IJAMS

The Narratives of EFL Lecturers at a Thai University about Storytelling as a Pedagogical Tool: A Multiple Case Study

KRISNA RIKA O. BARRON
University of the Immaculate Conception, Davao City, Philippines
School of Languages and General Education, Walailak University, Thailand

HENRY E. LEMANA II
University of the Immaculate Conception, Davao City, Philippines
Research Center for Language Teaching and Learning, Walailak University, Thailand

Abstract — The use of storytelling as an English as a Foreign Language (EFL) pedagogical tool in higher education remains relatively novel and underexamined. This qualitative multiple-case study explored the narratives of EFL lecturers at a Thai university on how they integrated storytelling into their teaching practices. Data were collected through interviews, classroom observations, post-teaching reflections, and teaching artifacts, and were subjected to within-case and cross-case thematic analysis. Findings reveal that storytelling functions as an adaptive, relational, and differentiated pedagogical practice. Lecturers used strategies such as simplifying narratives, scaffolding tasks, integrating cultural and ethical themes, and employing multimodal supports to engage students across varying proficiency levels and foster comprehension, learner participation, intercultural awareness, and moral reflection, while carefully aligning with curriculum objectives and institutional support. The study highlights the potential of storytelling to transform classrooms into engaging, culturally responsive, and learner-centered learning environments. Implications stressed the need for professional development, curriculum integration, and policy support to sustain storytelling as an effective EFL pedagogical tool in higher education.

Keywords — Storytelling, narratives, English language learning, EFL pedagogy, multiple-case study, Thailand

I. Introduction

Background of the Study

Storytelling, considered one of the oldest forms of human communication, has been employed for entertainment, cultural reasons, and even education. As a pedagogical approach, it is deemed adequate for its use of imagery and expressions, which enhance comprehension, engagement, and retention of information (Landrum et al., 2019; Ramalia, 2023; Yuniawati et al., 2019). Benabbes and Taleb (2024) asserted that storytelling is a highly effective pedagogical tool for the development of language skills in both first language (L1) and second or foreign language (L2) acquisition, facilitating learners' language comprehension, vocabulary, syntax, and overall

fluency. However, research reveals that storytelling is not always compelling due to challenges such as large class size, varying student abilities, and insufficient preparation time for teachers (Ghafar, 2024; Prongkitsanuluck et al., 2022; Xiang, 2023). Furthermore, Hossain (2024) discussed the issues related to the appropriateness of the stories used, as well as how language complexity could complicate comprehension and student engagement.

Around the world, the challenges in using storytelling as a pedagogical tool in basic education have been documented and explored. In the United States, for example, Landrum et al. (2019) reported on educators' perspectives on storytelling, which, for them, could not fully engage low-proficiency learners struggling to understand stories' language and themes, leading to demotivation in language learning. Furthermore, Lucarevschi (2016) noted that teachers in Canada were skeptical of storytelling's effectiveness, citing concerns about mismatches in language levels and a lack of empirical evidence regarding its drawbacks.

In Asia, educators have encountered similar difficulties. In Ukraine and China, for example, limited instructional time poses a significant challenge, since some classes meet only a few times a week (Ghafar, 2024; Xiang, 2023). This makes it harder to create immersive English lessons, and, as a result, storytelling in these contexts has also been restricted. Meanwhile, Rahman et al. (2022) found that low-proficiency students in Malaysia often struggled with linguistically demanding stories, which limited their classroom engagement.

In Thailand's basic education classrooms, the use of storytelling as a pedagogical tool faces several challenges despite its recognized potential to foster language learning. As per Asmara et al. (2024), large class sizes and limited instructional time often restrict opportunities for interactive story-based activities, making it difficult for teachers to provide adequate feedback and ensure active participation. Moreover, teachers report heavy preparation time for story selection and adaptation, as well as the strain of repeated storytelling performances in large, mixed-ability classrooms (Prongkitsanuluck et al., 2022). Besides, Murad et al. (2023) noted that limited access to resources, particularly in rural schools, exacerbates these difficulties, especially when digital storytelling requires technological support.

Put differently, issues in the use of storytelling as a pedagogical tool in basic education have been well studied across different educational settings, underscoring the broader need to find more effective ways to integrate storytelling into language education (Benabbes & Taleb, 2024; Hossain, 2024). In contrast, storytelling in higher education remains largely unexplored. As Tian and Suki (2023) argued, it remains an emerging practice in universities, mainly because it is traditionally viewed as a tool for younger students.

A similar pattern can be observed in Thailand, where storytelling has been predominantly implemented in kindergarten, elementary, and secondary classrooms, as documented in several studies (e.g., Kaewdee et al., 2024; Murad & Badarni, 2023; Nampaktai & Suksiripakonchai, 2018; Panapob & Abkakorn, 2022). Notably, one public autonomous university in southern Thailand has

taken the pioneering step of integrating storytelling into its EFL classes, making it the first institution in the country to employ this approach at the higher education level. This represents a significant pedagogical shift within Thailand's tertiary sector and accentuates the urgency of examining how storytelling is being employed as a pedagogical tool through the lens of EFL lecturers from diverse backgrounds and characteristics.

This multiple-case study explores the narratives of EFL lecturers at a Thai university regarding their use of storytelling as a pedagogical tool. Given the paucity of research on storytelling in higher education, particularly within the Thai context, the study offers insights into the pedagogical value of storytelling and its potential to inform more contextually responsive and learner-centered EFL practices, as well as curricular innovations and policy directions in higher education. Thus, to pursue this study, the following research questions were constructed:

1. What are the narratives of EFL lecturers in a Thai university about storytelling as a pedagogical tool?

2. What explains the similarities and differences across the cases?

Theoretical Lens

Social Constructivism, as articulated by Bruner (1996) and Vygotsky (1978), posits that individuals construct meaning through social interactions and shared narratives. In the context of EFL teaching, stories are not merely language-teaching tools; they are rich pedagogical resources through which teachers and learners actively negotiate meaning. In this study, Social Constructivism guided the exploration of how EFL lecturers used storytelling to create meaning in the classroom while facilitating language acquisition. It also provided a lens for understanding how lecturers managed classroom challenges, such as varying student motivation and mixed proficiency levels.

Comprehensible Input Hypothesis (Krashen, 1982; Mason, 2019), which suggests that language learners acquire new skills most effectively when they receive input slightly above their current level, but still understandable. Within this framework, storytelling serves as a powerful pedagogical tool by providing learners with authentic, context-rich language input. This theory posits that lecturers challenge students while simultaneously helping them comprehend content, linguistic elements, and cultural references.

II. Methodology

Design. This research used a qualitative approach to explore how EFL lecturers in a Thai university use storytelling as a pedagogical tool. This approach focuses on understanding individuals' lived experiences, shedding light on how people make sense of their worlds and the meanings they attach to their experiences within specific social and cultural contexts (Creswell & Poth, 2018). Specifically, this study employed a multiple case study design (Yin, 2014). This

design was particularly appropriate because it allowed for a comprehensive investigation of the phenomenon across several distinct cases, each representing an individual EFL lecturer and their unique teaching context. Likewise, the multiple case study design enabled the researcher to compare and contrast lecturers' experiences, highlighting both commonalities and variations in how storytelling was employed as a pedagogical tool.

Locale. This study was conducted at a public autonomous university in southern Thailand, recognized by the *Times Higher Education* as a world-class institution due to its strong academic reputation, international outlook, research excellence, and commitment to high-quality teaching and learning standards. In 2023, this university began implementing a major reform by introducing English-language courses that adopted storytelling as the primary pedagogical approach for EFL teaching and learning. These courses were offered through one of its schools dedicated to general education, which, although not a degree-granting school, provided English language instruction to all enrolled students. The school's lecturers represented a highly diverse and multicultural community in terms of age, nationality, linguistic background, and gender.

Participants. Five EFL lecturers served as the cases in this study. Following Yin (2014), multiple-case studies often include a few cases to allow for replication. Maximum variation sampling was used to purposefully select participants with diverse characteristics (Creswell & Poth, 2018). Of 48 lecturers at the university, 20 met the inclusion criteria of actively using storytelling for at least one academic year and of being willing to participate in interviews and classroom observations. These 20 were profiled across nationality, years of experience, institutional role, educational background, qualifications, language proficiency, linguistic background, gender, and age. The five selected cases represented the widest variation, including a balance of novice, mid-career, and senior lecturers, diverse roles and academic backgrounds, gender diversity (male, female, and LGBTQIA++), and a broad age range.

Informants. The study also included informants such as colleagues, course coordinators, or program staff. Informants were purposively selected based on having worked closely with the lecturer for at least six months, familiarity with storytelling in the classroom, and willingness to share perspectives on the lecturer's pedagogical practices.

Data Collection. Data were collected following ethical approval from UIC-REC, the Graduate School, and the Thai university. EFL lecturers were selected via maximum variation sampling, and informants were included to provide additional perspectives. Informed consent was obtained from all participants. Semi-structured in-depth interviews (IDIs) were conducted with lecturers to capture their narratives on using storytelling as a pedagogical tool. Additional interviews with colleagues, academic supervisors, and other closely associated individuals triangulated findings and provided insights into teaching practices and institutional context. Classroom observations were conducted for each lecturer, with detailed field notes documenting storytelling in practice. Supplementary data, including post-conference notes and teaching artifacts

such as yearly performance evaluation slides, provided further evidence of lecturers' reflections, student progress, challenges, adaptations, classroom activities, and feedback.

Data Analysis. Data analysis followed a two-step process: within-case and cross-case analysis. In the within-case analysis, each lecturer's data were presented individually to provide a detailed account of their experiences using storytelling. This involved organizing interview excerpts, classroom observations, post-conference notes, and teaching artifacts into coherent narratives for each case, highlighting key experiences, practices, and reflections. Themes were not constructed at this stage; the focus was on presenting the richness and uniqueness of each case. In the cross-case analysis, findings from all five cases were compared to identify recurring themes, similarities, and differences across participants. This thematic cross-case analysis highlighted standard practices and context-specific adaptations, providing a broader understanding of how storytelling functions as a pedagogical tool in higher education EFL contexts.

Trustworthiness of the Study. To ensure rigor, the study followed principles of credibility, dependability, confirmability, and transferability (Lincoln & Guba, 1994). Credibility was ensured through triangulation of interviews, observations, reflective notes, participant verification, and peer debriefing. Dependability was maintained via detailed documentation of methods, procedures, and research logs, enabling replication. Confirmability was strengthened through methodological memos, multiple data sources, and expert oversight to minimize bias. Transferability was supported by providing rich descriptions of participants, institutional context, and EFL teaching practices, allowing readers to assess applicability to similar settings.

Ethical Considerations. This study was submitted to the University of the Immaculate Conception Research Ethics Committee (UIC-REC) for review and approval to uphold ethical standards. The protocol code (GS-ER-06-25-0307) was indicated in the pre-final manuscript upon REC approval. Informed consent was obtained from all participants, who were fully informed about the study's objectives, methods, benefits, and any potential risks or discomforts, including fatigue or unease during interviews or observations. Breaks were provided, and participants were allowed to skip questions or withdraw at any time without penalty. Member checking was conducted before data analysis to ensure accuracy and transparency.

III. Results and Discussion

Lecturer 1

Background and Character

Lecturer 1 is a Filipino educator currently serving as a lecturer, course coordinator, and course developer at a Thai university. With 19 years of teaching experience, he is among the senior educators in his field. His academic background is in accounting, a non-language discipline, though he later pursued a Master of Arts in Education as his highest qualification. At 40 years old,

he identifies as a member of the LGBTQIA++ community and is proficient in both English and Thai, a skill that allows him to support learners in a bilingual environment.

Colleagues described him as creative, emphatic, and adaptable, often characterized by his dynamic classroom presence. Observations showed that he used gestures, facial expressions, and voice modulation to sustain student attention. He frequently began classes with icebreakers, reviewed the previous lesson, and integrated multiple materials, including slides, visuals, and textbooks. When students struggled, he code-mixed Thai and English strategically to maintain understanding and engagement. One colleague noted, "He is very active; he uses actions and voice modulation to gain attention" (I2, 00:01:53). His demeanor reflected enthusiasm and warmth, traits that shaped both his teaching identity and classroom atmosphere.

Narratives about Storytelling as a Pedagogical Tool

Lecturer 1 initially encountered storytelling as a required approach upon joining the university. He recounted that he "was quite surprised" when informed that storytelling would be the primary teaching method, as he had expected "to do some higher-level courses." However, this surprise shifted into enthusiasm when he was appointed course coordinator, stating, "I have been using storytelling for many years… but never as the primary teaching method" (L1, 00:02:00). Over time, storytelling became central to his teaching identity and practice.

Classroom observations revealed that he often opened sessions with simple greetings, chants, or pair activities before introducing the story. During storytelling, he relied on gestures, varying tone, and eye contact to engage learners. Students were observed leaning forward, smiling, and occasionally echoing his gestures. These performative strategies created an interactive and affective classroom environment. As one student commented, "Every class, he makes fun of students. This is one of my happiest in the university" (SE, 2025).

Storytelling also emerged as a strategy for engagement and comprehension. Lecturer 1 described moments when students emotionally connected with stories, such as when a learner reacted to *The Boy and the Apple Tree*, saying, "Teacher, the tree is like my mom. She does everything for me." These emotional responses demonstrated how storytelling transcended linguistic comprehension and facilitated affective learning.

He viewed storytelling as foundational to his pedagogy but emphasized that it worked best in combination with other approaches. He explained, "There is no one best way to teach language… storytelling is the main strategy, but it should go together with other activities" (L1, 00:14:02). Observations supported this integration, showing lessons that began with a story and continued with chants, role-plays, or quick vocabulary games to reinforce comprehension.

For Lecturer 1, storytelling was also a personal and expressive act. He adapted narratives to reflect his students' experiences, sometimes inserting their names into stories—"If the character is a boy, I say, 'Oh, that is Phuwasit'"—to capture attention and make learning personal (L1,

00:10:55). Informants remarked that his teaching effectiveness was "strongly tied to his personality and positive outlook" (I1, 00:00:53–00:01:27). These practices reflected how storytelling functioned as both pedagogy and self-expression, grounded in authenticity and connection.

Adaptation was a recurring element of his storytelling. He often localized unfamiliar images or cultural references, noting, "Sometimes the example in the book is very Western, like wheat or snowstorm, so I change it to rice or heavy rain" (L1, 00:37:46). Such adjustments made stories more relatable to Thai learners while aligning with institutional outcomes. A colleague affirmed that "he does not just follow the book—he makes it real for the students" (I2, 00:12:14).

Despite his enthusiasm, the repeated delivery of storytelling across four course sections presented challenges. He admitted that "by the last section, my energy is down," emphasizing that storytelling "is not like lecturing—you need to give emotion and act" (L1, 00:39:22–00:40:01). Observation notes indicated that while early classes were highly animated, later sessions displayed reduced energy. Nonetheless, he maintained consistency out of a sense of fairness, stating, "Even if I am tired, I must perform again because students in every section deserve the same" (L1, 00:41:07).

To sustain storytelling across sessions, he made minor variations—altering tone, questions, or pacing—to keep it "fresh again" (L1, 00:43:14). Informants confirmed this, saying, "Even if it is the same lesson, he makes it sound new" (I1, 00:12:52). These adjustments prevented mechanical delivery and helped maintain both teacher and student interest.

Differentiation was another consistent feature of his storytelling practice. He adjusted complexity depending on learners' proficiency, slowing down for weaker students and extending for stronger ones. "For lower-level students, I slow down, repeat, explain words. For higher-level students, I add more details or ask them to predict" (L1, 00:45:20). Classroom records showed that this flexibility allowed all learners to participate meaningfully, demonstrating that storytelling could function as an inclusive pedagogy adaptable to mixed-ability classrooms.

Overall, the within-case analysis of Lecturer 1 illustrates how storytelling operated as both method and expression—anchored in engagement, adaptation, and personality. His narratives and classroom practices demonstrated how storytelling was not merely a mandated technique but a dynamic, context-responsive approach shaped by creativity, reflection, and relational teaching.

Lecturer 2

Background and Character

Lecturer 2 (L2) is a Thai educator with more than two decades of experience in teaching English as a Foreign Language (EFL). His academic background is in Mass Communication and Journalism, and he holds a Master of Arts in International Affairs. Over the years, he has taken on several institutional roles, including lecturer, course coordinator, and course developer. His

bilingual proficiency in English and Thai allows him to facilitate instruction effectively across linguistic and cultural contexts.

Colleagues describe him as an approachable, energetic, and reflective lecturer. His teaching philosophy reflects a combination of traditional Thai educational values—emphasizing respect and structure—and a growing openness to learner-centered pedagogy. At 39 years old, he represents the older millennial/Gen X generation, where professional experience and adaptability to contemporary teaching trends converge. Informants and students describe Lecturer 2 as an engaging and reflective teacher who uses storytelling, carefully planned and creative, with cultural sensitivity to make English learning meaningful and inclusive.

Narratives about Storytelling as a Pedagogical Tool

In his account, Lecturer 2 first encountered storytelling with optimism and curiosity. He recalled being excited when he learned he would be teaching the storytelling course, saying, "OK, we are going to ease the students in… I thought at first that storytelling would be a good way to ease the students in" (L2, 00:01:37). He believed that storytelling would help students transition smoothly from high school to university and create a low-anxiety atmosphere for learning English.

Classroom observations showed that his sessions were lively and expressive. He often began with warm-up activities before telling a story, using gestures, facial expressions, and shifts in tone to capture attention. Students were observed smiling and leaning forward during storytelling (CO, July 2025). Informants described him as "lively and engaging," noting that his humour and energy made the class enjoyable and interactive.

Over time, he noticed that while students were engaged, they struggled with assessments. "It was already evident in students' performance that they could handle storytelling, but they cannot handle the assessments required for Storytelling 121" (L2, 00:06:06). This revealed a gap between enjoyment and academic performance, reflecting the common difficulty Thai learners face in shifting from receptive to productive skills.

He later realized that cultural unfamiliarity also affected comprehension. "The students could not relate to it because it was not localized yet," he explained, recognizing that "the stories were not contextualized to the Thai experience" (L2, 00:08:11). To address this, he began integrating local content, saying, "I actually tell them to look for local stories, or I look for Thai local stories and translate them into English" (L2, 00:09:58). Observations confirmed his use of visuals, gestures, and occasional code-mixing to scaffold meaning (CO, July 2025).

Through reflection, he came to view storytelling not only as entertainment but as a structured process for comprehension. He noted that *The Boy and the Apple Tree* worked well because "there were mini chapters… segments that made it easier for students to memorize and understand" (L2, 00:12:52). Segmenting stories, he said, allowed students to follow meaning step by step: "If it is chronological, if it is a flow, and focused on one scenario at a time, it is easier for

students to relate" (L2, 00:14:11). Observations described how he modelled tone and emotion before students retold stories, giving them confidence to perform.

He viewed storytelling as inclusive and adaptive to varied proficiencies. "It is a fairground for everyone," he said, noting that students came from varied school backgrounds (L2, 00:03:23). Informants confirmed that his expressive teaching and humour encouraged participation. In contrast, performance reports noted that students became "more confident in speaking and not afraid to make mistakes."

Despite its strengths, he found storytelling demanding. Vocabulary gaps and the English-only policy were significant challenges: "There are many words that the students do not understand… and the biggest challenge is how do I teach the class without translating it in Thai at all?" (L2, 00:57:25). To sustain English input, he used pictures and gestures, explaining meanings through visuals. He assessed proficiency early, grouped students by ability, and adjusted tasks accordingly. Though he admitted storytelling "takes time" and "much preparation" (L2, 01:03:54), he viewed it as an investment in comprehension.

Overall, the within-case analysis of Lecturer 2 shows how storytelling functioned as both pedagogy and performance—rooted in localization, segmentation, and differentiation. His narrative revealed it as a responsive, culturally attuned approach shaped by adaptability, reflection, and emotional engagement.

Lecturer 3

Background and Character

Lecturer 3 (L3) is an Indonesian educator serving as a lecturer and course developer at the university. With three years of teaching experience, she is at a relatively early career stage compared to her colleagues. Her academic background is in English Literature, complemented by a Master of Arts in American Studies. At 29, she belongs to the millennial/Gen Z age cohort. Her proficiency in English and her Indonesian linguistic background inform her approach to teaching English as a Foreign Language (EFL), shaping her perspectives on comprehension, student engagement, and the balance between form and meaning.

Observation records describe her teaching as structured and efficient. She typically begins lessons with storytelling, often reading the story aloud while students follow along silently in their textbooks. The delivery is calm and measured, supported by PowerPoint slides and visual aids to assist comprehension (CO, Aug. 2025). Her class sessions follow a consistent structure—story reading, vocabulary scaffolding, comprehension checks, and follow-up exercises. While gestures and intonation are minimal, her integration of multimedia elements, such as videos and images, adds variety and maintains focus. Student participation, however, is primarily voluntary and tends to increase only when explicitly prompted.

Interview data portray her as reflective and pragmatic. She attributes her confidence in storytelling to her own experience as an English learner, emphasizing that the approach feels both familiar and manageable. *"Yeah, I think I have like… a positive reaction. Actually, it is not surprising, because growing up, I was also an English learner and saw much storytelling in my English classes. So, yeah, it is not new actually"* (L3, 00:01:45). Her demeanor reflects that of a thoughtful young educator in the process of refining her style, demonstrating awareness of how structure and repetition can support comprehension and learner confidence.

Narratives about Storytelling as a Pedagogical Tool

In her narrative, Lecturer 3 consistently presents storytelling as a pedagogical approach grounded in familiarity and practicality. Rather than perceiving it as a new instructional demand, she describes it as a continuation of her earlier learning experiences. *"I feel helped with the storytelling part because I think it is not only making it easier for students but also for teachers"* (L3, 00:02:12). This sense of continuity shapes her confidence and frames storytelling as a mutually beneficial process for both educators and learners.

Storytelling for her encompasses a variety of media and forms—books, short films, and TV series—which she views as legitimate storytelling resources. *"Storytelling comes in different forms… it is not only fables or short stories but also like short movies and TV series. To me, those are also storytelling"* (L3, 00:11:27). This perspective underscores her flexibility and her capacity to adapt traditional pedagogical tools to contemporary formats.

Her storytelling practice integrates both emotional and cognitive dimensions. She intentionally selects emotionally charged or sentimental stories, believing that such narratives sustain attention and deepen comprehension. *"Sad stories or emotional, touching stories work better because they are not only trying to understand the stories through English, but also the content by context"* (L3, 00:14:49–00:15:12). Observation notes corroborate that students reacted with laughter, empathy, and even tears, confirming her belief in affective engagement as a pedagogical catalyst. *"…they actually paid attention and some of them even, like, cried a little bit"* (L3, 00:16:30).

Her teaching also demonstrates sensitivity to learner proficiency and cognitive load. She relies on pacing and questioning to scaffold understanding across diverse ability levels. *"The pace of story reading matters. I insert questions like, 'Have you ever seen a fox that has no tail?'… I do not always get answers, but it is important to go off-script sometimes so it will not be boring for the students who easily understand"* (L3, 01:01:46–01:02:25). Informant reports similarly indicate that some students struggle due to limited English proficiency and dependency on translation (I1, 00:11:19).

Resource use emerges as a central feature of her storytelling pedagogy. Visuals, audio recordings, and supplementary stories are regularly used to accommodate learners' varying needs. *"Sometimes I make visuals for the stories… because I understand that some students are visual*

learners. If there is possible audio, I also include that; if not, I will just read it myself" (L3, 00:03:21). She differentiates story selection by proficiency level, noting, *"If I see they are having difficulties, I just use the main story. But if I teach more advanced students, I find another story online that is more challenging, maybe B1 level and up"* (L3, 00:05:19). Informant feedback confirms her practice of guiding students line by line through texts and highlighting key vocabulary (I1, 00:01:03–00:01:29).

Institutional context also shapes her storytelling delivery. Weekly storytelling is a program requirement, yet its repetitiveness can limit engagement. *"After half the semester, the students expect me to read another story, so they are like, oh, it is time for her to read what is in the book already"* (L3, 00:54:28). This sense of predictability, combined with comprehension-focused assessments, occasionally shifts focus from listening to mere translation. *"They lose interest because if the activity is to answer comprehension questions anyway, they are just going to read and translate rather than paying attention to what I say"* (L3, 00:54:57). Despite these constraints, her minor adaptations—visuals, videos, and open-ended questions—reveal efforts to sustain learner attention within institutional boundaries.

Workload management further influences her use of storytelling. Teaching multiple sections, she relies on repetition to manage preparation demands. *"Also with the 121, the stories repeat every year, so some stories I already know"* (L3, 00:59:25). Without formal training in storytelling pedagogy—*"No, no formal training"* (L3, 00:58:47)—she refines her approach through experience and experimentation. Her performance evaluation documents over 2,000 workload hours in a year (PE, 2025), highlighting how repetition and accumulated familiarity function as survival strategies under heavy teaching demands.

Classroom management and delivery dynamics also illustrate her adaptability. To maintain attention, she combines humor, proximity, and authority: *"I try to walk around because it really affects them. When I walk around, students will at least pretend to look at the projector rather than playing games"* (L3, 00:55:57). When necessary, she delegates storytelling to students to encourage participation and conserve energy: *"Sometimes I told them to read the story by sentence… I give the mic to them"* (L3, 01:00:17).

Overall, Lecturer 3's case illustrates storytelling as a structured yet flexible pedagogical practice shaped by familiarity, resource integration, and institutional realities. Her narratives depict storytelling as an accessible, emotionally resonant, and adaptable approach that supports both comprehension and affective engagement. Despite limited institutional support and heavy workloads, she sustains storytelling through pragmatism, repetition, and responsiveness to learner diversity. *"Whether they like the story or not, they will pay attention… and they will have to listen"* (L3, 00:04:25).

Lecturer 4

Background and Character

Lecturer 4 is an American educator serving as both lecturer and course coordinator at a Thai university. With eight years of teaching experience, he falls into the mid-career category. His academic training is in Creative Writing and Literature, with a Master of Arts in Composition and Rhetoric. At 39, he belongs to the older millennial/Gen X age group and is a native English speaker.

Colleagues describe him as approachable, energetic, and creative, while students consistently rate him highly in performance evaluations (PE, 2025). Classroom observations noted a relaxed learning environment with background music, gestures, and visuals to sustain attention (CO, Aug. 5, 2025). Students are engaged through choral recitation, Q&A, and guided attention to narrative elements. One colleague observed, "He is very passionate in using storytelling… it works best with our students" (I1, 00:02:16).

Narratives about Storytelling as a Pedagogical Tool

Lecturer 4 views storytelling as an intentional and adaptable pedagogical practice. He emphasized creating readiness for stories: "I try to make space… mentally, emotionally with my students so they are ready to hear a story" (L4, 00:05:41). Simple classroom rituals such as standing, breathing, or stretching help students transition between lessons (L4, 00:07:26). He noted the importance of easing student anxiety about assessment: "Some kids are thinking… is this a listening test right now? I try to ease these fears… just listen… you do not have to get everything" (L4, 00:06:40).

Engagement is constructed through performance, humor, and relational cues. Observation notes recorded the use of sound effects, such as imitating cattle, which elicited laughter and sustained attention (CO, Aug. 5, 2025). He explained, "When students are relaxed, they can express themselves without pressure" (PC, Aug. 14, 2025). Visual aids, voice modulation, and explicit attention to story elements support this performative engagement.

Storytelling is closely linked to his personal and professional identity. "I have always been kind of a storyteller… with adult friends in my 20s, we would have story time" (L4, 00:04:33). Emotional resonance is central to his approach: "The Boy in the Apple Tree… it had an emotional effect on me… I saw several students also have an emotional reaction" (L4, 00:08:10). He described follow-up activities, such as discussing childhood memories, as generating empathy and connection: "All my students wrote sad memories… it clearly had an emotional connection" (L4, 00:09:39).

Lecturer 4 adapts storytelling for diverse proficiency levels. He adjusts voice, pacing, and prosody to ensure comprehension: "For my lower-level classes, I am more dramatic… they

understand the intonation even if they do not know every word" (L4, 01:13:44). Self-deprecating humor reduces performance anxiety: "If I am the cringiest person in the room, nobody feels pressured to say the right thing" (L4, 01:16:01). Colleagues confirmed that mixed-proficiency groups require subtle performance adjustments rather than separate materials (I1, 00:12:05).

Institutional and technological contexts are also navigated strategically. He expressed concern over multiple-choice follow-ups: "I would rather do my five story elements than any of the multiple choice… the trap door" (L4, 01:04:22). Digital devices are minimized to reduce distraction: "No devices, just listening… I always have some lofi background… it removes tension" (L4, 01:18:55; 01:23:55). Informants noted that these strategies preserved attention and engagement in EFL contexts (I2, 00:12:50).

Sustaining storytelling requires drawing on personal history, identity, and creativity: "My background is so tied up in storytelling… telling stories to siblings and cousins… I have always understood storytelling" (L4, 01:09:03). Techniques such as intonation, phrasing, and dramatization are combined with personal memories to maintain energy across multiple classes (L4, 01:11:21; 01:11:46).

Overall, Lecturer 4 demonstrates a pedagogy in which storytelling functions as a performative, emotionally resonant, and adaptive practice. Classroom observations, informant perspectives, and evaluation reports indicate that his methods integrate personal identity, student readiness, and institutional demands to create meaningful and sustained learning experiences.

Lecturer 5

Background and Character

Lecturer 5 is a 58-year-old Mexican–American educator serving as lecturer, course coordinator, and course developer. With 10 years of teaching experience, he is considered a mid-career teacher. His academic background is in Architecture (Bachelor of Architecture), and English is his primary language; he does not speak Thai.

Lecturer 5's teaching style is structured, consistent, and practical. Lessons typically begin with a review of prior material, followed by lead-in questions to prepare students for storytelling. Storytelling is adapted to students' proficiency, emphasizing vocabulary reinforcement, comprehension, and reflective dialogue. Classroom activities include choral reading, question-and-answer sessions, pictures, and Google Translate. Performance-based techniques, such as gestures or physical movement, are used sparingly, while background music is occasionally employed to maintain focus. Storytelling functions as a vehicle for engagement, ethical reflection, and relational trust rather than as performative demonstration.

Narratives about Storytelling as a Pedagogical Tool

Storytelling is a flexible, adaptable practice responsive to students' language proficiency and comprehension needs. Vocabulary is prepared in advance, with new words explained or translated before the story begins, as in: "What I did was get the vocabulary… explain or translate and then start reading the story… 'The man was digging…'" (L5, 00:02:18). Complex texts are replaced with more accessible alternatives, such as Hansel and Gretel or Thai legends, instead of *The Frightened Rabbit* (L5, 00:04:22). For lower-level learners, activities shift from full storytelling to picture description, with students providing Thai equivalents for difficult English words (CO, Aug. 6, 2025). Colleagues noted that these adjustments allowed low-proficiency students to participate while higher-level learners engaged in critical thinking (I2 00:04:10; I1 00:05:02).

Storytelling also sustains student engagement and provokes reflection. Ethical and social questions are used to extend discussion beyond comprehension, for example: "What would you do? The spirit gave you a golden axe. What would you do?" (L5, 00:16:33), and "Do we need to be honest? Why?" (L5, 00:16:33). Repetition, gestures, and visual supports maintain attention across the lesson (CO, Aug. 6, 2025). Scaffolding facilitates expression, ensuring that students at different proficiency levels can participate (I2 00:03:55; I1 00:04:48).

Lecturer 5 frames storytelling as a personal and human experience, connecting moral, cultural, and identity-related concerns to language learning. Stories are adapted to local or familiar contexts: "There was no story… it was a fact, yeah, but it was no story. So that one, I adapted to a Thai legend" (L5, 00:11:16). Issues of identity and bias are addressed through reflection, as in: "Would you treat me differently than if I am black? Same personality" (L5, 00:06:39). Simplified tasks and visual support allow students to engage confidently, often beginning with Thai responses before shifting to English (CO, Aug. 2025; I2 00:03:20; I1 00:05:15).

Storytelling also functions as a relational practice, building rapport and trust in the classroom. For low-proficiency groups, story reading is replaced with picture description: "When I have a really low group, I do not tell them that story… I let them describe the pictures" (L5, 00:12:18–00:13:05). For higher-level groups, extended questioning promotes critical thinking: "The Spirit and the Woodcutter… I had a nice group, so I used much critical thinking… I asked many questions… reflections" (L5, 00:16:08–00:17:54). Translation and scaffolding reduce anxiety and support student participation (I2 00:04:40; I1 00:05:25).

Adaptation to learner and institutional contexts is central to practice. When texts are too dense, they are simplified or replaced: "If I cannot simplify… I tell the students to make a story" (L5, 00:50:58–00:52:06). Scaffolded tasks, visual aids, and Q&A sessions manage comprehension, while institutional constraints are navigated pragmatically without abandoning storytelling (I1 00:04:55).

Managing multiple sections requires strategic effort and reuse of materials. Lecturer 5 noted, "We cannot change 121… either we adapt it and make it fun for us" (L5, 00:50:11–00:50:20). Recycled visual aids, choral readings, and Q&A sessions reduce preparation demands (CO; post-conference notes).

Sustaining storytelling delivery involves expressive reading, gestures, visuals, and background music to maintain energy across repeated sessions. For example, while reading a story repeatedly, vocal intensity is varied: "It is a wonderful day! Ah! Okay, so they…" (L5, 00:47:13–00:47:23). Difficult vocabulary is acted out to reinforce understanding (I2 00:05:22).

Storytelling balances creativity with curricular constraints. Lecturer 5 simplifies language, substitutes stories, and scaffolds tasks to meet learning outcomes: "I… I taught the rabbit last last semester and it was tough… Because it is tough to explain" (L5, 00:50:58–00:51:04; I1 00:04:55). Creative elements are embedded within these structural limits to maintain engagement.

Differentiation is applied to accommodate varied learner proficiency. Low-level students describe pictures (L5, 00:55:37–00:56:23), mid-level students write basic sentences (L5, 00:56:52–00:56:55), and higher-level students rewrite or create story endings (L5, 00:57:15–00:57:45). Scaffolding with visuals and gestures supports inclusion, enabling access to the same story across multiple levels (CO; post-conference notes; I1 00:04:55; I2 00:03:20).

Lecturer 5 demonstrates a structured, adaptable, and student-centered approach to storytelling, balancing curricular requirements with learner needs and engagement. His practice emphasizes vocabulary support, differentiated tasks, and scaffolded activities to accommodate varied proficiency levels, while also fostering reflection, ethical discussion, and relational trust in the classroom. Storytelling is treated as a flexible pedagogical tool that simultaneously supports comprehension, critical thinking, human connection, and inclusive participation. His strategies reflect a pragmatic and creative adaptation to institutional constraints, multiple sections, and repeated delivery.

Similarities and Differences Across Cases

The table on the next page presents a cross-case comparison of the five lecturers' narratives about storytelling. It highlights both **similarities and differences** in how storytelling is enacted as a pedagogical tool, showing patterns across adaptation, engagement, relational practices, moral and cultural dimensions, curriculum awareness, and differentiation strategies.

Storytelling as Adaptive Practice. All five lecturers demonstrated a strong orientation toward adapting storytelling to suit their students' proficiency levels and classroom contexts. Common strategies included simplifying complex vocabulary, substituting difficult words, or restructuring activities to ensure comprehension. For example, Lecturer 5 frequently simplified texts or replaced challenging stories: "I… I taught the rabbit last last semester… either I simplify

it… or I tell the students to make a story" (L5, 00:50:58–00:52:06). Similarly, Lecturers 2 and 4 sometimes skipped stories deemed too complex for students (CO, Jul.10, 2025; PC, Jul.20, 2025).

Theme	Similarities Across Cases	Differences Across Cases
Storytelling as Adaptive Practice	All lecturers adjusted stories to student proficiency, simplified language, or substituted texts when needed.	L5 focused on practical simplification; L2/L4 skipped stories entirely if too complex; L1/L3 sometimes modified stories but maintained fidelity to the original.
Storytelling as Engagement Strategy	All lecturers used questioning, gestures, and interactive elements to maintain attention.	L5 used reflective and ethical questions; L1 emphasized dramatization and voice modulation; L3 included cultural prompts; L4/L2 less performative, more focused on comprehension.
Storytelling as Relational Practice	All emphasized rapport and student comfort.	L5 explicitly allowed Thai responses first; L1/L3 integrated supportive feedback and peer interaction; L2/L4 focused on scaffolding without explicitly framing it as relationship-building.
Storytelling as Moral, Cultural, and Human Experience	All recognized storytelling as more than language learning, embedding values, ethics, and cultural awareness.	L5 integrated Thai legends and moral questioning; L3 emphasized cultural reflection; L1/L2 focused mainly on ethical prompts; L4 less explicit about cultural dimensions.
Storytelling as Workload- and Curriculum-Aware Practice	All balanced creative storytelling with syllabus demands.	L5 managed multiple sections with recycled materials and humor; L4/L2 redistributed storytelling tasks; L1/L3 focused on aligning tasks to curriculum but less explicit about workload.
Storytelling as Differentiated Instruction	All differentiated tasks based on proficiency.	L5 used layered entry points (description → writing → story rewriting); L1/L3 scaffolded differently; L2/L4 provided simpler versions or omitted tasks for low-level students.

Differences emerged in the extent and style of adaptation. L5 approached adaptation pragmatically, balancing institutional expectations and student engagement, while L1 and L3 maintained closer fidelity to the original stories, making selective adjustments. L2 and L4 were more willing to omit stories entirely when students struggled, reflecting a more cautious stance toward method fidelity.

Overall, lecturers described storytelling as a flexible tool that requires adjustment to students' language proficiency, cultural background, and prior knowledge. This point resonates with Lemana et al. (2025), who concluded that simplifying stories, scaffolding tasks, and modifying narratives can allow learners to comprehend and engage effectively. However, while adaptation is achievable, this study supports Karim (2015) and Murad et al. (2023) in their claim that institutional constraints, such as prescribed curricula and limited resources, particularly in technology support, notably digital formats, can limit flexibility and the extent of modification. These findings call attention to storytelling as a responsive practice, not a fixed technique, that must continually adapt to preserve comprehension, relevance, and engagement.

Storytelling as Engagement Strategy. All lecturers used interactive techniques to maintain student engagement, including questioning, gestures, and multimodal supports such as pictures or choral reading. Lecturer 5, in particular, used reflective and ethical questions to provoke thought and discussion: "How about if I come to teach… How about discrimination?" (L5, 00:06:07). Lecturer 1 emphasized dramatization, voice modulation, and performance to sustain attention (CO, Aug.2, 2025). Lecturer 3 incorporated cultural prompts to stimulate reflection on identity and social issues.

Differences were evident in the focus and intensity of engagement strategies. L5 emphasized dialogue and moral reasoning, L1 highlighted theatrical delivery and dramatization, while L2 and L4 prioritized comprehension-oriented engagement over performance. These variations demonstrate that while engagement is a shared goal, its implementation reflects individual teaching style, personality, and pedagogical priorities.

Overall, these findings reinforce that storytelling effectively sustains learner attention and participation through techniques such as dramatization, humor, reflective questioning, and multimedia integration (Ghafar, 2024; Mason, 2019; Wilujeng et al., 2017). By connecting narratives to students' experiences, teachers can enhance both cognitive understanding and emotional engagement, making lessons more memorable and interactive (Lemana et al., 2025). Although some studies suggest that low-proficiency learners may struggle to remain engaged (e.g., Landrum et al., 2019; Lucarevschi, 2016), the lecturers in this study consistently reported positive outcomes when storytelling was carefully adapted to learners' abilities and contextual needs.

Storytelling as Relational Practice. Across all cases, storytelling was leveraged to build rapport, trust, and a supportive classroom climate. Lecturer 5 explicitly allowed students to use Thai responses before transitioning to English, creating a low-pressure environment: "Even if they cannot follow… at least we can use the material to describe" (L5, 00:13:07). Lecturers 1 and 3 also emphasized supportive feedback and peer interaction, while L2 and L4 used scaffolding to facilitate participation, though they framed it more as instructional support than relational cultivation.

The relational function of storytelling was strongest when lecturers actively mediated between student comfort and pedagogical goals. L5's approach reflects a deliberate focus on student well-being, whereas others relied on more indirect strategies to foster trust.

This finding supports the view that storytelling functions as a relational tool, fostering rapport, trust, and empathy between lecturers and students (Cummings et al., 2022; Brooks et al., 2022). This means that by cultivating supportive learning environments and prompting shared reflection on ethical and social issues, stories can encourage participation even among learners with limited English proficiency. This relational dimension emphasizes what Lemana et al. (2025) noted: storytelling is a pedagogical strategy that humanizes language learning while strengthening classroom connections.

Storytelling as Moral, Cultural, and Human Experience. All lecturers recognized storytelling as extending beyond language learning to engage values, ethics, and cultural awareness. Lecturer 5 integrated Thai legends and moral questioning: "There was no story… I adapted to a Thai legend" (L5, 00:11:16). Lecturer 3 emphasized cultural reflection, prompting students to explore social and identity issues (CO, Jul.15, 2025). Lecturers 1 and 2 incorporated ethical discussions, while Lecturer 4 was less explicit about embedding cultural dimensions.

Differences highlight varying emphases: L5 and L3 actively localized content to make moral and cultural connections salient, whereas others primarily used stories to illustrate ethical reasoning without deep cultural integration. This theme underscores storytelling's potential to foster humanistic learning and cross-cultural understanding.

The findings of this study extend previous research by showing that storytelling can simultaneously promote reflection on ethical principles, moral reasoning, and intercultural awareness among learners (Ghafar, 2024; Lemana et al., 2025; Xiang, 2023). In other words, storytelling not only supports language development but also enriches students' understanding of social, cultural, and human contexts, highlighting its broader pedagogical significance.

Storytelling as Workload- and Curriculum-Aware Practice. Lecturers consistently negotiated between creative storytelling and the constraints of prescribed curricula. L5 managed multiple sections by recycling materials, redistributing expressive responsibility, and using humor to reduce fatigue: "We cannot change 121… either we adapt it… or make it fun" (L5, 00:50:11–00:50:20). L4 and L2 redistributed tasks to students to manage the workload, while L1 and L3 aligned storytelling with curriculum goals but did not explicitly address fatigue or repetition.

The data indicate that sustaining storytelling requires both strategic adaptation and careful planning, particularly for teachers with significant teaching loads. Balancing creativity and curriculum was a common challenge, with each lecturer finding individualized solutions.

Consistent with previous research, storytelling, despite its pedagogical benefits, demands considerable preparation, sustained energy, and careful alignment with curriculum objectives across multiple sections (Fan, 2022; Ismail & Kassem, 2022; Prongkitsanuluck et al., 2022). Challenges reported by lecturers are also evident in other studies, including selecting culturally appropriate materials, scaffolding content effectively, and balancing attention among learners with varying proficiencies (Ghafar, 2024; Yuniawati, 2024). These findings accentuate that successful implementation relies not only on teacher creativity and adaptability but also on institutional support to manage workload and ensure the sustainability of storytelling as a pedagogical practice.

Storytelling as Differentiated Instruction. All lecturers differentiated storytelling to accommodate diverse learner proficiency. Lecturer 5 employed layered entry points: low-level students described pictures, mid-level students wrote sentences, and high-level students rewrote or completed stories imaginatively: "With low-level students… just describe… high-level students… rewrite the story" (L5, 00:55:37–00:57:45). Lecturers 1 and 3 scaffolded

comprehension and production tasks according to proficiency, while L2 and L4 often provided simplified alternatives or omitted tasks for struggling learners.

Differences reflect the sophistication and intentionality of differentiation. L5's approach maximized inclusion by using a single story for multiple levels, while others created separate tracks or adjusted only specific activities.

This finding reinforces prior studies showing that storytelling functions as a strategic tool for differentiation, enabling teachers to address diverse learner proficiencies and backgrounds (Sudrajat et al., 2024; Xiang, 2023). By adjusting narrative complexity, scaffolding tasks, and designing layered activities, teachers can challenge advanced students while supporting less proficient learners (Hien & Phuong, 2024; Gemmink et al., 2021). Such practices promote inclusivity, equitable participation, and learner confidence, demonstrating that storytelling can effectively operationalize differentiation in heterogeneous higher education contexts. Differentiated storytelling thus offers a practical approach to managing uneven proficiency levels and large class sizes, aligning pedagogy with learners' diverse needs.

In general, the findings of this study support the theoretical lenses guiding the research. Social Constructivism (Bruner, 1996; Vygotsky, 1978) is reflected in how storytelling fosters collaborative and interactive classrooms. Lecturers adapted stories to students' comprehension, used prompts and questions to scaffold understanding, and encouraged learners to co-construct meaning through imagination and cultural references. These practices illustrate Bruner's (1991) concept of scaffolding, where support gradually shifts responsibility to the learner, and Vygotsky's (1978) principle that knowledge is co-constructed with guidance from a more knowledgeable other. Storytelling thus promoted both language development and positive classroom interaction, emphasizing social learning and shared meaning-making.

The findings also align with the Comprehensible Input Hypothesis (Krashen, 1982; Mason, 2019). Lecturers reported that storytelling provided authentic, context-rich input that went beyond textbook drills. By simplifying vocabulary, shortening stories, and integrating gestures and visuals, they made input accessible and engaging. Students confirmed that stories were easier to follow, memorable, and enjoyable. At the same time, lecturers acknowledged the challenge of keeping input simple enough for lower-level learners yet rich enough to challenge advanced students, reflecting the tension highlighted in the hypothesis between accessibility and language growth.

IV. Conclusion

This multiple-case study examined the narratives of EFL lecturers at a Thai university regarding their use of storytelling as a pedagogical tool. The findings highlight storytelling as a versatile and adaptive practice that goes beyond language instruction to foster engagement, relational trust, differentiation, and moral and cultural reflection. Lecturers actively tailored stories to suit learners' proficiency levels, cultural backgrounds, and prior knowledge, demonstrating that compelling storytelling requires responsiveness, creativity, and careful scaffolding. Through

techniques such as simplifying narratives, using multimodal supports, prompting reflection, and encouraging co-construction of meaning, lecturers enhanced comprehension, sustained attention, and promoted both cognitive and emotional involvement in the classroom.

The study correspondingly revealed variations in implementation shaped by individual teaching styles, pedagogical priorities, and institutional constraints. While some lecturers emphasized ethical reasoning and cultural awareness, others focused more on comprehension, performance, or workload management. These differences emphasize storytelling's flexibility in addressing diverse learner needs and classroom contexts.

The study thenceforth highlights the need for institutional support—such as workload management, shared resources, professional development, and curriculum alignment—to sustain storytelling as an effective pedagogical tool. Lecturers are encouraged to design stories that scaffold comprehension, promote reflection, and build trust. At the same time, curriculum developers and policymakers should recognize storytelling as central to EFL instruction, supporting communicative competence, intercultural understanding, and learner-centered assessment.

Future research could explore storytelling across other higher education contexts, examine its long-term effects on language proficiency and intercultural competence, investigate digital or multimodal storytelling, and compare it with other learner-centered approaches. Although this study focused on a single Thai university and did not measure student outcomes, it offers valuable insights into how storytelling can transform EFL classrooms into engaging, ethical, culturally aware, and learner-centered learning spaces.

Taken as a whole, this study concludes that storytelling can function as a powerful pedagogical strategy in higher education, supporting language development, fostering classroom cohesion, promoting critical and ethical thinking, and cultivating intercultural awareness.

REFERENCES

[1] Asmara, C. H., Ma'rifah, U., & Fitria, A. D. (2024). The effect of using storytelling techniques based on Thai folktales to enhance students' vocabulary in Thai: EFL Elementary school. EduInovasi Journal of Basic Educational Studies, 4(1). https://doi.org/10.47467/edu.v4i1.1773

[2] Benabbes, S., & Taleb, H. A. A. (2024). The effect of storytelling on the development of language and social skills in French-as-a-foreign-language classrooms. Heliyon, 10(8), e29178. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.heliyon.2024.e29178

[3] Brooks, S. P., Zimmermann, G. L., Lang, M., Scott, S. D., Thomson, D., Wilkes, G., & Hartling, L. (2022). A framework to guide storytelling as a knowledge translation intervention for health-promoting behaviour change. Implementation Science Communications, 3(1), Article 35. https://doi.org/10.1186/ s43058-022-00282-6

[4] Bruner, J. (1996). The culture of education. Harvard University Press.

93

[5] Creswell, J., & Poth, C. (2018). Qualitative Inquiry and Research Design (Fourth). SAGE Publications.

[6] Cummings, J. J., Tsay-Vogel, M., Cahill, T. J., & Zhang, L. (2022). Effects of immersive storytelling on af fective, cognitive, and associative empathy: The mediating role of presence. New Media & Society, 24(9), 2003-2026. https://doi.org/10.1177/1461444820986816

[7] Fan, Y. (2022). Facilitating content knowledge, language proficiency, and academic competence through digital storytelling: Performance and perceptions of first-year medical-related majors. Journal of Research on Technology in Education, 56(2), 129–150. https://doi.org/10.1080/15391523.2022.2110337

[8] Gemmink, M. M., Fokkens-Bruinsma, M., Pauw, I., & Van Veen, K. (2021). How contextual factors influence teachers' pedagogical practices. Educational Research, 63(4), 396-415. https://doi.org/10.1080/00131 881.2021.1983452

[9] Ghafar, Z. (2024). Storytelling as an Educational tool to Improve Language acquisition: A Review of the literature. Journal of Digital Learning and Distance Education, 2(10), 781–790. https://doi.org/10.56778/jdlde.v2i9.227

[10] Hien, N. T. T., & Phuong, V. T. (2024). The effectiveness of the storytelling technique on students' achievement and motivation in English-speaking skills. Multidisciplinary Reviews, 6, Article 2023spe011. https:// doi.org/10.31893/multirev.2023spe011

[11] Hossain, K. I. (2024). Literature-Based Language Learning: Challenges and opportunities for English learners. Ampersand, 100201. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.amper.2024.100201

[12] https://so02.tci-thaijo.org/index.php/JRKSA/article/view/255130

[13] Ismail, S. M., & Kassem, M. A. M. (2022). Revisiting creative teaching approach in Saudi EFL classes: theoretical and pedagogical perspective. World, 12(1), 142–153. http://dx.doi.org/10.5430/wjel.v12n1p14

[14] Kaewdee, K., Wuttipornpong, T., & Witoon, S. (2024, April 30). The effectiveness of storytelling practice on Thai grade 6 students' use of the present and the past simple tenses. https://so06.tci-thaijo.org/index.php/mcjou/article/view/273850

[15] Karim, B. H. H. (2015). Storytelling as a pedagogical tool to learn the English language in higher education: Using reflection and experience to improve learning. Vol. 2, No. 4.

[16] Krashen, S. (1982). Principles and practice in second language acquisition.
NewYork: Prentice-Hall. Available at:
http://www.sdkrashen.com/content/books/principles_and_practice.pdf

[17] Landrum, R. E., Brakke, K., & McCarthy, M. A. (2019). The pedagogical power of storytelling. Scholarship of Teaching and Learning in Psychology, 5(3), 247–253. https://doi.org/10.1037/stl0000152

[18] Lemana, H. E., II, Wong, W. L., Suarez, Z. D., Ahmad, C. V., & Singh, A. K. J. (2025). Affective, Behavioural and Cognitive Dimensions of Storytelling: Exploring Thai EFL University Students' Attitudes through Mixed-Methods Analysis. Journal of Education, Culture and Society, 16(2), 797–817. https://doi.org/10.15503/jecs2025.3.797.817

[19] Lincoln, Y., & Guba, E. G. (1994). Competing paradigms in qualitative research.In N. K. Denzin & Y. S. Lincoln (Eds.), Handbook of qualitative research (pp. 105–107). Sage.

[20] Lucarevschi, C. R. (2016). Teaching through storytelling: The National Center for Case Study Teaching in Science, 26(1), 24–44.

[21] Mason, B. (2019). Guided SSR before self-selected reading. Shitennoji University Kiyo, 67, 445–456.

[22] Murad, T., Assadi, J., & Badarni, H. (2023). Digital Storytelling and EFL speaking skill improvement. Journal of Language Teaching and Research, 14(5), 1189–1198.https://doi.org/10.17507/jltr.1405.06

[23] Nampaktai, P., & Suksiripakonchai, W. (2018). The use of digital storytelling in fostering English-speaking ability among Thai secondary students. Veridian E-Journal, Silpakorn University, 11(4), ISSN 1906 – 3431.

[24] Panapob, K., & Abhakorn, J. (2022). Thai EFL Teachers' Experiences and Viewpoints of Using Stories and Themes for Teaching English to Young Learners. NIDA Journal of Language and Communication, 27(42).

[25] Prongkitsanuluck, N., Adipat, S., & Imsa-Ard, P. (2022, July 31). The Development of Vocabulary Acquisition for Thai Kindergarteners through Digital Storytelling (DST).

[26] Rahman, M. M., Karim, A., & Singh, M. K. M. (2022). English Language Policy and Planning in Malaysia : Issues and Outcomes. The Journal of AsiaTEFL, 19(3), 1079–1087. https://doi.org/10.18823/asiatefl.2022.19.3.23.1079

[27] Ramalia, T. (2023). Digital Storytelling in Higher Education: Highlighting the making process. Journal on Education, 06(01), 2654–5497.

[28] Sudrajat, D., Puspandari, K., & Meisarah, F. (2024). A comparative study between traditional and digital storytelling in improving the listening skills of ESL learners. Indonesian Journal of Education (INJOE), 4 (3), 886~899. https://www.injoe.org/index.php/INJOE/article/view/160

[29] Tian, Y., & Suki, N. M. (2023). Evaluating Future Trends of Digital Storytelling in Higher Education: A Bibliometric Analysis. https://doi.org/10.3991/ijim.v17i17.39121

[30] Vygotsky, L. S. (1978). Mind in Society: The Development of Higher Psychological Processes. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

[31] Wilujeng, N. C. S., Ekowati, V. I., & Sudarmaji, S. (2017). Storytelling in Higher Education Institutions: How to Enrich the Learning Experience in Multidisciplinary Areas? INTED Proceedings, 1, 9170– 9180. https://doi.org/10.21125/inted.2017.2167

[32] Xiang, Y. (2023). Reforming College English Listening and Speaking Teaching: Telling Chinese Stories Well with a Task-Based Approach and Cross-Cultural Method. Frontiers in Educational Research, 6(13). https://doi.org/10.25236/fer.2023.061301

[33] Yin, R. K. (2014). Case study research: Design and method (5th ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

[34] Yuniawati, D. T. (2024). EFL Teachers' voices in Differentiated Instruction. International Journal of Contemporary Studies in Education (IJ-CSE), 3(2), 94–106. https://doi.org/10.56855/ijcse.v2i2.780

95