# The Influence of Tpr, Gtm Methods and Linguistic Intelligence Toward the Learning Outcomes in English Dap Based (An Experimental Study at the Students of the Second Grade of Sdn Samarinda, East Borneo)

## Hasbi Sjamsir
A Senior Lecturer at Faculty of Teacher Training and Education Mulawarman University Samarinda Indonesia

## Abstract

This research was aimed to find out the effect of Teaching Method and Linguistic Intelligence on the student's learning outcomes in English. The research was conducted at the Public Primary School 023 and 010 Sidomulyo, Samarinda East Borneo between using experimental method with factorial design 2 x 2, with a sample group A treated by Total Physical Response (TPR) and group B treated by Grammatical Translation Method (GTM) taken by simple random sampling. Data was analysed by two ways ANOVA. The research findings are (1) the student's learning outcomes in English taught by TPR are higher than those who were taught by GTM, (2) The mean score of the student's learning outcomes in English with high linguistic intelligence is higher than the mean score of the student's learning outcomes in English with lower linguistic intelligence, (3) For the students with lower linguistic intelligence, there is significant difference between the application of TPR and GTM in their learning outcomes, (4) There is an interaction effect among the teaching method and linguistic intelligence on the learning outcomes in English.

**Keywords:** Total physical response (TPR); Grammatical translation method (GTM); Linguistic intelligence; Developmentally appropriate practice (DAP).

## 1. Introduction

In Indonesia, English served as the first foreign language taught in schools, ranging from kindergarten, elementary school level as local content subjects, and a compulsory subject in junior high school to college level. However, those students have not been able to learn the language to communicate, both orally and in writing, using a good and right variety of language. On a national scale, it is recognized that the level of English language competence of junior high or high school students each year have not experienced a significant increase. In the test results of students' English elementary schools in Samarinda, with an average value of 61.9 in the academic year 2010/2011.

This failure probably due to the teaching and learning undertaken by teachers have not done optimally, or the methods and approaches have not been applied appropriately. Alternatively, in delivering course material, lack of mastering the material, but more than that because teachers are not informed about how to convey the subject matter well, in a fun and exciting as well as must consider the purpose of curriculum development in accordance with the characteristics and developmental needs of students (Developmentally Appropriate Practice-DAP).

The fact found in the field where learning English is applied to the level II class of primary school, some deficiencies have been found, one of which is the use of learning methods that are still traditional which is teaching more of the language instead of how language is used. The teachers only emphasizing memorization, translation, lecture and question and answer method that is boring and monotonous for students, as it does not generate motivation, sense of fun and positive attitude of the students towards the English language with the students themselves are not interested in learning, causing low results learn English in school.

Based on the facts, some innovation in English language learning for young children need to be established, especially in elementary school as recommeded by Asher (2009), *"if you are teaching students who are in the initial stage of language acquisition, you should definitely use Total Physical Response (TPR) because the sounds and the patterns of the new language can be internalized rapidly through language-body conversations*. This statement is supported by F.-R. Kuo et al (2014) that there are various types of English teaching methods in elementary schools, among which, TPR is mostly used in conventional education settings.

There is no one best approach because the circumstances and needs of ESL students vary so greatly (Norland and Pruet, 2006). Although there are various methods and techniques in teaching foreign languages, the most appropriate one for young learners is TPR method (Sühendan, 2013). In other words, TPR is a language teaching method built around the coordination of speech and action; it attempts to teach language through physical (motor) activity. TPR considers that one learns best when he is actively involved and grasp what he hears (Caroline, 2005; Freeman, 2011; Haynes et al., 2004). While, it is very important that TPR is used EFL classroom at primary level to enhance the listening and speaking skills and to enrich their vocabulary (Singh, 2011).

Therefore study of the effect of TPR and GTM Learning Method and Linguistic Intelligence to Learn English Result Elementary Student grade II in accordance with the level of child development was conducted. The results of this study will provide a benchmark overview on the implementation of DAP teaching English to young children.

*Corresponding Author

## 2. Methodology

This study was conducted in SDN 023 and 010, Sidomulyo SDN Samarinda, East Kalimantan, Indonesia. Population in this study were all grade II students of the Elementary School of academic year 2010/2011 in the District of North Samarinda

This study used an experimental method, consisting of a bound variable, the result of learning English, and the two independent variables, namely (1) variable-free treatment, the learning method (TPR method and method GTM) and (2) the free variable attributes, namely linguistic intelligence. The experimental design applied 2 x 2 factorial, where each independent variable was classified into two parts. Forms of research design as in the following table 1:

**Table.** Factoral Experimental Design 2 x 2

| Teaching Method<br>Linguistic Intelligence | TPR<br>($A_1$) | GTM<br>($A_2$) |
|---|---|---|
| High Linguistic Intelligence ($B_1$) | $A_1B_1$ | $A_2B_1$ |
| Low Linguistic Intelligence ($B_2$) | $A_1B_2$ | $A_2B_2$ |

**Source:** Modification of Meredith D. Gall, Walter R. Borg, Joyce, *Educational Research An Introduction*(USA:Longman Publishing. 1996 ), p. 508-510

Notes:
A1 = A group of students given TPR Method (treatment).
A2 = A group of students given GTM Method (control).
B1 = A group of students having high linguistic intelligence
B2 = A group of students having low linguistic intelligene

The treatment in this study was teaching with TPR method for SD 23 and GTM Method for SD 010 Samarinda. The treatment developed in accordance with the SBC textbook-based. Learning activities were designed as treatments using the themes for applied in the I semester. Data collection for measuring the English learning outcomes carried out using a test instrument, while data collection for measuring or knowing the linguistic intelligence of students was done using linguistic measurement instrument. Data were analyzed by descriptive research data in general.

Research hypothesis testing used technical analysis of variance (ANOVA) two-path. Before testing the hypothesis, the requirement analysis was tested, namely the data normality test using Lillifors test, and the data homogeneity test using the Bartlett test. Tukey test was performed when there is an interaction.

## 3. Results and Discussion

In the group treated with TPR and GTM learning methods, there were differences in the results of learning English. Results of English learning of student group treated with learning methods TPR ($A_1$) higher than the group of students with learning method GTM ($A_2$) in which the the average score of group of students with learning method TPR was 85.78 while for group of student with GTM 81.48 (Table). Therefore it could be stated that applying learning method of TPR (Total Physical Response) in English learnig at Primary school is highly affecting the result of English learning of the student compare to GTM learning method.

In TPR method, students are persuaded to apply or demonstrate the teaching materials so they will understand the lessons given. Besides, the learning process is quite fun that will create comfort and less stress atmosphere. Method of TPR is a method of language learning based on coordination between talk and action, that is teaching language by activating psychomotor activities or body movements. This method is also based on some disciplines such as, psychology of development, learning theory, humanistic pedagogy, and procedures of teaching language. Contrast with GTM method in which teacher is the centre of learning process, and there is no motoric activities involved in the learning process. From the aspect of linguistic intelligence, the group of students with high linguistic inteligence has a higher result of English learning compare to the group of students with low linguistic intelligence. As can be seen from the average score of English study result, the score for group with high linguistic intelligence was 85.26 and for group with low linguistic intelligence was 83.63.

There are differences in achievement between groups of students with high linguistic intelligence with the group of students with low linguistic intelligence during treatment of learning methods TPR (A1B1) and GTM (A2B1). The average value of the results of learning English for a group of students with high linguistic intelligence when given TPR learning methods was higher (92.74) compare to GTM learning method (77.78).

Students with high linguistic intelligence prefer to imitate sounds, language, reading and writing, as well as learning by listening, reading, writing, and discussion. They also good at listening efectively, understanding, summarizing, interpreting, and explaining. Moreover, childred with high linguistic intelligence are easily to remember what they read, always try to increase their language, creating new forms of language, work by writing or prefer oral communication[3].

Students with high linguistic intelligence tend to use language learning method that multiply the number of language input, that can be achieved through coordination of speech and the movement of activities of the whole body, so that making the student more confidence. Therefore, it is presumed that students with high linguistic intelligence achieved higher result of learning english when using TPR method.

Contrast to the group of student with high linguistic intelligence, group of students with low linguistic intelligence achieved a better result when given GTM learning method (85.19) compare to TRP learning method (78.81). Childeren with low linguistic intelligence generally characterized by lack of attention on activities related to the using of language, for example writing articles and phoem, making aphorisms, etc. Therefore, they do not fit to

study using TPR method. Student with low linguistic intelligence tend to have strong memory, such as memorizing people names, new terms, or things with details. They tend to have difficulty in learning by listening and verbals, therefore GTM learning method are more appropriate for them. On the other hand, group of student with high liguistic intelligence performed better when treated with TPR learning method compare to the group of student with low linguistic intelligence with the average score of 92.72 and 78.81, respectively. Yet, when treated with GTM learning method, students with low linguistic intelligence performed better (85.19) than those students with high liguistic intelligence (78.81).

Therefore, with appropriate learning method students will enjoy the learning process, resulting in the good result of student that can absorb the lesson faster. The using of learning method should be adjusted to the development of the child. The method should be functioned as equipment or way of presenting (elaborating, giving examples, and exercising) material of the lesson to the students to achieved specific goals.

1. **English Study Results of Group of Students with GTM Method (A2)**
   The student result of English study with GTM Teaching method empirically have maximum score of 91 and minimum score 67, with average of 81.48. The mode, median, standard deviation , and variation were 82; 82; 6.43, and 41.32 respectively.

2. **English Study Result of Student with High Linguistic Intelligence ($B_1$)**
   The English study result of student with high linguistic intelligence empirically have maximum score of 96 and minimum score of 67. The average, mode, median, standard deviation , and variation were 85.26; 93; 83; 8.74, and 76.45 respectively.

3. **English Study Result of Student with Low Linguistic Intelligence ($B_2$)**
   The English study result of student with low linguistic intelligence empirically have maximum score of 91 and minimum score of 69. The average, mode, median, standard deviation , and variation were 82.0; 82; 82; 6.35, and 40.31, respectively.

4. **English Study Result of Student with High Linguistic Intelligence Given Teaching Method of TPR ($A_1B_1$)**
   The English study result of student with high linguistic intelligence and giver teaching method of TPR empirically have maximum score of 96 and minimum score of 84. The average, mode, median, standard deviation , and variation were 92.74; 93; 93; 3.30, and 10.91, respectively.

5. **English Study Result of Student with High Linguistic Intelligence Given Teaching Method of GTM ($A_2B_1$)**
   The English study result of student with high linguistic intelligence and giver teaching method of GTM empirically have maximum score of 82 and minimum score of 67. The average, mode, median, standard deviation , and variation were 77.78; 82; 80; 5.25, and 27.51, respectively.

6. **English Study Result of Student with Low Linguistic Intelligence Given Teaching Method of TPR ($A_1B_2$)**
   The English study result of student with low linguistic intelligence and giver teaching method of TPR empirically have maximum score of 84 and minimum score of 69. The average, mode, median, standard deviation , and variation were 78.81; 82; 82; 5.75, and 33.06, respectively.

7. **English Study Result of Student with Low Linguistic Intelligence Given Teaching Method of GTM ($A_2B_2$)**
   The English study result of student with low linguistic intelligence and giver teaching method of GTM empirically have maximum score of 91 and minimum score of 73. The average, mode, median, standard deviation , and variation were 85.19; 89; 87; 5.36, and 28.69, respectively.

8. **The result of English Study of the whole student Based on their Linguistic Intelligence and Teaching Methods**
   As a whole, the outcomes of students in learning English based on their linguistic intelligence and teaching methods were as follow: the maximum score was 96 and the minimum score 67. The mean score was 83.63, mode 82, median 82.2, standard deviation 7.75, and the variance 60.09. Frequency distribution of the score of English study result of group of students as a whole based on the linguistic intelingence and teaching method can be seen in Table 10 below.

# 4. Conclusion & Suggestion

There is influence of interaction between learning method and linguistic intelligence on the result of English learning of student grade 2 of Primary school. The effect of interaction of learning method on the English learning result depend on students linguistic intelligence in which student with high linguistic intelligence could increase their English learning result when using TPR Method. Yet, students with low linguistic intelligence will be able to enhance their English learning result if using GTM method.

Language skills are also often referred to as integrated skills in English lessons that closely related with each other. Thus it will also affect the evaluation of learning English. When one of the capabilities in the integrated skills is evaluated, then other ability will come up indirectly. Therefore, evaluation of learning English must be done thoroughly, including language policy that need to be considered so that the position of English as a foreign language (FL) can be changed to be a second language (L2) in Indonesia. Another, teachers need to apply the appropriate learning methods and in accordance with the characteristics of the students, in this case the TPR method should be considered.

# References

Asher, J. J. (2009). *Learning another language through actions. Total physical response.* 7th edn: Sky Oak Productions: California.

Caroline, L. (2005). *Practical ELT for young leaners.* Mc.Graw Hill: NY.

F.-R. Kuo *et al* (2014). The Effects of Embodiment-based TPR Approach on Student English Vocabulary. *Journal of King Saud University – Computer and Information Sciences,* 26(2): 63-70.

Freeman, L., Diane. (2011). *Technique and principles in language teaching.* Cambridge Univ. Press: NY.

Haynes, O. M., Bornstein, M. H. and Leach, D. B. (2004). Vocabulary competence in first- and second born siblings of the same chronological age. *Journal of Child Language,* 31(4): 855-73.

Norland, L. D. and Pruet, T. S. A. (2006). *Kaleidoscope of models and strategies for teaching english to speakers of other languages.* Westport, Connecticut: London.

Singh, J. P. (2011). Effective of total pysical response. *Academic Voices A Multidisciplinary Journal,* 1(1): 13-21.

Sühendan, E. (2013). Using total physical response method in early childhood foreign language teaching environments. *Procedia-Social and Behavioral Sciences* 93(October): 17-66.