THE EEFECT OF TEACHING PROFICIENCY THROUGH READING AND STORYTELLING (TPRS) METHOD ON TEACHING SPEAKING SKILL

Muhammad Anjar Nugraha
Universitas Subang
anjarnugraha@ymail.com

Abstract: This study will look into the usefulness of TPRS method in teaching speaking skills to the tenth-grade students in one of Bandung's senior high schools, as well as their attitudes after using it in the classroom. The students' speaking pre-test, post-test, and questionnaire provided the quantitative data. Meanwhile, to record the treatment process, qualitative data was obtained through classroom observation field notes as secondary data. This study included 24 students in the experimental group and 23 students in the control group who were chosen at random. The data analysis revealed that, at the.05 levels of significance, the experimental group's speaking score was considerably higher than the control group treated with language learning-based non-TPRS after seven meetings of treatment. This study's null hypothesis was found to be false. TPRS training was acceptable to scaffold language in making it intelligible and accessible because this study dealt with poor achiever pupils who were mostly unmotivated. Furthermore, the results of the questionnaire revealed that students' behavioral attitudes toward the employment of the TPRS approach in teaching speaking skills were overwhelmingly positive. Students have become more appreciative, engaged, and confident as a result of TPRS.

Keywords: *language acquisition, language learning, speaking skill, TPRS*

INTRODUCTION

The status of English as a foreign language in Indonesia makes its use limited in clases; thus, making the best use of English classes to encourage students to speak becomes a challenge for English teachers. Shyness, fear of making mistakes, and lack of vocabularies and confidence are some of factores of students' speaking difficulties.

Several studies have identified several characteristics that influence speaking ability. According to Astuti (2012), there are two reasons why Indonesian students lack speaking abilities: an emphasis on grammar and structure in the classroom and a lack of practice for listening-speaking skills. Furthermore, linguistics, psychological, cognitive, and performance aspects, according to Paputangan (2014), may influence students' speaking. Lack of vocabulary, grammatical patterns, and improper pronunciation are all linguistic factors. Fear of making a mistake, shyness, nervousness, and a lack of confidence are psychological factors; unfamiliarity with the material is a cognitive element; and classroom interaction or scenario is a performance issue.

This study looks into one of the language teaching approaches known as TPRS (Teaching Proficiency through Reading and Storytelling), which focuses on providing comprehensible input to help students with linguistic, psychological, cognitive, and performance issues. This research looks at how TPRS addresses students' lack of vocabulary and grammar as a linguistics issue, their fear of making mistakes as a psychological factor, their lack of comprehension of the material as a cognitive factor, and their lack of confidence as a performance factor in speaking competence. As a result, the purpose of this study is to address the following research questions: I Is Teaching Proficiency through Reading and Storytelling (TPRS) beneficial in improving students' speaking skills? (ii) What are students' attitudes toward the application of TPRS in teaching speaking skills?

LITERATURE REVIEW
Teaching Proficiency through Reading and Storytelling (TPRS)

TPRS is an extension of Total Physical Response (TPR). TPRS is the development from TPR method. TPR is one of the language methods developed by Asher in 1960s. TPR emphasizes students listening comprehension first, then speaking following later. TPRS method combines TPR theory and Second Language Acquisition (SLA) theory from Krashen (Ray & Seely, 2009). Krashen (1983) claims that languages in the theory of second language acquisition are acquired mainly by understanding verbal or written messages (comprehensible input) rather than by speaking or reading without understanding properly. In other words, when language learners understand what they hear or read, it means the language is comprehensible for them.

In the beginning, TPRS is an abbreviation from Total Physical Response Storytelling. Ray registered it as Teaching Proficiency through Reading and Storytelling. Ray is the founder of this method. Formerly, it is a technique to introduce vocabulary and grammar. However, it has grown to be considered a method, which is not only to teach vocabulary and grammar but also to teach language teaching skills (Beal, 2011).

TPRS method combines TPR theory and Second Language Acquisition (SLA) theory from Krashen (Ray & Seely, 2009). Krashen (1983) claims that language in the theory of second language acquisition are acquired mainly by understanding verbal or written messages (comprehensible input) rather than by speaking or reading without understanding properly. In other words, when language learners understand what they hear or read, it means the language is comprehensible for them.

Comprehensible input is one of the theories from 5 Krashen's hypothesis of SLA. Input Hypothesis plays as to how the language learner acquires an L2. Language learners will improve and progress in mastering language when they receive interesting L2 input. Lastly, the Affective Filter Hypothesis means that language learners will get comprehensible input when they are in the appropriate environment. In other words, this hypothesis is related to language learner's motivation, self-confidence, and anxiety. Therefore, TPRS focuses on acquisition in order to make meaningful ways rather than learning.

The Three Steps in Conducting TPRS in the Classroom

Three steps that will be a guideline in conducting TPRS in the classroom, are: Establish meaning, Story, and Reading (Gaab, 2008: Gross, 2010, Ray & Seely, 2015). In this first step, the teacher establishes the meaning of some new vocabularies or phrases via actions, gestures, visuals, or verbal explanations. The list of new

vocabularies and phrases could be written on a whiteboard or paper. The students should have easy access to these new vocabulary and phrases lists. It means that the students will check their understanding of these lists in the next step. After the students have known some new vocabularies and phrases that will help them in the next phase, the teachers will move to the second phase. In this phase, the students listen to the story that followed by Personalized Question and Answer (PQA) to check the input from what the students heard. This stage has three activities. First, the teacher retells the story. Second, the students retell the story. Last, the teacher teach a nwe perspective or point of view. Finally, after it focuses on listening comprehension and speaking skills, reading and writing skills will be gained through step 3 named reading. This phase begins with delivering a written story in the target language to the students. Students will be asked to read and comprehend the written version of the story.

The Advantages and limitations of TPRS

Brune (2004) defines the advantage of TPRS by connecting it with Brown's three language teaching principles, there are affective, cognitive, and linguistics principles. The first is the affective principle. TPRS method applies the language ego. The language ego could be seen by giving the students some fictitious names related to the story. The second is the cognitive principle. The automaticity term in the cognitive principle also could be found in the TPRS method. Automaticity refers to the way how the brain processes language. TPRS emphasized students simply understand the language meaning-based rather than form-based. It means the TPRS teacher encourages the students to understand the language repeatedly to increase their fluency. The last is from the linguistics principle. The linguistics principle refers to an ability of a language learner in learning a language from like language itself. Since TPRS has included the use of story, exploits the facilitating to increase the comprehensibility in the target language. The students also are exposed to the correct structures not only repeatedly but also comprehensibly during telling the story with the correct form.

As with any other teaching methods, TPRS has its limitations. There are several language experts had appointed some limitations of TPRS. One of them from Safdarian (2012). They found six obstacles in the implementation of TPRS in the classroom. First, the use of storytelling may need much more time. Second, the TPRS class might be hard in the case of grammar point questions. Third, collage instructors would be unfamiliar with TPRS method. Fourth, since TPRS method applied grammar instruction contextually, the explicit grammatical terms would be unfamiliar by the students. Fifth, TPRS teacher could not cover much grammar material. Last, the difficulty to align TPRS lesson with the textbook. It is similar to the Castro's survey research. He claimed that a main problem of TPRS death with the students' need on the grammatical material could not be covered by TPRS method (Castro, 2010). He proposed to add another teaching strategy neither to defend nor to diminish the value of TPRS method. In addition, Davidheiser's survey research in 2002 found that language teachers mostly used teaching method for conceptual learners who prefer textbook, drilling, memorization, and reading. However, most of students tended to be creative and experiential learner. The characteristics of TPRS method covered those students' need. Hence, TPRS also should provide technique such as worksheet, writing task, reading materials, additional vocabulary, and explicit grammar instruction to cover conceptual learners.

METHOD

This experimetal study conducted in one of the private high schools in Bandung. The quantitative data was collected from students' speaking pre-test, post-test scores, and questionnaires. Meanwhile, the qualitative data came from surveys and field notes from teachers in the classroom. In both the speaking pre-test and post-test, students were asked to recall a monologue. Their performances were taped with a video recorder to make scoring easier for the researcher and rater. Three raters were used to determine the students' speaking scores. The first rater was an English lecturer. The second was one of the research site's English teacher. The third was the researcher who applied for this study's treatment program.

The four components of speaking skill suggested by Hadley were used to analyze the speaking test in this study (2001). Accuracy, fluency, vocabulary, and pronunciation were among the components. Meanwhile, the questionnaire reveals the students' perspectives on behavioral, cognitive, and affective issues. The questionnaire consisted of 10 statements: four for behavioral characteristics, three for cognitive aspects, and three for affective aspects. The results were based on a Likert scale, which measured how much a person agreed or disagreed with the claims.

The researcher can use field notes and video recording to keep track of events, activities, and teacher and student activities during the implementation of TPRS (Creswell, 2012). In seven meetings, qualitative data was collected using classroom observation fieldnotes and video recordings of teaching and learning. This data was evaluated in three steps: reviewing both written and taped transcripts, describing the data, and categorizing, grouping, and coding the data into themes (Gay et al., 2009).

FINDINGS AND DISCUSSION

RQ #1: **Does Teaching Proficiency through Reading and Storytelling effective to improve students' speaking skills?**

The Quantitative Findings

The quantitative data from speaking pre-tests and post-test were collected and analyzed using SPSS 16.0. Table 1. provides the results of descriptive statistics from speaking scores of pre-test both from the experimental and control group.

Table 1. The Descriptive Statistic of the Experimental and Control Group Pre-test

	N	Score	Mean	Std. Dev.	Min.	Max.	Median
Experimental Class	24	1137	47.29	1.0924	25	78	45
Control Class	23	1148	49.87	1.0069	33	75	48

The pre-test score of each group tested for normality and homogeneity variance by using SPSS 16.0. The data found that the sig. value of the experimental (.356) and control group (.158) was higher than the level of significance (.05). The homogeneity test (.756) was higher than the level of significance (.05). Then, the sig. 2-tailed (.405) was also higher than the level of significance (.05). Therefore, the pre-test data from both the experimental and control group were normal and homogenous.

The speaking post-test was conducted in order to find out the differences in students' speaking scores before and after the treatment. Table 2 provides the results of descriptive statistics from speaking scores of pre-test both from the experimental and control group.

Table 2. The Descriptive Statistic of the Experimental and Control Group Post-test

	N	Score	Mean	Std. Dev.	Min.	Max.	Median
Experimental Class	24	1492	62.17	11.511	45	90	58
Control Class	23	1230	53.57	11.512	37	85	50

The data showed that the sig. value of experimental (.273) and control group (.082) were higher than the level of significance (.05). The homogeneity test (.707) was higher than the level of significance (.05). However, the sig. 2-tailed (.014) was lower than the level of significance (.05). It means that eventhough the post-test data from both the experimental and control group were normal and homogeneous but the independent t-test were different. It means that there was a difference in achievement between the post-test of the experimental and control group.

To know whether there is a significant difference between the pre-test scores and the post-test scores after the implementation of TPRS treatment, the paired sample t-test was administered to the experimental group.

The computation shows that the paired samples correlation of the experimental group was .905 with sig. value .000. It can be concluded that the correlation values were close to 1, and the sig. value was lower than 0.05 (0.00 < 0.05). When the correlation value close to 1, and sig. value is lower than the t-table, which means that there is a strong correlation among the pre-test and post-test scores in this group.

The paired-samples t-test of the experimental group. The sig. (2-tailed) value of this group was 0.00. This value score was less than 0.05. It can be stated that there is a difference between the mean in the pre-test and the post-test scores. Hence, those scores became the evidence to support the claim that the use of TPRS in teaching spoken recount to the experimental group was significantly improved after the treatment.

To conclude, the use of TPRS group was effective to teach speaking skills in the experimental group. The evidence to support that claim can be shown from the improvement of the mean score after conducting the TPRS program; the sig. value was lower than 0.05, and the sig. 2 tailed was also lower than 0.05. The next sub-chapter will be presented the qualitative findings.

The Qualitative Findings

The main aim of these qualitative findings is to capture the process of the implementation of TPRS method in the experimental group. This study observed seven meetings of treatment. The observation data focused on capturing three stages of TPRS, they are Establish meaning, Story, and Reading.

The students enriched by some new vocabularies and phrases written on the whiteborad including each meaning and phonetics transcription. When the new vocabularies or phrases were administered to the students, it was followed by Personalized Question and Answer (PQA) technique. Sometimes, the students answered the teacher's questions in a complete sentence or just in a simple answer such as Yes or No. It can be seen from the example of excerpt bellow.

Teacher	*I had a terrible day yesterday. Repeat after me, terrible.*
Students	*Terrible*
Teacher	*And the antonym of terrible is relaxing. Repeat after me, relaxing.*
Students	*Relaxing*
Teacher	*Did I had a terrible day yesterday?*
Students	*Yes.*

Teacher	I will I ask you, did I had a terrible day or relaxing day yesterday?
Students	Terrible
Teacher	Do you know what the terrible means?
Students	(silence)
Teacher	It means bad
Student 1	Buruk
Teacher	So, I had a terrible day yesterday. I had not a relaxing day yesterday.

The excerpt above is one of the examples how to establish a new vocabulary and phrase in establish meaning step. After the teacher told it each vocabulary or phrase, the teacher asked the student to ask the question to their friends next to him/her related to it. Providing a chance to all students to speak is one of the reasons why the students had to ask their friends. It can be seen from the excerpt bellow.

Teacher	I had a terrible day yesterday. Do you know why?
Students	No.
Teacher	I lost my money.
Students	Oh yay a ya ya…
Teacher	Now, s1 ask to the s2 then s2 ask to s3 and so on.
Student 1	Did you have a terrible or relaxing day yesterday? And why?
Student 2	I had a terrible day yesterday. My girlfriend angry.
	Did you have a terrible or relaxing day yesterday? And why?
Student 3	I had a relaxing day yesterday. I go to mall.

It can be seen from the above excerpt that every student could express their ideas. However, their statements were grammatically needs an improvement. The technique to improve their grammatical was provided in a pop up grammar. As it mentioned in the literature review, the pop up grammar was administered implicitly in the context. This pop up grammar was conducted after all the new vocabularies or phrases were established, and all the students had tried to make a statements already.

In the second stage, the teacher moved on the story practice. The teacher read the story followed by PQA technique. The students listen to the whole of story and try to imagine it. The teacher asked a volunteer to come forward and act the story out. The students tried to retell the story in a small group. The teacher gave a text to the students who were the storyteller only because they faced difficulties in retelling it. Finally, the teacher ask students to change from first to third person, change from singular to plural, and synonym to antonym. It can be seen in the following excerpt.

Storyteller	A man stopped her and asked her the way to the Hyatt Hotel.
	Who do stop her and ask her the way to the Hyatt Hotel?
Students	A men
Teacher	What did the man do to her?
Students	Stop you and ask you
Student	Stopped you and asked you
Teacher	Where would the men go?
Student	To the Hyatt Hotel

The last stage of conducting TPRS method is reading. The teacher divided the students into a group of two. They used their 10 minutes to read and understand the story. They have to answer several questions about the story to meausre their comprehension. This third stage conducted in the second meeting. The teacher implemented the simmilar stage in the third and fourth meetings. However, the teacher used movie-talk in these meetings.

The movie-talk is a short video not more than five minutes that has not dialogue or script on it. The students tried to analyze every single screen of the video and describe anything what appeared on screen. This technique applied after the students got new

vocabuleries or phrases in the fisrt stage of TPRS. The following excerpt is the examples how the the teacher made a statement that describe the screen or frame.

Teacher	Last afternoon Mr. Bean had a date with his girlfriend. I will ask you, who had a date with Mr. Bean?
Students	Girlfriend Mr. Bean
Teacher	When was the date happen?
Students	Yesterday ....
Teacher	I will ask you, what will Mr. Bean do after taking a pasta?
Students	Mr. Bean will took a pan. Mr. Bean will boiled the water. Mr. Bean will call his girlfriend.
Teacher	Well, Mr. Bean boiled the water.

Based on the excerpt above, the teacher did the same thing as same as in the story step in the first and meeting. However, the students were helped by the visual of movie-talk story. In the movie talk, the students also could guess what the story will be next. This part was very interesting because the students felt curious to guess. The reading activity was simmilar to what have conducted in the second meeting.

In the fifth meeting, the students got further challenge of the movie-talk technique in a group of five. They had to create their own script or dialogue based on the story. Each group has diffirent movie-talk story to each other. They could find the video on YouTube. One of the students' transcriptions could be seen as follows.

Yesterday, a bee played in the room. In the room there were Konod and Karyo. Konod draw on the table. On the table there are pencil, eraser, and paper. A bee flied to Karyo. Karyo was very annoyed. He hit the bee. Then, Karyo wanted to annoy Konod. He throw eraser to Konod. He also throw a sharpener to Konod. And then he untidy Konod's table. Konod's table was very untidy. And Konod tidy up again his table. Karyo annoyed Konod with a trumpet and a scary mask. After that, he scribble Konod's drawing. Konod was very angry. So Konod hit Karyo. Finally, Konod draw again for the second time on his paper.

In conclusion, the treatment between the experimental and control group was distinguished by the elements of the acquisition and learning model. The experimental group was implemented by the acquisition elements, and the control group was implemented by the learning model elements. The element of these two models consisted of three parts, there are theory, teaching side, and learning side.

The theory elements in the TPRS method could be seen from the students' response during PQA technique, and from some repeated input before the students produce the output. The input could be found in the use of establishing meaning step, PQA technique, storytelling-based instruction, and the frequent exposure to the language. Meanwhile, in the learning model of the control group, the theory is focused on the students' output. The students are emphasized to speak or write consciously. It could be seen from the prudence or doubt about making mistakes in producing the language. It contrasts with the findings in the experimental group. The students tried to produce the language, even just said yes or no.

Since the TPRS method has had a storytelling-based instruction, it seems the learning and teaching material focuses on meaning, implicit treatment, and listening-based instruction. The three steps of TPRS provide comprehensible input to the students. It means the students need to understand what is being said and given by the teacher. However, the learning model in the control group was focusing on explaining the grammar. It could be seen that the teacher defines the grammar rules explicitly to make the students are good in language form and in spoken language.

The last element is the learning side. In the learning process of TPRS method, the students mostly unaware of its process. It could be seen from the students' attitude in listening to the story from the teacher, and the spontaneous speech in the three TPRS steps. In contrast, the students in the control group seemed mostly aware of the learning process. It is because the students' task depends on filling out the worksheet, and need to practice speech.

RQ# 2. What is the Students' Attitude on the implementation of TPRS method in teaching Speaking skill?

To answer this second research question, the questionnaire was distributed only to the experimental group. It because the control group was not getting TPRS method. The questionnaire consists of ten statements which were divided into three aspects of attitude aspects: affective, cognitive, and behavior aspect. The affective and the cognitive aspect consists of three statements. Meanwhile, the behavioral aspect consists of four statements.

The affective aspect concerns feelings or emotions related to Bloom Taxonomy. The first statement is to find out students' attitudes on the use of story-telling in teaching English. Meanwhile, the second and the third statements are to find out students' attitudes on the use of Movie Talk and Mini-Story technique. The total of affective aspect is 221. When that score onverts to the class interval, it can be stated that it belongs to positif. The data questionnaire of affective aspect can be seen in the table 3 below.

Table 3. Affective aspect of students' attitude on the use of TPRS method

No	Statements	The scale of students' feeling				TOTAL
		SA (4)	A (3)	D (2)	SD (1)	
1	I like to learn English subject through storytelling-based instruction.	9	11	3	1	76
2	I like to learn English through Movie Talk technique.	9	11	4	-	77
3	I like to learn English through Mini Story Technique.	5	11	7	1	68
	TOTAL					221

Note   : SA: Strongly Agree, A: Agree, D: Disagree, SD: Strongly Disagree

TPRS method focuses on how the students use a language. Delivering a storytelling to the students in the classroom is really helpful in learning because it demands learners' imagination, increases motivation, and creates a meaningful context (Safdarian, 2013). The use of storytelling also could increase learners' interest and make the students involved with the use of target language (Nguyen et al., 2014). The movie talk TPRS formed in a short video which is played, paused, narrated, paraphrased, and asked by the teacher in order to check for comprehension (Murphy & Hastings, 2014; Hastings, 2014). When the teacher pauses in frame of video, a circling and PQA technique are used to check and increase comprehensibility (Segal, 1992; Ray & Seely, 2012). The use of video could motivate and encourage the students in learning process (Sherman, 2003; Pinter, 2006). TPRS movie talk is not just showing the video to the students. Hastings (2014) shows a video first to play without interruption, replays, pauses, and make a statement in each segment for the second time, then does a circling and PQA technique. However, Herman (2014) argued that students' engagement surfaces in the first time, so it will be better not showing the clip first. Hence, in order to engage the interaction

between the teacher and the students, this current research did what Herman said. In this current research, TPRS mini story was used as a homework for the students. It means that the students could have a large chance to do this task. TPRS mini story formed in an audio visual. The written text also is provided in the mini story. However, the limitation of this mini story is almost the mini story video was not provided the image of the story to help the students in imagining the story. The teacher shared the video to their own hand phones, and asked them to watch that video, then they should retell that story in the next meeting. Gaab, (2011) said that mini story plays as one of TPRS techniques that required students to listen-re-listens and read-reread the story.

The behavior aspects means the manner in which of a person acts or behave to its environment. The first item is to find out whether or not the students feel more confidence to speak after TPRS treatment. The second item in the behavioral aspect is to find out whether or not the students feel worrying about making mistakes in the target language. Therefore, the third item in the behavioral aspect was used to find out whether the students did not feel afraid to volunteer answer in the target language or not. the total score of behavioral aspect is 316. When it is compared to the class interval, it can be stated that the students' attitude in the affective aspect is Strongly Positive. The data questionnaire of behavioral aspect can be seen in the table 4 below.

Table 4. Behavioral aspect of students' attitude on the use of TPRS method

No	Statements	The scale of students' feeling				TOTAL
		SA (4)	A (3)	D (2)	SD (1)	
1	I have more confidence to speak English after TPRS treatment.	4	18	2	-	74
2	I do not worry about making mistakes in my foreign	17	5	2	-	87
3	I feel not afraid to volunteer answer in my foreign language.	6	15	2	1	74
4	TPRS makes me to appreciate more in teaching and learning process	9	15	-	-	81
	TOTAL					316

This data of first and second statement is in line with what Cubukcu have claimed in his research (2014) that in the TPRS method, making the learners feel comfortable to learn, and building their self-confidence in order to learn target language without any hindrance is very important. that the language learner will easily monitor speech without any hesitation after they have received enough language input. The use of movie talk TPRS technique was able to get their attention in teaching and learning process. The TPRS movie talk is formed of short video appreciation that allowed students to enjoy the richness of the frames (Herman, 2014). It has conceded that the use of video has been a powerful technique to motivate and enjoy the students in learning (Denning, 1992; Canning, 2000; Harmer, 2007; Puspita, 2013, Hilmansyah, 2013).

The cognitive aspects aims at finding out the students' developmental of intellectual skills. Skills that provided in these three statements are focusing on the ability to learn new vocabularies or phrase, grammatical structure, and written text. The first item is to find out whether or not TPRS method helped the students to learn and remember new vocabularies and phrase. The second item in the cognitive aspect is to find out whether or not TPRS was helping the students to learn grammatical structure. The

last statement in the questionnaire of cognitive aspect was to find out whether or not TPRS method helped the students in understanding the written text. The total score of cognitive aspect is 225. When it is compared to the class interval, it can be stated that the students' attitude in the affective aspect is Positive. The data are summarized in the table 5.

Table 5. Cognitive aspect of students' attitude on the use of TPRS method

No	Statements	The scale of students' feeling				TOTAL
		SA (4)	A (3)	D (2)	SD (1)	
1	TPRS helps me to learn and remember new vocabularies and phrase.	7	15	2	-	77
2	TPRS helps me to learn grammatical structure.	5	16	3	-	74
3	TPRS helps me to understand written text.	5	15	3	-	74
	TOTAL					225

This finding is supported with Roof and Kruetter (2010) which claimed that when it was compared to the traditional method, the students who treated by TPRS method got score significantly higher on vocabulary. Ray & Seely (2012) state if the teacher wants to teach for fluency, h/she needs to emphasize to working with high frequency vocabulary. In the TPRS method, grammar instruction was taught on the context of the story. The TPRS method focuses on teaching the basic and frequent grammar structure rather than explaining the explicit grammar analysis (Cubucku, 2014). Grammar instruction was implicitly taught in the structure that found in the story. Kamaludin, et al., (2015) was conducted the research to investigate the effectiveness of using storytelling technique in to teaching grammar. TPRS method is a story-based learning. According to Norton (1993), the use of storytelling provides the opportunity to involve students actively in the literacy experience. Increasing early literacy and promoting reading comprehension could be developed by storytelling (Haven & Ducey, 2007). It is in line with the phase reading in TPRS step that emphasized students to understand the text and to retell both written and spoken in their own language. After two steps of TPRS, the students were asked to comprehend the text in step three.

After providing the results of three aspects, the next part is presenting, discussing, and interpreting the integration of all aspects. The results will be presented in the table 6.

Table 6. The Integration of all aspect of students' attitude on the use of TPRS method

No.	Aspects of attitude	Score
1	Behavioral	316
2	Cognitive	224
3	Affective	221
	Total	761

Based on the table 6 above, the total score of all aspects is 761. When it compares to the class interval, 761 is in between 602 – 782 which is positive. It can be concluded that the experimental group has a positive attitude towards the use of TPRS method in teaching spoken recount. TPRS has made the students more appreciate, engaging, and confident. TPRS method also could help the students to learn vocabularies, grammar, and reading comprehension. Then, the students liked to learn English through storytelling, movie talk, and mini-story TPRS.

CONCLUSION

The study's findings revealed that after using the TPRS approach, the experimental group's speaking scores dramatically improved and outperformed the control group. The experimental group's mean was higher than the control group's mean (62.17>53.57). The sig. (2-tailed) value was lower than the level of significance (.014.05), according to the results of the t-test on the post-test. In the paired samples correlation, the sig. value was also lower than the level of significance (.000>.05). According to these three pieces of data, this approach was effective in teaching speaking skills to tenth-grade students in one of Bandung's senior high schools. In other words, the study's null hypothesis was rejected. The null hypothesis claimed that there was no difference in the experimental group's speaking scores before and after the TPRS therapy. The null hypothesis was rejected based on the findings. Because the method provided a scaffolding that allowed pupils to proceed from less comprehension to greater knowledge, it could help students feel more at ease when learning a language. Despite the fact that this method appears to be slow, students with lower competency were able to follow the instructional instructions. Even if the students respond yes or no, the TPRS was able to handle their attention. The students were also interested in movie discussions that could help them underline their points. Because the participants appeared to be of lower proficiency, this approach was appropriate to utilize in this circumstance.

Input from this approach was used to build students' readiness before they actually spoke to tell their prior events. It may be found in vocabulary growth through established meaning, visual stimuli through movie speak, pronunciation practice through mini-story, and classroom interaction through PQA and circling approach. The employment of PQA and circle approaches in the classroom could improve teacher-student and student-student engagement. When asked by the teacher or a classmate, the pupils were able to express and demonstrate their ideas. Because the teacher employed both storytelling and story asking when using the TPRS approach, the kids were able to use more imagination in creating the narrative. The kids were invited to speculate on what might happen next in the scenario. It could be noticed in the utilization of movie talk in meetings 5 to 7. Following the teacher's discussion of a story frame, the students were given the opportunity to use their imagination and creativity to imagine what would happen in the next frame. The mini-story technique, on the other hand, failed to provide further reading and listening content as homework. The students appeared to be uninterested in the mini-story video.

The experimental students agreed that they had a favorable attitude toward the execution of the TPRS approach on affective and cognitive levels, according to the questionnaire results. Meanwhile, the experimental students acknowledged that they had a high positive attitude toward the TPRS method's application in terms of behavioral characteristics. To summarize, the experimental students were enthusiastic about implementing the TPRS method in their classroom.

REFERENCES

Asher, J. J. (1969). The Total Physical Response Approach to Second Language Learning. *Modern Language Journal.* 53, pp.3-17.

Astuti, D. K. (2012). The gap between competence and performance (Performance: The learners' speaking ability). *International Conference on Foreign Language and Teaching (FLLT).* Pp. 660-670.

Beal, K. D. (2011). Proficiency through Reading and Storytelling (TPRS) method of foreign language instruction on anxiety, continued enrollment and academic success in middle and high school students. (Dissertation, University of Kansas, 2011). Retrieved 20th January, 2016 from https://kuscholarworks.ku.edu/.../Beal_ku_0099D_11358_DATA_1.pdf

Brown, H. Douglas. (2001). *Teaching by principles: An interactive approach to language pedagogy*. Englewood Cliffs: Prentice Hall.

Brune, M. K. (2004). *Total Physical Response Storytelling: An Analysis and application.* (A Theis, University of Oregon, 2004). Retrieved 18th Juanuary, 2016

Castro, R. (2010). A pilot study comparing Total Physical Response Storytelling (TPRS) with the Grammar-Translation teaching strategy to determine their effectiveness in vocabulary acquisition among English as a second language Adult learners. (A Thesis, Dominican University of California, 2010). Retrieved 5th January, 2016 from http://scholar.dominican.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=1123&context=masters-theses

Cubukcu, F. (2014). A synergy between storytelling and vocabulary teaching through TPRS. *International Association of Research in Foreign Language Education and Applied Linguistics.* 3(2), pp.84-90.

Creswell, J. W. (2012). *Educational Research: planning, conducting, and evaluating quantitative and qualitative research.* New Jersey: Pearson Prentice Hall.

Davidheiser, J. (2002). Teaching German with TPRS (Total Physical Response Storytelling). *Die Unterrichtspraxis/ Teaching German.* 35. pp.23-35.

Gaab, C. (2011). Multistory Construction. *The International Journal of Foreign Language Teaching (IJFLT).* 7(1), pp. 2-8.

Gaab, C. (2008). TPRS: Evolution or Creation? *Language Magazine*, 5(7), pp. 36-40.

Gay *et al.*, (2009). *Educational research competencies for analysis and aplications*. USA: Pearson.

Gross, S. (2010). The three steps of TPR Storytelling. Retrieved 12th January, 2016 from: http://susangrosstprs.com/articles/THREESTEPS.pdf

Hadley, A. O. (2001). *Teaching language in context.* USA: Heinle & Heinle.

Harmer, Jeremy. (2007). *The practice of English language teaching.* Malaysia: Pearson Education Limited.

Haven, K. & Ducey, M. (2007). Crash course in storytelling. Westport, CT: Libraries Unlimited.

Herman, E. (2014). How to use movie talk to teach with comprehensible Input. *The International Journal of Foreign Language Teaching.* pp. 18-24.

Kamaludin et al., (2015). Innovating grammar teaching through storytelling to low intermediate learners. *Journal of creative practices in language learning and teaching (CPLT).* 3(1), pp.1-7.

Krashen, S. D. (1983). *Principles and practice second language acquisition.* Prentice-Hall International.

Krashen, D. (2015). TPRS: Contributions, problems, new frontiers, and issues. Retrieved 15th January, 2016 from http://www.sdkrashen.com/content/articles/2015_krashen_tprs contributions,_problems,_new_frontiers,_and_issues.pdf

Nguyen, et al., (2014). Perceptions about storytelling in teaching Chinese as a second/foreign language: Opportunities and challenges. *International Conference on Educational Reform (ICER)*. pp. 458-467.   .

Norton, D. E. (1993). *Through the eyes of a child: An introduction to children's literature.* Ochio: Charles E. Menril Publishing Co.

Paputangan, et al., (2014). Unveiling the silence of students in classroom discussion. *KIM Fakultas Sastra dan Budaya*. 2(2), pp.1-16.

Pinter, A. (2006). *Teaching young language learners*. New York: Oxford University Press.

Ray, B. & Seely, C. (2008). *Fluency through TPR storytelling*. Berkeley: Command Performance Language Institute.

Ray, B. & Seely, C. (2012). *Fluency through TPR storytelling — achieving real language acquisition in school* (5th ed.). Berkeley, CA: Command Performance Language Institute.

Ray, B and Seely, C (2015). Fluency through TPR storytelling. Berkeley: Command Performance Language Institute.

Roof, L. & Kreutter, C. (2010). An Interactive storytelling puzzle: Building a positive environment in a second language classroom. *Networks: An Online Journal for the Teacher*. 12 (1), pp.1-10.

Safdarian, Z. (2012). The effect of stories on young learners' proficiency and motivation in foreign language learning. *International Journal of English and Education.* 2(3), pp.200-248.

Segal, B. (1992). Teaching English through action. 5th ed. Brea, CA: Berty Segal, Inc.

Sherman, J. (2003). Using authentic video in the language classroom. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.