

CHAPTER III RESEARCH PROCEDURES

3.1 Research Design

This study employed a descriptive qualitative design. The design was selected because the purpose of the research was to provide a detailed and contextual account of how TPR was implemented in a real classroom. It did not seek to test a hypothesis, compare groups, or calculate the effect of the method. Instead, the study examined the sequence of instructional actions, teacher modelling, students' physical responses, classroom interaction, and practical challenges observed during the lesson.

Descriptive qualitative research is appropriate when the research question asks how an activity or phenomenon occurs and when the data consist primarily of observations, field records, and documents. Recent TPR studies by Setiawan et al. (2022), Afrianti and Rustipa (2023), and Rosiana et al. (2025) used qualitative description to examine instructional stages and teacher roles in classroom implementation. The present research follows a comparable process-oriented orientation while focusing on the specific context of MI Sindangraja.

The researcher was directly involved in conducting the TPR lesson. To reduce reliance on the researcher's perspective, the classroom teacher served as a collaborating observer. The observer completed a structured observation sheet and recorded field notes about the lesson sequence, student responses, teacher adjustments, and classroom-management issues. Lesson plans and visual documentation were used as supporting sources.

3.1.1 Rationale for Qualitative Description

Qualitative research is appropriate when a phenomenon needs to be understood through context, process, participant activity, and interpretation. Creswell and Poth (2024) emphasize that qualitative inquiry requires alignment among the research problem, purpose, question, data collection, analysis, and representation. In the present study, the problem concerned how a teaching method was enacted in one classroom. The corresponding data were therefore records of actions, instructional language, classroom responses, teacher adjustments, and documents rather than numerical measures of change.

Qualitative description was selected because the study sought an accessible account close to classroom events. The purpose was not to develop a formal theory, reconstruct a life history, or describe the essence of a lived experience. The analysis organized observed events into implementation themes while retaining chronological and contextual detail. This design is consistent with recent descriptive studies of TPR that focus on teaching stages and teacher roles (Setiawan et al., 2022; Afrianti & Rustipa, 2023; Rosiana et al., 2025).

The word descriptive does not mean that analysis is absent. Raw field notes do not become findings merely by being copied into a chapter. The researcher must decide which events answer the research question, code recurring processes, compare sources, identify themes, examine contradictory or incomplete evidence, and write an interpretation. The description is analytical because it explains how the parts of the lesson were connected and why adjustments became necessary.

3.1.2 Unit of Analysis and Study Boundaries

The unit of analysis was the classroom implementation of TPR, not the individual achievement of each student. Student actions were included when they helped explain how the teacher's procedure operated. For example, peer dependence was relevant because it prompted restored modelling, while increased noise was relevant because it prompted changes in grouping. The study did not construct individual learner profiles or rank participants.

The study was bounded by place, participants, time, content, and data source. The place was the second-grade classroom at MI Sindangraja. The participants were the researcher as teacher, the collaborating observer, and one intact class of young learners. The instructional content was limited to concrete animal vocabulary and movement verbs. The data sources were observation, field notes, lesson plans, classroom materials, and visual documentation. These boundaries prevent the analysis from drifting into claims about the entire English curriculum or the long-term development of vocabulary.

The two implementation stages were treated as connected parts of one instructional sequence. The first stage emphasized modelling and guided response, while the second emphasized variation and reduced support. The analysis compared the functions of these stages without presenting them as experimental conditions.

Any difference between stages was interpreted as part of the planned progression and classroom interaction.

3.1.3 Researcher Role, Positionality, and Reflexivity

The researcher served as the classroom teacher and therefore participated directly in the phenomenon being studied. This role provided access to lesson planning, instructional decisions, and immediate classroom interaction. It also created the possibility that the researcher's expectations about TPR could influence both teaching and interpretation. Reflexivity was necessary to make this dual role visible rather than treating observation as completely neutral.

Three procedures were used to address the dual role. First, the classroom teacher acted as a collaborating observer and recorded events while the researcher concentrated on instruction. Second, field notes separated descriptive entries from reflective comments so that observable actions could be distinguished from interpretation. Third, the findings were compared with lesson plans and documentation rather than relying on memory alone. These procedures do not remove subjectivity, but they make the interpretive process more transparent.

Reflexivity also influenced the language of the report. Claims were phrased as classroom observations and interpretations rather than universal conclusions. When evidence showed participation but not vocabulary mastery, the report retained that distinction. When some students depended on peers, the event was included rather than removed to create an idealized picture of TPR. This approach supports the credibility of a qualitative implementation study.

3.1.4 Nature and Boundaries of Qualitative Claims

The claims in this study are descriptive, interpretive, and context-bound. A descriptive claim states what was documented, such as the teacher's use of a model before collective response. An interpretive claim explains the apparent function of that event, such as modelling serving as an initial cue for meaning. A context-bound claim identifies the conditions within which the interpretation is relevant, including the learner group, concrete vocabulary, classroom layout, and instructional sequence.

No claim was derived from a numerical threshold. Recurrence could make a pattern analytically visible, but importance was not determined by counting how

often an event appeared. A single event could be important when it changed the course of the lesson, exposed a constraint, or prompted a teacher adjustment. For example, renewed modelling was analytically relevant because it showed that support withdrawal was reversible and responsive.

Qualitative claims also require attention to absence and ambiguity. If the written record did not preserve a spoken command, the analysis did not reconstruct it from a photograph. If the observer described participation but not independent comprehension, the report did not add an achievement interpretation. These boundaries were applied consistently so that the findings remained traceable to available evidence.

The reporting vocabulary reflects this logic. The thesis uses expressions such as the observation indicated, the field note described, the sources converged, and the event was interpreted as. These phrases make the basis and level of a claim visible. They also allow readers to distinguish a documented event from the researcher's analytical explanation.

3.2 Focus of the Research

The research focused exclusively on the implementation of TPR in teaching selected English vocabulary to second-grade students. The analysis covered five interrelated components: (1) preparation and selection of movement-compatible vocabulary; (2) teacher modelling and delivery of commands; (3) guided physical response and repetition; (4) transition toward pair, group, and individual responses; and (5) classroom adjustments and challenges. Students' attention, participation, and visible responses were documented only as contextual evidence of how the lesson unfolded, not as measured learning outcomes.

3.3 Setting and Participants

The research was conducted at MI Sindangraja, Tasikmalaya, during the 2025/2026 academic year. The setting was selected because the researcher had identified a need for more concrete and active English vocabulary instruction in the second-grade classroom. The student participants belonged to one intact second-grade class and were treated as a classroom community rather than as individually ranked cases. Personal names were omitted from the analytical records because the unit of analysis was the implementation process, not individual achievement.

The researcher acted as the classroom instructor during the implementation. Mrs. Annisa Nurul Azizah, S.Pd., the classroom teacher, served as the collaborating observer. Her role was to observe the lesson from outside the teaching role, complete the observation sheet, and record descriptive field notes. The target vocabulary was organized under the theme *Animals Around Us* and included familiar animal nouns and action verbs that could be demonstrated safely.

3.3.1 Classroom Context Relevant to TPR Implementation

The setting description focuses on features that could shape the implementation of movement-supported vocabulary instruction. The lesson took place in an ordinary second-grade classroom. The available environment required movements that could be performed within personal space rather than activities involving unrestricted running. Pictures and the teacher's model therefore became the principal visual resources, while the arrangement of students and visibility of the demonstration became important practical considerations.

English was not the dominant language of daily classroom communication. The students' limited exposure meant that the teacher could not assume that a spoken English command would be understood without support. Contextual pictures, a stable command frame, deliberate pronunciation, and repeated teacher modelling were used to make the initial input accessible. The description of these supports is necessary because the same commands could operate differently in a class with more extensive prior English experience.

The learners participated as an intact class with established peer relationships and classroom routines. Peer observation could support participation, but it could also make it difficult to distinguish response to language from response to classmates. The data collection therefore attended to when peer cues appeared and how the teacher varied grouping. Individual learner ranking was outside the purpose of the study.

The madrasah setting also shaped expectations concerning respectful interaction, manageable voice levels, and safe conduct. Expressive animal movements were acceptable when they remained connected to the learning purpose and classroom boundaries. The teacher's reminders, stop signals, and return to a calm closing routine were treated as integral components of implementation.

3.4 Data Sources and Research Instruments

The data were generated through classroom observation, field notes, and documentation. The relationship between each source and the research focus is summarized in Table 3.1.

2. Table 3.1 Data Sources and Research Instruments

Data Source	Instrument	Purpose	Data Produced
Classroom observation	Structured observation sheet	To record the stages and features of TPR implementation.	Descriptive evidence of modelling, commands, physical responses, repetition, interaction, and management.
Field notes	Field-note form completed by the collaborating observer	To preserve the chronological flow of classroom events and teacher adjustments.	Narrative records of activities, student responses, notable events, challenges, and reflections.
Documentation	Lesson plans, teaching materials, photographs, and checklist	To verify planned procedures and support the classroom description.	Written and visual records of materials, activity organization, and classroom context.

3.4.1 Classroom Observation Sheet

The observation sheet was designed to keep the observation aligned with the single research question. It did not assign achievement scores to students. Instead, it contained indicators and space for descriptive evidence. The collaborating observer recorded whether and how each aspect occurred, what classroom evidence was visible, and what adjustment was made by the teacher. The observation focus is shown in Table 3.2, while the complete instrument is provided in Enclosure 4.

3. Table 3.2 Focus of Classroom Observation

Observation Dimension	Indicators
Preparation and context	The vocabulary was familiar, concrete, connected to the theme, and suitable for movement.
Teacher modelling	The teacher pronounced the command clearly and demonstrated the intended action.
Physical response	Students were given time to listen, observe, and respond through movement.
Repetition and variation	Commands were repeated and varied in sequence, speed, grouping, or level of teacher support.
Gradual independence	Teacher modelling was reduced and students responded in class, pairs, groups, or individually.

Observation Dimension	Indicators
Feedback and support	The teacher repeated, slowed, re-modelled, or used visual support when students appeared uncertain.
Classroom management	Movement was organized safely and noise, space, and attention were managed.
Closure	The teacher reviewed vocabulary and reconnected the spoken forms with the actions.

3.4.2 Field Notes

Field notes were used to record events that could not be represented adequately by a checklist. The form contained contextual information, a chronological account of the lesson, notable student responses, teacher decisions, classroom-management issues, and the observer's analytical reflection. Consistent with Saldaña (2021), the notes distinguished descriptive records of what occurred from reflective comments about possible meaning. The field notes were written during and immediately after each implementation stage so that important details were not lost. The consolidated field notes are presented in Enclosure 5.

3.4.3 Documentation

Documentation consisted of lesson plans, vocabulary materials, animal pictures, command lists, classroom photographs, and the documentation checklist. These records were used to compare the planned lesson with the observed implementation. Photographs were treated as supporting context rather than as a separate source of claims. Personal names were omitted or replaced with neutral participant labels in written data, and visual documentation should be used only in accordance with school and guardian permission.

3.4.4 Development and Alignment of the Instruments

The instruments were developed from the single research question and the recent TPR literature. The observation dimensions represented the main components of implementation identified across previous studies: contextual vocabulary selection, teacher modelling, comprehensible commands, physical response, repetition, variation, gradual independence, feedback, classroom management, and closure (Xie, 2021; Setiawan et al., 2022; Rosiana et al., 2025). Each dimension was written as an observable process rather than as a judgement of student ability.

The observation sheet used descriptive evidence columns so that the observer could record what occurred. For example, the indicator “teacher support is reduced gradually” required evidence about whether a command was given without simultaneous modelling and what happened afterward. This structure is more informative for qualitative implementation research than a single numerical rating because it preserves the instructional condition and response.

The field-note form complemented the structured sheet. It included date, setting, instructional focus, chronological description, notable responses, teacher adjustments, challenges, and reflective notes. The structured and open formats served different purposes: the observation sheet maintained consistency across implementation components, while field notes preserved sequence and unexpected events. The documentation checklist ensured that lesson plans, materials, and visual records were accounted for.

Instrument alignment was reviewed by comparing every item with the research focus. Items that measured achievement or required score calculation were excluded. The instruments were not presented as standardized psychological measures. They were classroom-research tools designed to support transparent description. Before submission, the collaborating observer should confirm that the completed records correspond to the original observation.

3.4.5 Data Organization and Management

Qualitative data management began with the separation of sources. Observation-sheet entries, field notes, lesson plans, materials, and photographs were retained as distinct records. Each source was labelled by implementation stage and function. Student names were omitted or replaced with neutral labels in working records, and the analysis did not require disclosure of individual identities.

The researcher created a working evidence matrix linking source, event, initial code, and potential relevance to the research question. This matrix helped prevent a finding from being based on an isolated impression. An event was considered stronger evidence when it appeared in more than one source, such as a planned modelling step in the lesson plan and a corresponding description in the observer’s field note. Visual records were used only to confirm classroom

arrangement or activity context and were not interpreted beyond what the image clearly showed.

Data management also involved negative and incomplete evidence. If the lesson plan included an activity that was not described in the field notes, the report did not automatically state that it occurred. If a photograph showed movement but did not reveal what command was given, it was not treated as proof of linguistic comprehension. These rules maintained a clear boundary between documented evidence and inference.

3.5 Data Collection Procedures

Data collection began with preparation of the lesson plans, observation sheet, field-note form, vocabulary materials, and documentation checklist. Before the lesson, the researcher and collaborating observer discussed the observation focus so that both understood the indicators and their respective roles.

During the first implementation stage, the researcher introduced the theme, displayed or referred to animal pictures, pronounced the target commands, and modelled the corresponding movements. Students first observed and then responded together. The observer recorded the clarity of commands, the relationship between words and actions, the organization of collective responses, and points at which students required additional modelling.

During the second implementation stage, the researcher reviewed the familiar commands, varied their order and manner, reduced continuous modelling, and organized pair, group, and individual responses. The observer recorded how support was withdrawn or restored, how students participated in different arrangements, and what classroom-management issues emerged. After each stage, the observer completed the reflective section of the field note, while the researcher organized the supporting documentation.

3.5.1 Preparation before Classroom Observation

Before data collection, the researcher reviewed the lesson sequence with the collaborating observer. The discussion clarified that the observer should record instructional processes and visible classroom responses rather than assign vocabulary achievement scores. The observer received the structured sheet and

field-note headings in advance so that the record could cover both predetermined dimensions and unexpected events.

The researcher prepared the four core commands, animal pictures, board use, and movement area. Safety decisions were made before students began moving: running was represented by a movement in place, hopping was controlled, arm movements required personal space, and the roaring action used a moderate classroom voice. These decisions were documented because physical safety and classroom order were part of implementation.

The division of roles was also established. The researcher would teach and make immediate instructional adjustments. The classroom teacher would observe, record the sequence, and note important responses or management issues. The observer was not expected to write every individual action. The priority was to capture events that clarified how TPR was being enacted and adjusted.

3.5.2 Data Collection during the First Implementation Stage

During the first stage, the observer recorded the introduction of the theme, the relationship between pictures and commands, the visibility of the teacher's model, and the organization of collective response. Particular attention was given to what happened when students did not respond immediately. The field note preserved whether the teacher repeated the command, slowed delivery, changed the gesture, or allowed additional observation time.

The first stage produced evidence about high-support implementation. Students encountered the target language through simultaneous spoken and physical modelling, then acted with the class. The observer recorded the extent to which students watched the teacher or peers and how classroom noise and movement were managed. The researcher retained the lesson plan and relevant materials as documentation of intended procedure.

3.5.3 Data Collection during the Second Implementation Stage

During the second stage, observation focused on variation and changing levels of support. The teacher reviewed the core commands, introduced limited modifiers, changed command order, and organized pair, group, and individual responses. The observer noted when a spoken command was given without a simultaneous model and whether the teacher later restored support.

The field note also recorded management decisions. Pair and group activity created a different noise level from whole-class response, and individual turns created additional time and emotional demands. The observer documented changes in group size, pace, movement boundary, and teacher feedback. These records allowed the analysis to connect implementation principles with the practical conditions of the classroom.

3.5.4 Post-Observation Organization

Immediately after the implementation, the observer completed reflective notes while the sequence was still recent. The researcher organized the observation sheet, field notes, lesson plans, materials, photographs, and checklist. No missing detail was filled through guesswork. When a source provided insufficient evidence, the limitation was marked for cautious reporting.

The records were then prepared for analysis by labelling the implementation stage and source type. Student names were not required for the thematic implementation analysis. The use of stage and source labels made it possible to compare intended procedures, observed enactment, and documentation systematically.

3.6 Data Analysis

The data were analyzed using reflexive thematic analysis adapted from Braun and Clarke (2021). First, the researcher became familiar with the observation sheet, field notes, lesson plans, and supporting documentation by reading them repeatedly. Second, relevant segments were coded with process-oriented labels such as modelling, collective response, repetition, reduced support, peer dependence, activity variation, and classroom management.

Third, related codes were grouped into provisional themes that represented recurring stages or implementation features. Fourth, the themes were reviewed against the complete dataset to ensure that they were supported by more than one piece of evidence. Fifth, each theme was defined and named in direct relation to the research question. Finally, the themes were reported as a coherent description of the TPR lesson and discussed in relation to recent research. The analysis remained descriptive and did not use statistical comparison or make causal claims about learning achievement.

3.6.1 Initial Coding

Initial coding identified actions and decisions relevant to implementation. Process-oriented codes were used because the research question asked how the method was implemented. Examples included selecting familiar words, preparing movement space, modelling meaning, acting together, repeating a command, changing order, slowing delivery, reducing modelling, restoring support, organizing groups, monitoring noise, and reviewing vocabulary. The codes remained close to the data before being grouped into broader themes.

Coding did not count every movement or student response. Its purpose was to identify recurring instructional processes and turning points. A single event could receive more than one code. For example, when the teacher slowed a command and repeated the gesture after students hesitated, the event was coded as adjusting pace, restoring modelling, and responding to uncertainty. Multiple coding preserved the complexity of the classroom decision.

4. Table 3.3 Illustrative Initial Coding Framework

Illustrative Data Segment	Initial Code	Analytical Relevance
The teacher pronounced the command and demonstrated the matching action.	modelling meaning	Shows how spoken form was connected to physical representation.
Students first watched and then moved together with the teacher.	guided collective response	Shows the initial high-support participation arrangement.
When hesitation appeared, the teacher slowed and repeated the command.	adjusting pace; restoring support	Shows responsive rather than fixed implementation.
Familiar commands were later given without continuous demonstration.	reducing modelling	Shows movement toward a more independent response.
Noise increased during group movement, so the teacher reduced group size.	managing movement and noise	Shows how physical activity required classroom-management decisions.

3.6.2 Developing and Reviewing Themes

Codes were compared for conceptual relationship. Codes concerning vocabulary selection, pictures, and safe actions were grouped under contextual preparation. Codes concerning demonstration, pronunciation, and visual cues formed teacher modelling. Acting together, repetition, and listening time formed guided response. Changing sequence, pace, and grouping formed repetition and

variation. Reducing and restoring modelling formed gradual independence. Noise, space, different response speeds, and time formed classroom-management adjustment.

Themes were reviewed against the full set of sources. A theme needed to answer part of the research question and contain sufficient evidence to be described meaningfully. Overlapping themes were refined so that each had a clear function. For example, repetition was separated from modelling because it involved not only re-demonstration but also changes in sequence and grouping. Participation was treated as a classroom response within several themes rather than as an independent outcome variable.

The final themes were organized in an instructional sequence while acknowledging that the classroom process was recursive. The teacher sometimes returned from reduced modelling to renewed demonstration. This movement did not contradict the sequence; it showed that implementation involved continuous monitoring and adjustment. The findings chapter therefore reports both the planned progression and the recursive support observed during the lesson.

3.6.3 Evidence and Claim Rules

Three claim rules guided the final report. First, descriptions of procedure had to be supported by an observation record, field note, lesson plan, or documentation source. Second, statements about student response were limited to visible or recorded behavior, such as watching, moving, waiting for peers, or attempting verbal repetition. Third, the analysis did not convert participation into claims about vocabulary achievement, retention, or effectiveness.

The rules were particularly important after the research focus was revised. Removing achievement measures required more than deleting terminology. It required rewriting conclusions so that they answered how TPR was implemented. The evidence and claim rules ensured that the revised thesis remained internally consistent and academically defensible.

3.6.4 Pattern, Variation, and Salient Event Analysis

The analysis distinguished among patterns, variations, and salient events. A pattern was an implementation process supported across related classroom records, such as teacher modelling followed by guided response. A variation was a

difference in how that process appeared, such as direct response in one moment and peer-supported response in another. A salient event was an occurrence that clarified teacher decision-making even when it was not repeatedly documented, such as restoring a model after hesitation.

This distinction prevented frequency from becoming the main analytical criterion. The study did not assume that the most frequently mentioned event was automatically the most meaningful. Field notes naturally contain more detail about visible or unusual moments, and a documentation checklist may mention an item only once. Analytical weight depended on relevance to the research question, clarity of evidence, relationship with other sources, and explanatory value.

Variations were retained because they represented the classroom more accurately than a uniform description. Student response was not presented as consistently independent or consistently dependent. Instead, the analysis explained that readiness changed across commands and response arrangements. Teacher support was likewise described as flexible rather than steadily declining. These variations became part of the implementation pattern.

Salient events were examined for their pedagogical consequence. When noise increased, the teacher changed grouping and reinforced boundaries. When a spoken-only command produced hesitation, modelling was temporarily restored. These events explained how the lesson was adapted. Their value lies in the decision they revealed, not in a count of occurrence.

3.6.5 From Coded Event to Written Finding

The transition from coding to writing followed a consistent chain. The researcher first identified an observable event in a source, assigned a process-oriented code, compared it with related evidence, and considered its role in the implementation sequence. Related codes were then organized within a theme. The written finding combined a descriptive account, source relationship, and restrained interpretation.

For example, records of slowed commands, renewed gesture, picture use, and changed grouping were not reported as disconnected actions. They were coded as forms of responsive support and interpreted together as teacher adjustment. The interpretation remained grounded because every component referred to an

observable instructional decision. It also remained bounded because the theme did not claim that the adjustment produced a measured learning gain.

Writing also required separation of findings and discussion. The findings chapter explains what the records showed and how the events formed an implementation pattern. The discussion connects that pattern with TPR, young-learner pedagogy, embodied learning, and recent studies. Maintaining this distinction reduces repetition and prevents external literature from replacing classroom evidence.

The evidence-to-claim matrices in the enclosures make the analytical chain visible. They are not statistical tables. Their function is documentary: readers can inspect how source segments informed codes, themes, and conclusions. This transparency supports the dependability of the revised qualitative design.

3.7 Trustworthiness

Several procedures were used to strengthen trustworthiness. Source triangulation was conducted by comparing the observation sheet, field notes, lesson plans, and visual documentation. Observer collaboration reduced exclusive dependence on the researcher's teaching perspective. An audit trail was maintained through dated lesson plans, observation records, and documentation checklists. The findings were also kept close to observable classroom events, and interpretations were phrased cautiously when the available data did not support broader conclusions. These practices are consistent with recent qualitative guidance emphasizing transparency, reflexivity, and a clear connection between claims and evidence (Ravitch & Carl, 2021; Braun & Clarke, 2021).

3.7.1 Credibility and Source Triangulation

Credibility was strengthened by comparing the planned procedure with recorded classroom events. Lesson plans indicated what was intended, the observation sheet recorded implementation dimensions, field notes preserved chronology and adjustments, and photographs provided limited contextual confirmation. Agreement across sources increased confidence that a described event occurred. Disagreement or absence of evidence was retained as a limitation rather than resolved through assumption.

Collaborative observation also supported credibility. Because the researcher was teaching, the collaborating observer could attend to student responses and classroom management that the researcher might miss. The observer's role did not make the record completely objective; it provided an additional perspective. Before final submission, verification of the field notes by the collaborating observer remains an important procedural check.

3.7.2 Dependability, Confirmability, and Transferability

Dependability concerns whether the research process is documented clearly enough to be followed. The thesis provides the research focus, instrument matrix, observation indicators, lesson plans, field-note structure, coding examples, thematic framework, and audit-trail summary. These materials show how classroom records were transformed into findings.

Confirmability concerns the relationship between interpretation and evidence. The evidence matrix and claim rules were used to keep conclusions grounded in documented events. Reflexive statements acknowledge the researcher's dual role and prevent the report from presenting interpretation as neutral fact. The inclusion of challenges, peer dependence, and restored support also reduces the risk of reporting only favorable events.

Transferability does not mean statistical generalization. It is supported through contextual detail about the school, participants, vocabulary theme, classroom resources, lesson sequence, and management conditions. Readers can compare these conditions with their own settings and decide whether particular procedures may be relevant. Creswell and Poth (2024) describe such contextual and validation considerations as central to the quality of qualitative reporting.

3.7.3 Negative Evidence and Rival Interpretations

Trustworthiness required attention to evidence that complicated an ideal account of TPR. Peer dependence, delayed response, noise, limited space, and the need to restore modelling were therefore retained. These events did not disprove the method; they revealed the conditions under which the procedure required support. Excluding them would have produced a selective and less credible description.

Rival interpretations were considered when an event could have more than one meaning. Collective movement might indicate understanding of the command, imitation of the model, following peers, or overlapping influences. The report did not resolve the ambiguity by assumption. It described the available cues and interpreted the event as supported participation. Spoken-only commands and changed order provided additional evidence, but they still did not establish stable individual mastery.

Visual documentation required similar caution. An image can confirm arrangement, visible participation, or material use. It cannot preserve pronunciation, timing, or the complete relationship between a command and response. Photographs therefore supported contextual description but did not override the observer's written record.

Considering negative evidence and rival interpretations strengthens credibility because it demonstrates that the analysis was not designed to defend a predetermined positive conclusion. The resulting account is more useful to teachers because it includes both workable procedures and conditions that demanded adjustment.

3.7.4 Auditability of the Revised Research Design

Auditability refers to whether a reader can follow the decisions that connect the research question, data, analysis, and conclusion. The revised design supports this through an alignment matrix, instrument descriptions, completed descriptive records, a coding matrix, cross-source comparison, and explicit claim rules. Each component serves a distinct function within the analytical chain.

The audit trail also records methodological exclusions. Achievement measures and causal claims were removed because they did not align with the descriptive question. Numerical ratings were not used to summarize observation. The absence of those elements is not a missing analysis; it is a deliberate design decision supported by the revised purpose.

Dependability further requires that the completed field notes and observation sheet correspond to original records. The thesis identifies this verification requirement explicitly. Any discrepancy should be corrected in favor

of the contemporaneous record rather than the reconstructed narrative. This safeguard is particularly important because the researcher also taught the lesson.

The enclosures provide templates for observer verification and reflexive review. Their inclusion allows the study to show how data quality was considered, while the limitation chapter acknowledges what the available records cannot establish. Together, transparency and restraint support an academically defensible qualitative report.

3.8 Ethical Considerations

The research was conducted with permission from the school. Student names were omitted or replaced with non-identifying participant labels in working records. The data were used only for academic purposes, and visual documentation was treated carefully because the participants were minors. Any photograph included in the final thesis should be supported by the permission required by the school and the institution; otherwise, the image should be removed or anonymized. The researcher also avoided presenting uncertain or incomplete records as verified data.

3.9 Research Steps and Schedule

5. Table 3.4 Research Steps and Documentary Sequence

Stage	Main Activities	Documentary Position
Preparation	Identifying the classroom issue, reviewing recent literature, and preparing the qualitative focus.	Before classroom implementation
Instrument preparation	Preparing lesson plans, observation sheet, field-note form, vocabulary materials, and documentation checklist.	Before implementation
Initial implementation stage	Introducing target vocabulary through teacher modelling and guided whole-class physical response.	Initial classroom record
Extended implementation stage	Reviewing and varying commands, reducing modelling, and organizing pair, group, and individual responses.	Extended classroom record
Data organization	Compiling observation records, field notes, lesson plans, and visual documentation.	Immediately after implementation
Thematic analysis	Coding, developing themes, reviewing evidence, and writing the findings.	After data organization