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Abstract
The aims of this study were to find out the extent to which TPR method contribute to students mastery of vocabulary. The research employed quantitative method with quasi-experimental design, control, and experimental group involved in pre-test and post-test. The research was carried out at SDN 1 Bonebone Baubau. Forty two students were purposively selected for samples divided in to two groups. Twenty one students were assigned for each group. Pre and posttest on vocabulary were presented on experimental and control group. Data were analyzed with statistical analysis and the use of independent t-sample and frequency test. The result indicated that TPR method contributed to the students’ vocabulary mastery. It was confirmed that the experimental group had better performance than control group. The analysis of posttest using independent sample t-test showed the probability value was 0.026 and it was less than 0.05 (0.026 ≤ 0.05). there were significant differences of posttest result between the experimental and control group.
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INTRODUCTION

Learning English means learning the elements and skills in the language. Vocabulary, pronunciation, grammar, and spelling are language elements, while language skills are listening, writing, reading and speaking. In the process of learning a foreign language, the ability to understand the language greatly depends on one’s knowledge of vocabulary besides the other elements of language itself. Vocabulary is one of the important language elements of any languages. In line with this, (Brown, 2007)) stated that vocabulary is the basic of all the skill in English. Furthermore, (Zimmerman, 1998) stated that in language learning, vocabulary acquisition is basic to language and greater attention to typical language learner. It means that the learners can easily understand and master the skill of reading, listening, speaking and writing when they have good coverage of...
The more vocabularies that learners have the better chance they have to communicate in English.

Based on pre observation on some Elementary schools, English teachers still use traditional method for all materials. The teacher presents the material by focusing on grammar rules, memorizing vocabulary, translating text, and doing written exercises. Consequently, students feel bored and forget the material easily because they tend to be passive during the learning process. Besides, the learning environment factor caused there is no conducive atmosphere of learning process in the class because less of interaction and response between students and teacher. Learning process is monotonous, the students just sit in their chairs and listen to teacher’s explanation. It will make students bored and do not enjoy the learning process, as strongly supported by (Harmer, 2007) who states that the students must be encouraged to respond to texts and situations with their own thoughts and experiences, rather than just answering questions and doing abstract learning activities. The teacher must give them tasks which they are able to do, rather than risk humiliating them.

The failure in the teaching and learning vocabulary in elementary school in Baubau has been attributed to the method and strategy of the teacher in teaching English. A wide range of method and strategy have been applied to teach the students to develop their comprehension in vocabulary such as grammar translation method, Audiolingual and the others. But still, there have been consistency in reports of low achievement in English. That is why, considering the need to improve the students achievement in English vocabulary the researcher proposes the application of TPR method to investigate its effect on the elementary school students’ achievement in English vocabulary.

Some studies have been conducted in examining students’ knowledge on vocabulary. (Tehrani, 2013) conduct a research about the effect of applying Audiolingual and Natural Method in teaching vocabularies. The focus of the study was on the acquisition of English words and communicative skills in a certain period of time, and on the best method for improving communication in English for EFL young learners. The results found that young learners’ vocabulary learning and communication skills improved significantly in Natural approach compared in that of Audiolingual method. The difference between teaching vocabulary through two methods of Audiolingual and Natural approach, as the observation of two groups show, is that in Audiolingual method, repetition of the new words is the key element in learning vocabularies but in Natural approach, the teacher is the input provider (in this case vocabularies) and the learners are not forced to use the new language until they feel ready.

By applying TPR, students can memorize the meaning of the vocabulary by looking at the action, even though the vocabulary is not translated. TPR creates positive thinking which in turn facilitates the students’ involvement in learning process, develops verbal behaviour and makes communication easy. Also, it enables the students to understand meanings of words in real context and makes students to involve in activities with little stress. As (Freeman et al, 2000) stated “Total Physical Response was developed in order to reduce the stress people feel when studying a foreign
language and thereby encourage students to persist in their study beyond a beginning level of proficiency”.

Based on the explanation above, it can be said that TPR is supposed to give more effective result than traditional method in terms of improving the students’ vocabulary mastery. To support this assumption, the researcher tries to investigate the effectiveness of TPR to improve students’ vocabulary mastery.

METHOD

The researcher used Quasi Experimental Design. This research design employed by the researcher to collect and analyze the data in order to get answer from the research questions. (Creswell, J. W., & Clark, 2007) stated that quantitative data including test and closed-ended questionnaire, and the analysis consist of statistically analyzing scores collected from instruments. Two intact classes were used by the researcher in order to avoid disruption of the normal academic programme of the schools. The subjects were divided into two groups, namely experimental group and control group. The experimental group was taught by applying TPR method and the control group was taught through conventional method. Pre-test and Post-test was administered for both control and experimental groups. Both of groups was given the same test. The pretest was intended to find out the students’ prior level on vocabulary achievement while posttest was used to measure the improvement of students’ vocabulary achievement after giving the treatment. At the end, the results from both experimental and control groups were compared.

The use of TPR method was measured through quantitative data, which covered in what extent of using TPR in enriching students’ vocabulary and gained students’ perceptions over the questionnaire distributed. Cluster random sampling was used in this research, the group of samples was selected randomly (Gay, L. R., Mills, Geoffrey E., & Airasian, 2006) The researcher used this technique because all the members of the selected group had similar characteristics. The instuments were used in this study consist of two items, they are test and questionnaire. The data collected through the test was analyzed quantitatively. Percentage score, mean score, standard deviation, and t-test was used to justify the students’ score at pretest and postest. Questionnaire was to find the students perception on teaching vocabulary by applying TPR method.

RESULT AND DISCUSSION

Statistical Data Analysis on Students’ Vocabulary Mastery

1. Descriptive analysis for students’ pretest

The students score in pretest both experimental and control group was also presented in table of descriptive statistic analysis, as shown in the following table:
The table above shows that the highest students’ pretest score in experimental group was 59 (fair classification) and control group gained 60 (fair classification). While the lowest score that students gained in experimental group was 24 and it classified in poor classification and in control group was 17 classified in very poor classification.

Moreover, the table above also performs the mean score for both group which experimental group was 43.29 (fair classification) and control group was 46.38 (fair classification). Based on those scores, it could be drawn that in mastering vocabulary the students in experimental and control group were the same level that was fair classification.

2. Descriptive analysis for students posttest

The students score in posttest both experimental and control group was also presented in table of descriptive statistic analysis in following table:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>N Minimum</th>
<th>Maximum</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Experimental group</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Control group</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>82</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As seen on the table above, there was improvement of students in mastering vocabulary after the treatment. Whereas, it proved by the increasing of students’ highest score, which is the experimental group was 59 (fair classification) in the pretest to 96 (very good classification) in the posttest and the lowest score in experimental group was improved from 24 (poor classification) in the pretest to 46 (fair classification). Also, the the highest students’ pretest and posttest score in control group increased from 60 (fair classification) to 82 (very good classification) while the lowest score was from 17 (very poor classification) to 38 (poor classification).

Additionally, the table above performs the improvement of the mean score for both group in pretest and posttest which experimental group was 43.29 (fair classification) into 71.33 (good classification) and control group was 46.38 (fair classification) into 61.43 (good classification).

The mean score difference between experimental and control group showed in following figure below:
The chart above describes the mean score both experimental and control groups in pretest and posttest that the distance of mean score both experimental and control groups were not quite different. The pretest score in experimental group was 43.29 and 46.38 in control group. The classification of the mean score both groups were in fair classification. However, in pretest, the experimental group has showed better performance by gaining mean score 71.33 (good classification) than in control group the mean score only gained 61.43 (good classification). Besides, the chart also shows that the gain score of experimental group higher than control group, which experimental group was 28.04 while control group was 15.05.

**Inferential Statistical Analysis**

1. Normality test of the data

The table below could describe the normality test both for experimental and control group

![Table 4. Normality Test](image)

Regarding the table, the observed significance of the pretest in experimental group was 0.143 and control group was 0.129. This means that the observed significance both for experiment and control groups were greater than 5% (0.143 and 0.129 > 0.05). Based on those values, it concluded that the pretest was distributed normally. Moreover, table above also showed that the observed significance of experimental group in posttest was 0.200 (0.200 > 0.05) and the control group was 0.099 (0.099>0.05). Based on the scores, the observed significance in posttest both for experimental
and control group were also greater than 5%. It could be concluded that the pretest and the posttest were distributed normally to both groups.

**Hypothesis testing**

The aim to test the hypothesis was to find out the students’ significance difference both for experimental and control groups. The test was analyzed by using parametric test of SPSS version 20 software program with the formula of Independent sample t-test with the level of significance of 5% (α=0.05). Independent sample t-test was administered by comparing students’ pretest and posttest score in both experimental and control groups.

1. Independent Sample-t-test

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Levene’s Test for Equality of Variances</th>
<th>t-test for Equality of Means</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Sig.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prettest Score</td>
<td>Equal variances assumed</td>
<td>0.773</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Equal variances not assumed</td>
<td>-0.828</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Before analyzing the t-test, the homogeneity of variances must be checked with F test (Levene’s Test). This test is intended to see if the variances of two groups in the analysis are equal or not. If the observed probability value of the Levene’s Test (shown in “Sig.” row) is greater than 0.05, then the t-test will be looked on the “Equal variance assumed” column. While if the observed probability value is less than 0.05 for the Levene’s Test, the t-test will be looked on the second column that is “Equal variances not assumed” (Gay, L. R., Mills, Geoffrey E., & Airasian, 2006)

Referring to the table 9, the observe probability in Levene’s test was 0.773 and it was greater than 0.05. It indicated that the data from both groups was homogeneous. Therefore, to test t-test, the researcher should look the t-test at the first row of equal variance assumed”. Based on table , the t-test was -0.828 and the df was 40 at the level of 5% (0.05), hence the t-table was 2.021 (see appendix). To find out there is a significant difference between the score of two groups, the requirement of t-test should greater than t-table. Based on that, it indicated that there is no significant difference between both groups because the t-test less than t-table (-0.828 < 2.021). Another way to see if there is no significant difference between the groups is by looking the probability value. If the probability value is less than the level of significance 0.05. It means that there is a significant difference between the groups. The probability value was 0.413 which was greater than the level of significance 0.05. It could be drawn that there is no significant different between the groups in pretest score.

The way to test the t-test on students’ posttest score was same as before. This is the determiner of this research, if there is significant difference between the groups it means the alternative hypothesis is accepted. Meanwhile, if there is no significant difference between the groups,
it means the null hypothesis is accepted. Therefore, to see the result of comparing the students’ score in pretest is presented in table of independent sample t-test of students score in posttest for both experimental and control groups as follows:

Table 6. Independent Sample Test of posttest both experiment and control groups

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Levene's Test for Equality of Variances</th>
<th>t-test for Equality of Means</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Sig.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Posttest Score</td>
<td>.033</td>
<td>.856</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equal variances</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>assumed</td>
<td>Equal variances not assumed</td>
<td>2.313</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Reffering to the table above, the Levene’s test was 0.865 which was greater than 0.05. Therefore, to analyze the t-test should be looked the first row of “Equal variance assumed”. The t-test was 2.313 and the df was 40 at the level of 5% (0.05) while the t-table was 2.021. To find out there is a significant difference between two groups, the t-test must be greater than t-table. Regarding to the table 10 , the t-test was 2.313 and it was greater than 2.021 (2.313 > 2.021). It can be concluded that there is a significant difference between experimental and control group in students’ posttest result.

Another way to see if there is a significant difference between experimental and control group is by looking the value of the probability which should be less than 0.05. Based on the table, the probability value was 0.026 and it was less than 0.05 (0.026 < 0.05). Furthermore, it can be concluded that the alternative hypothesis is accepted. Whereas, there is a significant difference in enhancing vocabulary between experimental group who taught by applying TPR method and control group who taught with listing method.

**Discussion**

Firstly, the researcher discussed about the first objective of this study which was to find out the extent to which TPR method contribute to students’ vocabulary mastery. The vocabulary test was given to the students in both experimental and control groups to delve the students’ vocabulary knowledge. The data in this study performed the difference mean score between experimental and control groups in pretest and posttest distribution. The mean score of experimental group from 43.29 (fair classification) to 71.33 (good classification) and the control group gained mean score from 46.38 that also in fair classification to 61.43 or good classification. Those scores proved that there was a significant difference between both groups in posttest. Also the mean scores from both groups showed different range which was experimental group gained 28.04 while the control group was 15.05.

Moreover, in pretest the highest score both experimental and control group had the same level of fair classification in which experimental group was 59 and control group was 60. While the lowest
scoring for both groups were 24 (poor classification) for experimental group and 17 (very poor) for control group. In spite of that, the mean score in both groups also showed in the same level of fair classification which was experimental group gained 43.29 and control group gained 46.38. Based on those scores, it implied that most students were still lack of vocabulary eventhough the mean score leveled them in fair classification. This due to the students in both groups were not once taught vocabulary specifically verb, noun and adjective intentionally. The students knew the words but in general term, hence the students unable to recognize the words based on the context. Students were not easy to identify the words specifically verb, noun and adjective based on the picture that had already served in the text.

Furthermore, the significance progress showed in posttest section in both groups. The experimental group was able to gain the highest score 96 that was classified as very good classification. It means that students much more understand about vocabulary after getting treatment by applying TPR. The students easier to learn the vocabulary by stimulating them with gestures and contextualized it with colorfull pictures.

However, in control group where students was treated by conventional method, the highest score also improved to be 82. Both groups had improvement in the highest scoring but experimental group was better than control group. It indicated that students were also easy to learn vocabulary by listing technique but not as effective as TPR. Listing technique makes students be monotonous in learning vocabulary because students were encouraged to list the words on their note book and memorize it without considering the context.

Besides, the comparison of both groups in independent sample t-test presented that the t-test was greater than t-table (2.313 > 2.021). That meant the alternative hyphotesis (H^1) was accepted. In other words, there is a significant difference between vocabulary mastery of students who were taught by applying TPR method and those who were taught with listing technique. Therefore, TPR method has contribution in helping students to master vocabulary. The finding of this present study were as in line with other previous studies in field of applying TPR. (Hwang, 2014) investigated the effect of TPR method which utilized Kinesthetic English Learning System (KELS) to build the kinesthetic interaction with life related context in English. They conducted the study for tenth grade students. They found that there was a significant difference in students’ posttest result between control and experimental group. TPR affected students in experimental group significantly between peers to facilitate learning in speaking and listening skill.

(Ilwana N, 2010) also conducted a research on the effect of TPR method to enhance the Junior High School. His findings showed that the application of TPR method was effective in improving the vocabulary comprehension for the seventh grade students at Junior High school.

Reffering to that, a study by (Gardner, 2011) conducted a research on the successes of TPR strategy on vocabulary development of adult ESL students at the Maryland Correctional Institution on Jesup. The results of her study showed the effectiveness of TPR to increase the enrichment of words
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and phrases of students. Those previous studies agreed that TPR method was effective to enrich students’ English vocabulary mastery. The result of the analysis in this study can be supported by the following reasons. As has been discussed in previous chapter that TPR works as in line with the way children learn their mother tongue. In TPR activities which was applied in experimental group, students didn’t learn by memorizing the lists of vocabulary, but students respond to commands and gestures that require physical movement. Hence students easy to learn and understand the vocabulary because it was more fun and reduce the learners’ stress and anxiety. TPR method places more emphasis on the link between word and action. (Harmer, 2007) states that the learners must be encouraged to respond to texts and situations with their own thoughts and experiences, rather than just answering questions and doing abstract learning activities. It means that it was be easier for the students to remember the words they have learned for long-term retention if they were involved directly and use their body in learning vocabulary items. It could be implied that this condition caused the students were easy to master and remember vocabulary for long term retention.

On the other hand, in listing method that applied in control group, the students were not active during learning process. The students did not involved in learning process directly and there was no interaction or response between students and teacher. The students just sat on their chair, write the lists of the vocabulary that was given and memorize words. That condition made students bored and forget the material easily. They also did not enjoy the learning process. That was why the students in control group did not much better in getting improvement of vocabulary mastery compared with experimental group.

In addition, some aspects influencing of the students mastery was the contribution of TPR method itself in teaching vocabulary. It was proved by the result of this study that students mastery increased from fair to good classification. Another aspect was the class management during learning by TPR method. Students were grouped into 5-6 of each group. After memorizing and practicing the vocabulary individually by applying TPR method, each group of students was assigned to identify the words in English passage. They discussed and shared each other in their group related the words that they found in English passage. Then, each group shared what they found in passage in front of the classroom. The other groups payed attentions to the presentation as well. This process of sharing good knowledge helped students to be more understand.

CONCLUSION

Twenty one students were assigned for each group. Pre and posttest on vocabulary were presented on experimental and control group. Data were analyzed with statistical analysis and the use of independent t-sample and frequency test. The result indicated that TPR method contributed to the students’ vocabulary mastery. It was confirmed that the experimental group had better performance than control group. The analysis of posttest using independent sample t-test showed the probability
value was 0.026 and it was less than 0.05 (0.026 ≤ 0.05). there were significant differences of posttest result between the experimental and control group.
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