



Original Article

Impacts of Total Physical Response on Young Learners' Vocabulary Ability

Nguyen Trung Cang^{1,*}, Le Thi Kieu Diem¹, Le Quang Thien²

¹*Kien Giang University, 360A Chau Thanh, Kien Giang, Vietnam*

²*Freelance Teacher of English, Rach Gia, Kien Giang, Vietnam*

Received 24 August 2021

Revised 18 October 2021; Accepted 18 October 2021

Abstract: This study aimed to investigate the impacts of total physical response (TPR) method on the fourth graders' vocabulary ability and their perceptions toward this method. This study was conducted at Luong The Vinh Primary school. There were 30 students participating in this study and they were divided into two groups: 15 students in experimental group (EG) and 15 students in control group (CG). The students in the experimental group were taught with TPR while students in the control one with grammar translation method. A mixed method was employed consisting of quantitative and qualitative approaches. Qualitative data were from the interviews to get feedback of students' perception and advantages and disadvantages they faced when TPR was implemented in teaching vocabulary in their classroom. Quantitative data were from the questionnaire, scores of the pretest and posttest to check the impact of TPR on students' vocabulary ability. The study revealed that the EG had better vocabulary learning ability than the CG. They not only remembered vocabulary better but also understood the meaning of the words more easily. It also showed that students had positive perceptions in learning vocabulary through TPR. In addition, the result from the interviews also revealed a limitation that it was sometimes not suitable especially for some outstanding students in the class. The results shed light on the impact of TPR on young learners' vocabulary ability and perceptions toward TPR and provide some valuable features for further research studies that relate to TPR method in teaching vocabulary for young learners.

Keywords: Total Physical Response, Young Learners' Vocabulary Ability.

1. Introduction

Nowadays, English is considered as a global phenomenon of the 21st century and people find it indispensable in global

integration. Most of the countries all over the world in general and Vietnam in particular use English as a foreign language and it has been taught to learners at different levels from kindergartens to universities. According to Anh and Ho (2018), the educational policy for English in the Vietnamese public primary schools fall in line with the national education policy for English in Primary established by the

* Corresponding author.

E-mail address: ntcang@vnkgu.edu.vn

<https://doi.org/10.25073/2588-1159/vnuer.4573>

Minister of Education and Training of Vietnam. Based on that policy, the project 2020 of National Foreign language was launched for the purpose of enhancing English learners' communicative competence by carrying out child-centered communicative teaching methods which are meaningful to young learners.

In learning a foreign language, it is necessary for learners to master the language skills including listening, speaking, reading and writing and components (vocabulary, structure, pronunciation, etc.). Among these components, vocabulary has an important role in language learning, without mastering vocabulary nothing can be conveyed (Wilkins, 1972). However, Grammar Translation Method which is widely used in teaching vocabulary seems to focus on forms and meanings of words, not the practice of the actual language so it may make students feel uninterested and bored in class Jingyuan (1997). In term of theory of language teaching, there are many kinds of methods which are used in teaching English to young learners. According to Harmer (2007), some students especially young ones are easy to forget the material if they are not directly involved in the process of learning. To help fix this issue, it is necessary for teachers to choose an appropriate method that can help students improve their vocabulary learning and Total Physical Response is worth being considered. TPR approach is considered to be an alternative method to help language learners to remember, retrieve and use words as it covers many teaching modes, including drawing music, games, roleplays, competition, physical movement, etc. Children are more likely to remember words which associate with fun games, real colorful objects, interesting pictures, songs, or absurd situations Asher (1996). However, there have not been many studies on impacts of TPR on young learners' vocabulary ability especially how they feel about TPR in the literature.

Based on the above-mentioned discussion, the research "Impacts of total physical response on young learners' vocabulary ability" was

carried out with the aims to answer the two following research questions:

- i) What impacts does TPR method have on students' vocabulary learning ability;
- ii) What are students' perceptions about learning vocabulary through TPR.

2. Literature Review

2.1. Young Learners

2.1.1. Definition

Young learners are defined as those who are at the age between five and twelve years old (Phillips, 1993). "They have their own classification in which they divided young learners into two main groups, five to seven year olds, and eight to ten year olds" (Scott and Ytreberg, 2001, pp. 1). In general, different researchers have different ways to classify the word "young learners". In this research young learners are understood as learners up to the age of finishing primary school (11 years old). Learners at these ages usually share many things in common.

2.1.2. Characteristics

According to Brumfit (1991), young learners are supposed to be keen, enthusiastic and motivated learners, who are able to be easily stimulated. Salyers and Mckee (2016) say they have a holistic approach to learn a language which means that they understand messages but they are not able to analyse language. Furthermore, they have no, or limited ability to read and write, even in their first language, they are more concerned about themselves than others and have limitation about the world. They can follow and imitate the actions or stories, guess what will come next and ask some questions about it. Another important feature is that young children are less shy, especially they do not worry about using the language although their proficiency is limited and are not afraid of taking part in activities without being embarrassed (Vanessa and Sheila, 1997). For the above-mentioned features, they are believed to

be able to learn or acquire a second or foreign language easily with TPR method.

2.2. Vocabulary and Vocabulary Teaching and Learning

2.2.1. Vocabulary

Vocabulary is like a list of words collection which is used in language learning and vocabulary is considered as a key in language acquisition (Hayward and Sparkes, 1982). No matter how the language is the first, second or foreign, vocabulary is an indispensable factor for communication (Murcia, 2001). According to McCarthy (1990), the importance of vocabulary in term of language learning, no matter how good the students' grammar is, no matter how successfully they master the second language's sound, the process of communicating will not happen in a meaningful way without words so as to express the meaning in a wider range. From the explanation above, it is supposed that vocabulary is known and recognized as a central component to any language acquisition process.

Mastering vocabulary means that students have deep knowledge about the vocabularies including the meanings, the spoken form, the written form, the grammatical behavior, the root of the word, the collocations of the words, the register of the word - spoken and written, the connotation or associations of the word, and word frequency (Thornbury, 2002). Mastering vocabulary will deal with both words and meanings. This means that students can recognize and understand the meaning of the words but also apply them in real contexts.

2.2.2. Vocabulary Teaching and Learning

Vocabulary is so important in learning a language that language teachers should bear in mind techniques which help facilitate the process of vocabulary acquisition. It means that first, they have to carefully consider what technique should be used and what should be included in the technique. Then, what needs teaching, practicing and revising to avoid forgetting. Techniques chosen by teachers should rely on some factors such as the content, space, environment, time and its value for the

teacher (Takač, 2008). In addition, teachers should combine more than one technique instead of applying one single technique in teaching vocabulary. teachers should apply planned vocabulary teaching in different techniques such as: using objects, mime, expressions and gestures, using pictures, collocation, concept, giving examples, translation, enumeration (see Pinter, 2006).

2.3. Total Physical Response (TPR)

2.3.1. Definition

TPR is a method of teaching English that was developed by Dr. James Asher, a professor of psychology at San Jose State University. "TPR is a language teaching method that involves the coordination of speech and action. It attempts to teach language through physical (motor) activity" (Richard and Rodgers, 2001, pp. 277). Teachers give a set of instructions to students in a target language to have them to do some tasks in order to activate their kinesthetic sensory system. Besides this, TPR is implemented based on commands which are put forward by the teacher and the students should give physical response (Kimfasirah, 2011). From the view of the discussion above, TPR is regarded as a simple method that combines commands and physical movement to teach both vocabulary and grammar of the target language. It only involves series of teacher's instructions to let students respond to those instructions in physical movement.

2.3.2. Characteristics

One of the basic representative characteristics of TPR is that the students focus much on entire-body actions instead of verbal language (Asher, 1966). Therefore, during the foreign language activities, students can respond with actions instead of striving to respond with verbal language. This can reduce the anxiety and stress of learners and help improving their memory retention. Besides this, some characteristics of TPR teaching are supposed to be a process of TPR in teaching vocabulary. For the first stage, the instructors give commands to students. Then, they perform the actions with them. In the second stage, these

students will demonstrate that they could understand the commands of the instructors by doing them alone. Next, the teacher makes a combination of the command to ask students to develop flexibility to check if they understand unfamiliar utterances. These commands often have humorousness. After learning to respond to oral commands, the students learn to read and write them (Larsen-Freeman, D, 2000).

Variations of TPR

According to Asher (1966), TPR is not just limited to whole body commands such as walking, turning around, and pointing to your ears, eyes and so on, in fact TPR has four major types of activities that could be done using TPR mindset. It consists of TPR-B, TPR-O, TPR-P and TPR-S.

TPR-B Stands for "TPR with body". It focuses on using Physical movement: stand up, sit down, put on, put off, get in, get out, raise your hands up, put your hands down, etc. This is best done in a room with some space to move around. It could be suitable for teaching learners with Phrasal verb.

TPR-O stands for "TPR with objects". It means using objects to demonstrate.

TPR-P stands for "TPR with pictures". Pictures are supposed to be an effective language learning tool. It means the teachers use pictures to teach learners.

TPR-S stands for "TPR with Storey telling" which was developed by Blaine Ray and being used in classrooms throughout the United States. It involves the teacher (and eventually the students) acting out simple stories as a means of understanding the story and internalising vocabulary.

2.4. Related Studies

Researchers and educators have carried out enormous studies in an attempt to investigate the effects of TPR on vocabulary learning.

Qiu (2016) investigated the application of TPR to vocabulary teaching. The participants of this study were forty students of third grade in Dong Da Central Primary school in Xi'an, Shaanxi in China. Each class accounted for twenty students. Their English ability was in

the same level. It was the first time that they started learning English at the third grade. They were about eight years old. They were divided into the experimental group and the control group. The former used the TPR approach to learn vocabulary. The latter experienced the traditional teaching methods. The results of the pre-test and the post-test scores showed that the experimental group had better achievement of vocabulary spelling than the control one.

Sariyati (2013) conducted a research project on the effectiveness of TPR method in English Vocabulary Mastery of Elementary School Children and how the students responded toward teaching English vocabulary using TPR method. Forty-two students in one Islamic elementary school in Bandung were divided into 2 groups randomly (21 in the control group and 21 in the experimental one). This research used quasi-experimental design with the pre-test and post-test to find out effectiveness of TPR in the two groups. Besides, observation was also used to know the students' response toward the TPR method in the experimental group. The results showed that the TPR was more effective and suitable to be used for elementary school children to learn English vocabulary and they felt happier and easier when learning with TPR.

Ilwana, (2010) investigated the effectiveness of Total Physical Response (TPR) to enhance students' vocabulary mastery on the seventh grade of SMP N 3 Ajibarang in 2009-2010. The random sampling was used to choose 70 students (34 for the experimental group and 36 for the control group). The research instruments used to collect the data were test and documentation. The result showed that the group taught by Total Physical Response had a better achievement in vocabulary mastery than those taught by Grammar Translation Method.

Zhen (2011) conducted a research project on using TPR in teaching English adjectives for the pupils aged 11 in a middle school in Kristianstad. 30 pupils were selected as samples and divided into two groups: one experimental group and one control group. The results showed that the mean score of the experimental

group was much higher than that of the control group. The study pointed out that the pupils' achievements in the experimental group were improved with TPR.

Although many studies on the effect of TPR on vocabulary have been conducted, there is a shortage of them related to the EFL young learners' vocabulary ability as well as young learners' perceptions toward learning vocabulary through TPR. Neither much research has been conducted in Vietnam nor in the Mekong delta. For this reason, my research would be necessary to provide more understanding into the research topic and the findings will provide some valuable information related to TPR method in the region.

3. Methodology

3.1. Research Design

According to Denscombe (2002), there is no single approach that is universally accepted and a combination can enhance the possibility of obtaining qualitative and quantitative data. Therefore, the mixed method approach including quantitative and qualitative was used. Qualitative data were collected through the interviews to get feedback of students' perceptions in learning vocabulary through TPR and quantitative from scores of the pretest and posttest to get the impacts of TPR compared with GTM on vocabulary learning and questionnaire to get student's perceptions toward learning vocabulary as well as the advantages and disadvantages through TPR.

3.2. Participants

Thirty young children in grade four at a primary school participated in this study. Most of them had studied English for at least three years. They were assigned into one control group and one experimental group including 15 participants each. While students in the CG (taught with GTM) only did the pretest and posttest, those in the EG (with TPR) were involved in doing the pretest, posttest, questionnaires and interviews (6 among 15).

3.3. Research Instrument

3.3.1. Tests

In this study, picture vocabulary size tests were used as the pretest and posttest. "Picture vocabulary size test is a receptive vocabulary size test designed primarily for young pre-literate native speakers up to eight years old and young non-native speakers of English" (Anthony and Nation, 2017, para. 1). For testing, the researchers aimed to test student's receptive vocabulary size with multiple choices and matching.

Both the pre-test and post-test are a kind of picture vocabulary size tests for the purpose of measuring students' receptive vocabulary. The test consists of 20 items for multiple choices with 4 options and 10 for matching. The time allocation was 20 minutes each and the contents were different from each other.

3.3.2. Questionnaire

The questionnaire consists of 15 items including three clusters which aim to investigate students' perceptions of leaning vocabulary through TPR as follow:

- i) Cluster 1: students' perceptions toward learning vocabulary through TPR. (items 1-5);
- ii) Cluster 2: student's perceptions toward the advantages of TPR. (items 6-10);
- iii) Cluster 3: student's perceptions toward the disadvantages of TPR (items 11-15).

A five-point Likert scale ranging from strongly agree to strongly disagree was employed within students' perceptions.

3.3.3. Interview

There are four core questions in the semi-structured interview generated by the researchers. They were mostly designed based on the questionnaire items. The interview questions were about the advantages and disadvantages students faced when TPR was implemented in their classroom.

3.4. Data Analysis

3.4.1. Data Analysis of Test

In this study, SPSS 20 would be used to analyze the data in the form of T-test and Statistic hypothesis. The findings from pretest of two groups was measured by using

Independent T-test consisted of the findings from group statistic and from independent sample test including the numbers of participant, the mean of the score, standard deviation and standard error mean. The authors also used Independent t-test to get the findings of posttest of two groups. The findings of the pretest and posttest of the experimental group was measured by using Paired samples T-test to get the mean score of pretest and posttest of the experimental, the standard deviation, the standard error, the correlation, the significance. For pretest and posttest of the control group, the authors also used the Paired samples T-test to get the mean score, standard deviation, standard error, correlation and significance.

3.4.2. Data Analysis of Questionnaire

The data were reported with Excel software by calculating the percentages of (1. Strongly

agree; 2. Agree; 3. Neutral; 4. Disagree; and 5. Strongly disagree) for each item.

3.4.3. Data Analysis of Interview

The data collected from the interviews were analyzed and triangulated with the quantitative data in the questionnaire, based on the thematic protocol arranged by the researcher to provide more data on advantages and disadvantages students face when TPR was implemented in their classroom.

4. Findings and Discussion

4.1. The Pretest Posttest of Two Groups

The findings of pretest measurement using Independent T-test and Independent samples test are presented below (Table 1):

Table 1. Independent sample T-test of the two groups on pretest Group Statistics

	GROUPS	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
SCORES	Control group	15	6.7000	1.39898	0.36121
	Experimental group	15	6.9333	1.20811	0.31193

Independent Samples Test

		Levene's Test for Equality of Variances		t-test for Equality of Means						
		F	Sig.	t	Df	Sig. (2-tailed)	Mean Difference	Std. Error Difference	95% Confidence Interval of the Difference	
									Lower	Upper
SCORES	Equal variances assumed	0.558	0.461	-0.489	28	0.629	-0.23333	0.47726	-1.21096	0.74429
	Equal variances not assumed			-0.489	27.418	0.629	-0.23333	0.47726	-1.21189	0.74523

The mean scores of the control and experimental groups are 6.70 and 6.93 respectively. Standard deviation of the CG is 1.398 and the EG is 1.208. The standard error

mean of the CG is 0.361 and that of the experimental group is 0.311. Therefore, it can be concluded that the result from both groups were not significantly different or mean equal.

The significance (2-tailed) is 0.629 which is > 0.05. Since it is higher than 0.05 (level of significance). It can be concluded that there is not any significant difference between the two groups about the initial ability.

4.2. Findings from Posttest of the CG and the EG

The findings of posttest measurement using Independent T-test considered group statistics consisting of the mean score, standard deviation and standard error mean (Table 2).

The mean score of the control group is 6.46 and the experimental one is 7.90. Standard

deviation of the control group is 1.26 and that of the experimental one is 0.73.

It means that the students in the experimental group made higher improvement than those in the other one. The standard error mean of the control group is 0.325 and the standard deviation of the experimental group is 0.190. Therefore, it can be concluded that the results from both groups were significantly different. The significance (2-tailed) is 0.001 which is < 0.05. Since it is less than 0.05 (level of significance). It means that there is significant difference between the two groups.

Table 2. Independent sample T-test of the two groups on posttest Group Statistics

	GROUPS	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
SCORES	Control group	15	6.4667	1.26020	0.32538
	Experimental group	15	7.9000	0.73679	0.19024

Independent Samples Test

		Levene's Test for Equality of Variances		t-test for Equality of Means						
		F	Sig.	T	Df	Sig. (2-tailed)	Mean Difference	Std. Error Difference	95% Confidence Interval of the Difference	
									Lower	Upper
SCORES	Equal variances assumed	5.241	0.030	-3.803	28	0.001	-1.43333	0.37691	-2.20540	-0.66126
	Equal variances not assumed			-3.803	22.570	0.001	-1.43333	0.37691	-2.21386	-0.65281

4.3. Findings from pretest and posttest of the CG

The data gained from the pretest and posttest given to the CG were measured by paired samples computation to determine if the difference between the two mean (pretest and posttest) scores were significant. This measurement consists of the CG scores from paired samples statistic, paired sample correlation and paired samples test (Table 3).

The mean score of the pre-test is 6.70 and that of the post-test is 6.46. The standard deviation of the pretest and post-test scores is 1.39 and 1.26 respectively. The standard error of the pretest score is 0.36 and that of the posttest score is 0.32. The correlation of pretest and posttest score is 0.774. The significance of pretest and posttest score is 0.001. Therefore, the positive relationship of statistical significance between the pretest and posttest was observed.

The significance (2-tailed) is 0.334 which is >0.05. Since it is higher than 0.05 (level of significance). It means that there is no significant difference between the pretest and

posttest mean of control group. Therefore, it can be concluded that the vocabulary acquisition of control group was not significantly improved.

Table 3. Paired sample T-test of the Control group on pretest and posttest

Paired Samples Statistics

		Mean	N	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
Pair 1	Pretest	6.7000	15	1.39898	0.36121
	Posttest	6.4667	15	1.26020	0.32538

Paired Samples Correlations

		N	Correlation	Sig.
Pair 1	Pretest & Posttest	15	0.774	0.001

Paired Samples Test

		Paired Differences					t	df	Sig. (2-tailed)
		Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean	95% Confidence Interval of the Difference				
					Lower	Upper			
Pair 1	Pretest - Posttest	0.23333	0.90370	0.23333	-0.26712	0.73378	1.000	14	0.334

4.4. Findings from Pretest and Posttest of the EG

The data gained from the pretest and posttest given to the experimental were measured by paired samples computation to determine if the difference between the two

mean (pretest and posttest) score was significant. This measurement consists of the experimental group from paired samples statistic, paired sample correlation and paired samples test (Table 4).

Table 4. Paired sample T-test of the Experimental group on pretest and posttest

Paired Samples Statistics

		Mean	N	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
Pair 1	Pretest	6.9333	15	1.20811	0.31193
	Posttest	7.9000	15	0.73679	0.19024

Paired Samples Correlations

		N	Correlation	Sig.
Pair 1	Pretest and Posttest	15	0.794	0.000

Paired Samples Test

		Paired Differences					t	df	Sig. (2-tailed)
		Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean	95% Confidence Interval of the Difference				
					Lower	Upper			
Pair 1	Pretest - Posttest	-0.96667	0.76687	0.19801	-1.39135	-0.54199	-4.882	14	0.000

The mean score of the pre-test is 6.93 and that of the post-test is 7.9. The standard deviation of the pre-test and post-score is 1.2 and 0.73 respectively. The standard error of the pretest score is 0.31 and the post-test one is 0.19. The correlation of the pretest and posttest score is 0.794. The significance of the pretest and posttest score is 0.000. Therefore, the positive relationship of statistical significance between the pretest and posttest was observed.

The significance (2-tailed) is 0.000 which is <0.05 . Since it is less 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 the experimental group. Therefore, it can be concluded that the vocabulary acquisition of the experimental group was significantly improved.

4.5. Findings of Students' Perceptions

4.5.1. Students' Perceptions Toward Learning Vocabulary through TPR Method

The first part on the questionnaire table is the students' perception about learning vocabulary through TPR. It consists of five questions. The data show that all students were interested learning vocabulary through TPR. The data are shown in Table 5 below.

Table 5. Students' perceptions about learning vocabulary through TPR

	Options	Percentage				
		SA	A	N	DA	SD
Students' perceptions toward TPR method	1. I feel that it is easy to learn English vocabulary with TPR	60	40	0	0	0
	2. I am interested in learning vocabulary through this method	53	47	0	0	0
	3. I understand the meaning of the words better	60	33	7	0	0
	4. I get the meaning of the words more quickly	60	40	0	0	0
	5. I feel enjoyable with this method without any pressure	60	40	0	0	0

Note: SA (strongly agree), A (agree), N (neutral), DA (disagree), SD (strongly disagree).

From Table 5 above, it can be seen that for item 1, 60% of the students chose SA and 40% for A. It means they felt it easy to learn English through TPR. With item 2, 53% and 47% were observed for SA and A respectively. For question 3, the number was 60% SA, 33% A and 7% N which means that with this method students could understand the meaning of the words better. For question 4, 60% students chose SA and 40% A, this shows that students could remember vocabulary longer. Question 5,

there were 60% students choosing SA and 40% A. It can be concluded that they felt enjoyable with this method without any pressure.

The data from the interviews also support the results from the questionnaire. Most students thought that TPR made it not only easy to understand and remember the meaning of words but also interesting and comfortable for the process of learning vocabulary. Some statements such as: "I find this method easy to follow. It is not only easy but also interesting to

learn. I learned vocabulary in a similar way as I am playing,...” or “... this method was very fun and easy, the more I learned, the more I liked, I could remember the vocabulary easily,...” were heard. This result is in line with what Nugrahaningsih (2007) and Qiu (2016) found out in their studies.

4.5.2. Students’ Perceptions Toward the Advantages of TPR Method

The second part for the questionnaire is the perception of students about the advantages of TPR in the vocabulary classroom. The findings are shown in Table 6 below.

Table 6. Students’ perceptions toward the advantages of Total physical Response method

	Options	Percentage				
		SA	A	N	DA	SD
Advantages of TPR method	6. I find it helpful in learning vocabulary	73	27	0	0	0
	7. I can follow the instructions when learning with TPR method	67	33	0	0	0
	8. I find it happy to learn vocabulary with this method)	40	60	0	0	0
	9. I find it easy to learn a new word	67	33	0	0	0
	10. I feel active with physical actions	53	47	0	0	0

From Table 6 above, students who answered question 6 with 73% SA and 27% A. They thought it was very helpful in learning vocabulary through TPR. Students answering question 7 were with SA 67% and A 33%. This means they could follow the instructions well. For question 8, the answers from the students were 40% strongly agree and 60% agree, this shows that most of them felt happy with TPR in leaning vocabulary. For question 9, the students who chose SA were 67% and A 33%. It means that they could learn vocabulary easily. Lastly, the students answered question 10 with 53% SA and 47% A. The number shows that they became happier and more active through TPR.

The interview data also help strengthen the results from the questionnaire. Five out of six

students interviewed agreed that with TPR, they had more fun and they were more active in the classroom. Student 2 says, “*This method is really fun and easy to follow. It also makes the class more exciting and interesting.* Student 6 adds that, “*I can learn and remember the vocabulary and meaning right in the classroom so I do not need to learn at home like I used to when I was in grade 3*”.

4.5.3. Students’ Perceptions Toward the Disadvantages of TPR Method

The third part of the questionnaire is the perception about the disadvantages of TPR in the classroom. This part consists of 5 questions from 11- 15. In general, most of them are about the students’ interest in learning vocabulary through TPR. The result is showed below.

Table 7. Students’ perceptions toward the disadvantages of TPR

	Options	Percentage				
		SA	A	N	DA	SD
Disadvantages of TPR method	11. It is difficult for me to understand the meaning	0	0	13	40	47
	12. I feel fed up with this method	0	0	13	20	67
	13. I find it ineffective when using this method to teach vocabulary	0	0	0	40	60
	14. I could not improve my vocabulary through this method	0	0	13	53	33
	15. It is only suitable for beginner levels	13	27	2	20	20

Note: SA (strongly agree), A (agree), N (neutral), DA (disagree), SD (strongly disagree).

From Table 7, we can see that students who answered question 11 with SD were 40% and D 47%. There were also 13% of them choosing N. It can be seen that students did not have any difficulties in understanding the meaning of the words that they learned. The students who answered question 12 with strongly disagree were 67% disagree 20% and neutral 13%. For question 13, 60% chose strongly disagree and 40% for disagree 40%. It means this method was not ineffective. With question 14, 33% of strongly disagree and 53% of disagree and 13% for neutral were seen. This shows that most of them thought they were able to improve their vocabulary. And the last question, 13%, 27%, 20%, 20% and 20% for strongly agree, agree, neutral, strongly disagree and disagree respectively were observed. It can be concluded that the students are divided in this item. It means no consensus can be drawn here.

It is not surprising when in the interviews all of the participants said this method was effective and they neither felt bored nor passive during the class time. They mentioned, *"I observed that all of my friends loved this method very much. I like the pictures that the teacher showed and the physical activities that the teacher and my friends did such as you moving around the table or doing a mine to express the meaning of words"* (Student 4) or *"Every time the lesson starts, I only want to take part in with my friends to do the activities. I find it very comfortable and relaxing"* (Student 3).

5. Conclusion

In conclusion, the present study has shed light on the possibility of employing TPR on teaching vocabulary to young learners. Basically, young learners in this study expressed their happy and welcoming attitude toward TPR. The results also indicated that the students were more interested active in joining the classroom activities. These help them understand and remember the meaning of words easy without spending time reviewing them at

home. The results are similar to those from Ilwana's (2010), Sariyati's (2013) and Qiu's (2016) studies. In addition, the mean score of the EG (7.90) was much higher than that of the EG (6.46). From these results, it can be concluded that with TPR students gain better achievement in vocabulary ability than with grammar translation method. This result is also supported by Zhen (2011), when he concluded that TPR was effective in teaching English adjectives.

The present study also came up to some noticeable implications for implementing TPR in teaching vocabulary to young learners.

First, for teachers, they should involve learners in the process of teaching as much as possible to make the classroom active and interesting. This can also help draw learners' attention so that they can remember and use the vocabulary. Moreover, it is better if teachers can make learners feel that they are playing with the language, learning the language and contributing to the lesson as well.

Second, for researchers, gaps in employing TPR are still available for exploiting to make more profound understanding of effects of TPR in teaching vocabulary to young learners. So future studies should focus on what TPR (TPR with body, TPR with objects, TPR with pictures, TPR with story-telling, etc.) is more preferred by learners and which seems to be more effective in teaching vocabulary to young learners.

References

- [1] N. T. C. Anh, P. V. P. Ho, The Effect of using Total Physical Response on EFL Young Learners' Vocabulary and Speaking Fluency, 2018.
- [2] L. Anthony, I. S. P. Nation, Picture Vocabulary Size Test (PVST), 2017.
- [3] M. Alqahtani, The Importance of Vocabulary in Language Learning and How to be Taught, International Journal of Teaching and Education, Vol. 3, No. 3, 2015, pp. 21-34.
- [4] J. Asher, The Learning Strategy of the Total Physical Response: A Review, The Modern Language Journal, Vol. 53, No. 1, 1966, pp. 79-84.

- [5] J. Asher, What is TPR? TPR-World, 2012.
- [6] T. T. B. Ba, N. B. Huan, Reading Strategy Instruction to Vietnamese Young Language Learners: Teachers' Practices and Perceptions, *Can Tho University Journal of Science*, 2017, pp. 138-147.
- [7] R. A. Baron, Physiology, USA: Simon and Schuster Company, 1995.
- [8] J. Brewster, G. Ellis, D. Girard, The Primary English Teacher's Guide, Penguin English, 1992.
- [9] L. Cameron, Teaching Languages to Young Learners, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2001.
- [10] M. Denscombe, The Good Research Guide: For Small-scale Social Research Projects, Buckingham England: Open University Press, 1998.
- [11] N. Ilwana, The Effectiveness of Total Physical Response to Enhance Students' Vocabulary Mastery, 2010.
- [12] J. Harmer, The Practice of English Language Teaching, Harlow: Pearson Longman, 2007.
- [13] J. Harmer, An Introduction to the Practice of English Language Teaching, Longman: London, 2002.
- [14] P. Kariuki, E. Bush, The Effects of Total Physical Response by Storytelling and the Traditional Teaching Styles of a Foreign Language in a Selected High School, 2008.
- [15] F. Klippel, Language Program Evaluation, Cambridge University Press: Cambridge, 1994.
- [16] D. L. Freeman, Techniques and Principles in Language Teaching, Oxford University Press: Oxford, 2000.
- [17] M. McCarthy, Language teaching: A Scheme for Teacher Education, Oxford University Press: Oxford, 1990.
- [18] J. L. Mckenchnie, Webster New Twentieth Century Dictionary Cambridge, William Collins Publisher, 1980.
- [19] C. Murcia, Teaching English as a Second or Foreign Language Third Edition, USA: Thomson Learning Inc, 2001.
- [20] Nation Teaching and Learning Vocabulary, Heinle and Heinle: Boston, 1988.
- [21] N. Nugrahaningsih, The Use of TPR Method in English Preposition Teaching, Semarang: Semarang State University, 2007.
- [22] D. Nunan, Second Language Teaching and Learning, Boston, Heinle and Heinle, 1999.
- [23] D. Nunan, Teaching English to Young Learners, Anaheim University, 2010.
- [24] Y. Qiu, Research on the Application of Total Physical Response Approach to Vocabulary Teaching in Primary Schools, *International Journal of Arts and Commerce*, Vol. 5, No. 7, 2016, pp. 18-24.
- [25] J. C. Richard, C. Rodgers, S. Theodore, Approaches and Methods in Language Teaching Second Edition, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2001.
- [26] I. Sariyati, The Effectiveness of TPR (Total Physical Response) Method in English Vocabulary mastery of Elementary School Children, *PAROLE: Journal of Linguistics and Education*, Vol. 3, No. 1, 2013, pp. 50-64.
- [27] H. Susan, F. M. P. Jennifer, Teaching Vocabulary Explicitly Pacific Resources for Education and Learning, 2011.
- [28] V. P. Takac, Vocabulary Learning Strategies and Foreign Language Acquisition, Multilingual Matters, Clevedon, 2008.
- [29] S. Thorbury, How to Teach Vocabulary, England: Pearson Education Limited, 2002.