficiency”, and “students” mean according to this research study.

**Developmentally Appropriate Practice (DAP)**

Developmentally Appropriate Practice (DAP) is a term describing the best approach by an early childhood teacher to teach their class. The term was first penned in a statement written by Copple and Bredekamp (2006) for the National Association for the Education of Young Children (NAEYC). Best practice means that with the knowledge of the students development in all areas (cognitive, emotional, physical, and social) and the knowledge of the development of the student’s individually, the teacher would choose pedagogy that best suites the class for further development. Since there is no one-way to do this given the teachers knowledge, the NAEYC has published guidelines as to how to use DAP (Copple & Bredekamp, 2006).

An example of DAP lesson activities from Supertots 3 was the use of action songs. Another example of DAP lesson activities was the use of role-play activities as the young students were able to pretend to be other characters. Furthermore, the Supertots 3 lesson activities follow the DAP guidelines, which were explained further in Chapter 2.

**Kirakira Kids International Kindergarten**

Kirakira Kids International Kindergarten is the said school in which this research was conducted. It is a Japanese-English bilingual school that was founded in 2009. Since then the school has amassed approximately 180 students with classes
explain the details of what the terms “developmentally appropriate practice”, “progress report”, “English listening proficiency”, “English speaking proficiency”, and “students” mean according to this research study.

**Developmentally Appropriate Practice (DAP)**

Developmentally Appropriate Practice (DAP) is a term describing the best approach by an early childhood teacher to teach their class. The term was first penned in a statement written by Copple and Bredekamp (2006) for the National Association for the Education of Young Children (NAEYC). Best practice means that with the knowledge of the students development in all areas (cognitive, emotional, physical, and social) and the knowledge of the development of the student’s individually, the teacher would choose pedagogy that best suites the class for further development. Since there is no one-way to do this given the teachers knowledge, the NAEYC has published guidelines as to how to use DAP (Copple & Bredekamp, 2006).

An example of DAP lesson activities from Supertots 3 was the use of action songs. Another example of DAP lesson activities was the use of role-play activities as the young students were able to pretend to be other characters. Furthermore, the Supertots 3 lesson activities follow the DAP guidelines, which were explained further in Chapter 2.

**Kirakira Kids International Kindergarten**

Kirakira Kids International Kindergarten is the said school in which this research was conducted. It is a Japanese-English bilingual school that was founded in 2009. Since then the school has amass approximately 180 students with classes
ranging from playgroups to K3. All of the research conducted for this study was based on the K3 class of this school.

**Progress Scores**

Each term the teachers from the school issue a progress report for each student. The school principals and administrators created the progress report for each class. The progress report contains five sections: listening, speaking, reading, writing, and behavior. In each of these sections there are items specifying what proficiencies the student must be able to perform. For example, under the section listening item 1.4 states that the students follow simple oral directions (see Appendix A).

Appendix A presented the progress report that was used for each student. There were two sections in the progress report with ten items. For each of these items the student got a mark: N, S, M, and R. These marks were then converted to scores for data analysis. The marks on the progress reports were used in this research study as progressive scores. The two sections used for this study were listening section and speaking section, which are defined as English listening proficiency and English speaking proficiency as further explained below.

**English Listening Proficiency.**

This refers to the student’s proficiency to hear and understand the key vocabulary words, action phrases, and dialogue to respond accordingly. The criteria for the students’ English listening proficiency was defined in progress report presented in Appendix A.
English Speaking Proficiency.

This refers to the student’s proficiency to speak the dialogues, phrases, or vocabulary words taught by the researcher. As with the English listening proficiency, the criteria for the students’ English speaking proficiency was defined in the progress report shown in Appendix A.

Students

Students of the K3 class in Kirakira Kids International Kindergarten were the subjects for this research study. All the students were Japanese and their age ranged from five to six years old. Thirty-four students had attended the school previously, while six were new. All of the 40 students were the subjects for this study although they were grouped in to two groups of 20 students each.

Significance of the Study

This research will be significant to those teachers who teach English to students whose mother tongue is not English in a non-English speaking country. It also may be of use to those who are using the DAP guidelines in teaching young children. This research will be significant to Kirakira Kids International Kindergarten. This research may bring to mind some issues that may arise with using the Supertots curriculum over a long period of time and might offer insight as to why some students who have been learning in the school longer than their peers perform less than those who are new. Overall, this research study will be significant to those who are researching in the field of teaching English as a foreign language, as it may provide some insight to the process. The following chapter explains the literature review of this study.
CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF LITERATURE

This chapter describes and explains key factors and theories to the research. This chapter will summarize Piaget’s stages of cognitive development, Krashen’s theory of second language acquisition, developmentally appropriate practices (DAP), the Supertots 3 curriculum, and explain the background of the school.

Piaget’s Stages of Cognitive Development Theory

Piaget was a biologist categorized how children thought in different stages (Huitt & Hummel, 2003). He did this observing his own children and his friend’s children, and he realized that children develop at different stages according to their biological advances and that children’s development of knowledge advanced as the aged as well. His theory, along with the theories of Vygotsky, Dewey, and Bruner formed the constructivist learning theory (Huitt & Hummel, 2003).

Piaget focused on cognitive development and also categorized children’s development into four stages (McLeod, 2009). There are four stages of Piaget’s stages of development: sensorimotor (from birth to two years old), pre-operational (from two to seven years old), concrete operational (seven to 11 years old), and formal operational (11 years old to 15 years old) (Santrock, 2009).

There are distinct characteristics at each developmental stage. For example, in the sensorimotor stage infants learn by using their senses. In the preoperational stage young children move from learning with their senses to using words and images to construct their knowledge. In the concrete operational stage, begin to use logic in their thought constructs with the ability to categorize and put
things in logical order. The last stage shows that adolescents can start to formalize ideas and think out of the box as well as have the ability to feel strong emotions about a particular subject matter or individual. (Santrock, 2009)

The preoperational stage

For this research, the young children learning at Kirakira’s K3 classroom fall into Piaget’s second stage of development: preoperational, which can be broken down into two subcategories: symbolic function and intuitive thought. The first category is called the symbolic function substage. This substage ranges from the ages of two to four years old. Children in this substage primarily are egocentric; they cannot envision another point of view other than their own. They are also able to imagine things on their own. (Santrock, 2009)

The second substage is called the intuitive thought substage. Here, the young children’s ages range from four to seven years of age. Children going through this stage also have the ability reason and answer questions, yet not know how they know what they know. However, the children also strongly believe in what they know to be true. In addition to this, children in this stage often ask questions about why. This shows that the children in this stage are interested in gaining knowledge. (Santrock, 2009).

Knowing all these factors from Jean Piaget’s research, researchers today know what to expect from young children. The following section is taken from the book “Basics of Developmentally Appropriate Practice” (Copple & Bredekamp, 2006) which shows the different tables of the a child at five years of age’s development. It also shows how much DAP is based on Piaget’s research.
How children at age five develop

In addition to knowing Piaget’s theory on cognitive development, it is also important to understand how young children develop physically, intellectually, socially, and emotionally. The follow sections explain how children at age five develop in these areas by summarizing tables referenced from the book The Basics of Developmentally Appropriate Practices (Copple & Bredekamp, 2009). On the left column, the table shows what children at five are like, and on the right column it shows how adults can help them.

Physical development.

Table 1 shows that children at age five love physical activities. Hence, a DAP curriculum for children at this age should involve a lot of physical activities in addition to their playtime. In the researchers K3 class, there was allotted time for play in the playgrounds outdoor, but while teaching English speaking and listening there was also a fair amount of physical activities with the total physical response (TPR) action phrases and role play.
Table 1

**Physical Development of Children at Age Five**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Children at five years old</th>
<th>How adults can help</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>At five years old, children have developed more physical prowess. They can run, jump, and play roughly. Often they like to show off what they can do.</td>
<td>Teachers and adults can help by providing and playing highly physical games with children. More supervision is needed as the students get more daring to perform physical stunts.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Children at this age like to cut, draw, paste, and write.</td>
<td>Adults can help by providing arts and crafts while experimenting with different types of art forms.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>They can do things on their own such as setting up tables and dressing themselves.</td>
<td>Adults can offer a child assistance with such things as needed.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note. From Copple & Bredekamp, 2006, pp. 84*

In the Supertots 3 syllabus, there are English phrases that are taught with actions. These are called TPR actions as they associate the English phrase with an action the students must perform. In addition to the TPR actions, there are also crafts and art works to do such as coloring and drawing. Also, each song sung in the class during the lesson incorporates actions. Physical interaction is important to the DAP classroom that teaches young children aged five years old, because it helps advance their development.
Intellectual development.

Table 2 shows that children have already developed more concrete language structures and have simple mathematical skills. It also states that children have the interest to explore on their own and are starting to develop skills in brainstorming and planning. In addition, it shows that children have the potential to learn and use up to 5,000 to 8,000 words. This helps show the researcher that children at this age can do more when it comes to language learning.

Table 2

Intellectual Development of Children at Age Five

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Children at five years old</th>
<th>How adults can help</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>They are gaining the ability to plan ahead.</td>
<td>Adults can include brainstorming activities and challenge students to think about what comes next.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>They like hands-on exploration.</td>
<td>Teachers can provide a stimulating environment for students to explore.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Their observational skills are increasing.</td>
<td>Give time for students to explore.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Foster faster initiative and sustained engagement.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Teachers can support students by letting them take risk, while setting clear boundaries for them.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Children at five years old</strong></td>
<td><strong>How adults can help</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Their understanding of shapes is not quite global yet.</td>
<td>Teachers and adults can help by providing puzzles and encouraging children to make their own patterns.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>They have a good understanding of colors.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>They are able to know words to poems and songs. They also love to play with words.</td>
<td>Teachers can help by singing silly songs and saying funny poems.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>They can count in sequence and backwards.</td>
<td>Teachers can incorporate numbers into everyday activities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Their vocabularies increases and they can use between 5,000 and 8,000 words. They can use full sentences, take turns in sentences, and master most grammatical structures.</td>
<td>Teachers should answer the students’ questions and can encourage them to find out more through their own means.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>They can match letters to sounds.</td>
<td>Teachers can highlight letters and sounds in their environment.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>They can tell and retell stories, poems, songs, as well as act out short plays.</td>
<td>Teachers should encourage students to record stories.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note. From Copple & Bredekamp, 2006, pp. 85-87*

For this research, the students who are involved in the research study are second language learners. However, most of the students have already been immersed in a bilingual English program having attended the school a year or more.
before entering the K3 class. For that reason, most of the students can speak and understand some dialogues and phrases spoken in English. The chart above shows that students can learn more English dialogues and understand more through intellectually stimulating activities for the students such as: songs, role-play, games, and fun exploration.

**Social Development.**

Table 3 shows that it is important for students to feel like they belong to the class. This decreases their anxiety in the classroom and helps motivate and encourage them. This was also an important factor as the students in this research are learning a second language. It was important for them to feel like they are learning as part of the group and that they are comfortable enough with their peers to try a new language.

Table 3

*Social Development of Children at Age Five*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Children at five years old</th>
<th>How adults can help</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>They like cooperative play and dramatic play.</td>
<td>Teachers can encourage group activities,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>They enjoy having a company of friends.</td>
<td>dramatic and creative plays using props.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>They can maintain friendships.</td>
<td>Teachers can coach young children to</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>They also know how to reject and snub others,</td>
<td>encourage more pro-social behaviors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>even threatening to end some friendships.</td>
<td>Teachers should also model friendly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>inclusive language.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Children at five years old | How adults can help
---|---
They can cooperate well and take turns as well as share. | Teachers and adults should verbally encourage students in these areas.

Note. From Copple & Bredekamp, 2006, pp. 87-88

Emotional Development.

Table 4 shows that children can be taught to see things from another person’s perspective and empathize although children at five are generally egocentric. It also shows that students have strong feelings and should be reassured. As learning another language can be quite intimidating especially to a new student, this helps the researcher understand that children need a caring environment to learn the new language, in this case English. The classroom should not encourage any behaviors that belittle a student that cannot speak or understand English. It also affirms that good behavior in the classroom helps the learning process in each individual student.

Table 4

Emotional Development of Children at Age Five

| Children at five years old | How adults can help |
---|---|
They are primarily egocentric. | Teachers can provide a variety of activities and model acceptance of other’s differences in the classroom. |
They enjoy others and can behave in a warm and empathetic manner. | Teachers should model kindness and empathy. |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Children at five years old</th>
<th>How adults can help</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>They take responsibility given to them seriously.</td>
<td>Teachers can let students be their helpers.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Also, teachers should allow students to choose their own activities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>They are capable of being behaved and polite.</td>
<td>The teacher should practice attentive listening and responsiveness to reinforce good behaviors in the young students.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>They have strong feelings and fears with increased imaginative skills.</td>
<td>Teachers should reassure children when they are afraid and take their concerns seriously.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>They should limit the young student’s exposure to media.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note. From Copple & Bredekamp, 2006, pp. 88-89*

**Criticisms of Piaget’s Theory**

Although Piaget’s theory formed the base of what developmentally appropriate early childhood programs are built now, there were some researcher who opposed his view (Cherry, 2016). They suggest that he did not the children’s emotional development to be important to the cognitive development of the child. Researchers like Peter Bryant and Margaret Donaldson (Sylva & Lunt, 1994) that the stages are not levels that children go into directly, but rather blend into. For example, the child does not simply go from the pre-operational stage to the operational stage over night, but rather the stages slowly blend. In addition to this, his critics claim that
the items in the stages were too vague, not giving the full picture of what a child’s attributes are in that stage.

Furthermore, his critics claimed that he was too biased in his research because he only focused on his own children. Some have even stated that since the theory of multiple intelligences arose, it can be seen that young children had more abilities than Piaget thought. Also that preoperational-staged children were capable of not being egocentric. (Cherry, 2016)

Despite what some have claimed about Piaget’s stages of development in their criticisms, his work still remain a major influence of early childhood education today. It has definitely had an influence in the philosophy of developmentally appropriate practices. The following section explains the theory of second language acquisition as developed by Stephen Krashen.

**Krashen’s Theory of Second Language Acquisition**

There are numerous theories on how one acquires the proficiency to speak a second language (Fry, 2006). Previously, in the 1960s, it was popular to follow behavioristic theories in teaching a second language in the United States (Payne & Sitler, 2014). Sometime later, Krashen’s theory of Second Language Acquisition with his six supporting hypotheses became popular (Krashen, 2009). He suggested that there was no difference in how we attain a second language as opposed to our mother tongue, and he also combined several other theories on second language learning in the development of his theory (Shoebottom, 2016). The following section explains the six hypotheses and later presents some criticisms of Krashen’s theory to present a rounded view. Firstly, the following passages describe the six different hypotheses of Krashen’s theory. They are presented in the following order: acquisition-learning
hypothesis, monitor hypothesis, input hypothesis, natural order hypothesis, and active filter hypothesis.

**Acquisition-Learning Hypothesis**

Acquisition-learning hypothesis suggested that second language acquisition happens in a natural way, just as the first language of a child is acquired. This theory has two parts: acquisition and learning. In acquisition, Krashen stated that the acquisition of second language happens at a subconscious level through meaningful interactions with the target language. According to the hypothesis, acquisition is more concerned with the communicative act of the language, hence acquiring of the second language begins at a subconscious level. For example, the student becomes more concerned with communicating the message that speaking the actual words follow. (Krashen, 2009)

The learning part of this hypothesis involves learning the formal knowledge of the language. For example, learning how to say a certain dialogue the right way to develop a conscious level of understanding how to use the target language. It involves the conscious deliberate act of learning the language. However, Krashen stated that acquisition of the language at a subconscious level is more important than learning although it is still important. (Krashen, 2009)

According to this hypothesis, communication should be natural and fulfill an authentic purpose (Bilash, 2009). If language is acquired subconsciously, second language teachers should try to speak as much as possible, naturally, to their students. Furthermore, teachers instruct students in real situations to communicate in the target language. For example, if a second language student wanted to ask for help but could not, the teacher could teach the student to say *help please*. In turn, the student would
learn and then over time attain the proficiency to seek help in the target language when they needed it. The following passage describes the monitor hypothesis.

**Monitor Hypothesis**

The monitor hypothesis states that the learning of the language influences the acquisition of the second language (Krashen, 2009). This happens because monitoring how one says a certain word or dialogue is a product of what was learned about the target language. For example, if a student knew how to say the phrases “I like” and “apples”, but spoke in this way “Apples, I like”, they may monitor themselves by saying “I like apples”. Another way monitoring may happen, is if someone who has a better understanding of the language corrects them. Monitoring is the planning, editing, and correcting of the learned language (Krashen, 2009).

The researcher helped the students monitor the way they spoke to develop correct grammar in everyday conversation. For example, students would say, “Me like to play”. The researcher would correct the students gently by having them repeat, “I like to play”. The students would then repeat and communicate what they were saying. Most of the students sometimes correct themselves if they spoke wrongly. The following passage explains the input hypothesis.

**Input Hypothesis**

Input hypothesis was an important component of the acquisition of the second language. According to the input hypothesis, the students improve in the second language when taught what is one step beyond or harder than what they can already do. This involved what he called comprehensible input, which meant that
teachers should use the target language that the learner cannot yet say but understand in their mind. (Krashen, 2009)

According to the hypothesis, comprehensible input involves using the presentation of the context of the language, explanation of what is being said, rewording of unclear parts, visual cues and aides, and meaning negotiation. For example, if the researcher were to speak to students in Japanese naming their facial features (eyes, ears, nose, mouth), a student would understand because they know what eyes, ears, noses, and mouths are in English. According to the hypothesis, meaningful learning experience has taken place when the message is conveyed. (Krashen, 2009)

Other researchers supportive to Krashen's theory state that it is important to include as much comprehensible input as possible in the second language classroom (Bilash, 2009). There are many ways to do this and the Supertots 3 curriculum does so. The researcher included comprehensible input in the form of flashcards and total physical response (TPR). The use of flash cards is a form of comprehensible input because it associates visually the meaning of the word. Total physical response is a way of using actions to associate meanings to phrases and new vocabulary (Frost, 2014). The following passage explains the natural order hypothesis.

**Natural Order Hypothesis**

According to the natural order hypothesis, the acquisition of grammatical structures follows a natural order (Shutz, 1998). Krashen's research also showed that some grammatical structures are acquired early while others are acquired later (Krashen, 2009). According to Shutz (1998), Krashen's theory presents that
curriculums should not use the natural order as the basis for their syllabus, but keep language acquisition as the key.

This hypothesis could help second language teachers keep in mind to start teaching the easier language structures first and then move on to the difficult ones (Bilash, 2009). For this research study, the researcher taught a class who were ready to speak longer English phrases and even sentences. In their previous years, the students learned from the curriculums Supertots 1 and Supertots 2. These previous books were easier than Supertots 3. This is an example of how the natural order hypothesis was exemplified in the school. However, not all students were experienced in speaking English. This meant that the researcher had to make new students feel unthreatened when they learned how to speak and listen in English. The next passage explains Krashen’s theory for doing this in the affective filter hypothesis.

Affective Filter Hypothesis

According to this hypothesis, the affective filter helps or hinders the student to learn more or less. The affective filter has three variables: motivation, self-confidence, and anxiety, which meant that how a student felt in the second language class has bearings on how they learn the language. The lower students feel motivated, the less confidence they feel, and the higher anxiety they have will impede their acquisition of the second language. On the other hand if the motivation is high, the students have self-confidence, and the anxiety is low the student will be more able to acquire the second language. (Krashen, 2009)

This hypothesis presents that creating a secure and caring class environment is important for students to acquire second language (Bilash, 2009). This was similar to DAP guidelines mentioned earlier in this chapter. For this study, the
researcher created a class environment that kept the affective filter low by following the lesson activities. The lesson activities included singing with actions, TPR actions with games, and role-playing. Furthermore, no student was allowed to laugh at others attempt to try to speak the dialogues taught. Trying to participate was highly encouraged by the researcher and the team teacher. This is an example of how the affective filter was addressed in this research.

Reading Hypothesis

This hypothesis states that the more reading the students do, the more vocabulary they can attain (Bilash, 2009). The K3 students were also taught to read and write in English. However, it was not the focus of the researcher to based his research on the reading and writing proficiencies of English. Instead, the researcher focused mainly on the listening and speaking proficiencies for the research study.

Krashen’s theories formed a good base of knowledge for the researcher as to how second of foreign languages are taught and acquired. However, Krashen has received some fierce criticisms for his views.

Criticisms for Krashen’s theory

There are a number of criticisms directed at Krashen’s theory by a number of researchers studying how languages are learned. This passage gives explanations to some of the prevalent criticisms towards the theory. Most of the criticisms focus how there is a lack of scientific evidence to support Krashen’s claims and that he does not esteem grammar learning to have that much of a bearing on second language learning while research shows otherwise (Shoebottom, 2016).
For example, some have stated that for the acquisition hypothesis, there is no way to really tell if the learner has really understood what they have said because according to Krashen acquisition of the language just comes subconsciously (Fry, 2006). There is research to showing that what is incomprehensible to the student actually pushes them towards comprehension (Fry, 2006). This shows how there is not enough scientific evidence to support Krashen’s claims. Furthermore, some researchers have found that grammar learning helps improve the student’s second language skills (Fry, 2006).

However, despite the criticisms, Krashen’s hypotheses still form a good base for the knowledge second or foreign language learning. Krashen’s theory shows the researcher that it was important to include comprehensible input in the lesson activities. It also showed that there should be a separation between teaching listening and speaking, which was how it influenced the research hypothesis of this study. The following section summarizes developmentally appropriate practices (DAP).

**Developmentally Appropriate Practices (DAP)**

In Kirakira Kids, each English class teacher followed DAP guidelines. In DAP classrooms, the researcher met the students where they were in their development, because children learn best at their own mental, physical, and emotional stages (Copple & Bredekamp, 2009). The term DAP was first introduced in the 1990’s by the National Association for the Education of Young Children (NAEYC) in the USA (Copple & Bredekamp, 2006). For kindergarten teachers, it meant that the teachers should have an understanding of how young children develop and how their students are developing individual as to decide on the best approach to teach them.
Origins of DAP

Around the mid 1980s, the NAEYC were accrediting early childhood education programs around the USA. At that time there was no term that could describe complete all that the teachers were doing to meet the needs of young children. They developed a term based on child development theory, research, and practice to describe what the teachers were doing to meet the needs of the children in the USA. The term they came up with was “developmentally appropriate practice” which was published in the book “Developmentally Appropriate Programs in Early Childhood Programs” by the NAEYC. (Copple & Bredekamp, 2006)

The term described what the early childhood educations were doing already. The term DAP specifies guidelines for best practices for teaching young students. The philosophy has been successful in helping kindergarteners achieve more in their learning (Wong, 2001). Therefore most early childhood education programs and curriculum try to follow the guidelines described in the DAP statement paper published by the NAEYC (Copple & Bredekamp, 2009).

The Main Idea of DAP

The main idea of DAP is to meet the student where they are and to help them achieve challenging yet achievable goals. This means that the teacher must have an understanding of the students as individuals and as a group, understanding their physical, intellectual, emotional, and social development level. Knowing this, teaching with DAP standards means approaching the lesson for the class with the best approach: teaching, knowing the strengths and weaknesses of each student as well as the class as a whole, at the right pace, dispersing the information needed in a way that will benefit all. (Copple & Bredekamp, 2006)
Developmentally appropriate practice draws from a number of development theories. The theories include maturational theory by Gessell, the constructivist theory by Piaget, multiple intelligences theory by Gardener, psychosocial theory by Erikson, behavioral theory by Skinner, sociohistory theory by vygotsky, the theory of humanism by Maslow, and social learning theory by Bandura (Wong, 2001). However for this study, the researcher focused on Piaget’s theory.

How young children learn and develop

There are a number of ways young children can learn. Some theorist like Thorndike and Skinner discovered that young children learned by being affected by rewards or satisfaction, which is called instrumental learning. Others like Pavlov state that students can learn by being “conditioned”, as his experiments with his dogs at meal times. Others have stated that students learn by observing and then doing the activity themselves. (Sylva & Lunt, 1994)

According to the book *The Basics of Developmentally Appropriate Practices* (Copple & Bredekamp, 2006) young children learn and develop best through the following guidelines:

Firstly, through relationships with responsible adults. Young children need care and guidance, and as such they need a caring responsible adult to care for them. The adult must keep in mind the child development during interactions with the young child.

Secondly, through active hands-on involvement. Involvement of the young learners is one of the best ways to gain their interests and get them to participate. It also helps the young students construct their knowledge of the world around them as they have a sense of how things feel and how they work.
Thirdly, through having meaningful experiences. As children are constructing their understanding of the world around them, meaningful every day experiences help shape that construction. Activities that are dull and repetitive may loose its meaning and cause the young child to be less motivated.

Fourthly, through constructing their understanding of the world. This is because children learn and develop through meaningful experiences. Play is one of the ways students have meaningful experiences. Through play students construct understanding of the world.

Furthermore, there are other knowledge about children’s development that inform DAP. Firstly, researchers and educators have to recognize that all domains of the student’s development are important aspects of their growth. Also that many of these aspects of their development follow a certain sequence, such as Piaget’s stages of development. (Mincemoyer, 2011)

It is also important to acknowledge that a child’s development and learning advance variedly. That is, that no child develops exactly in the same way. Development happens when a child interacts with others in accordance to their biological stage. Hence, early interactions with others and their environment play a pivotal role in their development. (Mincemoyer, 2011).

**DAP Guidelines**

Knowing these factors the early childhood education professionals in the NAEYC developed the guidelines for DAP which are: creating a caring community of learners, teaching to enhance development and learning, planning appropriate curriculum, assessing children’s development and learning, and developing reciprocal
relationships with families. It can be shown in the star diagram presented below which was developed by the NAEYC ("5 Guidelines", 2009).

![Star Diagram](image)

1. **Creating a caring community of learners**
2. **Teaching to enhance development and learning**
3. **Planning appropriate curriculum**
4. **Assessing children's development and learning**
5. **Developing reciprocal relationships with families**

**Figure 2. 5 Guidelines for Effective Teaching (2009).** This figure shows the five guidelines for effective teaching for DAP.

The star concept above show each separate guideline as one of the five points on the whole star. This shows that although each guideline has its own sets of descriptions, the five of the guidelines define what is DAP. Below is a description of each guideline.

**Creating a caring community of learners.**

The classroom should be a place where all students feel like they belong. It should be a place where they are comfortable and accepted without having stress and anxiety. It is the teacher’s job as well as any supporting adult to create this type of environment for the child. (Copple & Bredekamp, 2006)

Teacher’s can do this by keeping the classroom lively and organized. Also by allowing the students to work collaboratively and cooperatively while coaching them to be inclusive, promoting good social behavior. In the caring classroom, teachers should also be attentive to the students’ individual needs as well as the
whole. They should listen to the students and guide them in their activities. (Copple & Bredekamp, 2006)

**Teaching to enhance development and learning.**

The early childhood teacher should have a repertoire of teaching strategies at their disposal. They should also seek to add to their repertoire, remembering that the goal is to enhance the child’s development and learning. The teaching strategies in DAP programs include, but are not limited to: acknowledgement, encouragement, giving specific feedback, modeling, demonstrating, creating or adding a challenge, providing assistance, providing information, and giving clear directions. (Copple & Bredekamp, 2006)

Teachers can also help children develop by scaffolding their learning by pairing them with a friend or by giving cues and help. As all children develop at different paces, the teacher should be aware of this providing the necessary assistance. In addition to this, DAP teachers also use a variety of learning formats in their classrooms. This includes individual learning, small groups, large groups, and different forms of play and interactivity with the students. (Copple & Bredekamp, 2006)

**Plan appropriate curriculum.**

Keeping in mind that the focus on following the DAP guidelines, teaching to enhance development and learning, involves planning the appropriate curriculum (Copple & Bredekamp, 2006). What is appropriate for education will vary from country to country. In Kirakira Kids International Kindergarten, the focus is on
teaching English conversation skills using the Supertots 3 curriculum, which utilizes DAP guidelines.

According to DAP guidelines, what makes a curriculum effective is if it has an underlying focus for social emotional development, language development, literacy development, mathematics, technology, scientific enquiry and knowledge, understanding ourselves and communities we live in, creative expression and appreciations for arts, and physical development skills (Copple & Bredekamp, 2006). Knowing the above, teachers should consider how each age group develops to determine the pacing and strategy for teaching the students.

Assess children’s development and learning.

In DAP, teachers should assess the children in order to keep track of their development and inform important parties involved in a child’s life about their progress. It is assumed by most that children in DAP classrooms play all the time (Copple & Bredekamp, 2006). However, the authors point out that this not the case as assessing children is a key guideline in helping them grow. From the assessment, the teacher can make more informed steps on how to further the development of each child as an individual.

Develop reciprocal relationships with families.

It is also important that teachers communicate and cooperate with parents according to DAP. The parents need to be a major part of a child’s life and develop and henceforth need to be informed of how they are performing and developing in the school. The communication should be two ways and requires mutual respect for the parent and for the teacher. (Copple & Bredekamp, 2006)
Other factors that influence DAP

Teachers that follow DAP guidelines make decisions based on their knowledge of child development and research, and knowledge about their students individually (Morgan, 2010). To apply these standards, teachers should always have a strong understanding of child development, understand the individual students, understand the student’s culture, be intentional about planning learning activities, use effective teaching approaches, help students by scaffolding them in their learning, use a variety of methods, and have an understanding that methods and approaches change (Mincemoyer, 2016).

Support and criticism of DAP

Developmentally appropriate practice states that children learn best through play (Mincemoyer, 2016). It’s not hard to find those who think that the DAP classrooms only have play as classroom activities. However, there was research that showed that play is important to the development of the child. Piaget stated that symbolic play in the pre-operational stage help young children develop language, because it is used in their make believe (Sylva & Lunt, 1994). This language is then helpful for young children to connect with one another, or for educational purposes, connect with teachers (Genishi & Dyson, 2009). Hence, teachers maybe able to instill curriculum knowledge through these interactions all while children seem to play.

Supertots 3 was curriculum used to teach English conversation in this research, which included varied activities such as play, songs and chants, tpr action phrases and games to help students gain English listening and speaking proficiencies. According to Copply and Bredekamp (2006), the activities stated previously were
developmentally appropriate for the age group of subjects for this research study. The following section discussed the Supertots 3 curriculum.

**Supertots 3 Curriculum**

Supertots 3 is the third book in the Supertots series by Krause and Nagashima (2002). In Kirakira Kids International Kindergarten, the K1 to K3 classes used this curriculum to teach English conversation, that is English listening proficiencies and speaking proficiencies. There were three reasons why Superots 3 was used in the school.

These reasons were that the three types of activities that followed DAP guidelines. For each unit lesson there was a numbers of different activities to teach English to the students, but the three types of lesson activities were action songs and chants, role-play activities, which was story based, and total physical response (TPR) activities.

Songs and chants can help a child’s acquisition of a second or foreign language. The use of music in learning can be linked to Gardeners multiple intelligence theory as he stated that musical and linguistic intelligence go hand in hand (Robertson, 2015). Some ways music can help students attain the second language is if the songs are repetitive, include actions, a rhythm that can be followed, contain easy lyrics to follow, and rhyme (Languagelizard, 2012). The songs and chants in the Supertots 3 curriculum were able to capture these aspects.

Role-play activities would also be used in the lesson activities of the class with the dialogue from the student book. Role-play is important because it helps the student attain the language through social interactions (Genishi and Dyson, 2009). By letting the students act out scenarios using the dialogue, the students can be an active
participator in the language while playing symbolically (Nell, Drew, and Bush, 2013). Play is an important part of a child’s development as previously discussed.

Total physical response actions and phrases were also incorporated in the units. Developed by Dr. James J. Asher, total physical respond is responding to dialogues or phrases with actions or movements (Frost, 2004). These activities would help students understand the meaning of what they were saying by connecting it with an action that they did. According to Asher, it works well in mixed abilities class, works in small or large groups, and also is ideal for kinesthetic learners (Asher, 2006). Total physical response does by allowing students to have longer retention in a shorter time span and fosters instant understanding of the dialogue or phrase. The dialogues and actions used in the Supertots 3 curriculum were aimed at these objectives.

**Lesson Activities in Supertots 3**

In the Supertots 3, there are different lesson activities that were used to teach the students English through activities such as “Talk about it!”, “What is it?”, “Do it!/Use it!”, “Sing it!”, and “Discover it!”. Each activity is given a title that is represented in each unit lesson. The following paragraphs explain what each title teaches and represents.

In “Talk about it!” the students were shown a two-page spread of a story picture. The pictures usually depict the characters from the Supertots 3 story and the conversation they are having in dialogue bubbles. The theme of the story is the theme of the unit that the students were learning about in audio form in a CD. The audio track includes a song using the words for the dialogue. The dialogues were then used in the role-play activities.
In the “What is it?” section of the unit, the students learned about the vocabulary words that pertain to the unit. The “What is it?” page in the student book depicts the pictures of the vocabulary words. There was also an audio track for the students to hear how to say the words.

The “Do it!/Use it!” sections taught the students the TPR actions and commands for the unit and also teach additional dialogues using the commands given. There were four actions that follow the unit theme. Students are taught to listen to the actions and to do the actions. Then the students are also taught to say the additional dialogue using the commands.

In the “Sing it!” section, the story of the unit taught the students to learn an additional dialogue. The dialogue was also used in a song that is taught to the students. The students are also to practice speaking the dialogue using various activities explained in the teacher’s guide.

The final section used in the Supertots 3 curriculum is the “Discover it!” section, which connects the unit theme to real life issues that are relevant to the students. This section varied from unit to unit about the subject being taught, but it is also teaching the students English terms they can use to describe things daily. For example, in the first unit the “Discover it!” section teaches the students how to identify different types of houses (i.e. apartment, wooden house, tent).

Each of the section of the unit has a responding activity in the Activity Book. After being taught a lesson, the students had chance to complete the corresponding activity for each section. A copy of the unit and lesson activities can be found in Appendix B.
Student Book and Activity Book

Each student had two Supertots 3 books: one student book, which includes the story, vocabulary words, conversations, and TPR action phrases; and another activity book, which is a collection of written activities for the students to reinforce and check what they have learned from each lesson. Furthermore, there are also songs and flash cards that are used as teaching materials for this curriculum.

The students' parents were encouraged to go over the student book and activity book with the students every weekend. The students did not take the book home during the week to work on it as homework.

The researcher used the curriculum to teach the students English listening proficiencies and English speaking proficiencies. The activities from this curriculum were used to teach the students the English listening and speaking proficiencies. Although this curriculum has been used before, the students have never used this new level: Supertots 3. In addition to moving up to a new class level, the curriculum proved to be more challenging for the students and influenced the research hypothesis by showing the researcher that there could be a difference between learning how to listen and learning how to speak in English. The following section gives the background of the school of this research.

Background of the School

Kirakira Kids International Kindergarten was founded in 2009 as a bilingual program for Japanese kindergarten students. Students were taught in both Japanese and English throughout the entire day for the entire year. There were also three teachers per year level, which were two teachers for English and one teacher for
Japanese. The teachers worked together to teach the students both Japanese culture and the English language.

The students for each level were divided into two groups (group A and group B). While one group stayed with the Japanese teacher, the other group stayed with the English teachers. After each period, students exchanged classes and this continued throughout the day. There were some periods such as outdoor play and lunch that were shared by both the English and Japanese teachers.

The objective of the school was to teach the students English language skills while teaching the students to retain their unique Japanese culture and language. That was why the students shared two different classrooms (English and Japanese). That was also the reason why heavy emphasis was put on Japanese cultural education in the form of events. At the same time, the students learned about other important international events such as Christmas, Halloween, and the International Festival. Thai events were also incorporated into the school year event calendar.

The school’s emphasis on events throughout the year sometimes disrupted the students’ learning in the English lessons. Usually English teachers worked around event schedules because the students were always involved. For example, in the School Show all classes were expected to perform an English skit and musical performance as well as a Japanese one. As this happened in Term 2, the English teachers adjusted lessons to include the performance practice and finished their academic curriculum.

High expectations in performance and participation in events was especially placed in the K3 class. Students of the K3 class were expected to perform in the International Festival and the Matsurida Festival in the first term, a full skit in both Japanese and English in the School Show for the second term, and in the
Graduation for the third term. Furthermore, in term 2 additional events such as Halloween, Loy Krathong, Teacher Change, Christmas Pot-luck Party, and Odango (Japanese moon festival) which students participated in by making crafts or practiced for performances. In the third term, additional events were the Art Exhibition, Setsubun (Japanese demon festival), Omucitsuki (Japanese new year), Song Kran Festival, and Easter Egg Hunt. All these events took up time in the classroom as well.

For this reason, the research for this study had to be conducted entirely in the first term. As the first term had the least amount events and the students are just started to learn about their new class level. It was the most accessible time to conduct the research without the stress of extra events because the students do not start practicing for their performance in the International Festival until the end of June.

This chapter has presented the literature related to the study. It was important for the researcher to understand the guidelines of DAP in early childhood education as well as how Piaget’s cognitive development theory contributes to DAP. Knowledge of how children’s thinking develops was helpful to the researcher in finding the right approach for the K3 class. Knowledge of Krashen’s theory and its hypotheses also contributed to the researchers approach to the Supertots 3 lessons. As discussed earlier, the lesson activities in Supertots 3 are follow the best practice guidelines of DAP for young learners. As the researcher has established a basis for supported literature for this study, the next chapter discusses and explains the research methodology, research instrument, and experimental process of this research study.
CHAPTER III
RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

This chapter presents the methods and instruments used in conducting this research project. It also outlines the timeline for the research, data collection and data analysis.

Research Design

The researcher utilized qualitative and quantitative methods, which were observational notes and progressive scores, in documenting the students’ acquisition of the English language in regards to the students English listening proficiency and English speaking proficiency. The results of the progressive scores were also compared to see if there was a difference between the students' English listening proficiency and English speaking proficiency.

In this study, the researcher taught the lessons from the Supertots 3 curriculum and observed the students with his team teacher from the 27th of April to May, June, and July of 2015. The researcher and his team teacher observed two students for five hours each day for each month and wrote down observational notes in a shared notebook. The notes were then discussed before giving the students their progressive scores in May, June, and July of 2015. The outcomes of the progress scores for English listening and English speaking were analyzed separately to determine the means of the progressive scores for each of the months. Later, the progressive scores of the English listening proficiency and the English speaking proficiency were compared to determine whether there was a significant difference.
Population

All of the students in the K3 students of Kirakira Kids International Kindergarten academic year 2015 were the research population for this study. There were 40 students total. All of the students were Japanese.

Sample

The sample for this study was 40 students’ progress scores. The sample was from the K3 class of the academic year 2015 in Kirakira Kids International Kindergarten.

Research Instrument

The research instrument for this study was the students’ progress reports given for the first term and observational notes taken from the periods of April and May 2015 (for the pre-test), and June and July 2015 (for the post-test).

Progress Reports

The progress report (see Appendix A) used by each class, provided by the school’s English department principal, included subjects and English language proficiencies other than listening and speaking. For the purposes of this research, only the listening and speaking sections were used to draw conclusions about the students’ development English language proficiency. The progress reports were marked based on the observations by the researcher and his team teacher in assessing the students of the K3 class.

It shows that in the listening and speaking section of the progress report has 10 abilities that the students must be able to do. The English listening abilities and
speaking abilities of the student will be marked as N for “Not yet”, S for “Sometimes”, M for “Making progress”, and R for “Regularly”. For the data analysis, each mark will be given a corresponding number: N=0, S=1, M=2, and R=3.

Table 5 shows the interpretation criteria for the marks on the progress report. Items marked “N” will be scored 0.00-0.99, which is interpreted that the student cannot perform in this area of English proficiency. The next mark, “S”, will be given a score from 1.00-1.99. This mark is interpreted as the student only being able to perform this proficiency sometimes. Next, the mark “M” is scored from 2.00-2.99, which is interpreted that the student is starting perform more in that particular proficiency. Hence it is marked “M” for “making progress”. The final mark, “R”, is scored as 2.99-3.00, which is the highest mark that can be given. This mark is interpreted as the student performing this proficiency regularly.

Table 5
Interpretation of the Progressive Scores

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mark</th>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Interpretation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>0.00-0.99</td>
<td>The student has very low proficiency in this area.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S</td>
<td>1.00-1.99</td>
<td>The student has moderately low proficiency in this area.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M</td>
<td>2.00-2.99</td>
<td>The student has average proficiency in this area.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>The student is highly proficient in this area.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Student Observations**

There were double observation reports for the two students observed on each day. The researcher and the team-teacher observed the same students for the five hours that the students were in school. The researcher and the team-teacher wrote down actual conversations or incidents that took place throughout the day in the notebook where the observations were written. The progress report was used as the criteria as to what was to be observed by the researcher and the team-teacher.

The observational notes were used as a basis to give the students a mark (N, S, M, or R) in their progress report. The researcher and his team teacher deliberated and discussed the observations for each student to determine the marks in the progress reports, which were then converted to progressive scores.

**Validity and Reliability of the Progressive Scores**

The researcher took the following steps to ensure the validity and reliability of the research instruments, namely the student observations and the progressive scores. For the progressive scores, the researcher can establish that there was face validity in the items of the listening and speaking sections as those items of English proficiency reflect what the English listening proficiency and speaking proficiency are. Face validity for the progressive scores means that the progress report seems to measure the students' English listening proficiency and speaking proficiency at face value (Phelan & Wren, 2005).

In regards to content validity, which is a measure how much of the content does the test actually test (Trochim, 2006). For example, in the progress report (see Appendix A) has ten items each for the listening section and the speaking section. This covers a broad range of items which was covered in the class
curriculum, which includes Supertots 3 and other English activities. As these items reflect the broad range of activities in the class, content validity can be established.

In regards to construct validity, which is the measure by the test actually testing what was intended, each item of the progress report needs to be observed in detail (Trochin, 2005). For example, follows simple oral directions is point 1.4 of the listening section of the progress report. The researcher gave aural instructions for the students to follow hence the content validity could be established through this item. The item reflects what actually happened in the classroom.

To assess the internal reliability of the progressive scores, the researcher analyzed the progressive scores using Cronbach's alpha in excel. The analysis yielded an alpha of 0.95. A Cronbach's alpha that is greater than 0.70 is considered to be internally consistent. Thus the results of the Cronbach's alpha analysis for this study showed that the progress report itself is internally consistent.

As for the student observations, the school's head teacher and principal checked the observational notes weekly, this ensured the inter-rater reliability of the student observations. Inter-rater reliability is the measure to which two judges agree on a particular result (Phelan & Wren, 2005.). In this case, there was inter-rater reliability in the student observations as the observational notes were checked. Furthermore, the students' observational notes were also discussed weekly amongst the teachers of the English department with the head teacher and principal on a Monday meeting.
Observational Process

For this study, the student’s English listening and speaking proficiencies were observed and assessed. The researcher conducted the study by teaching the Supertots 3 curriculum and observing the students’ English language proficiencies. The observations were then noted in a collection of anecdotes of all the students, which became the basis of discussion and deliberation between the researcher and team teacher. Based on the observational notes and discussion, the researcher and team teacher gave each student a mark (N, S, M, or R) for each of the ten items on the listening and speaking sections of their progress reports, which were used in the study as a pre-test and a post-test.

Before observing the students in April, the researcher sought and obtained permission from the school principals to retrieve the student’s admission records determining the number of years the student attended the school and also determining if the student learned English previously. This helped the researcher understand the students’ developmental stage. It also provided the researcher with insight to the students’ previous progress in the English language.

In April and May of 2015, the researcher taught the dialogues, vocabulary, actions, and action songs from Unit 1 “Helping at Home” of the Supertots 3 Curriculum (see Appendix C), while observing each student. At the end of May, the researcher and team teacher discussed the observation for each student. The researcher and team teacher then gave them a mark on their progress report based on their observations and discussions. In June and July of 2015, the researcher taught the lessons from Unit 2 and 3, which are “Community Helpers” and “An Undersea adventure” respectively. They then followed the same procedure in observing
throughout June and July and discussing before giving each student the outcome on their progress report.

The researcher followed lesson activities detailed in the Supertots 3 curriculum teacher guide. The lessons included singing action songs, listening and repeating dialogues, memorizing vocabulary words, and learning TPR action phrases. The researcher also used flash cards, the student book, and activity book to impart the lessons to the students. The lesson activities were also taught using games and structured play activities to impart the knowledge to the students.

To assess the children’s listening and speaking ability according to the lesson, the researcher conducted formative assessments with each student. For example, to assess the student’s knowledge of action phrases, the researcher spoke the command to the student and watched if they responded with the correct action. To assess if the student speak the dialogues taught in the lesson, the researcher role-played with each student each speaking part of the characters in the Supertots 3 book as instructed by the teacher’s guide.

Furthermore, the students were also observed daily outside of class activities to gather information of their proficiency in listening and speaking English outside of class time. The data collected from these observations will be contributed to the discussion that resulted in pre-test and post-test marks in this study.

After July, the marks on the pre-test and post-test were analyzed to determine in which items on the progress report were the students more proficient in. The pre-test and post-test were also compared using a two-tailed t-test to determine whether or not the student progressed. Presented below is the timeline by which the research study was conducted.
Collection of Data

First, the researcher obtained the school admission records of the K3 class of the Academic Year 2015 to obtain their demographic data. Then the researcher taught the students the Supertots 3 lessons from units one to three and collected the data needed for the research project from the observational notes and progressive scores.

The researcher taught and observed the students over three periods in the first term. The first observation period took place from April 27 to May 31, 2015. The second observational took place in June 2015. The third observational period took place in July of 2015. How the data was acquired was presented in the two sections below. The observations followed the guidelines presented below as stated in *The Power of Observation for Birth Through Eight* (Jablon, Dombro, & Dichtelmiller, 2007):

1. Observe over time: the researcher observed the students over a period of four months.
2. Watch children in varied situations: the researcher taught Supertots during an hour period of the day, but the students were observed throughout the day.

**The first observational period (April 27 to May 31, 2015)**

The first observation period of the students was from April 27 to May 31, 2015. The researcher scheduled to observe two students per day within the first observational period. The researcher and the team-teacher observed two students for
five hours each day. The K3 class was divided into two groups (Group A and Group B), that meant that one student from each group was observed each day. The division of the class was based on the students’ enrolled at the school. If the student were absent on the day, they would be observed on another day.

Also in this time the researcher taught Supertots 3 Unit 1 to the students of the K3 class. The lessons included dialogues, songs and chants, vocabulary words, and total physical response phrases. This was the way that the English listening and speaking were taught to the K3 students. As the lessons were taught, the researcher and team-teacher also observed the students that were on the schedule for that day.

After the first observational period, the researcher and team-teacher discussed the observations of each of the student according to their observational notes. The discussion, based on the observational notes, was in regards to each item on the listening and speaking section of the progressive report of each student. From the discussions, the researcher and team-teacher gave each student the progressive scores from the period of April 27 to May 31, 2015.

**The second (June 2015) and third (July 2015) observational period**

During the second and third observational period, the researcher also made the schedule to observe two students per day for five hours. This period took place from June 2015. Again, one student from each group would be observed per day. If a student was absent or missed, the researcher would reschedule their observation and make up for it.

In this June 2015, the researcher taught Supertots 3 Unit 2 to the K3 class, which included the same kind of lesson activities but with different dialogues, songs and chants, vocabulary words, and total physical response phrases. Then in July
2015, the researcher taught Supertots 3 Unit 3 to the K3 class. The researcher and the
team-teacher also observed the students that were scheduled and wrote down what
was observed during these periods.

Then researcher and team teacher discussed the observational notes in
regards to the listening and speaking sections of the progress reports to give the
students a progressive score in June and in July. This time they discussed whether or
not the students improved from the previous observational periods.

Data Analysis

The data analysis for each research objective is presented in this section.
Namely there are four research objectives in this study.

For research objective one the researcher analyzed the data by using
numbers and percentage. The researcher used the student admissions records, which
contains the biographical data of each student (name, age, parents, previous schools,
and previous English language experience), to identify how many boys or girls there
were, how many were in Kirakira for more than a year, and how many students had
English lessons prior to their time in the school.

For research objective two the researcher used means and standard
deviation to identify which area of English listening proficiency is the strongest
among the students. The researcher analyzed the data from the progressive scores,
which were based on the discussion of the observation notes of the researcher and the
team teacher. The progressive scores were the result of the researcher and team-
teacher's discussion of each student. If there were disagreements, both the researcher
and team-teacher referred to the observational notes taken for each student.
For research objective three the researcher also used means and standard deviation to identify which area of English speaking proficiency is the strongest among the students. The researcher analyzed the data from the progressive scores, which was also based on the discussion of the observation notes of the researcher and the team teacher. As with objective two, the progressive scores were the result of the researcher and team-teacher’s discussion of each student. Also, if there were disagreements, both the researcher and team-teacher referred to the observational notes taken for each student.

Finally for research objective four the researcher analyzed the data using dependent paired-samples two-tailed t-test to compare the differences of the progressive scores of the listening and speaking proficiencies. Table 6 shows the summary of the research process for this study.
### Summary of the Research Process

Table 6

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Research Objective</th>
<th>Source of Data or Sample</th>
<th>Data Collection Method or Research Instrument</th>
<th>Data Analysis</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. To identify the students’ demographic data (age, amount of years spent in the school previously, and background in English) at Kirakira Kids International Kindergarten.</td>
<td>40 students</td>
<td>School admission records</td>
<td>Numbers and percentage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. To determine the progressive scores of the students’ English listening proficiency at Kirakira Kids International Kindergarten</td>
<td>40 students</td>
<td>Observational notes Progress scores</td>
<td>Summary of observations Means and standard deviation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research Objective</td>
<td>Source of Data or Sample</td>
<td>Data Collection Method or Research Instrument</td>
<td>Data Analysis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. To determine the progressive scores of the students' English speaking proficiency at Kirakira Kids International Kindergarten.</td>
<td>40 students</td>
<td>Observational notes Progress scores</td>
<td>Summary of observations Means and standard deviation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. To compare the difference between the students' proficiency in English listening and speaking at Kirakira Kids International Kindergarten.</td>
<td>40 students</td>
<td>Total means of the progressive scores</td>
<td>Paired-samples two-tailed t-test</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
CHAPTER IV

RESEARCH FINDINGS

The findings of the research are presented in this chapter. Each research objective is presented with a discussion of the findings for each objective starting from research objective one to four.

Research Findings of Objective 1: To identify the students’ demographic data (age, amount of years spent in the school previously, and background in English) at Kirakira Kids International Kindergarten.

To address research objective one, the researcher obtained the K3 students’ admission records as a tool to gather the data needed. The gender of the student, previous years at Kirakira, and previous English activities before attending the school were detailed in the admission records. These findings are presented in the sections below.

Students’ gender

Table 7 shows the number of boys and girls within the K3 class of the academic year 2015. There were 17 boys and 23 girls in the K3 class. There were a total of 40 students in the K3 class. Also all of the students were Japanese whose ages ranged from five to six years old.
Table 7

**Number and percentage of boys and girls.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Boys</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>42.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Girls</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>57.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Student’s years at Kirakira International Kindergarten before 2015

Table 8 shows the previous number of years the students have attended the school before entering the K3 level as retrieved from the students’ admission records. There were six students who never attended the school before and were attending the school for the first time. There were 11 students who attended the school one year previously. There were three students who attended the school two years before. There were 15 students who attended the school three years before. There were five students who previously attended the school for four years.

Table 8

**Students with Previous Years at Kirakira Kids International Kindergarten**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0 Year</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>15.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Year</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>27.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Years</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Years</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>37.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Years</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>12.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Student’s background in English

From the admission records the researcher also obtained information regarding the students’ previous English activities. Table 9 shows the number of students who had English activities before attending the school. Of the 40 students in
the K3 class, only five students had English activities before attending the school while 35 of the students did not have any previous activities with English before attending the school.

Table 9

Students with English Activities Before Attending Kirakira Kids International Kindergarten

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>English Before Attending Kirakira</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>12.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No English Before Attending Kirakira</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>87.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Research Findings of Objective 2: To determine the progressive scores of the students’ English listening proficiency at Kirakira Kids International Kindergarten.

To address research objective 2, the researcher wrote observational notes about the students from April 27 to July 2015. The researcher scheduled to observe two students per day in every month from April 27 to the end of July 2015. The researcher and the team-teacher observed the students for five hours per day. They wrote the observational notes in the observation notebook (see Appendix B) and discussed the observational notes written for each student, which resulted in progressive scores given for each item of the listening portion of their progress report. The following sections present the summary of the findings of the progress scores, which were based on the observational notes of the students from April 27 to May 31, 2015, June 2015, and July 2015 for the listening section.
The first observational period and progressive scores of the students’ English
listening proficiency from April 27 to May 31, 2015

Table 10 shows the means and standard deviations of the students’
progressive scores in the listening section of the progress report from the period of
April 27 to May 31, 2015. The table shows the total means of the progressive scores
to be 1.94 (SD = 0.57). According to table 5 in chapter 3, a score that ranges from
1.00 to 1.99 shows that the students showed moderately low proficiency in English.
The table showed that from the period of April 27 to May 31, 2015, the students’
proficiency was moderately low.

Table 10

1st Observational Period Listening Progressive Score Means

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1. Listening</th>
<th>April 27-May 31, 2015</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.1. Demonstrates understanding of everyday vocabulary</td>
<td>M 1.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.2. Uses appropriate listening skills</td>
<td>S.D. 1.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.3. Listens to songs, chants, rhymes and repeats them after teacher’s instruction</td>
<td>M 2.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.4. Follows simple oral directions</td>
<td>S.D. 0.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.5. Demonstrates understanding of simple adjectives</td>
<td>M 1.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.6. Answers literal or inferential oral comprehension questions</td>
<td>S.D. 0.97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.7. Demonstrates understanding of spatial prepositions</td>
<td>M 1.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.8. Demonstrates understanding of simple commands used in the class</td>
<td>S.D. 1.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.9. Demonstrates understanding of the uses of language</td>
<td>M 1.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.10. Demonstrates understanding of classroom schedules and school events</td>
<td>S.D. 0.98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>M 2.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>S.D. 0.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>M 2.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>S.D. 0.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>M 2.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>S.D. 0.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>M 1.94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>S.D. 0.57</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. n=40
The second observational period and progressive scores of the students’ English listening proficiency from June 2015

Table 11 shows the means and standard deviations of the students’ progressive scores in the listening section of the progress report in June 2015. The table shows the total means of the progressive scores to be 2.11 ($SD = 0.19$). According to table 5 in chapter 3, a score that ranges from 2.00 to 2.99 shows that students show average proficiency in English. Table 11 shows that in June 2015, the students’ proficiencies were average.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1. Listening</th>
<th>June 2015</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.1. Demonstrates understanding of everyday vocabulary</td>
<td>1.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.2. Uses appropriate listening skills</td>
<td>1.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.3. Listens to songs, chants, rhymes and repeats them after teacher’s instruction.</td>
<td>2.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.4. Follows simple oral directions</td>
<td>2.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.5. Demonstrates understanding of simple adjectives</td>
<td>1.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.6. Answers literal or inferential oral comprehension questions</td>
<td>1.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.7. Demonstrates understanding of spatial prepositions</td>
<td>1.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.8. Demonstrates understanding of simple commands used in the class</td>
<td>2.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.9. Demonstrates understanding of the uses of language</td>
<td>2.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.10. Demonstrates understanding of classroom schedules and school events</td>
<td>2.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>2.11</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note. n=40*

The third observational period and progressive scores of the students’ English listening proficiency from July 2015

Table 12 shows the means and standard deviations of the students’ progressive scores in the listening section of the progress report in July 2015. The table shows the total means of the progressive scores to be 2.48 ($SD = 0.39$).
According to the interpretation table in chapter 3, a score that ranges from 2.00 to 2.99 shows that students started to show average proficiency in English. Table 11 shows that in July 2015, the students’ proficiencies in English listening were also average.

Table 12

3rd Observational Period Listening Progressive Score Means

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1. Listening</th>
<th>July 2015</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>M</td>
<td>S.D.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.1. Demonstrates understanding of everyday vocabulary</td>
<td>2.28</td>
<td>0.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.2. Uses appropriate listening skills</td>
<td>2.35</td>
<td>0.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.3. Listens to songs, chants, rhymes and repeats them after teacher’s instruction</td>
<td>2.85</td>
<td>0.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.4. Follows simple oral directions</td>
<td>2.60</td>
<td>0.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.5. Demonstrates understanding of simple adjectives</td>
<td>2.03</td>
<td>0.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.6. Answers literal or inferential oral comprehension questions</td>
<td>2.03</td>
<td>0.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.7. Demonstrates understanding of spatial prepositions</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>0.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.8. Demonstrates understanding of simple commands used in the class</td>
<td>2.78</td>
<td>0.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.9. Demonstrates understanding of the uses of language</td>
<td>2.93</td>
<td>0.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.10. Demonstrates understanding of classroom schedules and school events</td>
<td>2.98</td>
<td>0.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>2.48</strong></td>
<td><strong>0.39</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note. n=40*

The summary of the observations and progressive scores for the students’

English listening proficiency

Table 13 presents a summarized table of all the total means, standard deviations, and interpretations of the observations and progressive reports of the students’ English listening proficiency. The table shows that from April 27 to May 31, 2015, the total means of the progressive score was 1.94 (SD = 0.57), which was interpreted as moderately low proficiency in listening to English. In June 2015 the total means of the progressive scores was 2.11 (SD = 0.19). In July 2015 the total
means of the progressive scores was 2.48 ($SD = 0.39$). This was interpreted that the students had an *average* proficiency in English listening. The total means of all the progressive scores from all the months was 2.18 ($SD = 0.28$). According to table 5 in chapter three, the score of 2.00 to 2.99 shows that the students had an *average* proficiency in listening to English.

Table 13

*Summary of the Listening Progressive Score Means*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Month</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>S.D.</th>
<th>Interpretation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>April 27-May 31, 2015</td>
<td>1.94</td>
<td>0.57</td>
<td>The students performed <em>moderately low.</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>June 2015</td>
<td>2.11</td>
<td>0.19</td>
<td>The students showed <em>average</em> proficiency in English.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>July 2015</td>
<td>2.48</td>
<td>0.39</td>
<td>The students showed <em>average</em> proficiency in English.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>2.18</td>
<td>0.28</td>
<td>The students showed <em>average</em> proficiency in English.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Research Findings of Objective 3:** To determine the progressive scores of the students’ English speaking proficiency at Kirakira Kids International Kindergarten.

To address research objective 3, the researcher wrote observational notes about the students from April 27 to July 2015. The researcher scheduled to observe two students per day in every month from April 27 to the end of July 2015. The students were observed by the researcher and the team-teacher during this time. They wrote the observational notes in the observation notebook (see Appendix B) and
discussed the observational notes written for each student, which resulted in progressive scores given for each item of the speaking portion of their progress report.

The following sections present the summary of the findings of the progress scores, which were based on the observational notes of the students from April 27 to May 31, 2015, June 2015, and July 2015 for the speaking section.

**The first observational period and progressive scores of the students’ English speaking proficiency from April 27 to May 31, 2015**

Table 14 shows the means and standard deviations of the students’ progressive scores in the speaking section of the progress report from the period of April 27 to May 31, 2015. The table shows the total means to be 1.81 ($SD = 0.69$).

According to table 5 in chapter 3, a score that ranged from 1.00 to 1.99 showed *moderately low* proficiency in English. The table showed that from the period of April 27 to May 31, 2015, the students speaking proficiency was *moderately low*.

Table 14

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1st Observational Period Speaking Progressive Score Means</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2. Speaking</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.1. Greets teachers and peers in English</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.2. Recites the days of the week</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.3. Recites the months of the year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.4. Identifies and tells the date, day and weather</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.5. Sings English songs and chants from the warm-up and unit songs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.6. Names vocabulary from the flashcards of the unit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.7 Recites and performs the actions phrases taught in the lesson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.8 Attempt to use new vocabulary in everyday conversation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.9 Gives directions to their friends</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.10 Tries to speak English on their own</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note. n=40*
The second observational period and progressive scores of the students’ English speaking proficiency from June 2015

Table 15 shows the means and standard deviations of the students’ progressive scores in the speaking section of the progress report in June 2015. The table shows the total means of the progressive scores to be 2.18 (SD = 0.21). According to the table 5 in chapter 3, a score that ranged from 2.00 to 2.99 showed average proficiency in English. Table 15 shows that in June 2015, the students’ proficiency in speaking English were average.

Table 15

2nd Observational Period Speaking Progressive Score Means

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2. Speaking</th>
<th>June 2015</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>M</td>
<td>S.D.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.1. Greet teachers and peers in English</td>
<td>2.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.2. Recites the days of the week</td>
<td>2.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.3. Recites the months of the year</td>
<td>2.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.4. Identifies and tells the date, day and weather</td>
<td>2.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.5. Sings English songs and chants from the warm-up and unit songs</td>
<td>2.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.6. Names vocabulary from the flashcards of the unit</td>
<td>2.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.7. Recites and performs the actions phrases taught in the lesson</td>
<td>2.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.8. Attempt to use new vocabulary in everyday conversation</td>
<td>1.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.9. Gives directions to their friends</td>
<td>2.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.10. Tries to speak English on their own</td>
<td>1.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>2.18</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. n=40

The third observational period and progressive scores of the students’ English speaking proficiency from July 2015

Table 16 shows the means and standard deviations of the students’ progressive scores in the listening section of the progress report in July 2015. The table shows the total means of the progressive scores to be 2.61 (SD = 0.39). According to the interpretation in table 5 found in chapter 3, a score that ranged from
2.00 to 2.99 showed *average* proficiency in English. Table 16 shows that in July 2015, the students were also *average* in their proficiency to speak English.

Table 16

3rd Observational Period Speaking Progressive Score Means

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2. Speaking</th>
<th>July 2015</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Means</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.1. Greets teachers and peers in English</td>
<td>2.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.2. Recites the days of the week</td>
<td>2.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.3. Recites the months of the year</td>
<td>2.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.4. Identifies and tells the date, day and weather</td>
<td>2.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.5. Sings English songs and chants from the warm-up and unit songs</td>
<td>2.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.6. Names vocabulary from the flashcards of the unit</td>
<td>2.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.7 Recites and performs the actions phrases taught in the lesson</td>
<td>2.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.8 Attempt to use new vocabulary in everyday conversation</td>
<td>1.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.9 Gives directions to their friends</td>
<td>2.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.10 Tries to speak English on their own</td>
<td>2.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>2.61</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note.* n=40

The summary of the observations and progressive scores for the students’ English speaking proficiency

Table 17 presents a summarized table of all the total means, standard deviations, and interpretations of the observations and progressive reports of the students’ English speaking proficiency. The table showed that from April 27 to May 31, 2015, the total means of the progressive score was 1.81 (SD = 0.69), which meant that the students were *average* in their proficiency to speak English. In June 2015 the total means of the progressive scores was 2.18 (SD = 0.21). Also, in July 2015 the total means of the progressive scores was 2.61 (SD = 0.39). This showed that the students were *average* in their proficiency to speak English in the months of June and July of 2015. The total means of all the progressive scores from all the months was
2.20 ($SD = 0.40$). According to table 5 in chapter three, the score of 2.00 to 2.99 shows that the students were *average* in their proficiency to speak in English.

Table 17

*Summary of the Speaking Progressive Score Means*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Month</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>S.D.</th>
<th>Interpretation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>April 27-May 31 2015</td>
<td>1.81</td>
<td>0.69</td>
<td>The students performed <em>moderately low.</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>June 2015</td>
<td>2.18</td>
<td>0.21</td>
<td>The students showed <em>average</em> proficiency in English.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>July 2015</td>
<td>2.61</td>
<td>0.39</td>
<td>The students showed <em>average</em> proficiency in English.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>2.20</td>
<td>0.40</td>
<td>The students showed <em>average</em> proficiency in English.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The following section presents the research findings for objective four.

**Research Findings of Objective 4:** To compare the difference between the students’ proficiency in English listening and speaking at Kirakira Kids International Kindergarten.

Table 18 shows the paired-samples two-tailed t-test results of the listening and speaking means. The results showed $t$ statistic of 0.36 with a significant level of 0.73. The results show that there was a significant difference at the .05 level, therefore the hypothesis can be accepted that there was a significant difference between the English listening proficiency and the English speaking proficiency.
### Table 18

*The t-Test Results of the Progressive Scores*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>M</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>Sig. (2-tailed)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>English Listening Proficiency</td>
<td>2.18</td>
<td></td>
<td>-0.02</td>
<td>0.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English Speaking Proficiency</td>
<td>2.20</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.36</td>
<td>0.73</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The following chapter presents the conclusions, discussions, and recommendations about the research study that was conducted.
CHAPTER V

CONCLUSION, DISCUSSION, AND RECOMMENDATIONS

This chapter presents the conclusion of the study and discusses the findings and its importance to the study. It will also present where the findings of the study converge and diverge with the theories and related literature presented in chapter 2. Later, this chapter will present the limitations of the study, concluding with recommendations for further research.

For this research study there were four research objectives: the first one was to identify the students’ demographic data (age, amount of years spent in the school previously, and background in English). The second was to determine the progressive scores for the students’ English listening proficiency at Kirakira Kids International Kindergarten. The third was to determine the progressive scores for the students’ English speaking proficiency at Kirakira Kids International Kindergarten. The fourth research objective was to compare the difference between the students’ proficiency in English listening and speaking at Kirakira Kids International Kindergarten. The research hypothesis for this study was that there would be a difference between the students listening proficiency and the students’ speaking proficiency. The following section presents the findings in regards to the research objectives and hypothesis.

Findings

1. The findings of the demographic data showed that there were 23 girls and 17 boys. It also showed that 15 students spent at three years at the school previously. It also
showed that 87.5% of the students have never had any English activities before attending the school.

2. The total means of the students’ English listening proficiency progressive scores was 1.94 in April 27 to May 31, 2015; 2.11 in June 2015; and 2.48 in July 2015.

3. The total means of the students’ English speaking proficiency progressive scores was 1.81 in April 27 to May 31, 2015; 2.18 in June 2015; and 2.61 in July 2015.

4. There was a significant difference the English listening proficiency scores and English speaking proficiency scores at the .05 level. Therefore the hypothesis can be accepted that there was a significant difference between English listening and speaking proficiency.

These findings show that despite the majority of the students having spent only a few years at the school with the majority also never having any English activities before attending the school, the students’ English listening proficiency and speaking proficiency progressive scores improved. However, there are other factors that are not included in this research such as the students reading and writing lessons, and center play where the students can freely speak in English whilst participating in activities.

Conclusions

From these findings, the following conclusions were about the students and their English listening and speaking proficiency.

1. The research data showed that the students scored lower in their progressive scores in April 27 to May 31, 2015 although 34 students spent years previously at the school.
2. The research data of June 2015 and July 2015 showed that over the course of the teaching Supertots 3, the students improved in the English listening and speaking proficiency.

3. The paired two-tailed t-test showed that there was a significant difference at the .05 level between the students listening and speaking proficiencies. Indicating that either the listening proficiency is stronger than the speaking proficiency, or that the reverse is true.

Discussion

The data collected for this research study showed that the students had lower progressive scores in the first observational period than in the second and third observational periods. Then in the second and third observational periods the progressive score means increased, showing that the students did not show high proficiency for English listening and speaking at first, but then later started to show more proficiency.

The first observational period took place at the beginning of the school year. The students were new to the new class level and were starting to adjust to the new environment. Not only were they adjusting to the new environment, but they were also taught new lessons from a new curriculum. According to Piaget’s research, the child gained knowledge in their minds by assimilating and accommodating (Santrock, 2009). This means that when they are taught new things, the child’s mind has to struggle to learn the new knowledge, before the child can fully understand the new knowledge. This was why the progressive scores were lower at first as the students were learning new conversations and words as well as adjusting to the new
school year. As the students got more used to the new environment and the learning activities the researcher was able to use more comprehensible input (Krashen, 2009).

With that knowledge and the use of DAP guidelines, the researcher and team-teacher created a classroom environment that was age appropriate for students aged five to six years old (Copple & Bredekamp, 2006). As the researcher followed DAP guidelines, he also discouraged students from laughing at their friends during lessons also creating a caring for the new students (“5 Guidelines”, 2009.). The researcher and team-teacher maintained a classroom environment that was conducive for learning, which also led to the students’ affective filter being lowered (Krashen, 2009).

As the affective filter was lowered, it was easier for the researcher to include more comprehensible input in the form of role-play, action songs, and total physical response phrases and actions to the lesson, which helped the students learn more in English and enhanced their proficiency in listening and speaking. In this, the researcher’s knowledge of Piaget’s stages of cognitive development supported the way the Supertots 3 lessons were taught. In the Supertots 3 lessons, the students carried out role-play activities and action songs. This was appropriate for their cognitive stage as they were starting to increase in their knowledge of language with thinking symbolically (Santrock, 2009).

The research data also showed that the there was a difference between the students’ English listening proficiency and the students’ English speaking proficiency significant at the .05 level. According to Krashen, the second language is acquired much like the first language, through natural biological means because our aim is to communicate. This can be seen in the acquisition-learning hypothesis, where the
learner first acquires the language through hearing, then learns the language by practicing how to speak it. (Krashen, 2009)

This shows that there is a separation between listening and speaking in language learning. The difference was shown by the result of the paired-samples two-tailed $t$-test. Hence, the research data showed that the students improved slightly over time, and that there was a significant difference between the English listening proficiency and the English speaking proficiency.

**Recommendations**

**Recommendations for Early Childhood EFL Teachers**

Recommendations for teachers teaching EFL to early childhood students are as follows:

First, teachers should follow DAP for teaching young students. Include activities that interest them such as games, songs and chants, and guided-play activities. Secondly, teachers should follow the activities and teaching methodologies in a given curriculum if it is appropriate for their class level. There were some activities in the Supertots curriculum that were too easy for the K3 class of the researcher’s school. For that reason, these activities were skipped. Teachers should also repeat activities to help the students retain the content taught in the lesson activities.

**Recommendations for Further Research**

Recommendations for researchers in the field of early childhood education EFL teaching are as follows.
The first recommendation is do the research over a longer period of time. The length of this research was done over the span of four months. Although there was an improvement in the student’s post-test and pre-test. A longer research period would probably provide more substantial data. Secondly, the research was done with a class of 40 only. A larger sample size would provide interesting knowledge on the students’ progress and the effectiveness of the curriculum and DAP. For the next researcher, if possible, it would be better to use a sample of several hundred students. Next it would be interesting to compare different curriculums and teaching methods between two groups. That is, having a comparison between two groups that are taught using a different curriculum. This was not possible as the curriculums are closely followed in the said school. Finally, there are several different Japanese Kindergartens in Bangkok that have some English program. It would prove a worthy study to compare the teaching methods between each school against a common research instrument like the pre-test and post-test. Comparing such a large sample of different schools with similar programs would be a worthwhile endeavor.
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APPENDIX A

Sample of the Progress Report
## ENGLISH-AS-A-FOREIGN LANGUAGE
### Progress Report
#### School Year 2015-2016

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PARTICULARS</th>
<th>TERM 1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Legend:</strong> N = Not Yet  S = Sometimes  M = Making Progress  R = Regularly</td>
<td>April  May  June  July</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>1.0. Listening</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.1. Demonstrates understanding of everyday vocabulary</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.2. Uses appropriate listening skills</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.3. Listens to songs, chants, rhymes and repeats them after teacher’s instruction.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.4. Follows simple oral directions</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.5. Demonstrates understanding of simple adjectives</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.6. Answers literal or inferential oral comprehension questions</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.7. Demonstrates understanding of spatial prepositions</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.8. Demonstrates understanding of simple commands used in the class</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.9. Demonstrates understanding of the uses of language</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.10. Demonstrates understanding of classroom schedules and school events</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>2.0. Speaking/Language</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.1. Greets teachers and peers in English</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.2. Recites the days of the week</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.3. Recites the months of the year</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.4. Identifies and tells the date, day and weather</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.5. Sings English songs and chants from the warm-up and unit songs</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.6. Names vocabulary from the flashcards of the unit</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.7. Recites and performs the actions phrases taught in the lesson</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.8. Attempt to use new vocabulary in everyday conversation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.9. Gives directions to their friends</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.10. Tries to speak English on their own</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX B

Student Observational Notes
| **Speaking** | During cooking he heard his friend say, "Teacher Micah so yummy." He said the same thing as his friend. |
| **Listening** | Despite being told directions for the craft, he looked at his friends first to see what they did. |
| **Writing** | |
| **Reading** | |
| **Working Habits** | |
Speaking

Listening
He followed the steps in cooking carefully but did it slowly.

Writing
We were able to write numbers 1-100 although he didn't finish the worksheet and he knew what he was doing.

Reading

11 & 12 June
Listening: he listened and tried to follow the density steps. I said "Follow me" he looked at me and did it.

Working Habits
Speaking: he repeated the phrases in Spanish in spite of his rare speaking English on his own.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date: 9 July</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Name:**
Toma Makino

**Speaking/Literacy**
I asked Toma to help me demo the game.

Me: Toma can out help me.

T: OK.

**Listening**
Me: Toma say "Whose turn is it" with me (we said it together.) Then we play rock, scissors, paper. (We played)

Who won?

**Writing**
T: Teacher Micah.

Me: Then I say "Mine" and you say "Yours." *Mine.*

T: "Yours."

**Reading**
He read all the words in the book "Not Yet." correctly.

He named the objects with "cat, hat."
APPENDIX C

Sample of Supertots 3 Lesson
UNIT OVERVIEW

Storyline

Helping Grandma

Peter and Toni arrive at Grandma's house with their friends, Beth and Chip. Grandma is in the yard doing some gardening. Toni introduces her friends. The children help Grandma with the chores. They learn about other children's homes around the world. Then they leave for their first adventure in Grandma's magical car, Jessie the Jeep.

Definitions of success for this unit

Talk about it! (Student pages 1–2): Children can ask about and introduce someone using, Hello. Who's this? My friend, (name). Children can greet a new acquaintance with, Nice to meet you.

What is it? (Student page 3): Children can point to and name: table, chair, sofa, bookcase, bed.

Do it! (Student page 4): Children can respond through actions to: Wipe the table. Wash the dishes. Put away the dishes. Make the bed.

Use it! (Student page 4): Children can politely request help using, please and respond with, OK.

Sing it! (Student page 5): Children can offer to help using, Can I help? and respond with, Yes, please.

Discover it! (Student page 6): Children can recognize different styles of homes from around the world: an apartment, a tent, a wooden house, a bamboo house.

Say it! (Student page 7): Children can identify the sounds 'b', 'g', 'm', 'p', 's', and 't' in the Sounds Rap 1.

Activities in this unit

- Musical dialogues, Teacher's page 3 (Lesson 1)
- Look around!, Teacher's page 4 (Lesson 1)
- Slow motion, Teacher's page 4 (Lesson 1)
- Finish it!, Teacher's page 6 (Lesson 2)
- Teacher says 'please', Teacher's page 6 (Lesson 2)

- Watch us!, Teacher's page 6 (Lesson 2)
- Dialog relay, Teacher's page 8 (Lesson 3)
- Who's the leader?, Teacher's page 8 (Lesson 3)
- 'Where we live' graph, Teacher's page 9 (Lesson 4)
- Draw your house, Teacher's page 10 (Lesson 4)
- Musical sounds, Teacher's page 11 (Lesson 5)
- Odd one out in groups, Teacher's page 12 (Lesson 5)
- Instant artist, Teacher's page 12 (Lesson 5)

Recommended storybooks

- Houses by Ann Morris (Little Celebrations – Celebration Press)
- How to Build a House by Charlene Norman (Little Celebrations Stage 2A Book 3 – Celebration Press)
- Rush, Rush, Rush by Diane Engles (Ready Readers Stage Two Book 40 – Modern Curriculum Press)
- When I Go See Gram by Bonnie Ferraro (Ready Readers Stage Three Book 8 – Modern Curriculum Press)

Extending the unit

Cross-curricular ideas

Science: Find out what kinds of houses different animals live in. Birds live in nests; squirrels live in trees; some bats live in caves. Show some pictures of different animal homes and have the children try to guess which animal lives where.

Crafts

Grandma's House: The children color, cut out and glue the furniture into the rooms, then talk about their houses. See Teacher's pages 134 and 135.

Jessie the Jeep: Using a box or carton and TR3, the children can construct their own Jessie the Jeep. TR3 can be enlarged and a bigger, class-size jeep can be made. As Jessie changes in the story, changes can be made to the classroom jeep, too. TR4 can be used to add different parts to Jessie the Jeep and change her into different modes of transportation.
Lesson 1 continued

(Student Book page 3)

What is it?

OPTIONAL ACTIVITY

Musical dialogue

1. Play the SuperTots Theme Song while students sing. Have the children move around the room.

2. Stop the music at frequent intervals. When the music stops, the children quickly make groups of three:
   - One group is Grandma.
   - The second group is Toni.
   - The third group is Chip.

3. Have the group to Paper, Stone, Scissors. The winner asks, "Hello, Who's this?" pointing to one of the other two children who responds, "My friend, (real name)."

4. Then they each say, "Nice to meet you," and all three sit down together. Start and stop the music often.

Large/small class option: For large classes, divide the children into several groups and have them take turns. For small classes, have the children take turns also playing using the Picture Cards of Grandma, Toni, and Chip.

2. Before the Book

Introduce the vocabulary

1. Have the children listen to the tape and practice the target vocabulary by following the steps below.

A. Play the tape and show Picture Cards 8–12 in proper sequence. Have the children repeat the words with voices on the tape.

Listen and repeat.

| table | table |
| chair | chair |
| sofa  | sofa  |
| bookcase | bookcase |
| bed   | bed   |

B. Continue the tape. This time the children repeat the words during the pauses on the tape.

Listen again. Repeat.

| table  | (pause) |
| chair  | (pause) |
| sofa   | (pause) |
| bookcase | (pause) |
| bed    | (pause) |
Lesson 1
(Student Book pages 1, 2, 3)

Talk about it!

LESSON TARGETS

Children can ask about and introduce someone using, Hello. Who's this? My friend, (name). Children can greet a new acquaintance with, Nice to meet you.

Children can point to and name: table, chair, sofa, bookcase, bed.

MATERIALS

- Cassette Tape: SuperTots Theme Song, Hello. Who's this? Song, Goodbye Song, story, dialog, vocabulary
- Picture Cards: 1 (Grandma), 2 (Peter), 3 (Toni), 4 (Beth), 5 (Chip), 8 (table), 9 (chair), 10 (sofa), 11 (bookcase), 12 (bed)
- Stickers: I can do it! stickers for the What is it? lesson, one for each child
- Activity Book: Crayons, pencils
- A large sheet of paper

1. Introduction

Warm-up

1. Greet the children as they come in.
   Say, Hi! I'm (your name). Encourage the children to answer, Hi! or Hello!

Option: Play the SuperTots Theme Song in the background. Some of the children may be able to sing along, if they have studied SuperTots 1 or 2 before. Plan to demonstrate the song with the actions in a later lesson.

Note: For the musical scores, lyrics and actions to the songs in SuperTots 3, please refer to pages 146–166 in this Teacher's Guide.

2. Attach Picture Cards 1–5 to the board. Point to them, wave and encourage the children to repeat, Hi! and Hello! Then, hold up the cards one by one and have the children greet each character after you, Hi, (Grandma, Peter, Toni, Beth, Chip)! Have the children practice greeting the characters by name a couple of times and then take down the cards.

Introduce the Story/Dialog
(Student Book pages 1, 2)

1. Creating children's interest: Open your Student Book to pages 1 and 2. Look at the picture and make some comments to show your enthusiasm. [Wow! Look at that! Can you see this? Isn't this fun?] Turn the Student Book around and show it to the children. Point to each of the characters and ask, Who's this? (Chip, Beth, Toni, Peter, Grandma). Point to Sammy Kitten sitting under the tree and ask, Who's this? (Children who have completed SuperTots 2 will remember.) Point to some of the magical things happening in the garden and encourage the children to comment on them. Using their native language is appropriate. Some of the magical things we can see are: The elves dancing with the dog. Beth greeting the flowers. Peter chasing a fairy. Another fairy serving tea for Sammy. Grandma's magical car Jessie the Jeep.

2. Play the tape and point to the items on the pages as the narrator speaks.

Listen to the story.

It's a sunny day! Toni and Peter are at Grandma's house with their friends, Chip and Beth. Where's Grandma? There she is. She's in the yard. She's gardening. Grandma asks, 'Hello, Who's this?' Toni says, 'My friend, Chip.' Grandma says to Chip, 'Nice to meet you.' Chip says to Grandma, 'Nice to meet you.' Where's Sammy Kitten? There he is! He's having tea. This is Grandma's car. Her name is Jessie the Jeep. She has two eyes, a nose, and a mouth. What a funny jeep!

3. ♫ Hello, Who's this? Song

Draw the children's attention to Grandma, Toni, and Chip. Point to the speech bubbles and say, I wonder what they're saying? Encourage the children to remember what was on the tape or to guess. (Grandma is meeting Chip for the first time.)
Lesson 1 continued
(Student Book page 3)

What is it?

2. Before the Book

Introduce the vocabulary

1. Have the children listen to the tape and practice the target vocabulary by following the steps below.

A. Play the tape and show Picture Cards 8–12 in the proper sequence. Have the children repeat the words with the voices on the tape.

B. Continue the tape. This time the children repeat the words during the pauses on the tape.
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2. Before the Book

Introduce the vocabulary

1. Have the children listen to the tape and practice the target vocabulary by following the steps below.
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B. Continue the tape. This time the children repeat the words during the pauses on the tape.
2. Show each Picture Card, name each one, and have the children repeat. Do this several times until the children can say the words confidently.

3. Show the cards again. Encourage the children to try to remember the words by themselves.

5. Wrap-up

Sticker time!

Have the children turn to page 8 of their Student Books. Distribute the I can do it! stickers for the What is it? lesson to each child. [Sticker, please. Here you are. Thank you.] Allow the children to place the sticker on any of the pieces of furniture.

Option: If time permits, ask the children to name one of the vocabulary items on Student Book page 3. Give the sticker as a reward. [Good job! Super!]

Goodbyes

If you have children in your class who are new to English, introduce the meaning of goodbye. Walk into the classroom, walk towards the children, and say, Hello! Then turn away from the children, go back to the door, and say, Goodbye! as you leave. Repeat the action and word a few times, encouraging the children to say, Goodbye! to you.

Play the Goodbye Song in the background as the children leave. See Teacher’s page 151 for the musical score.

Activity

Look around!

1. Put Picture Cards 8–12 in different places around the room. Say the word on one of the cards.

2. The children point to the card you name.

Small class option: In small classes, have the children walk, hop, skip, or jump to the card.

3. Open the Book

Practice the vocabulary

(Student Book page 3)

Name the items in random order. Have the children point to the pictures on their page as they are named. [Point to the table!] (Teachers may choose to play the vocabulary words again from the tape for further review.)

4. After the Book

Activity

Slow motion

1. Use Picture Cards 8–12 and a large sheet of paper. Cover one card (the picture on the card must not be seen by the children) with a large piece of paper.

2. Hold up the covered card and slowly uncover it from the top, bottom, or side. The children try to guess what it is. Let the first child who guesses correctly choose the next card to be revealed, or hold the next covered card and reveal it.