Jurnal Ilmu Pendidikan dan Teknologi

https://journalpedia.com/1/index.php/jipt Vol. 6 No. 3 Juli 2024

THE EFFECT OF TOTAL PHYSICAL RESPONSE (TPR) TEACHING METHOD ON THE SEVENTH GRADE STUDENTS' VOCABULARY MASTERY AT SMP NEGERI 4 PEMATANG SIANTAR

Aprina Wati Siagian[1], Bloner Sinurat[2], Bertaria Sohnata Hutauruk[3]

[1,2,3]Universitas HKBP Nommensen Pematangsiantar, Indonesia

Email: aprinawatysiagian@gmail.com[1], blonersinurat@yahoo.com[2], bertharia.hutauruk@uhnp.ac.id[3]

Abstrak: Tujuan dari penelitian ini adalah untuk mengetahui pengaruh metode pengajaran TPR terhadap penguasaan kosakata siswa kelas tujuh di SMPN 4 Pematang Siantar. Penelitian ini berfokus pada pengaruh metode pengajaran TPR terhadap penguasaan kosakata siswa kelas tujuh. Penelitian ini menggunakan penelitian kuantitatif dengan desain penelitian quasi eksperimen. Populasi penelitian ini adalah siswa kelas VIII SMP Negeri 4 Pematang Siantar yang berjumlah 320 siswa. Sampel penelitian ini dibagi menjadi dua kelas, yaitu kelas eksperimen (VII-7) yang terdiri dari 32 siswa yang menggunakan strategi total physical response dan kelas kontrol (VII-8) yang terdiri dari 32 siswa yang menggunakan metode konvensional. Instrumen pengumpulan data menggunakan tes menulis untuk pre-test dan post-test. SPSS versi 26 digunakan untuk menganalisis data, dengan melakukan analisis deskriptif, uji normalitas, uji homogenitas dan uji Mann Whitney serta Uji N Gain Score. Hasil analisis data menggunakan uji Mann Whitney menunjukkan bahwa Assymp. Nilai Sig (2-tailed) sebesar 0,000 < 0,05. Berdasarkan hasil penelitian ini, Ha1 diterima dan Ho1 ditolak. Oleh karena itu, dapat disimpulkan bahwa terdapat pengaruh metode pengajaran TPR terhadap penguasaan kosakata siswa kelas VII SMPN 4 Pematang Siantar. Selain itu, hal tersebut dapat dilihat dari nilai rata-rata N-Gain Score sebesar 77,39 atau 77,39% termasuk kategori efektif. Hal ini menunjukkan bahwa penggunaan Metode Pengajaran TPR lebih efisien daripada tidak menggunakan metode ini, terhadap Penguasaan Kosakata Siswa Kelas VII SMPN 4 Pematang Siantar.

Kata Kunci: Metode Pengajaran TPR, Penguasaan Kosakata Siswa

Abstract: *The objective of this research was to determine the effect of TPR teaching method on the seventh-grade students' vocabulary mastery at SMPN 4 Pematang Siantar. This research focuses on effect of TPR teaching method on the seventh-grade students' vocabulary mastery. This research used quantitative research with a quasi-experimental research design. The population of this study was the VIII grade students of SMP Negeri 4 Pematang Siantar with a total of 320 students. The sample of this study was divided into two classes, namely the experimental class (VII-7) consisting of 32 students who used the total physical response strategy and the control class (VII-8) consisting of 32 students who used conventional method. Data collection instruments used writing tests for pre-test and post-test. SPSS version 26 was used to analyze the data, by conducting descriptive analysis, normality test, homogeneity test and Mann Whitney test and N Gain Score Test. The results of data analysis using the Mann Whitney test showed that the Assymp. Sig (2-tailed) value of 0.000 < 0.05. Based on these findings, Ha1 is accepted and Ho1 is rejected. Therefore, it can be concluded that there is an*

effect of TPR teaching method on the seventh-grade students' vocabulary mastery at SMPN 4 Pematang Siantar. Besides, it can be seen in the average score of N-Gain Score, 77.39 or 77.39% including the effective category. It shows that there is more efficient using the TPR Teaching Method than not using this method, for the Seventh Grade Students' Vocabulary Mastery at SMPN 4 Pematang Siantar.
Keywords: *TPR Teaching Method, Students' Vocabulary Mastery*

INTRODUCTION

Mastery of English in junior high school is crucial for students' overall educational development. English is not just a subject but a gateway to understanding science, culture, and technology. As students become proficient in English, they can broaden their intellectual horizons and contribute to the advancement of Indonesia with a strong national character (Muhyiddin, 2019). However, in Indonesia, English is often treated as just another subject tested for progression rather than a practical communication tool (Katemba & Tampubolon, 2011). Despite the importance of speaking skills in social and cultural contexts, the practice of speaking English is minimal in daily activities. Addressing these issues is essential for effective English language education in junior high schools.

English is an integral subject in junior high school curricula, and students must achieve basic competency. Although not an official language, English is essential for international communication. Proficiency in English offers numerous benefits, including easier access to information, enhanced communication, and the ability to form global connections (Hartiwi et al., 2015). Given that English is the most widely spoken language worldwide, it is vital for young people to master it, emphasizing its role as a common medium of communication globally.

A solid vocabulary foundation is fundamental to learning English. Without a strong vocabulary, students struggle to apply another knowledge effectively. Vocabulary encompasses the words students use and understand, both orally and in writing (Chalikandy, 2013; Muflihah, 2016). Teaching vocabulary should be prioritized in English language classrooms, as it supports the development of other language skills (Sholekhah, 2017). A rich vocabulary allows for clear and precise expression, essential in daily interactions, discussions, and presentations. Moreover, vocabulary mastery enhances reading comprehension, writing, academic achievement, and critical thinking skills (Brown, 2000; Miller, 2007).

In Indonesia, English education begins early, with English introduced as a local subject in kindergarten and elementary school and becoming compulsory in junior high and high school (Hayati, 2008). However, the emphasis remains on passive learning rather than active usage. Vocabulary is central to English language teaching; without sufficient vocabulary, students cannot understand or express their ideas effectively (Sarre & Whyte, 2017). Therefore, mastering vocabulary significantly influences students' ability to use English for communication.

Reading comprehension is bolstered by a strong vocabulary, enabling individuals to deduce meanings from context, which leads to better text understanding (Brown, 2000). Effective writing also depends on choosing the right words to convey ideas and emotions, and a broad vocabulary allows for more engaging and articulate written pieces. In education, a robust vocabulary is linked to higher academic achievement (Miller, 2007). It aids in understanding academic materials, essential for excelling in various subjects. A rich vocabulary is closely tied to critical thinking, allowing for better analysis, evaluation, and decision-making.

However, students face numerous challenges in vocabulary learning, such as pronunciation, spelling, and understanding grammatical forms (Rohmatillah, 2014). These difficulties hinder their ability to continue studying English effectively. Many students struggle with selecting the correct meaning of words and employing them in context, often confused by idiomatic expressions.

Vocabulary learning is most effective when students are sufficiently exposed to words and understand their structure and usage (Liu, 2015). Sufficient vocabulary is necessary for communication, as expressed by Wilkins: "Without grammar very little can be conveyed, without vocabulary nothing can be conveyed" (Celik et al., 2021). However, various factors hinder vocabulary acquisition, including differences between written and spoken forms, the volume of words, lack of reliable word information sources, complexity of word knowledge, grammatical grasp, and pronunciation issues due to differences between English sounds and the students' native language (Muhyiddin, 2019).

Observations at SMPN 4 Pematang Siantar revealed that students' limited vocabulary led to passive participation in English classes, indicating a deficiency in English language learning implementation. Effective vocabulary learning involves interactive and contextual teaching methods, yet traditional methods like word lists and lectures dominate (Demircan, 2013).

The Total Physical Response (TPR) method, focusing on coordinating speech and physical actions, is an effective approach for vocabulary learning. TPR reduces stress and engages students in learning through physical activities, enhancing their understanding and retention of vocabulary (Celik et al., 2021; Richards & Rogers). The principles of TPR include coordination of speech and action, inductive grammar teaching, prioritizing meaning over form, delaying speech until comprehension, and creating a low-stress learning environment (Jansen, 2014). TPR has proven successful in teaching English in non-native contexts.

At SMPN 4 Pematang Siantar, traditional lecture methods prevail, but the TPR method has shown promise in improving vocabulary mastery. Preliminary observations indicate that TPR encourages student participation and makes learning enjoyable, thus improving vocabulary acquisition (Katemba & Tampubolon, 2011). Studies have demonstrated the effectiveness of TPR in enhancing vocabulary and language skills at various educational levels (Yanuarita, 2017; Nuraeni, 2019; Astri, 2018).

To improve vocabulary mastery among seventh-grade students at SMPN 4 Pematang Siantar, integrating TPR into teaching methods can be highly effective. This approach not only enhances vocabulary learning but also fosters a more engaging and interactive classroom environment. Further research should explore the impact of TPR at the junior high school level, utilizing varied methods such as experimental research to validate its effectiveness.

RESEARCH METHOD

Research Design

This quasi-experimental study examines the impact of the TPR Teaching Method on students' vocabulary mastery. Quasi-experiments control external variables to enhance result validity. Using a pre-test-post-test control group design, the study involves an experimental group (using TPR) and a control group (using the lecture method). Both groups are tested before and after the experiment to measure changes in vocabulary skills.

Research Setting

The study was conducted at SMPN 4 Pematang Siantar, from November 3 to November 17, 2023.

Population and Sample

The study population includes 320 seventh-grade students. Using purposive sampling, two classes (VII-7 and VII-8) with similar characteristics were selected, totaling 64 students.

Research Instrument

A multiple-choice test assesses students' vocabulary mastery before and after the intervention. The assessment focuses on identifying parts of speech, subject-verb agreement, and simple present tense in descriptive texts. Scores range from 0 to 100.

Data Collection and Analysis

Data were collected through pre-tests and post-tests. Validity and reliability of the instrument were ensured through expert judgment. Data analysis involved simple linear regression and tests for normality and homogeneity. Hypothesis testing was conducted using an independent-sample t-test with SPSS.

Hypothesis

- Ha: The TPR Teaching Method significantly improves vocabulary mastery compared to traditional methods.
- H0: The TPR Teaching Method does not significantly improve vocabulary mastery compared to traditional methods.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Data

Information was collected at Grade VII SMP in Negeri 4 Pematang Siantar. There were 64 students who became the research sample. They were students of class VII-7 as the experimental group and VII-8 as the control group. Data was obtained through a multiple-choice test. The experimental class used Total Physical Response (TPR) Strategy in the experimental group and conventional learning in the control group. Then the researcher analyzed student scores using SPSS Version 26.

Scoring Pre-Test of the Experimental Class

The pre-test was done in the experimental displayed 3 pre-test results (VII-7) consisting of 32 students. The researcher displayed those pre-test data as an example scoring a test of vocabulary that focused on adjective word and comprehending simple present tense in a

descriptive text for the experimental class and all students' scores (32). The highest student score on the pre-test in the experimental class (VII-7) was 90 and the lowest score was 46. The highest student score on the post-test in this class was 100 and the lowest score was 80.

Scoring Pre-Test of the Control Class

The pre-test was done in the control class VII-8 consisting 32 students. The researcher displayed 3 pre-test data as example of scoring a test that focused on adjective word and comprehending simple present tense in a descriptive text in the control class then all students' score (32). The highest student score on the pre-test in the control class VII-8 was 90 and the lowest 60. The highest students score on the post-test in the class was 93 and the lowest score was 60.

Findings

Respondent Data

Information and background of respondents in general are presented in the characteristics of respondents starting from gender. The results obtained are as follows:

Respondent Data

No	Class	Gender	Frequency	Percent
1	Experiment	Male	13	43.8 %
		Female	19	56.2 %
2	Control	Male	16	46.9 %
		Female	16	53.1 %

The research involved 32 respondents in each of the experimental and control classes. In the experimental class, 43.8% were male and 56.2% were female. In the control class, 46.9% were male and 53.1% were female.

1. Pre Test and Post Test Data

a. Data on Pre Test and Post Test Score of Experimental Class

The data on PreTest and Post Test Score of Experimental Class are the minimum, maximum, and mean obtained from a research respondent's score data is defined from descriptive statistical tests. The following is the distribution of the Experiment Class score data.

Pre Test and Post Test Score of Experimental Class Statistics

		Pre_Test	Post_Test
N	Valid	32	32
	Missing	0	0
Mean		76.7712	88.3334
Median		80.0000	86.6700
Mode		80.00	86.67
Variance		103.566	23.651
Range		43.33	20.00
Minimum		46.67	80.00
Maximum		90.00	100.00
Sum		2456.68	2826.67

Table above shows that in the experimental class, the pre-test scores on vocabulary mastery ranged from 46.67 to 90, with a mean of 76.77. The post-test scores ranged from 80 to 100, with a mean of 88.33.

Control Class Pre Test and Post Test Data

In an experimental study, the control class does not receive the treatment given to the experimental group. It serves as a comparison to measure the treatment's effect. Researchers divide participants into an experimental group, which receives the treatment, and a control group, which does not. Comparing both groups isolates the treatment's impact. Pre-tests, conducted before the treatment, establish baseline measurements, while post-tests, conducted after, assess the treatment's effectiveness by comparing changes in scores. Descriptive statistics from these tests provide the range, minimum, maximum, and mean scores. Here is the control class score distribution.

Pre Test and Post Test Score of Control Class Statistics

		Pre_Test	Post_Test
N	Valid	32	32
	Missing	0	0
Mean		76.1466	80.9375
Median		76.6700	83.3300
Mode		76.67[a]	86.67
Variance		65.319	68.990
Range		30.00	33.33
Minimum		60.00	60.00
Maximum		90.00	93.33
Sum		2436.69	2590.00

a. Multiple modes exist. The smallest value is shown

The table shows descriptive statistics for the control class's vocabulary mastery scores, including pre-test and post-test results. Pre-test scores range from 60 to 90, with a mean of 76.14. Post-test scores range from 60 to 93, with a mean of 80.93. Both experimental and control groups consisted of 32 subjects each, representing 7th-grade students from SMPN 4 Pematang Siantar. All students participated in both pre-test and post-test activities to assess vocabulary mastery.

Research Data Test Results

Assumption tests, including normality and homogeneity tests, determine the appropriate data analysis method, either parametric or non-parametric statistics. The normality test assesses if a dataset follows a normal distribution, crucial for hypothesis testing. Utilizing the Shapiro-Wilk technique, normality tests were conducted on all research data, including pre and post-test scores for reading comprehension in both experimental and control classes.

Normality Test Result of Experiment Class

Tests of Normality

		Kolmogorov-Smirnov[a]			Shapiro-Wilk		
	Kelompok	Statistic	df	Sig.	Statistic	df	Sig.
Hasil	Pre Test	.215	32	.001	.890	32	.004
	Post Test	.196	32	.003	.941	32	.079

a. Lilliefors Significance Correction

Based on this data, it shows that the pre-test data in the experimental class is not normally distributed because the significance value of the pre-test in the experimental class is less than 0.05, on the other hand, the data on the post-test in the experimental class is normally distributed because it has a significance value of more than 0.05, namely with a significance value of 0.079.

Normality Test Result of Control Class

		Kolmogorov-Smirnov[a]			Shapiro-Wilk		
	Kelompok	Statistic	Df	Sig.	Statistic	Df	Sig.
Hasil	Pre Test	.182	32	.009	.942	32	.085
	Post Test	.205	32	.001	.907	32	.009

a. Lilliefors Significance Correction

Based on this data, it shows that the pre-test data in the control class is normally distributed because the significance value of the pre-test in the control class is more than 0.05, namely 0.085, while the data on the post-test in the control class is not normally distributed because it has a significance value of less than 0.05, namely with a significance value of 0.009.

b. Homogeneity Test

The homogeneity test is a statistical test procedure that has the aim of showing that two or more groups of data samples taken from a population that has the same variance. The basis for decision making for the homogeneity test is that the data is homogeneous if the calculated result has a significance value greater than 0.05. The homogeneity test was carried out on the pre-test and post-test data of the use of TPR to increase the vocabulary mastery. The following is the explanation:

Homogeneity Test Result of Experiment Class

Test of Homogeneity of Variance

		Levene Statistic	df1	df2	Sig.
Hasil	Based on Mean	.769	1	62	.384
	Based on Median	.396	1	62	.532
	Based on Median and with adjusted df	.396	1	53.720	.532
	Based on trimmed mean	.704	1	62	.405

The table above shows the results of the research data homogeneity test of experiment class. Homogeneity is a condition or property of a group or set of data that shows uniformity or similarity of characteristics among the elements or parts that make up the group. In a statistical context, homogeneity often refers to homogeneity of variation or distribution between groups or conditions being compared.

The results of the research data homogeneity test can be seen in the significance value on the "based of mean" in the homogeneity test results table. Based on this value, it shows that the significance value at "based of mean" is 0.384 which shows greater than 0.05 so that it can be decided that the variant of pre-test data in the experimental class is homogeneous.

Homogeneity Test Result of Control Class

		Levene Statistic	df1	df2	Sig.
Hasil	Based on Mean	.012	1	62	.914
	Based on Median	.000	1	62	1.000
	Based on Median and with adjusted df	.000	1	60.660	1.000
	Based on trimmed mean	.012	1	62	.914

The results of the research data homogeneity test can be seen in the significance value on the "based of mean" in the homogeneity test results table. Based on this value, it shows that the significance value at "based of mean" is 0.914 which shows greater than 0.05 so that it can be decided that the variance of the pre-test data in the control class is homogeneous.

2. Hypothesis Test

Hypothesis testing is carried out by comparing the t count with the t table. The rule for decision making is that if t is greater than t table then Ho is rejected and Ha is accepted. Conversely, if the calculated t value is smaller than the t table then Ho is accepted and Ha is rejected. The t table value calculation was carried out with the help of SPSS. Here are the results:

Independent Sample Test Result

Independent Samples Test

		Levene's Test for Equality of Variances		t-test for Equality of Means						
									95% Confidence Interval of the Difference	
		F	Sig.	t	df	Sig. (2-tailed)	Mean Difference	Std. Error Difference	Lower	Upper
Hasil Belajar	Equal variances assumed	5.898	.018	4.347	62	.000	7.396	1.701	3.995	10.797
	Equal variances not assumed			4.347	50.019	.000	7.396	1.701	3.978	10.813

The calculated t value (4.347) exceeds the t table value (1.999), leading to the rejection of Ho and acceptance of Ha. This signifies the greater significance of the TPR Teaching Method compared to conventional teaching methods on vocabulary mastery among Seventh Grade Students at SMPN 4 Pematang Siantar. Additionally, a Mann-Whitney test, a non-parametric statistical test, demonstrates a variance in student learning outcomes between the TPR Teaching method and others, particularly in English language learning at the school. This test is utilized when data does not meet normality assumptions or when dealing with ordinal data, focusing on differences in medians rather than actual values.

Mann-Whitney Test Result

Test Statistics[a]

	Hasil
Mann-Whitney U	235.000
Wilcoxon W	763.000
Z	-3.783
Asymp. Sig. (2-tailed)	.000

a. Grouping Variable: Group

The Mann-Whitney Test yields a significance value of 0.00, indicating a difference in average scores between the TPR Teaching Method and conventional methods for Seventh Grade Students' Vocabulary Mastery at SMPN 4 Pematang Siantar. The study investigates the efficiency of using TPR Teaching method in English learning, comparing N-Gain Scores between control and experimental classes. N-Gain Score measures improvement between pre and post-intervention, indicating the impact of the TPR Teaching Method on vocabulary mastery.

Test Result on N-Gain Score

No	Class	Average	Percentage	Description
1	Experiment	77,39	77,39%	Effective
2	Control	17,77	17,77%	Less Effective

The N-Gain scores reveal that the Experimental class, employing the TPR Teaching Method, achieved an average N-Gain Score of 77.39%, categorized as effective. Conversely, the Control class, without the TPR Teaching Method, achieved an N-Gain Score of 17.77%, categorized as less effective. Thus, the TPR Teaching Method proves more effective for 7th-grade English vocabulary acquisition at SMPN 4 Pematang Siantar.

Discussion

The finding shows that there is a difference in the average score of using the TPR Teaching Method and not using it on the Seventh Grade Students' Vocabulary Mastery at SMPN 4 Pematang Siantar. Moreover, it is more effective using the TPR Teaching Method than not using this method, for the Seventh Grade Students' Vocabulary Mastery at SMPN 4 Pematang Siantar.

Total Physical Response (TPR) Teaching Method is a learning approach that emphasizes the use of physical movements in response to verbal instructions (Yanuarita, 2017b). TPR is designed to simulate the way children learn their first language, which is by responding to commands and instructions through physical actions. Through TPR, students are actively engaged in learning by responding to verbal commands with physical movements. This active engagement can help increase student attention and promote deeper understanding. TPR allows students to associate words with specific physical movements or actions. This helps form a connection between words and their meaning through physical experience, which can improve retention and comprehension.

This study is in line with previous research that discusses the use of the TPR method. Based on the previous research, the Total Physical Response (TPR) method can improve students' vocabulary mastery. The research shows that TPR can improve students' vocabulary mastery in several aspects, such as meaning, spelling, pronunciation, and the use of words in sentences (Fahrurrozi, 2017). The results also show that the application of TPR can increase students' motivation and confidence in learning vocabulary, however, there are weaknesses in the application of TPR, where students still have difficulty in using words in sentences and are sometimes confused in covering all four aspects of vocabulary simultaneously (Pujiningsih, 2010). Nevertheless, the study suggests that teachers can modify TPR activities based on students' interests as long as they still cover all four aspects of vocabulary acquisition. Thus, the application of TPR can be used as a technique to improve students' vocabulary acquisition and the quality of teaching and learning process.

In TPR, words are taught in the context of a specific action or situation. This helps students understand the meaning of words in everyday situations and facilitates better comprehension. TPR often involves repetition of commands and movements. This repetition can help students to understand and remember vocabulary through positive reinforcement (Hafidah & Dewi, 2020). TPR can improve vocabulary retention as students engage in a series of movements associated with specific words. The use of physical movement can provide an additional element that helps in recalling information. For students who may feel awkward or unconfident in language learning, TPR provides a non-stressful method. Students can respond naturally through physical movements without the fear of making mistakes. TPR adopts a

natural playful approach to learning. The physical movements and playful interactions help to create a positive learning environment.

The effectiveness of TPR depends on the teaching context, student needs and learning objectives. Also, while TPR can be effective in teaching vocabulary, successful language learning also depends on using diverse and integrated methods. Total Physical Response (TPR) can increase student engagement and comprehension because this approach utilizes the natural way children learn their first language. TPR refers to the way children learn their first language, which is by responding to commands through physical movements that create a learning environment similar to the first language learning process, which can be more natural and intuitive for students. By actively engaging students through physical movements, TPR creates a dynamic learning experience.

Physical activity motivates students to participate more actively, increasing their level of engagement in learning. TPR also allows students to make direct associations between words and physical movements or actions (Nuraeni, 2019b). This association can help in remembering and understanding the meaning of words, as students experience words in a concrete context. TPR also teaches words in the context of specific situations or actions. This use of context helps students understand the meaning of words in their everyday context, rather than just as isolated words. TPR also involves repetition of commands and movements, which can help strengthen the connection between words and movements. This positive repetition allows students to understand and remember information better.

For some students, engaging in foreign language conversation can be fearful or awkward. In TPR, physical movements provide a natural expressive outlet, helping students feel more comfortable and confident. TPR has elements of play and fun, creating a positive learning environment. Playful learning can increase student motivation and make learning more enjoyable. Involving physical movement can stimulate connections between the motor and cognitive nervous systems. This can help students remember and process information better. TPR provides a fun, active, learning approach that utilizes natural elements in language learning. The combination of physical movement and verbal interaction creates a unique and effective learning environment (Misbahillah et al., 2023).

Previous research also found that the use of the TPR method significantly improved students' vocabulary acquisition, especially in the context of a second or foreign language

(Widodo, 2005). Research results can show that students who engage in learning with the TPR method tend to be more active and enthusiastic, as it involves physical movement and active response to the teacher's instructions. Research findings also suggest that TPR helps students understand abstract or difficult concepts through the use of physical movement as part of learning. Research may show that students who learn with the TPR method tend to have higher levels of information retention compared to other teaching methods. Other studies have also shown that TPR is more effective in certain age groups, such as children or teenagers, and may be less effective in older age groups. Research results may show that TPR method helps improve students' communication skills, especially in terms of pronunciation and verbal comprehension (Astri et al., 2023).

Teaching using the Total Physical Response (TPR) method has a number of advantages that can support the learning process, especially in language teaching. TPR involves physical movement and active response from students to the teacher's instructions. This makes learning more dynamic and reduces the risk of boredom (Astutik et al., 2019). Through TPR, abstract concepts can be illustrated through physical movements. This helps students understand the concepts better. TPR integrates the use of all five senses, including hearing, vision, and physical movement. By involving more senses, information can be more effectively absorbed and processed. The use of physical movements helps students associate words with specific actions, which can improve vocabulary acquisition and accelerate the language learning process. Through TPR exercises, students can develop their communication skills naturally, as they are invited to respond using the target language in a situational context. Students who learn with TPR often feel more relaxed and less burdened as they can express themselves through physical movements without focusing too much on grammatical correctness or sentence structure.

TPR can be adapted for different age levels, from children to adults. This makes the method flexible and applicable in various educational contexts. TPR activities are often perceived as fun by students as they involve elements of play and physical interaction. This can increase students' motivation to learn. Physical involvement in the learning process can help improve information retention, as physical movement can help strengthen the connection between words and actions (Mohan et al., 2022). Although TPR has many advantages, the effectiveness of this method also depends on the teaching context and student characteristics,

therefore, it is important for teachers to understand their students' needs and learning styles and integrate TPR wisely in their lesson plans.

The steps of learning activities with the Total Physical Response (TPR) method involve using physical movement as a way to understand and respond to language (Astri et al., 2023a). The teacher gives instructions using the target language and ensures that the instructions given can be understood by the students. In the Physical demonstration, the teacher demonstrates the instruction with conspicuous physical movements. The teacher also ensures that the physical movements demonstrated are in accordance with the instructions given. On Student Participation, students are asked to imitate the physical movements shown by the teacher. The teacher gives sufficient time for students to respond with appropriate physical movements. On giving Further Instructions, the teacher gives further instructions and students respond with appropriate physical movements. The teacher can intensify the exercise by introducing more vocabulary or phrases.

At the repetition stage, the teacher repeats the instructions with physical movements to ensure students' understanding. Repetition helps strengthen the connection between the word or phrase and the corresponding physical movement. Question and Answer with movement, the teacher asks students questions and asks them to respond with the correct physical movement. Students respond with the appropriate physical movement as an answer to the teacher's question.

Movement-based games, teachers integrate physical movement-based games to make learning more fun and interactive. On Situational Contexts, teachers create situational contexts for the use of the target language, where students are asked to respond with appropriate physical movements (Diana et al., 2022). At the evaluation and feedback stage, the teacher evaluates students' understanding by monitoring their physical movements and responses. The teacher provides positive feedback and corrections if needed. The teacher can enrich the TPR activity by incorporating multimedia elements, such as images or videos that support the instructions and vocabulary.

CONCLUSION

The research concluded that the TPR Teaching Method significantly enhances vocabulary mastery among Seventh Grade Students at SMPN 4 Pematang Siantar, as indicated by a

calculated t value of 4.347, which is greater than the t table value of 1.999. Additionally, the Mann-Whitney test revealed a significant difference between students using the TPR method and those who did not, with an Assymp. Sig (2-tailed) value of 0.000, further supporting the effectiveness of TPR. The method proved more efficient, reflected in an average N-Gain Score of 77.39%. Recommendations include integrating TPR into vocabulary teaching, developing suitable learning materials, fostering teacher-student collaboration, enhancing students' communication skills through TPR, and engaging students in physically interactive language activities. Continuous evaluation of TPR's effectiveness, support from schools, and further research into TPR's impact on other language aspects and different educational levels are also advised.

REFERENCES

Achmad, Bachrudin, H. L. T. (2013). *Analisis Data Untuk Penelitian Survai*. Bandung : FMIPA-UNPAD.

Arikunto, S. (2015). *Prosedur Penelitian; Suatu Pendekatan Praktek*. Jakarta: PT Rineka Cipta.

Astri, Z. (2018). The Use of Total Physical Response Method for Different Learning Styles In English Vocabulary. *Scope of English Language Teaching, Literature and Linguistics*, *1*(1), 25–38. https://ejournals.umma.ac.id/index.php/seltics

Astri, Z., Hs, N., Fachrunnisa, N., & Misnawati, M. (2023). *Investigating the Influence of the TPR Method on the Development of English Vocabulary in Small Classroom*. *June*, 771–781. https://doi.org/10.2991/978-2-38476-054-1_66

Astutik, Y., Megawati, F., & Aulina, C. N. (2019). Total physical response (TPR): How is it used to Teach EFL Young Learners? *International Journal of Learning, Teaching and Educational Research*, *18*(1), 92–103. https://doi.org/10.26803/ijlter.18.1.7

Barnabas, S. (2019). *This research aimed at finding out the correlation between students" listening habit to English song and their vocabulary mastery . This research applied a correlational study and used a quantitative design . The subjects were 60 students of Third Grade* . *3*(3), 287–298.

Best, J. W., & Kahn, J. V. (2003). *Research in Education*. Pearson Education Inc.

Brooks, G., Clenton, J., & Fraser, S. (2023). Exploring the importance of vocabulary for English as an Additional Language learners' reading comprehension. *EAL Research for*

the Classroom: Practical and Pedagogical Implications, *11*(3), 35–58. https://doi.org/10.4324/9781003274889-5

Brown, D. (2000). *Principles of Language Learning and Teaching*. Longman, San Fransisco State University.

Brown, H. D. (2003). *Language Assessment Principles and Classroom Practices*. San Francisco: Longman.

Celik, T. I., Cay, T., & Kanadli, S. (2021). The Effect of Total Physical Response Method on Vocabulary Learning/Teaching: A Mixed Research Synthesis. *English Language Teaching*, *14*(12), 154.

Chalikandy, M. A. (2013). A comprehensive Method for Teaching English for Specific Purpose. *Arab World English Journal*, *4*(4), 310–322.

Dardig, M. H. (2015). Using the Communicative Language Teaching Approach (CLT) in Teaching English for Specific Purposes (ESP). *Journal of American Science*, *11*(3), 126–131.

Demircan. (2013). *Foreign Language Teaching Methods*. İstanbul: Der Yayınları.

Diana, M. W., Tyas Wilupi, A. Y., Setiawan, D., & Nurhajati, D. (2022). Promoting Social Awareness Through Total Physical Response (Tpr) in Teaching English At Elementary School. *JEELL (Journal of English Education, Linguistics and Literature) English Department of STKIP PGRI Jombang*, *8*(2), 95. https://doi.org/10.32682/jeell.v8i2.2041

Fahrurrozi. (2017). Improving Students' Vocabulary Mastery by Using Total Physical Response. *English Language Teaching*, *10*(3), 118. https://doi.org/10.5539/elt.v10n3p118

Hafidah, R., & Dewi, N. K. (2020). TPR (Total Physical Response) Method on Teaching English To Early Childhood. *Early Childhood Education and Development Journal*, *2*(1), 9. https://doi.org/10.20961/ecedj.v2i1.45167

Hartiwi, J., Herpratiwi, & Sudirman. (2015). Peningkatan Keterampilan berbicara bahasa Inggris pada mata kuliah Speaking. *Jurnal Bahasa Inggris Universitas Lampung*, *4*, 1–18.

Hatch, E. ., & Brown, C. (1995). *Vocabulary Sentence and Language Education*. Cambridge University Press.

Hatch, E., & Cheryl, B. (2005). *Vocabulary, Semantic, and Language Education*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Hayati, A. M. (2008). Teaching English for Special Purposes in Iran : Problems and sugessions. *Arts and Humanities in Higher Education*, *7*(2), 149–164. https://doi.org/10.1177/1474022208

Hornby. (1995). *Advance Learner's Dictionary.* New York: Oxfords University Press.

Jansen. (2014). *Brain-Based Learning The New Science of Teaching & Training. Translated by Yusron*. Yogyakarta: Pustaka Pelajar.

Katemba, C., & Tampubolon, K. (2011). Improving Vocabualary Achievement Through Total Physical Response Among Grade Four Elementary School. *Journal of Language Pedagogy*.

Liu, Y. (2015). Critical perspectives on language teaching materials. *Language and Education*, *December 2014*, 37–41. https://doi.org/10.1080/09500782.2014.925618

Malasari, N. (2019). *Implementasi metode Total Physical Response (TPR) dalam pembelajaran bahasa arab materi mufrodat kelas V di Madrasah Ibtidaiyah Masyariqul Anwar 4 Sukabumi Bandar Lampung*. UNIVERSITAS ISLAM NEGERI RADEN INTAN LAMPUNG.

Marine, M. (2001). *Teaching English as a Second or Foreign Language*. Thomson Learning Inc.

Massey, G. (2018). Transforming teaching through TPR: Models, methods and merits. *Young Linguists' Meeting in Poznań 2018, Poznań …*, *November*. https://www.researchgate.net/profile/Gary-Massey/publication/329467798_Transforming_teaching_through_TPR_models_methods_and_merits/links/5c0a3ecd92851c39ebd93666/Transforming-teaching-through-TPR-models-methods-and-merits.pdf

Miller, A. (2007). *Philosophy of Language* (2nd ed.). Routledge.

Misbahillah, A. K. N., Akbar, D. T., Aulia, D. S., Aldila, D. R., Maura, D., Carolina, N., Loka, N. W., Devi, P., Juliansyach, R. R., Ikhsan, S. M., & Utari, T. (2023). Penerapan Metode TPR untuk Meningkatkan Kosakata Berbahasa Inggris pada Siswa SMP di Asrama Yatim Piatu Hidayatullah. *Jurnal Pengabdian Masyarakat Madani (JPMM)*, *3*(1), 91–97. https://doi.org/10.51805/jpmm.v3i1.111

Mohan, N., Abhirami, J. S., & Arun, S. (2022). Total physical response (TPR). *International Journal of Health Sciences*, *6*(June), 10176–10187. https://doi.org/10.53730/ijhs.v6ns4.11035

Muflihah, T. (2016). Using Song to Improve Students' Vocabulary Mastery. *Journal of Education.*, 369–373.

Muhyiddin, I. (2019). *The effectiveness of using flash card to teach vocabulary at elementary school*. 1–11.

Nation, I. S. P. (2001). *Learning vocabulary in another language*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Ningrum, M. P. (2021). Teaching English Vocabulary through TPR Method in Virtual Classroom: Students' Perception at Fifth Grade Thai Students. *Journal of English Teaching, Literature, and Applied Linguistics*, *5*(1), 41. https://doi.org/10.30587/jetlal.v5i1.2158

Noviandari, F., & Rustipa, K. (2023). Implementation of the Total Physical Response (TPR) Method with the Help of Flashcards to Teach English Vocabulary. *Edunesia: Jurnal Ilmiah Pendidikan*, *4*(3), 1431–1446. https://doi.org/10.51276/edu.v4i3.573

Nunan, D. (1992). *Research Method in Language Learning*. Cambridge : Cambridge University Press.

Nunan, D. (2001). *Language teaching methodology: A textbook for teachers*. Sydney: Prentice Hall International (UK) Ltd.

Nuraeni, C. (2019a). (TPR) Method on Early Childhood. *Jurnal Penelitian Humaniora*, *20*(02), 67–79.

Nuraeni, C. (2019b). Using Total Physical Response (TPR) Method on Young Learners English Language Teaching. *Metathesis: Journal of English Language, Literature, and Teaching*, *3*(1), 26. https://doi.org/10.31002/metathesis.v3i1.1223

Nurul, I. (2020). Meaningful and Memorable Learning: Integrating TPR and Youtube Videos to teach Vocabulary. *International Journal of Quantitative Research and Modeling*, *1*(2), 100–111. https://doi.org/10.46336/ijqrm.v1i2.37

Pujiningsih, N. (2010). *Improving students ' English vocabulary by using total physical response*. 1–120.

Putri, R, A. (2016). Teaching english for young learners using a total physical response (TPR) method. *Jurnal Edulingua*, *3*(2), 16–20.

Ramberg, B. T. (1989). *Donald Davidson's Philosophy of Language An Introducction*. T.J. Press (Padstow) Ltd. http://www.elsevier.com

Rohmatillah. (2014). A Study On Students' Difficulties In Learning Vocabulary Rohmatillah Institut Agama Islam Negeri (IAIN) Raden Intan Lampung. *Institut Agama Islam Negeri (IAIN) Raden Intan Lampung*, *6*, 69–86.

Sama, D. (Mrs. . K. M. (2023). Teaching English as a Second Language in Nigeria: The Total Physical Response Option for Beginners. *International Journal of English Language and Communication Studies*, *7*(1), 16–25. https://doi.org/10.56201/ijelcs.v7.no1.2022.pg16.25

Sarre, C., & Whyte, S. (2017). New developments in ESP teaching and learning research. In C. Sarre & S. Whyte (Eds.), *Research-publising.net*. Research-publishing.net. https://doi.org/10.14705/rpnet.2017.cssw2017.9782490057016

Setiawan, D., Nurhajati, D., & Sulistyani, S. (2022). Teaching Vocabulary through Total Physical Response to Elementary Students. *Journal of Development Research*, *6*(2), 158–163. https://doi.org/10.28926/jdr.v6i2.231

Sholekhah, M. (2017). *Improving Student Vocabulary By Using Card Game*.

Siregar, S. (2013). *Metode Penelitian Kuantitatif*. Jakarta: PT Fajar Interpratama Mandiri.

Sugiyono. (2018). *Metode Penelitian Kuantitatif, Kualitatif dan R&D*. Bandung: Afabeta.

Sujarweni, W. (2014). *SPSS Untuk Penelitian*. Yogyakarta : Pustaka Baru Press.

Sulistiyo, U. (2016). English Language Teaching and Efl Teacher Competence in Indonesia. *Igniting a Brighter Future of EFL Teaching and Learning in Multilingual Societies*, *4*(2), 396–406. http://ejournal.unp.ac.id/index.php/selt/article/view/7001/5535

Sumarni, B., Bhatta, D., & Kho, S. F.-C. (2022). The Use of Total Physical Response in Teaching Vocabulary Integrated with Meaningful Classroom Interaction. *Journal of Language and Literature Studies*, *2*(1), 23–32. https://doi.org/10.36312/jolls.v2i1.710

Suryana, D., Sari, N. E., Winarti, Lina, Mayar, F., & Satria, S. (2021). English Learning Interactive Media for Early Childhood Through the Total Physical Response Method. *JPUD - Jurnal Pendidikan Usia Dini*, *15*(1), 60–80. https://doi.org/10.21009/jpud.151.04

Taie, M. (2023). *The Comparative Effects of Neurofeedback Training and English Instruction through the Total Physical Response Method on the Attention of Young Learners with Attention Deficit Hyperactivity Disorder*. *11*(2), 325–355.

Ur, P. (1990). *A Course in Language Teaching: Practice and Theory.* New York: Cambridge University Press.

Widodo, H. P. (2005). Teaching Children Using a Total Physical Response (TPR) Method: Rethinking. *Bahasa Dan Seni*, *33*(2), 235–248. https://sastra.um.ac.id/wp-content/uploads/2009/10/Teaching-Children-Using-a-Total-Physical-Response-TPR-Method-Rethinking-Handoyo-Puji-Widodo.pdf

Wood, W. L. (2010). *Communicative Language Teaching*. Cambridge: University Press.

Yang, L. (2014). The Application of TPR English Teaching Method in Primary Schools. *Proceedings of the International Conference on Education, Language, Art and Intercultural Communication*, *3*(Icelaic), 316–320. https://doi.org/10.2991/icelaic-14.2014.80

Yanuarita, F. (2017a). The Effect of Total Physical Response (TPR) Method and Word List for Teaching Vocabulary to Children. *Magister Scientiae*, *0*(23), 56–65. http://journal.wima.ac.id/index.php/Magister_Scientiae/article/view/1402

Yanuarita, F. (2017b). The Effect of Total Physical Response (TPR) Method and Word List for Teaching Vocabulary to Children. *Magister Scientiae*, *0*(23), 56–65.

Yuliawati, L. (2018). The Effects of Grammar and Vocabulary Mastery on Students' Reading Comprehension. *Wanastra: Jurnal Bahasa Dan Sastra*, *10*(1), 1–8. https://doi.org/10.31294/w.v10i1.2710

Zulfitri, N. A. H. (2022). Improving The Students' Vocabulary Mastery Through TPR Method At SMP Negeri 29 Medan Tahun Ajaran 2020-2021. *Education Achievement: Journal of Science and Research*, *3*(2), 1–7. https://doi.org/10.51178/jsr.v3i2.614