



## REVISITING PUPPETS TO TEACH ENGLISH TO CHILDREN: MODEL ACTIVITIES TO FOSTER CLASSROOM ORAL INTERACTION USING PUPPETS

Joibel Tadea Gimenez Mogollon<sup>i</sup>

Professor,  
Language Faculty Tijuana,  
Universidad Autónoma de Baja California,  
Tijuana, Baja California,  
Mexico

### Abstract:

Puppetry, as an educational resource, has been used for years to create a dynamic and interactive learning environment that encourages creativity, active oral participation and language fluency development. In a world where the use of technological tools, digital materials, apps and virtual classrooms have changed the dimension of education, making classes more dynamic and obliquus, puppets are still valuable in the class, as multiple research works have shown. For that reason, we revisited the use of puppets as a pedagogical tool in the English classroom, specifically to foster oral interactions in the English classes of a group of pre-schooling students. In that group, we observed that even though the teacher used multiple resources and activities (such as games, songs, act outs and more), some students did not participate in the oral interaction activities. We decided to design a set of activities mediated by impersonated puppets to foster oral interaction in the class. In this work, we presented the steps for designing those activities and a theoretical foundation for that design. The findings of its application are a matter of further research.

**Keywords:** puppetry, oral interaction, English learning

### 1. Introduction

The teaching of English among preschoolers has been widely supported by linguists and language teachers, considering the innate psychological, social, and/or cultural characteristics that favor the process. However, the learning of English at a young age should not be taken for granted: an adequate class design and a proper selection of pedagogical resources must be considered. The use of classroom activities such as show and tell, tongue twisters, storytelling or role-play scenarios, slides, charts, songs and

---

<sup>i</sup> Correspondence: email [joibel.gimenez@uabc.edu.mx](mailto:joibel.gimenez@uabc.edu.mx)

videos, are among the ones that children enjoy the most. Unfortunately, we might eventually face the reality of having a couple of students who, no matter how enjoyable and varied the activities are, do not participate actively in the class, especially the oral ones. Stage fright, apathy, or shyness can prevent children's participation in oral activities. The frequent exposure to the language, as in bilingual schools, for example, does not seem to change the lack of participation positively.

The starting point for this “in progress” work was the evidence collected in a class of preschool students of a private school in the north of Mexico. The class observed was made up by a group of twenty students (10 male and 10 female), with a frequency of English classes of 5 days a week, 45 minutes each day. The material used for the class included students' English books, activity books, flashcards and recorded audio. The activities developed by the English teacher were storytelling, coloring, choral drill repetition and dialogues. By the moment in which the observation of the class started, the students had had 180 hours of classes. Despite this, the oral participation of some students was low, tending to nonexistent, suggesting that the continuous exposure to the language, the diverse material, and the activities designed for children were not enough for those students. With the purpose of improving participation in oral activities, the notion of introducing puppets as mediators in the development of oral activities to foster oral participation among children was proposed. In this work, we present the process we followed to design the activities to foster oral participation mediated by puppets.

## 2. Literature Review

It has been widely proven that children learn English more easily than adults due to innate characteristics. On one side, Critical Period Hypothesis states that there is an optimal period for language acquisition that occurs between the ages of 2 and 13 in which, if the individual is exposed to appropriate language stimuli, language learning will result in a performance that shows no traces of the native language, especially in terms of pronunciation (Çağaç, 2018), accent and grammatical errors (Hartshorne, Tenenbaum & Pinker, 2018; Peinfeld and Roberts, 1959; Lenneberg, 1967). On the other hand, Krashen's Affective Filter Hypothesis proposed that due to the fewer inhibitions and open-mindedness that the majority of children possess, the achievement of an optimal oral interaction in a foreign language is feasible. Then, why are some children not capable of achieving that optimal oral interaction level? What can a teacher do to help them to overcome that problem? What is oral interaction, and how can we foster it? Let us set up some definitions.

### 2.1 Oral Interaction

Oral interaction has been defined as “*the use of the target language in its spoken form in meaningful exchanges with conversational partners. It involves language production, but also active listening*” (IGI, 2024). According to this definition, oral interaction demands reception as well as production. Also, it points out the significance of a conveyed message

in the interaction. Oral interaction demands that when person A talks and B responds, that response has to be related to the previous input. Otherwise, there is no interaction (Alcaide, 2007). Responses as well as interactions can be verbal or non-verbal.

Non-verbal interaction refers to those physical responses, and it is considered as focused on behavior: nodding, hand-raising, body gestures, eye contact, and all the resources we use gesturally. Verbal interaction refers to the vocal responses that include: asking questions, making comments, taking part in discussions, and others that require verbalization (Tuan and Nhu, 2010 in Palate Nuñez, 2021). During a conversation, the lack of a response, either gestural and/or vocal, could be perceived as a lack of interaction. As a consequence, communication is broken.

Also, in the oral interaction, we have to consider the principles that rule it. We used as a reference for this work the principles proposed in the project named “The Consortium” (2016). The principles they proposed are the following:

Principle 1: Target language input is essential for learning, but it can be made more effective if learners are encouraged to check their understanding of it by asking questions of what the teacher is saying or asking the teacher to repeat. This principle is focused on the importance of a proper target language input: the exposure to the vocal stimuli of the language to be acquired is crucial as a first step in language acquisition. Ellis (1985) said that the acquisition of a second language requires the existence of the L2 input as well as proper mechanisms to process that input. Thus, it is important to take into consideration the negotiation of the input. Zhang (2009) considers that learners “...selectively take portions of comprehensible input and choose the correct linguistic form to express themselves...”, making possible the internalization of the target language input. To provide sufficient and clear input: everyday conversation, oral instructions provided in class, games and any other activity that includes vocal utterances, will load the linguistic baggage of the learner.

Principle 2: Learners need to be encouraged to speak spontaneously and to say things that they are not sure are correct. Spontaneous speech has been considered as a “*stream of words, with no overt lexical marking of the punctuation itself*” (Shriberg, 2005). Spontaneous speech could be defined as the uttering of oral language that has not been previously planned or rehearsed, with plenty of imperfections from the grammatical point of view, unrestrainedly uttered, but full of meaning, emotions and feelings. It has been said that it contains peculiar elements such as filled pauses (noises that are not words, for example, ah, uh, um, etc.), restarts (to repeat a word or phrase without uttering fully), interjections, unknown or mispronounced words, ellipsis, ungrammatical constructions and constituents in unusual orders (Ward, 1989). It is not ruled by grammar but by spontaneity.

Principle 3: Less spontaneous oral interaction should nevertheless be of high quality. By referring to high-quality interaction, we mean the inclusion of activities such as: substantial student turns; use of an adequate waiting time; use of words and expressions that require cognitive challenge; receive appropriate feedback from the teacher; and nominate students turns rather than wait for volunteers. This principle is opposed to the previous one that expects production under the cost of correctness: this

principle demands the adequate development of skills required in the oral interaction, such as substantial turn-taking; use of an adequate waiting time, construction of challenging structures (such as compound sentences, complex compound and elaborated noun phrases); reception of an appropriate teacher feedback; nomination of students rather than waiting for volunteers.

Principle 4: Students should be explicitly taught strategies to use when faced with communication difficulties. These should be used alongside techniques for developing their oral fluency, such as repetition of tasks and chunking of pre-learned words into whole phrases. Regardless of the grammatical competence students could acquire, eventual communication difficulties might come up. It is valuable that teachers instruct the students in the use of different techniques to encounter those difficulties. Somsai & Intaraprasert (2011) suggest some techniques to achieve that purpose: switching some unknown words or phrases into the mother tongue, correcting his/her own pronunciation; using familiar words, phrases, or sentences; using non-verbal expressions such as mime, gestures, and facial expressions; appealing for assistance from the interlocutor; among others.

Summarizing, oral interaction requires the use of linguistic and paralinguistic elements; requires adequate exposure to the language, but also, it requires that the individual makes an effort to interact orally, either with words and/or gestures; and last, but foremost, requires a willingness to communicate. If there is no real desire to perform the oral interaction, the process of oral communication fails, and it is necessary to use resources to foster that interaction.

## 2.2 Puppetry for Children's English Learning

According to Vygotsky (2012), oral interaction is critical in children's learning because it favors the dynamic interaction between individuals and society, nurtures human development and consequently, encourages children to learn from teachers and fellow students. Other activities that the same author established as influential for children include ludic activities such as observation, mimicry, games and motor activities.

A resource that requires observation, mimicry, games, motor activities, and social interaction and has been highly used throughout the years in the teaching of English to children is puppets. A significant number of authors (Fernández, 1971; Hayati, 2009; Bravo & del Carmen Cisterna, 2020; Prabhakaran & Yamat (2017), Toledo & Hoit (2016), Andersen (1984), Adams (1985), Yang (1999), Gronna, Serna, Kennedy & Prater (1999), Peck (2001), among others) have experimented with the use of puppets in school environments.

Some of the benefits of the use of puppets to teach English to children reported are:

- 1) **Promotes the child's creative self-expression, encourages the child's independent dramatic play, and stimulates verbal activity and creativity alongside** (Brédikyté, 2002). Previous results were taken from a study about the use of puppets in the classroom to foster creativity in oral expression, following

the research method of videotaped material and observation. The study was conducted in one of Vilnius' nursery preschools, with children ranging between 2 to 7 years old. Four sessions of 55 minutes were recorded. Children were taught a fairy tale, rehearsed without puppets during the first session and later with puppets. It was observed that even though children were taught model conversations, their performance was not a mere repetition of the conversations, showing in the performance an oral creative and independent output.

- 2) **Promotes engagement and talk** (Naylor, Keogh, Downing, Maloney & Simon, 2007). In their case study, the authors found that teachers who adopted the use of puppets in the classroom started to develop a more narrative discourse that led the classes to reason and argument instead of recalling theory. As a consequence, children contributed more to the discussions. The study began with a pilot phase to instruct eight teachers on the use of puppets; the use of the puppets in the classroom was recorded. Data from the recording were used to develop an analytical framework for the discourse in the class. The main study included 16 primary school teachers in London and Manchester. Recordings of the class without puppets were made, and afterwards, they were made with puppets. The inclusion of puppets was found effective, especially for roles and characterizations in the class.
- 3) **Improves communication and socialization in a classroom** (Korošec, 2013). The previous conclusion was coined after descriptive and casual non-experimental research conducted among a random sample that included 249 female teachers: 27 preschool teachers working in 1<sup>st</sup> grade, 197 primary school teachers, 57 from the first stage of primary and 140 from the second (25 did not mention their workplace). The opinion poll revealed that preschool and primary school teachers who often use puppets as a tool in the classroom considered that puppets benefit the social and communicative development of children who use them to interact in the classroom using nonverbal and/or verbal signs.
- 4) **Mediates children's communication and learning** (Ahlcrona, 2012). In the ethnographic research, data was collected for 11 months, among a group of 20 children (ages 3 to 5), ten girls and ten boys, who attended a preschool located in a middle-class area of an important city in Sweden. The interaction of the children with their peers was recorded through observation and analysis. It was found that during the use of the puppets, children engaged in improvisations, individual conversations and games with the puppets.
- 5) **Mediates children's communication and personal interaction** (Korošec, 2012). Using a qualitative methodology, Korošec conducted the analysis of essays authored by 47 teachers in which their experiences with the use of the puppets as a tool in elementary school classrooms were recorded. The report and analysis of statements of children were also included. It was found that the puppets served as a mediator in the classroom communication. Some activities performed by the teacher mediated by puppets were greeting the children using puppets when

they arrived at the classroom, using puppets as a mediator to teach the class, and developing friendships between children and puppets as long others.

- 6) **Engages and motivates in English language learning** (Çağanağa and Kalmış, 2015). A case study using observation and interview was conducted in the English class of a preschool in Cyprus. The observed group was made by 20 children (12 boys and 8 girls), age 5. They had one hour of class during the week. The class was observed for 5 weeks. The authors found that children's engagement and participation in the class was positive.
- 7) **Increases interest and motivation in learning** (Remer and Tzuriel, 2015). Following an intervention program and using a semi-structured interview, Remer and Tzuriel studied the use of puppets as a mediation tool to teach preschool children; the number of children observed was 145 from 15 preschools located in central Israel: 77 regular and 68 special education. The mediators of the intervention program were 18 students: 10 from the bachelor program and 8 from the graduate program. A group of students was enrolled in a preschool education program at a college in Israel; another was enrolled at a university in Israel in special education. Data was collected from the mediator's point of view. The answers were: 78% of the mediators said that puppets helped a lot as mediators in the class, 17% said that they helped in certain subjects, and 5% said they helped as part of small projects. The mediators also mentioned that puppets were an effective tool that helped to create a personal connection between – children.
- 8) **It is an effective educational resource for teaching speaking in English** (Maharani, 2016). The findings of Maharani were derived from conducting an intervention methodology in a junior high school in Semarang Regency. A control group and an experimental group were observed. Each group had 30 students. Two instruments were used to collect data: a speaking test and a self-esteem questionnaire. Data was classified in 8 groups: (1) data of students' speaking tests using puppets; (2) data on students' speaking test scores using pictures; (3) data of speaking scores of students with high self-esteem; (4) data of speaking score of students with low self-esteem; (5) data of speaking score of students with high self-esteem taught using puppets; (6) data of speaking score of students with low self-esteem taught using puppets; (7) data of speaking score of students with high self-esteem taught using pictures; (8) data of speaking score of students with low self-esteem taught using pictures. The results of one of the tests showed that the scores of speaking tests of students taught using puppet media (81.60) were higher than the scores of those taught using pictures (79.12). After analyzing the complete data, the author concluded that puppets are interesting and joyful to use in the English classroom.

As we can observe, there is a general agreement about the usefulness of puppets as mediators in the classroom, particularly in preschool ones. The works mentioned above stated clearly how beneficial the use of puppets is in terms of developing speaking skills, motivation, socialization and communication; they are useful as a tool for the

instructors and as a tool for the students. However, using the puppets not as a tool but as a “part of the student” has not been explored. We also observed in previous works that model programs that propose the use of puppets as mediators have been designed: we find the experience of teachers using the puppets to convey the message; we find students using puppets as a “part of the class” item and/or a device to talk in class. Puppets have been seen as a company for children. However, impersonation of the puppet, which makes the puppet represent the child itself during the oral interaction in the class, is an unexplored field. The construction of a puppet with particular features chosen by the owner/user, being the puppet “the alter ego of the child”, could develop a sense of ownership in a child, which involves psychological, social and learning elements that might be positive for the development of the oral interaction because they represent a change of behavior.

Some authors have highlighted, from the psychological and cognitive perspective, how positive the use of puppets among children is. We could mention authors such as Bandura, Piaget, Vygotsky, and Gardner, who have provided concepts that serve as the foundation for the usefulness of the use of puppets in the children's classroom. Bandura (1986), in his social learning theory, proposed that children learn through imitation, including social behavior imitation; puppets themselves require imitation and proper social interaction. Piaget (2013), in his constructivist theory, stated that children build knowledge through physical interaction; meanwhile, Vygotsky's constructivist theory (1978), alleged that not only social interaction but also cultural tools, such as language, helped in the construction of knowledge; using puppets in the classroom involves social interaction and oral interaction, activities that are the media to knowledge construction.

Finally, Gardner (2008), in his theory of multiple intelligences, supported the existence of the bodily-kinesthetic, interpersonal, and linguistic intelligences, intelligences that could be enhanced by the use of puppets: puppets serve to develop the previous mentioned intelligences, which conduct to the integral development of children in the educational environment.

Considering that previous studies have examined the effectiveness of the use of puppets for teaching English to children as well as a means to practice oral interaction; also, considering the different pedagogical theories that support how important the interaction, oral interaction and bodily-kinesthetic activities are to benefit the development and learning of the children, we decided to revisit the use of puppets from the impersonation as a media to foster oral interaction in the English class. As has been mentioned before, our intention was NOT to introduce the puppets as an inanimate object that are manipulated while the student or the teacher talks: our intention was to explore the effect of the puppet as a real character developed by the child, with personality, personal features and voice. The impersonation, defined in the Cambridge Dictionary as “*the act of attempting to deceive someone by pretending that you are another person*”, might help the child to be who they want to be during the oral interaction.

The description of the process of designing the activities is presented below.

### 3. Material and Method

#### 3.1 Participants

The class observed was the 3rd level preschool English class of a private school in the north of Mexico. It was made up of 20 students (10 boys and 10 girls), ages ranging between 5 and 6 years old. One student had been previously diagnosed with a certain type of neurodivergent, and a second one, according to a school counselor, might also have some type of neurodivergence (at the moment of the study, their parents had not agreed to evaluate him professionally). The school period started in September 2023, with English classes from Monday to Friday, 45 minutes each day.

The class was observed during four weeks of May, on random days. By that time, they already had 180 hours of effective English classes. It was observed that the class was developed by the teacher following the scope and sequence of the textbook implemented for the class, as long as the book and complementary materials were used (audio, story cards, flashcards and a mat). It was observed that four students did not participate actively in the classroom oral interaction. Two of the four students were those referred before with actual and suspected neurodivergent.

To register the oral participation, we used a questionnaire that contains the following criteria:

The observed situation arose the following questions:

- Are not the materials used in class sufficient for all students to be active orally in class?
- Is there any other resource that could be used?
- Is it possible that the use of puppets as mediators makes those four students participate orally in class?

#### 3.2 Project design

In this “revisit” of the use of puppets, the design of multi-sensorial activities to foster classroom oral interaction is presented. For the design of the activities, the following theories were taken into consideration:

- the social learning theory of Bandura, which says that children learn through imitation;
- the constructivist theory of Piaget, which proposes the learning through physical interaction;
- the constructivist theory of Vygotsky, which proposes the learning by social interaction and language use;
- the multiple intelligences of Garner, who talks about bodily-kinesthetic, interpersonal, and linguistic intelligence.

The design has been defined as multi-sensorial because it requires that the children use listening skills, speaking skills, motor skills and theatrical skills (without lacking creativity and improvisation). Principles of oral interaction are taken into consideration in the design of the activities. Impersonation (pretending to be someone else, having



voice, attitude, character and personality different from your own) was considered an element in the design. Thus, the appropriation of the character might improve the oral interaction in class.

### 3.3 Detailed presentation of the activities

The activities were designed and organized sequentially. It is advisable not to alter the order presented here to respect the stages of peer collaboration, creativity, and ownership, which are previous to the speaking practices.

#### 1. Introduction of the characters (use of the Principle 1 of the oral interaction):

- a) On day one, the characters to be used during the experiment or designed program were introduced. For the purpose of the sample students, the characters used were insects presented in the student's book that had been used during the school period. Those insects were: butterfly, bee, ant, snail, spider.
- b) The characters were presented one by one using visual aids, mimicry and sound. For each insect, the picture was presented. The teacher said out loud the name of the insect 3 times. After that, the teacher encouraged the students to repeat the name of the insect as long as mime movements related to the insect. For example:

Bee

T: bee (emphasize the sound of the long /e/ in the word "bee" plus act out the movement of the hand up and sound, simulating a flying bee)

Ss: bee (students repeat the word and move the hand alongside)

Butterfly

T: butterfly (say the word plus act out the movement of the two hands, simulating a flying butterfly)

Ss: butterfly (students repeat the word and move their hands, recreating the movements of the wings of the butterfly)

#### 2. Selection of the character:

- a) after the characters were presented, the teacher encouraged the students to select the one they preferred. The process of impersonation started here: it was crucial that students selected the character they preferred in order to start to develop a sense of ownership, and this is the foundation to use the puppets as a tool to overcome the difficulties in the oral interaction: ownership of the character and its features.
- b) the teacher must select an insect and model the process. After the students had selected the character they preferred, the process of making the puppets started.

#### 3. Manufacturing the puppet:

- a) the type of puppet selected for this work was the sock puppet, due to its versatility to move, affordability and ease to carry.

- b) some materials were provided by the teacher: eyes, felt markers, laces and wings made of paper.
- c) after the selection of the insect, students were encouraged to create their own character: color and shape of eyes; color and shape of wings; and other accessories such as laces, shells, etc.).
- d) with the help of the teacher, they glued the accessories on the socks (eyes, mouth, wings, etc.).
- e) children were instructed to decide the gender of the puppet and name in this step.
- f) the teacher must manufacture a puppet or more as well.

4. Personalization of the puppets – impersonation:

- a) once the puppets were finished, the teacher instructed the students to “construct” the personality of the puppet. This part of the process probably is the one that challenges the creativity of the children the most, because they have to develop the impersonation of the puppet (impersonation is approached in this work as to assume to be someone else, with particular features different than the self).
- b) gender and name have to be decided by the children; besides, they must work on the development of the tone of the voice (cheerful, authoritative, formal, etc.), and the personality (friendly, grumpy, happy, etc.).
- c) It is required that the children are not rushed along this process. Some details, such as voices, might need to be rehearsed several times.
- d) allow children to experiment with it until they feel comfortable with the impersonation.

5. Practice of puppet manipulation (Principle 4):

- a) in this activity, the teacher suggests how to move the puppets and encourages the children to follow the lead. The practice of using voices is also advisable. Social interaction has been considered even more important than the provision of verbal input by in language learning. From an educational, ecological perspective, authors sustain that the exposure to “...*multisensory activities with a wide array of semiotic resources and diverse teacher-child and peer interactions*” provide elements to learn a language. (Van Lier, in Schwartz & Deeb, 2018). As a consequence, the practice of the movements of puppets during the interaction is necessary.

6. Use of the puppet in the class. Practice of the vocabulary (Principle 1):

- a) the teacher presented orally the vocabulary (insects).
- b) for the choral repetition of the vocabulary, students must manipulate and vocalize the puppets.
- c) emphasis on the use of the puppets has to be made.
- d) students must raise their puppets when the insect they represent is called out.
- e) suitable extra activities are: “bees on the right”, “snails on the left”.

7. Use of the puppet in the class. Practice of role-play (Principles 3 and 4):
- a) first, the teacher plays the audio of the role-play while showing the poster with the characters interacting.
  - b) second, the teacher plays the audio again, this time mimicking the role play by the use of puppets.
  - c) third, the audio is played, and children are encouraged to repeat it.
  - d) the teacher must confirm that all the students are moving the puppets and repeating aloud the content of the role play.
8. Use of the puppet in the class. Role play of the puppet (Principles 3 and 4):
- a) after the oral practice of the role play, students are paired to perform the role play.
  - b) possible combinations are: two butterflies together, one butterfly and a snail; one bee and an ant.
  - c) switch pairs at least three times.
  - d) if students want to continue the interaction, let them be free to do it for a couple of minutes.
- 9) Use of the puppet in the class. Free conversation/interaction (Principles 2, 3 and 4):
- a) this activity can be used either for evaluation, extra practice or review.
  - b) for this activity, the teacher mentions a topic.
  - c) provide some examples of words, phrases or questions to trigger the interaction. For example: "what is your name?" (moving the sock puppets and vocalizing alongside – tone of voice could be mocked).
  - d) children are allowed to mention either their real names or the names of their characters.

### **3.4 Additional suggestions**

The use of the puppets for every oral interaction is suggested. Since the aim of the use of the puppets is to make them serve as a mediator of the interaction, their use in the activities could turn into an asset.

Alongside the use of puppets in the classroom, some technological tools could be used to provide a refreshing variation of the class: record videos using the puppets and post them on social media, broadcast the sessions or other activities that involve the use of technology (under the supervision and agreement of parents and/or tutors and school managers), might enhance the experience of children.

## **4. Conclusion**

Age is an important factor in foreign language learning; it has been said that children possess natural abilities that ease their learning of foreign languages as English. This thesis has been supported by multiple theories and hypotheses through the years: Critical Period Hypothesis (Lenneberg, 1967), talks about a period of life in which language

learning is ideal; Universal Grammar (Chomsky) states that the inner ability of children to master grammar rules of the language; Neuroplasticity principle (Merzenich, 1980) argues that children's brains are more flexible to adapt to language input; the Affective Filter Hypothesis (Krashen, xxx) mentions that children are more risky than adults and they do not care making mistakes during the oral production. Relying on the previous theoretical foundation, an effective oral performance of children in English class should be an expected outcome. However, as was observed, exceptions would arise in a classroom, and one or several students might not perform the oral interactions as desired.

In addition, theories mention the usefulness of ludic learning activities, such as imitation (Bandura, 1986), physical interaction (Piaget, 2013), bodily-kinesthetic activities and socially interactive activities (Gardner, 2008), as well as oral interaction (Vygotsky, 1978), provide an ideal setting for the learning process. Puppets, regardless, are not "a new resource", continue to be a useful learning tool, as the historical references say. Consequently, the possibility of having success in the classroom after applying puppets to foster oral interaction seems to be plausible.

The use of puppets from the impersonation is a different perspective from previous research. Studies on puppetry have shown their effectiveness in helping children to overcome challenges in the classroom, such as anxiety, lack of confidence, and shyness, among others; we consider that the impersonated puppets could be more useful and effective than pre-made puppets. Impersonated puppets would favor children to develop a sense of ownership and identification with the character.

After the design of these activities, two hypotheses arose that will be the starting point of further research:

- Students who do not participate in the oral activities before the use of the impersonated puppets will do it after their implementation in class.
- The use of impersonated puppets as a means to perform oral interaction during the school year will give students time to perform oral interactions actively without puppets.

Either of the two will test the effectiveness of the proposed design.

### **Acknowledgements**

We acknowledge the assistant of the English teacher of the class, as well as the principal of the school, who let us conduct the observation of the classes.

### **Conflict of Interest Statement**

The author declares no conflicts of interest.

### **About the Author**

Joibel Tadea Giménez Mogollón is professor in the Language Faculty Tijuana, Universidad Autónoma de Baja California, Mexico. She holds a PhD in Education from the Universidad Fermín Toro, Venezuela, a Post-Graduate Diploma in English Teaching as a Foreign Language from the Universidad Pedagógica Experimental Libertador,

Venezuela and a bachelor's degree in Language Teaching from the Universidad Pedagógica Experimental Libertador, Venezuela. Her research interests are Applied Linguistics, Difficulties in English Learning, Technological Education and Mobile Learning.

## References

- Adams, I. M. C. (1985). Utilization of puppetry as a means of enhancing communication through oral language and attention to task. Retrieved from <https://digitalcommons.unomaha.edu/studentwork/3012/>
- Alcaide, C. H. (2007). La interacción en la destreza oral. In *Las destrezas orales en la enseñanza del español L2-LE: XVII Congreso Internacional de la Asociación del Español como lengua extranjera (ASELE)*. Logroño, 27-30 de septiembre de 2006 (pp. 613-622). Universidad de La Rioja. Retrieved from <https://dialnet.unirioja.es/servlet/articulo?codigo=2469954>
- Ahlcrona, M. F. (2012). The puppet's communicative potential as a mediating tool in preschool education. *International Journal of Early Childhood*, 44, 171-184. Retrieved from <http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/s13158-012-0060-3>
- Andersen, E. S. (1984). The acquisition of sociolinguistic knowledge: Some evidence from children's verbal role-play. *Western Journal of Communication* (includes Communication Reports), 48(2), 125-144. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10570318409374149>
- Bandura, A. (1986). Social foundations of thought and action. Englewood Cliffs, NJ, 1986(23-28), 2. Retrieved from <https://psycnet.apa.org/record/1985-98423-000>
- Bravo, P. V., & del Carmen Cisterna, C. (2020). Young learners English speaking skill development and motivation through the use of a puppet. *European Journal of Education Studies*, 7(8). <http://dx.doi.org/10.46827/ejes.v7i8.3212>
- Brédikyté, M. (2002). Dialogical drama with puppets (DDP) as a method of fostering children's verbal creativity. *The puppet-What a miracle*, 33-60. Retrieved from <https://eric.ed.gov/?id=ED447906>
- Çağaç, F. G. (2018). Benefits of Learning a Foreign Language at an Early Age. *Journal of International Social Research*, 11(59). Retrieved from <https://openurl.ebsco.com/EPDB%3Agcd%3A9%3A19498857/detailv2?sid=ebsco%3Aplink%3Ascholar&id=ebsco%3Agcd%3A132947588&crl=f>
- Çağanağa, Ç & Kalmı, A. (2015). The role of puppets in kindergarten education in Cyprus. *Open Access Library Journal*, 2(7), 1-9. Retrieved from <https://www.scirp.org/journal/paperinformation?paperid=68496#:~:text=The%20puppets%20not%20only%20encourage,of%20an%20adult%20or%20teacher>.
- Ellis, R. (1985). *Understanding Second Language Acquisition*. OUP Oxford. Retrieved from <https://www.routledge.com/Understanding-Second-Language-Acquisition/Ortega/p/book/9780340905593>

- Fernandez, Sue (2008). Research Unit for Multilingualism and Cross-cultural Communication at the University of Melbourne Teaching and Learning Languages Other Than English (LOTE). in Victorian Schools Paper, No. 14 February 1-2.
- Franz, C. E., & White, K. M. (1985). Individuation and attachment in personality development: Extending Erikson's theory. *Journal of Personality*, 53(2), 224-256. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-6494.1985.tb00365.x>
- Galarcep, M. F. (1971). Puppets in teaching English. *ELT Journal*, 25(2), 165-170.
- Gardner, H. E. (2008). *Multiple intelligences: New horizons in theory and practice*. Basic books. Retrieved from <https://psycnet.apa.org/record/2006-21200-000>
- Gronna, S. S., Serna, L. A., Kennedy, C. H., & Prater, M. A. (1999). Promoting generalized social interactions using puppets and script training in an integrated preschool: A single-case study using multiple baseline design. *Behavior modification*, 23(3), 419-440. Retrieved from <https://doi.org/10.1177/0145445599233005>
- Hartshorne, J. K., Tenenbaum, J. B., & Pinker, S. (2018). A critical period for second language acquisition: Evidence from 2/3 million English speakers. *Cognition*, 177, 263-277. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cognition.2018.04.007>
- Hayati, A. (2009). The Use of Puppets as Teaching Media to Teach Conversation for Young Learners. Semarang: Universitas Negeri Semarang. Retrieved from <http://lib.unnes.ac.id/2456/1/4621.pdf>
- IGI-Global.com. Available at: [What is Oral Interaction | IGI Global \(igi-global.com\)](http://www.igi-global.com)
- Korošec, H. (2012). Playing with puppets in class—Teaching and learning with pleasure. *The power of the puppet*, 29.
- Korošec, H. (2013). Evaluating Study of Using Puppets as a Teaching Medium in Slovenian Schools. *Journal for Pedagogical & Educational Matters/Školski Vjesnik*, 62(4). Retrieved from <https://hrcak.srce.hr/file/165899>
- Lier, L. (2004). *The Ecology and Semiotics of Language Learning: A Sociocultural Perspective*. Boston: Kluwer Academy. Retrieved from <https://link.springer.com/book/10.1007/1-4020-7912-5>
- Maharani, S. (2016). The use of puppet: Shifting speaking skill from the perspective of students' self-esteem. *Register journal*, 9(2), 170-186. Retrieved from <http://dx.doi.org/10.18326/rgt.v9i2.700>
- Naylor, S., Keogh, B., Downing, B., Maloney, J., Simon, S. (2007). The Puppets Project: Using Puppets to Promote Engagement and Talk in Science. In: Pintó, R., Couso, D. (eds) Contributions from Science Education Research. Springer, Dordrecht. [https://doi.org/10.1007/978-1-4020-5032-9\\_22](https://doi.org/10.1007/978-1-4020-5032-9_22)
- Palate Núñez, M. P. (2021). Influence of vocabulary e-learning strategies on oral interaction skills in EFL learners (Master's thesis). Retrieved from <https://repositorio.utn.edu.ec/handle/123456789/11482?mode=full>
- Peck, S. (2001). Developing children's listening and speaking in ESL. Teaching English as a Second or Foreign, 5. Retrieved from [https://www.researchgate.net/publication/350621379\\_Developing\\_Children's Lis](https://www.researchgate.net/publication/350621379_Developing_Children's_Lis)

[tening and Speaking in ESL In Marianne Celce-Murcia ed Teaching English as a Second or Foreign Language 3rd edition 2001](#)

- Piaget, J. (2013). *The construction of reality in the child*. Routledge. Retrieved from <https://doi.org/10.4324/9781315009650>
- Prabhakaran, D., & Yamat, H. (2017). Speaking anxiety: discover the power of puppets. *Journal of Education and Social Sciences*, 6(2), 79-87. Retrieved from [https://www.jesoc.com/wp-content/uploads/2017/04/KC6\\_50.pdf](https://www.jesoc.com/wp-content/uploads/2017/04/KC6_50.pdf)
- Remer, R., & Tzuriel, D. (2015). "I teach better with the puppet"—Use of puppet as a mediating tool in Kindergarten Education—An evaluation. *American Journal of Educational Research*, 3(3), 356-365. Retrieved from <http://dx.doi.org/10.12691/education-3-3-15>
- Schwartz, M., & Deeb, I. (2018). Toward a better understanding of the language conducive context: an ecological perspective on children's progress in the second language in bilingual preschool. *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism*, 24(4), 481–499. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13670050.2018.1484424>
- Shriberg, E. (2005, September). Spontaneous speech: how people really talk and why engineers should care. In INTERSPEECH (pp. 1781-1784). Retrieved from [https://www.isca-archive.org/interspeech\\_2005/shriberg05\\_interspeech.pdf](https://www.isca-archive.org/interspeech_2005/shriberg05_interspeech.pdf)
- Somsai, S., & Intaraprasert, C. (2011). Strategies for coping with face-to-face oral communication problems employed by Thai university students majoring in English. *GEMA Online Journal of Language Studies*, 11(3). Retrieved from [https://www.researchgate.net/publication/283133945\\_Strategies\\_For\\_Coping\\_With\\_Face-To-Face\\_Oral\\_Communication\\_Problems\\_Employed\\_By\\_Thai\\_University\\_Students\\_Majoring\\_In\\_English](https://www.researchgate.net/publication/283133945_Strategies_For_Coping_With_Face-To-Face_Oral_Communication_Problems_Employed_By_Thai_University_Students_Majoring_In_English)
- Teacher Research Program. Accessed from <http://puppetools.com/Reidmillerresearch.pdf> on June, 12, 2016.
- The Professional Development Consortium in Modern Foreign Languages (2016). Eight principles of teaching and learning languages. Retrieved from <http://pdcinmfl.com/>
- Toledo, F., & Hoit, S. (2016). Developing speaking skills in first grade: The impact of puppets on young learners' spoken interactions and motivation. Cambridge University Press. Van. Retrieved from [https://languageresearch.cambridge.org/images/pdf/2015-16\\_Toledo\\_Hoit\\_CUP\\_TRP\\_final\\_report.pdf?](https://languageresearch.cambridge.org/images/pdf/2015-16_Toledo_Hoit_CUP_TRP_final_report.pdf?)
- Vygotsky, L. S. (2012). *Thought and language*. MIT Press. Retrieved from <https://mitpress.mit.edu/9780262720014/thought-and-language/>
- Vygotsky, L. S. (1978). *Mind in society: The development of higher psychological processes* (Vol. 86). Harvard University Press. Retrieved from <https://doi.org/10.2307/j.ctvjf9vz4>

- Ward, W. (1989). Understanding spontaneous speech. In *Speech and Natural Language: Proceedings of a Workshop Held at Philadelphia, Pennsylvania, February 21-23, 1989*. Retrieved from <https://aclanthology.org/H89-1018/>
- Yang, Chen-Yuan (1999). Promoting communicative competence through drama in elementary English as a foreign language. Theses Digitization Project. 1723. Retrieved from <https://scholarworks.lib.csusb.edu/etd-project/1723/>
- Zhang, S. (2009). The Role of Input, Interaction and Output in the Development of Oral Fluency. *English language teaching*, 2(4), 91-100. Retrieved from <https://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/EJ1083691.pdf>
- Zhang, Y., & Wang, Y. (2007). Neural plasticity in speech acquisition and learning. *Bilingualism: Language and Cognition*, 10(2), 147-160. Retrieved from <https://www.cambridge.org/core/journals/bilingualism-language-and-cognition/article/abs/neural-plasticity-in-speech-acquisition-and-learning/EDDD238CB4A6A7002D45AE3BAEEF6069>



Creative Commons licensing terms

Authors will retain the copyright of their published articles agreeing that a Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International License (CC BY 4.0) terms will be applied to their work. Under the terms of this license, no permission is required from the author(s) or publisher for members of the community to copy, distribute, transmit or adapt the article content, providing a proper, prominent and unambiguous attribution to the authors in a manner that makes clear that the materials are being reused under permission of a Creative Commons License. Views, opinions, and conclusions expressed in this research article are views, opinions and conclusions of the author(s). Open Access Publishing Group and European Journal of English Language Teaching shall not be responsible or answerable for any loss, damage or liability caused in relation to/arising out of conflict of interests, copyright violations and inappropriate or inaccurate use of any kind content related or integrated on the research work. All the published works are meeting the Open Access Publishing requirements and can be freely accessed, shared, modified, distributed and used in educational, commercial and non-commercial purposes under a [Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International License \(CC BY 4.0\)](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/).