

THE EFFECTIVENESS OF TPR (TOTAL PHYSICAL RESPONSE) METHOD IN ENGLISH VOCABULARY MASTERY OF ELEMENTARY SCHOOL CHILDREN

Ice Sariyati
Indonesia University of Education, Bandung
icesariyati@yahoo.com

Abstract

This research employed a mixed method, combining quantitative and qualitative methods. To achieve the aims of the study, quasi-experimental design was used, involving two groups (control and experiment) at the first grade in one Islamic elementary school in Bandung and employing pretest, treatment (TPR method to experiment group, conventional method to control group) and posttest. The result of control class score computation to compare pretest score with posttest score showed that there is no significant difference between the pre-test and post-test score of control class. On the contrary, the result of experiment class score computation to compare pretest score with posttest score showed that there was significant difference between the pretest and posttest score of experiment class. Therefore, it can be concluded that the vocabulary mastery of experiment group was significantly improved.

Penelitian ini menggunakan sebuah metode gabung, yang menggabungkan metode kuantitatif dan kualitatif. Untuk mencapai tujuan penelitian ini, desain quasi-eksperimental digunakan dengan melibatkan dua kelompok (kendali dan eksperimental) di kelas satu sekolah dasar Islam di Bandung dan menggunakan pretes, perlakuan (metode TPR untuk kelompok eksperimental, metode konvensional untuk kelompok kendali) dan postes. Hasil perhitungan nilai kelas kendali dengan membandingkan nilai pretes dan postes menunjukkan bahwa tidak ada perbedaan yang signifikan antara nilai pretes dan postes di kelas kendali. Sebaliknya, hasil perhitungan nilai kelas eksperimental dengan membandingkan nilai pretes dan postes menunjukkan bahwa terdapat perbedaan yang signifikan antara nilai pretes dan nilai postes di kelompok eksperimental. Oleh karena itu, dapat disimpulkan bahwa penguasaan kosakata dikelas eksperimental dapat meningkat secara signifikan.

Keywords : effectiveness, TPR method, vocabulary, vocabulary mastery

INTRODUCTION

The enhancement of education that gives priority to the elementary students' ability to master English as a result of this subject categorized as local content in the curriculum is responded positively by public (Yauri, 2007). Many parents ask their children to be taught English in their elementary schools like in others (Suyanto, 2004), as in the society as Istiqomah (2011) implies, English plays an important role not only as academic language but also as daily one, such as in computer, internet, banking, medicine, tourism, flight, entertainment and radio. Moreover, Nunan (2003:591) states, "In business, industry, and government, workers are increasingly expected to develop proficiency in English." Therefore, the parents want their children to learn English as early as possible so that they will take advantage from English as an important part of their academic and business career in the future (Sad, 2010).

This condition also encourages a number of elementary schools to implement English education based on the government policy (Sukamerta, 2011), *SK Menteri Pendidikan dan Kebudayaan* (the Decree of Minister of Education and Culture) No. 060/U/1993 on February 25, 1993. This policy states that it is possible to teach English as a local content subject in elementary school starting from the fourth grade (Suyanto, 2004). The process of teaching and learning English in elementary school, however, does not always run well (Yauri, 2007; Suyanto, 2004) as in this level it is relatively new in Indonesia, unlike in Malaysia, Philippines, etc (Edisonyusman, 2011). Besides, teacher competency is as one of the obstacles (Yauri, 2007; Suyanto, 2004).

Teaching English to young learners or students of elementary school, according to Shin (2006), is different from teaching adults as they especially have fun with movement and physical participation. He adds that the more fun the students have, the better they will remember the language learned. As Scott and Ytreberg (1990: 2) emphasize, "Children's understanding comes through hands and eyes and ears, and the physical world is dominant at all times."

So far, however, English teachers have been experiencing difficulty in teaching children since the method used is less appropriate (Widodo, 2005; Samudra, Kuswardono, & Idayanie, 1999). Hence, the researcher endeavored to find out the effective method to teach them English and she tried Total Physical Response (TPR) as an alternative one. She assumed it would improve their English vocabulary mastery and this method was enjoyable and engaging as there are many positive research findings related to using this method in teaching English to children. Those findings are as follows: TPR method was found to be effective to improve English preposition mastery of the fifth grader in one elementary school in Semarang (Nugrahaningsih, 2007); TPR method enhanced students' motivation and interests of elementary school in Taiwan in learning English (Hsu and Lin, 2012); TPR seemed to have been helpful to find a more economical way of helping students in one Japanese junior high school to learn English script, and to find more time when they were engaged in language activities touching on their personal experiences (Sano, 1986); TPR was a successful classroom management tool that teachers could easily implement at any stage of their lessons, or once they faced a management problem and it could

be used in other grade levels as children in an elementary school in Sharjah in the United Arab Emirates, in general were active and they had fun in the English classroom (Sakhaweti, 2004).

Using TPR method in teaching English to children is a lot of fun and enjoyable, does not demand many preparation or materials, is very effective for teenagers and young learners, is appropriate for kinesthetic learners to be active in the class, is memorable for students to remember phrases and words well, and works properly with mixed-ability classes (Sopaktra, 2009). Moreover, according to Maroto, Garrido & Fuentes (n.d.), it makes students obtain good pronunciation and memorize learnt things for long.

According to Evan (2011), the original formulation of “Total Physical Response” (TPR) was first introduced by [Asher](#), a professor emeritus of psychology at San José State University after being inspired by how children actually internalize and learn their first language, by responding physically to speech, initially through commands.

Asher initiates TPR as he wondered why so many people have a hard time learning a second language when almost no one has any trouble learning his first language (Kennedy, 2000). Then Asher (as quoted from Silver, Adelman, & Price, 2003) observed the following characteristics about successful language learners: Good language learners achieve fluency faster when they involved in a situation where oral language meaning is immediately perceived and understood; They often start their language learning with a period of watching the effect of language on the actions of other student silence (as opposed to oral production student silence as opposed to oral production), and show their comprehension by successfully accomplishing language-generated tasks; They can focus on overall meaning rather than grammar and make faster progress when the instruction language is consistent on a daily basis, and they make faster progress when content involving English is clearly usable or valuable outside the classroom.

Therefore, Asher found the answer that it is dealing with the methods used by many teachers were not used while learning the first language and with the stress that is often found in the second language learning environment (Kennedy, 2000; Maroto, Garrido, & Fuentes, n. d.). Therefore they imply that Asher decided to create a stress-free approach in learning second language same in the first language learning experience which young learners respond physically to parents’ commands. Kennedy (2000) clarifies that infants and toddlers are not expected to speak until they are ready; however, they are constantly spoken to, provided that when speaking to a toddler, one direction at a time is given for the child to follow, including statements such as: “Come here!” “Find Mommy!” “Don’t touch, it’s hot!” “Throw me the ball!” In other words, TPR is designed based upon the way children learn their mother tongue (Neupane, 2008).

Richard and Rodgers (1987) state learners in Total Physical Response have the primary roles of listener and performer. Meanwhile, in their opinion, the teacher plays an active and direct role in Total Physical Response who decides what to teach, who models and presents the new materials, and who selects supporting materials for classroom use. They claim the teacher should also allow speaking abilities to learners and follow the example of parents giving feedback to

their children. As they say at first, teacher corrects very little, but as the child grows older, the teacher tolerates fewer mistakes in speech.

In this case, Tsai-ling, Lian (2004) as cited in Hsu & Lin (2012) suggests that a teacher must make the instruction interesting, and active to make the students' attention span longer and from the view of sensory input, TPR or role play helps to stimulate children's sense and encourage them to participate. Children in the elementary school learn to spell the words as well as learn their meanings (Anderson & Nagy, 1993) to learn and comprehend English as one of the local content subjects as early as possible and can practice simple conversation (Aminudin, 2009). Therefore, in teaching vocabulary teachers should choose and apply best practice based on the type of student being taught, the targeted words, the school system and curriculum, and many other factors.

Within education, the term children (as adapted from Harmer, 2007) are commonly used for learners between the ages of about 2 to about 14. He generally describes the students as young learners between the ages of about 5 to 9, and very young learners are usually between 2 and 5. Phillips (1993:5) describes 'Young Learners' as "children from the first year of formal schooling (five or six years old) to eleven or twelve years of age." While Lefever (2007) defines young learners as at the transition level (ages 5–8). And Scott and Ytreberg (1990), distinguish between two groups of young learners, one between 5-7 and another 8-11, considering mainly their ability to understand the abstract and symbols.

According to Scott and Ytreberg (1990, p. 1), "It is possible to point out certain characteristics of children which you should be aware of and take into account in your teaching." As it is also implied, that a teacher of young learners before conducting the teaching activity needs to consider their characteristics (Moeslichatoen, 2004; Lefever, 2007) as well as their learning style that affect their second language acquisition (Shin, 2009).

The following are some general characteristics of children according to Harmer (2001: 38): (1) They respond to meaning even if they do not understand individual words. They often learn indirectly rather than directly; (2) Their understanding comes not just from the explanation, but also from what they see and hear and crucially have a chance to touch and interact with; (3) They generally display an enthusiasm for learning and curiosity about the world around them; (4) They have a need for individual attention and approval from their teacher; (5) They are keen on talking about themselves and respond well to learning that uses themselves and their own lives as main topic in the classroom; (6) They have limited attention span, unless activities are extremely engaging, they can easily get bored, losing interest after 10 minutes or so. Levine (2005) writes other characteristics of young learners: (1) Children are more highly proficient at acquiring languages than learning languages; (2) Children are occupied completely with language; (3) Children are physically moving about while acquiring and learning languages; (4) Children engage in enjoyable activities with language; (5) Children are arranged in group; (6) Children learn in cooperation rather than in competition with one another; and (7) Children process the language actively – not passively.

From the characteristics above, it can be concluded that children learn a foreign language in the same way that they learn their mother tongue as it is also

stated by Clarke (2009:13) that, “Activities to assist babies and toddlers learning English as a second language are not different from those that are provided from children with English as their first language.” They learn another language with the help of their already well-established set of instincts, skill and characteristics (Halliwel, 1992).

In this case, since the learners are the first grade of elementary school, the vocabulary targeted to be taught is single word vocabulary items based on the school English module about numbers (1 up to 10), colors, things in the classroom, animals, and fruits. Moreover, as it is adapted from McCharten (2007), the teacher only introduces the vocabulary a little at a time, and it is repeated often, because students must work with a word or phrase many times before acquisition takes place, and they have to be offered variety to keep the exercises fresh and to cater to different learning styles.

Besides, there is also a positive evidence to support the principles above that children do readily acquire vocabulary when provided with a little explanation and through active learning by watching, listening, doing things, and imitating (Biemiller, 2000). In line with Biemiller’s opinion about the children’s being ready to acquire vocabulary when provided with little explanation, in teaching vocabulary, it is also necessary to consider what McCloskey (2002) states that children as social learners need to be ensured to have access to vocabulary and structures they need supported by rich exposure to many kinds of literature which is a very effective to model high quality and academic language.

In relation to the chosen topic, there have been several related studies on TPR method applied to teaching English vocabulary. Some of them are as follows: First research was conducted by Hsu and Lin (2012) from National Changhua University of Education, Taiwan. In this research they aimed in investigating the effects of TPR on English functional vocabulary learning for resource classroom students and experimental design was used to evaluate the effects. The study showed that the immediate and maintaining effects of TPR on listening comprehension as well as on expressing abilities of English functional vocabulary was found and students’ motivation and interests in learning English were enhanced through TPR.

Second research was employed by Octaviany (2007). After an action research about teaching English vocabulary to the fourth year students of elementary school using the Total Physical Response (TPR) method had been completed, the result showed that the mastery level of vocabulary in the second cycle is better than that on the first cycle. The students’ interest in teaching learning process through Total Physical Response was the main factor affecting this improvement. Based on this data, the researcher concluded that teaching English vocabulary through TPR is very beneficial for the students in order to facilitate them in learning English vocabulary.

The third research was carried out by Munoz (2011). The purpose of the research was to observe the impact caused by the usage of the Total Physical Response method (TPR), as a strategy to introduce English language vocabulary to third graders from “Gamma” school in Pereira, Colombia. The results obtained reveal that teaching English vocabulary through physical response made children learn faster and easier, since children found support from the physical

representation of their facilitator or their peers. Besides, a stress-free environment allowed children to be more receptive and motivated to the target language learning.

From the research results described above, there is still no research which focuses on the participants of the first grade of elementary school. Hence, the researcher tried to conduct the similar research involving the participants of the first class of elementary school who are still learning reading and writing their first language.

RESEARCH METHODS

This study used embedded mixed method, combining quantitative and qualitative methods (priority to the major form of quantitative data collection, and secondary status to the supportive form of qualitative data collection as additional to the primary form).

To find out whether the TPR method is effective in English vocabulary mastery of elementary school children, quasi-experimental design was used as it did not include the use of random selection, involving two groups (control and experiment) and employing pretest and posttest (after conducting pilot test to investigate the validity and reliability of the test instrument). For clearer description the design can be seen in the table below:

Description of Research Design

Experiment Class	Pretest	<i>X (treatment with TPR method)</i>	Posttest
Control Class	Pretest	<i>X (treatment with conventional method)</i>	Posttest

Besides, to know the students' response toward the TPR method, qualitative research approach was employed conducting observation by field notes in the experiment class. The participants of this research was elementary school children in the first class, class A (21 students) as control group and class B (21 students) as experiment group in one Islamic elementary school in Bandung.

In conducting the treatment, the researcher did not do it by herself. There were two teachers who gave the treatment. They taught same English vocabulary materials (single word vocabulary items) about numbers, colors, things in the classroom, animals, and fruits for eight meetings but the first teacher implemented Total Physical Response method as treatment to experiment group by introducing some language instructions. Meanwhile, the other teacher treated conventional method to control group.

TPR Method was Effective in English Vocabulary Mastery of Elementary School Children

The purposes of this study are to investigate whether the use of TPR method is effective in English vocabulary mastery of elementary school children and to investigate how the students respond toward teaching English vocabulary using TPR method.

In compliance with the aforementioned purposes, this research strived to use the instruments of pretest, posttest (of which the measurement results were tested with SPSS 15 for windows) and observation. The data gained from statistical computation using SPSS 15 for windows showed that TPR method was effective in English vocabulary mastery of elementary school children. For clearer description the findings obtained from the pretest and posttest score computation are presented in the subheadings below.

Findings from Pretest of Experiment and Control Group

The pretest was given to experiment and control groups before the treatment (experiment group with TPR method, control group with conventional method) to know the students' initial ability and students' initial equality between the groups and to make sure that the initial ability of the two groups was not significantly different.

The findings of pretest measurement using independent t-test consisted of the findings from group statistics and from independent samples test. The result of pretest from group statistics consists of the number of participant, the mean of the score, standard deviation and standard error mean.

The mean score of experiment group is 8.38 and the mean score of control group is 8.71. Standard deviation of experiment group is 4.283 and standard deviation of control group is 4.383. The standard error mean of experiment group is 0.93 and the standard error mean of control group is 0.96. Therefore, it can be concluded that the results from both groups were not significantly different or meant equal.

The significance (2-tailed) is 0.804 which is > 0.05 . Since it is higher than 0.05 (level of significance), the null hypothesis is accepted. It means that the two groups are similar and it can be concluded that the initial ability of the two groups was not significant difference.

Findings from Posttest of Experiment and Control Group

The posttest was given to experiment and control groups after the treatment (experiment group with TPR method, control group with conventional method) to know the progress of the students' ability and students' equality between the groups and to make sure that the ability of the two groups was significantly different.

The findings of posttest measurement using independent t-test consisted of the findings from group statistics and from independent samples test. The result of posttest from group statistics consists of the number of participant, the mean of the score, standard deviation and standard error mean.

The mean score of experiment group is 12.67 and the mean score of control group is 10.19. Standard deviation of experiment group is 3.62 and standard deviation of control group is 4.05. The standard error mean of experiment group is 0.79 and the standard error mean of control group is 0.89. The mean score of experiment group is higher than the mean score of control group. Therefore, it can be concluded that the treatment given to the experiment group worked.

The significance (2-tailed) is 0.43 which is < 0.05 . Since it is lower than 0.05 (level of significance), the null hypothesis is rejected. It means that the two groups are not similar and it can be concluded that the ability of the two groups was significantly different.

- Findings from Pretest and Posttest of Experiment Group

The data gained from the pretest and posttest given to experiment group were measured by paired samples computation to determine whether the difference between the two mean (pretest and posttest) score was significant. This measurement consists of the experiment class score from paired samples statistics, paired samples correlation and paired samples test.

The mean score of pretest is 8.38 and the mean score of posttest is 12.67. The standard deviation of pretest score is 4.28 and the standard deviation of posttest is 3.62. The standard error of pretest score is 0.93 and the standard error of posttest score is 0.79. The correlation of pretest and posttest score is 0.733. The significance of pretest and posttest score is 0.000. The significance (2-tailed) is 0.000 which is < 0.05 . Since it is lower than 0.05 (level of significance), the null hypothesis is rejected. It means that there is significant difference between the pretest and posttest mean of experiment class. Therefore, it can be concluded that the vocabulary acquisition of experiment class was significantly improved.

- Findings from Pretest and Posttest of Control Group

The data gained from the pretest and posttest given to control group were also measured by paired samples computation to determine whether the difference between the two mean (pretest and posttest) score was significant. This measurement consists of the control class score from paired samples statistics, paired samples correlation and paired samples test.

The mean score of pretest is 8.71 and the mean score of posttest is 10.19. The standard deviation of pretest score is 4.38 and the standard deviation of posttest is 4.06. The standard error of pretest score is 0.95 and the standard error of posttest score is 0.89. The correlation of pretest and posttest score is 0.523. The significance of pretest and posttest score is 0.015.

The significance (2-tailed) is 0.117 which is > 0.05 . Since it is higher than 0.05 (level of significance), the null hypothesis is accepted. It means that there is no significant difference between the pretest and posttest mean of control class. Therefore, it can be concluded that the vocabulary acquisition of control group was not significantly improved.

- Findings from Effect Size Calculation

Effect size was calculated to tell the relative magnitude of the experimental treatment or to investigate the effect of independent variable toward the dependent variable. The result of the effect size calculation showed that the coefficient correlation of effect size is 0.829. Based on the effect size scale in the table 3.7, it can be categorized large. It means that Total Physical Response had high effect in improving students' vocabulary acquisition.

Students Responded Positively to Teaching English Vocabulary Using Total Physical Response Method

As it is mentioned before, the purposes of this study are to investigate whether the use of TPR method is effective in English vocabulary mastery of elementary school children and to investigate how the students respond toward teaching English vocabulary using TPR method.

In compliance with the aforementioned purposes, this research strived to use the instruments of pretest, posttest (of which the measurement results were tested with SPSS 15 for windows) and observation. The data gained from observation showed that the students responded positively to teaching English vocabulary using TPR method. For clearer description the findings obtained from the observation are presented in the subheadings below.

Findings from Observation

In conducting the observation, the researcher used field notes to know students' behavior and responses to Total Physical Response method during the treatment given to the experiment group for eight meetings. Based on the data gained from observation using field notes during the learning process, it can be interpreted and classified as follows:

The students looked enthusiastic. They participated happily to the class activity without any stress condition as shown by the notes below:

April 16, 2012, Monday at 7:30. Learning Material Topic: Numbers

- Ketika guru meminta siswa untuk loncat 'jump!' sambil berhitung, siswa terlihat senang dan bersemangat melakukannya, walaupun awalnya mereka melakukannya tidak kompak dengan gerakan yang tidak beraturan (When the teacher asked the students to jump 'jump!' while counting, they looked happy and enthusiastic, even though, they firstly did not do it cohesively with irregular motion).

April 19, 2012, Thursday at 7:30. Learning Material Topic: Colors

- Siswa terlihat senang melakukan instruksi-instruksi yang diberikan guru. Mereka tidak sabar menunggu giliran untuk maju ke depan kelas (The students looked contented performing the instructions given by their teacher. They were impatient to wait their turn to come in front of the class).

May 21, 2012, Monday at 7:30. Learning Material Topic: Fruits

- Anak-anak melakukan instruksinya tanpa takut salah (The students performed the instructions without being afraid of making errors).

Most of students performed the teacher's commands perfectly after the teacher did as model and repeated the commands several times as shown by the notes below:

April 16, 2012, Monday at 7:30. Learning Material Topic: Numbers

- Ketika siswa diminta untuk berdiri 'stand up!', awalnya anak-anak masih tetap duduk dibangku. Setelah diberi contoh lewat gerakan oleh gurunya, maka hampir semua siswa serempak berdiri. (When the students were asked to stand up 'stand up!', they firstly just sat on their chairs. After being given example by their teacher, then most of them stood up at the same time).

April 19, 2012, Thursday at 7:30. Learning Material Topic: Colors

- Setelah diberi contoh oleh gurunya, anak-anak bisa melakukan instruksi-instruksi yang diberikan guru. Instruksi tersebut diberikan secara berulang-ulang sampai siswa tidak keliru lagi melakukannya (After being given the examples by their teacher, the students were able to do the instructions given by the teacher. The instructions were given repeatedly until the students did not make mistakes anymore).

The students were entertained and had fun as shown by the notes below:

April 16, 2012, Monday at 7:30. Learning Material Topic: Numbers

- Banyak siswa yang tertawa ketika mereka harus mengikuti gerakan olah raga ringan yang dicontohkan gurunya sambil berhitung, terlebih ketika mereka harus menggoyangkan pinggulnya ke kanan dan ke kiri (Many students were laughing when they had to follow the motion of light exercise exemplified by their teacher while counting, especially when they had to swing their hip to the right and left).

April 19, 2012, Thursday at 7:30. Learning Material Topic: Colors

- Anak-anak diminta menyanyikan lagu 'pelangi-pelangi' namun lirik yang menyebutkan warna diganti dalam Bahasa Inggris. Anak-anak menyanyikannya tidak kompak malah banyak yang tertawa karena lagunya menjadi aneh dan tidak enak dinyanyikannya (The students were asked to sing a song 'rainbows' but the lyrics mentioned colors were changed into English. Instead of singing the song cohesively, most students were laughing because the song became whimsical and not nice to be sung).

May 10, 2012, Thursday at 7:30. Learning Material Topic: Animals

- Anak-anak tertawa karena melakukan instruksinya begitu lucu dan menggelikan. Apalagi ketika mereka bertindak seperti monyet dan menirukan suara kuda (The students were laughing because of doing the instructions so

amusingly, especially when they acted like monkey and imitated the sound of horse).

The students understood both learning material and classroom instruction as shown in the following notes:

April 30, 2012, Monday at 7:30. Learning Material Topic: Things at Class

- Anak-anak serempak melakukan instruksinya dan sangat memahami apa yang harus dilakukan (The students, at the same time did the instructions and understood what to do).
- Anak-anak begitu faham dengan instruksinya dan bisa melakukannya dengan baik (The students understood the instructions so much and could perform them well).

However quite many students were frequently over acting when performed the commands as shown by some notes below:

April 23, 2012, Monday at 7:30. Learning Material Topic: Colors

- Siswa diminta untuk berdiri. Guru terlihat kaget melihat seorang siswa yang berdiri di atas meja dan segera diikuti oleh teman-temannya yang lain (the students were asked to stand up. The teacher looked surprised when a boy stand on his table and soon followed by his friends).
- Seorang siswa laki-laki diminta berjalan, dia malah berlari. Siswa lain saling bertubrukan karena melakukan hal yang sama (A boy was asked to walk, he was running instead of walking. Other students bumped each other because of doing same thing).

April 30, 2012, Monday at 7:30. Learning Material Topic: Things at Class

- Siswa diminta menyentuh meja, mereka malah memukulnya. Mereka diminta melakukannya berkelompok, malah semua siswa melakukannya (The students were asked to touch the table, they were hitting instead of touching it. They were asked to perform it per group but they all did it).

Quite few students looked less enthusiastic, less nimble and shy as shown in the following notes:

April 16, 2012, Monday at 7:30. Learning Material Topic: Numbers

- Ada siswa beberapa orang, 2 anak perempuan dan 1 anak laki-laki, selalu terlambat gerakannya dan kurang gesit (There were some students, 2 girls and 1 boy, who were less nimble and always do the commands late).
- Ada satu anak perempuan sepanjang belajar terlihat lemas (There was a girl who looked less enthusiastic).

April 19, 2012, Thursday at 7:30. Learning Material Topic: Colors

- Masih saja ada sedikit anak yang pemalu, bersuara pelan dan tidak banyak tertawa hanya senyum-senyum saja (There were still few students who were shy, spoke softly and did not laugh a lot just kept smiling).

From the data analysis above, it can be concluded that in general, the students had good response toward Total Physical Response method used in the learning activity. During the learning process, the students paid attention well to the teacher's explanation. When the students seemed to hesitate or do the commands wrong, the teacher did as model in front of class and repeated the commands several times until they mastered them. They were often found laughing when the teacher made jokes or when they had to perform funny commands. They did not look stressed. Most of them participated enthusiastically and excitedly to the class activity. They understood both learning material and classroom instructions. However, quite many students were frequently over acting when performing the commands. Besides, there were still few students who were less enthusiastic, less nimble and shy.

From the data gained above, it can be inferred that the Total Physical Response method is effective and suitable to be used for elementary school children to learn English, especially English vocabulary as it makes them learn it more easily and happily.

Discussion on Findings

TPR is an effective tool for building vocabulary. This fact stated by Head (n.d.) was proved by the findings shown on this research. The findings revealed that after conducting the experimental research to investigate whether TPR method was effective in vocabulary mastery of elementary school children, Total Physical Response method had high effect in improving vocabulary mastery of the students.

The advantages of this method to reduce pressure and stress for students as viewed by Shearon (2005) were also indicated by the findings from observation. The data from field notes showed that the students participated happily to the class activity without any stress condition. The data obtained from the observation also proved that as it was stated by Richard and Rodgers (1987), students learn more when they are relaxed. This is one of the reasons that the English vocabulary of the student investigated in this research was significantly improved.

TPR method is suitable for teaching young learners as in line with the statement from Levine (2005) that the characteristics of young learners are physically moving about while acquiring and learning languages and they engage in enjoyable activities with language. This fact emphasized by Head (n.d.) that learners will enjoy getting up out of their chairs and moving around was also indicated by the findings from observation. The data from observation using field notes showed that the students understood both learning material and the classroom instructions, even though, the data from observation using field notes also showed that most students performed the teacher's commands perfectly after the teacher did as model and repeated the commands several times.

From the findings gained on this research, it can be inferred that the Total Physical Response method is effective and suitable to be used for elementary school children to learn English, especially English vocabulary as it makes them learn it more easily and happily.

CONCLUSION

Based on the result of the data analysis, it can be concluded that:

- Total Physical Response (TPR) method is effective to improve vocabulary mastery of elementary school children, especially for the first grade. It is supported by the posttest result of experiment class that is significantly improved after being given TPR method treatment, different from that of control class after being given conventional method treatment.
- TPR method is very suitable for children's characteristics; as they love moving around and get bored easily if just sit on the chair. Moreover, it is supported by their good response toward TPR method.
- TPR method can motivate the children to be interested in learning English vocabulary, as it is entertaining them. It is proven by their being happy, enthusiastic and laughing much during the learning activity.
- TPR method, however, can cause some students over acting as they are too excited participating in the learning activity.

REFERENCES

- Aminudin .2009. *Teaching Vocabulary through TPR Method to Children*. Retrieved March 1, 2012, from <http://aminudin241072.wordpress.com/2009/02/08/teaching-vocabulary-through-tpr-method-to-children/>.
- Biemiller, A. 2000. *Teaching Vocabulary Early, Direct, and Sequential*. Retrieved May 28, 2012, from http://www.wordsmartedu.com/Biemiller_Teaching_Vocab.pdf.
- Clarke, P. (2009, p. 13). *Supporting Children Learning English as a Second Language in the Early Years (Birth to Six Years)*. Victorian Curriculum and Assessment Authority. Retrieved May 27, 2012, from http://www.vcaa.vic.edu.au/earlyyears/supporting_children_learning_esl.pdf.
- Edisonyusman. 2011. *Teaching English for Young Learner*. Retrieved April 9, 2012, from <http://edisonyusman.wordpress.com/2011/03/29/teaching-english-for-young-learner/>.
- Evan. 2011. *Total Physical Response*. Retrieved February 9, 2012 from <http://blog.hereareyourkeys.org/2011/01/10/4-total-physical-response=tpr-top-20-techniques-of-wayk/>
- Fegen, N. 2006. *What is IMS Vocabulary Definition Exchange?* Retrieved June 8, 2012 from <http://metadata.cetis.ac.uk/guides/WhatIsVDEX.pdf>
- Halliwell, S. 1992. *Teaching English in the Primary School*. London: Longman.
- Harmer, J. 2001. *The Practice of English Language Teaching*. London: Longman.
- Harmer, J. 2007. *How to Teach English*. Essex: Pearson Longman.
- Hsu, H., & Lin, C. 2012. *The Effects of Total Physical Response on English Functional Vocabulary Learning for Resource Classroom Students in the Elementary School* (National Changhua University of Education, Taiwan). Abstract retrieved February 9, 2012 from http://conference.nie.edu.sg/paper/new_converted/0600466.pdf.

- Istiqomah. 2011. *Globalisasi dan Bahasa Inggris*. Retrieved April 9, 2012, from <http://www.psb-psma.org/taxonomy/term/230/0>.
- Kennedy, A. 2000. *Total Physical Response: An Innovative Strategy for the Second Language Classroom*. Retrieved Mei 16, 2012 from <http://www.southalabama.edu/coe/bset/dempsey/isd613/stuproj/summer00is/angelakennedy.pdf>.
- Lefever, S. 2007. *English for Very Young Learners*. Retrieved May 28, 2012 from http://malfridur.ismennt.is/haust2006/pdf/malfr_27-31.pdf.
- Levine, L. N. 2005. *Unique Characteristics of Young Learners*. Retrieved May 28, 2012 from http://home.comcast.net/~educatlanta/Handouts05/UniqueCharacteristics_HO_LNLTESOLArabia05.pdf.
- Maroto, L. M. P., Garrido, C. S., & Fuentes, E. M. n.d., n. p.. *TPR and Activities in The Language Class Room*. Retrieved February 9, 2012 from http://www4.ujaen.es/-gluque/TPR_presentation.pdf.
- McCharten, J. 2007. *Teaching Vocabulary*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- McCloskey, M. L. 2003. *Principles and Best Practices for Teaching English to Elementary Learners*. *Arkansas TESOL*. P1-9. Retrieved June 4, 2012 from http://home.comcast.net/~mlmccloskey/Handouts03/Principles_of_ESL_Arkansas.pdf.
- Moeslichaton, R. 2004. *Metode Pengajaran di Taman Kanak-Kanak*. Cet ke 2, Jakarta: Rineka Cipta.
- Munoz, M. E. 2011. *Teaching English Vocabulary to Third Graders through the Application of the Total Physical Response Method* (Thesis, Universidad Tecnologica De Pereira, 2011). Retrieved Mei 17, 2012 from <http://recursosbiblioteca.utp.edu.co/tesisdigitales/texto/4281M971.pdf>
- Neupane, G. 2008. Act, "Don't Explain: Total Physical Response at Work." *Journal of NELTA Vol. 13* No. 1-2
- Nugrahaningsih, N. 2007. *The Use of Total Physical Response (TPR) Method in English Preposition Teaching* (Skripsi, Universitas Negeri Semarang, 2007). Retrieved February 8, 2012 from <http://www.scribd.com/doc>.
- Octaviany. 2007. *The Application of TPR in Teaching English Vocabulary to the Fourth Graders of SD Negeri 04 Krajankulon Kaliwungu Kendal in the Academic Year of 2006/2007* (Skripsi, Universitas Negeri Semarang, 2007). Retrieved February 8, 2012 from <http://lib.unnes.ac.id/1405/>
- Phillips, S. 1993. *Young Learners*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Richards, J. C., & Rodgers. 1987. *Approaches and Methods in Language Teaching*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Sad, S. N. 2010. "Theory–Practice Dichotomy: Prospective Teachers' Evaluations about Teaching English to Young Learners." *Journal of Language and Linguistic Studies Vol.6*, No.2, October
- Samudra, M., Kuswardono, A. A., & Idayanie, L. N. 1999. *Bukan Pelajaran Hafalan*. TEMPO online. Retrieved May 30, 2012 from <http://majalah.tempointeraktif.com/id/arsip/1999/02/23/PDK/mbm.19990223.PDK93658.i.html>.

- Scott, W. A., & Ytreberg, L. H. 1990. *Teaching English to Children*. New York: Longman.
- Shin, J. K. 2006. Ten helpful ideas for teaching English to young learners. *English Teaching Forum*, 44 (2), 2-13.
- Shin, J. K. 2009. *Teaching English to Young Learners*. Retrieved June 7, 2012 from http://202.29.33.54/portal/data_resource/NEWS/2009/INSIDE/FILE/1232942687_087864500.pdf
- Silver, M., Adelman, B., & Price, E. 2003. *Total Physical Response: A Curriculum for Adults*. Retrieved Mei 16, 2012 from <http://www.springinstitute.org/Files/tpr4.pdf>
- Sophaktra, U. 2009. *Total Physical Response (TPR)*. Retrieved February 8, 2012, from <http://www.scribd.com/doc/23194878/Total-physical-Response-TPR>.
- Sukamerta, I. M. 2011. *Implementasi Kebijakan Pembelajaran Bahasa Inggris pada Sekolah Dasar di Kota Denpasar* (Disertasi, Universitas Udayana, 2011). Retrieved Mei 3, 2012 from http://pps.unud.ac.id/disertasi/pdf_thesis/unud-27-191558789-bab%201-3.pdf.
- Suyanto, K. E. 2004. Pengajaran Bahasa Inggris di sekolah dasar: kebijakan, implementasi, dan kenyataan. Retrieved May 27, 2012 from <http://118.97.219.90/images/stories/pidatogurubesar/Pidato%20Guru%20Besar%20Prof.%20Kasihani%20E.%20Suyanto,%20M.A.,%20Ph.pdf>
- Widodo, H. P. 2005. Teaching children using a Total Physical Response (TPR) method: Rethinking. *BAHASA DAN SENI*, 33 (2), pp 235-238.
- Yauri, A. M. 2007. Problematika Pengajaran Bahasa Inggris pada Madrasah Ibtidaiyah di Watampone Sulawesi Selatan. *Jurnal Ichsan Gorontalo*, 2 (3), pp 1133.