

# DRILLS AND TOTAL PHYSICAL RESPONSE : AN ATTEMPT TO ENHANCE YOUNG LEARNERS' ORAL COMMUNICATIVE COMPETENCE

Ni Made Ratminingsih

Ganesha University of Education

**Abstrak:** Tujuan utama dari penelitian ini adalah: (1) untuk meningkatkan kompetensi komunikatif siswa SD dalam pembelajaran Bahasa Inggris dengan menggunakan kombinasi teknik *Drills* dan *TPR*, (2) untuk meningkatkan kemampuan siswa dalam menggunakan aspek kebahasaan, seperti kosakata, tata bahasa, lafal, kelancaran, dan pemahaman yang terkait dengan keterampilan berbicara. Dengan prosedur penelitian tindakan kelas, hasil penelitian menunjukkan bahwa pemanfaatan kombinasi teknik *Drills* dan *TPR* dapat meningkatkan kompetensi komunikatif siswa secara umum dan kemampuan siswa dalam menggunakan aspek kebahasaan, seperti kosakata, tata bahasa, lafal, kelancaran, dan pemahaman terhadap materi pembelajaran.

**Abstract:** The main objectives of this research were: (1) to improve the students' oral communicative competence in English lesson benefited from the combination of Drills and Total Physical Response (TPR) techniques, (2) to improve the students' ability in using the language aspects, such as vocabulary, grammar, pronunciation, fluency, and comprehension having a direct correspondence to speaking skill. Making used of the classroom action based research, the results of the study revealed that the implementation of Drills and TPR could improve the students' oral communicative competence. At the same time, both techniques could also improve the students' ability in using the language aspects, such as vocabulary, grammar, pronunciation, fluency, and comprehension which should be dealt with in speaking.

Kata kunci: *drills*, *Total Physical Response (TPR)*, dan kompetensi komunikatif

English language instruction for young learners in elementary schools across Bali province has been increasingly attended by the local government since 1994. In Singaraja particularly, almost all elementary schools in urban as well as rural areas, whether they are government schools or private ones, have introduced English language instruction in the school curriculum as a local content which is given to the students from grade four to grade six.

In order to actualize the competency-based curriculum as expected, there should be qualified teachers who possess an adequate competence to handle a good instruction. However, the researcher was shocked finding that among approximately a hundred English teachers in elementary schools in Buleleng district who participated in the refresh-

ment program concerning with strategies of teaching English for young learners in 2006, there were around 80% of the teachers who did not have background education in teaching English. As a result, they possess lack of communicative competence. This can be proved from their conviction in an informal interview that they were unable to speak English fluently. As well, when they taught English to their students, they mainly emphasized the teaching of vocabulary and pronunciation, of course with limited ability in pronouncing the English words. The strategies of teaching they used were more conventional ones, mainly through translation and explanation in Indonesian language.

There are many things which can be effortlessly done by teachers to make the language in-

struction more challenging and interesting. Among others are the use of realia, pictures, photos, cards, games, and songs as well as more innovative techniques, such as Drills and TPR which give more focus on forming a new habit in the target language. Hence, the natural concept of learning can be realized, that is through the habitual activity of listening which is followed by drills to strengthen the comprehension of concept and the movements which are instructed by the teacher to actualize the words further sharpen the comprehension before the learners are able to produce the words themselves.

Klein (2005:12) cites that children generally have high motivation to study as far as their teachers are inventive in selecting the interesting activity for their students. As well, the teachers should be able to vary the lesson, so that the students do not easily get bored. Klein introduced the techniques of teaching which combine Audio-Lingual Method (ALM) and Communicative Language Teaching Method (CLTM). They are Drills and TPR. Being inspired from Klein, the researcher wants to assist English teachers in elementary schools, particularly in SD LAB Undiskha Singaraja to improve the students' oral communicative competence. By utilizing these two techniques, not only vocabulary and grammar can be improved, but also speaking ability can be enhanced.

According to Brown (2001:131), drill is a technique of teaching which focuses on one or two language forms (grammatical structure or phonology) through several types of repetitions. Drill is generally handled classically or individually. There are several forms of drills, namely repetition drills, substitution drills, and moving slot substitution drills.

Brown (2001:133) further expresses that in a communicative-based language instruction, the use of drills can still be utilized. Drills are normally brief and for those students who have low level of language proficiency, drills are very suitable to help them to recognize structural patterns, rhythms, and certain elements of pronunciation. In order that learners are not seriously attempted to focus on grammar which is usually

frightening, jazz chants variation can be used as a prior drill. Graham (1978 as quoted by Klein, 2005:15) states:

“...jazz chant is highly motivating because of their rhythms and humors. In addition, the young learners need not patiently remain in their seats. They can move, clap their hands, snap their fingers, or tap their feet. They are involved both mentally and physically. Songs, poems, chants, and similar activities reduce anxiety and increase the personal involvement of second language learners”.

TPR was firstly introduced by James Asher (1977, in Larsen-Freeman, 1986; Richards and Rodgers, 2003; Brown, 2001) with a concept that comprehension is the most important part for language learners. They should be given as much chance as possible to listen to the target language before being able to produce it orally. In assisting the learners to comprehend what is being heard, they can be helped by giving physical responses, such as reaching, grabbing, moving, looking and so forth. Asher, as well, gives attention to the use of right hemisphere of the brain as a physical activity, which precedes the process of language learning, which actually becomes the activity of left hemisphere (Brown, 2001:30).

The other crucial concept of TPR is that teachers should be able to create a stress free atmosphere of learning. The way to do so is by not forcing the learners to speak when they are not yet ready. The use of humorous expressions and fun activities can improve their motivation to study (Richards and Rodgers, 2003; Brown, 2001).

On the basis of the above theories, this study was sought to investigate whether Drills and TPR were able to improve the oral communicative competence of fifth grade of elementary students of SD LAB Undiskha Singaraja.

## **METHODOLOGY**

### **The Subjects**

The subjects of this research were the fifth graders of SD LAB Undiksha Singaraja in the academic year 2006/2007 and the total number was 43 students.

### **The Research Design**

This is an action-based research which was conducted in two cycles. In each cycle there were 4 phases taken, (1) planning, (2) action, (3) observation, and (4) reflection. In each cycle, there were 3 teaching sessions, thus within two cycles there were 6 teaching sessions.

The steps taken in the planning phase were: (1) collaborating with the English teacher in SD LAB Undiksha Singaraja to make teaching scenarios, and (2) designing instruments of research.

The action taken to optimize the teaching of English in SD Lab Undiskha Singaraja was through the utilization of Drills and TPR. Through these two techniques, the students were guided to participate actively in the classroom by following various activities which integrated all language skills and aspects of language, such as grammar, vocabulary, and pronunciation. Additionally, their fluency and comprehension of the tasks worked out by the students were also evaluated. Through the integration of Drills and TPR, the students were involved in activities such as (1) listening to jazz chant and following the drills instructed by the teacher, (2) doing the imperatives to show the action of certain activities, (3) working in pairs to give question and answer by using flashcards provided by the teacher, and (4) working in groups to discuss and describe the activities in the card and write the result of group work on the board.

The observation was conducted seven times, once was prior to the research and six others were during the teaching learning sessions. In this phase, the researcher took a close look at the execution of the action using the combination of Drills and TPR. Furthermore, the evaluation was conducted during and after the action. During the action, the evaluation was done due to the accomplishment of the tasks, namely questioning and answering activity in pairs and writing the sentences on the board.

The evaluation at the end of each cycle was in the form of oral test in order to gain data about the students' progress in their ability to use English orally. The students were instructed to speak and in

their speaking they had to construct around 5 sentences in line with the pictures or flashcards shown by the evaluator.

### **The System of Evaluation for Oral Communicative Competence**

At the end of the cycle, the students' oral communicative competence was tested by the researcher with 3 assistants in doing the recordings. The students' oral production of speech was recorded in order that the researcher could evaluate their ability more objectively. The criteria of evaluation used the scale (1-5) by Harries (1984) in which speaking ability was valued from 5 variables, namely pronunciation, grammar, vocabulary, fluency, and comprehension. In detail, the criteria of evaluation are as follows:

#### **(1) Pronunciation**

<b>Score</b>	<b>Criteria</b>
5	Accurate pronunciation with native-like accent.
4	Accurate pronunciation with mother tongue accent.
3	Good pronunciation with one or two mistakes.
2	Having problems in pronunciation, thus it is difficult to comprehend.
1	Having problems in pronunciation, thus it is unable to comprehend.

#### **(2) Grammar**

<b>Score</b>	<b>Criteria</b>
5	Very few mistakes without deducing the meaning of information.
4	Occasionally making mistakes, e.g. order of words, but the meaning can be understood.
3	Making several mistakes, thus repetition is necessary to strengthen meaning.
2	Making many mistakes, so that meaning is unclear.
1	Making regular mistakes so that it is difficult to understand.

**(3) Vocabulary**

Score	Criteria
5	Accurate selection of words, native speaker-like.
4	Very few mistakes in word selection, but it does not deduce the meaning.
3	Occasionally uses inaccurate words, so that clarification of meaning is necessary.
2	Regular wrong uses of words which make meaning difficult to understand.
1	Serious problems in using accurate words, so that it is unable to understand.

**(4) Fluency**

Score	Criteria
5	Speak very fluently, native-like fluency.
4	Speak less fluently due to few problems of vocabulary.
3	Occasionally have problems in speaking due to selection of words, so that there are several pauses during speaking.
2	Regular pauses and hesitancy.
1	Very slow speaking due to serious language problems.

**(5) Comprehension**

Score	Criteria
5	Very good understanding of the material so that the story could be expressed nicely.
4	Good understanding of the material, but occasionally make repetitions in expressing the story.
3	Having comprehension problems, but not serious and directly understand after having some repetitions so that the story could be expressed.
2	Having difficulties to comprehend the material so that unable to express the story.
1	Unable to comprehend the material so that unable to express the story.

The minimum criterion of success which is required in this research is 70%, in which the achievement of the lesson using the proposed techniques is categorized as good.

**Score Interpretation**

Score	Achievement/Category
5	85% - 100%/very good
4	70% - 84%/good
3	55% - 69%/sufficient
2	45% - 54%/insufficient
1	0,0% - 44%/very insufficient

**Instruments****Test**

The test used in this research was an oral test. In the pre-test, the students were given certain topics to be spoken orally. Before speaking, the students were allowed to prepare written concept. Their ability to communicate was then evaluated using the above criteria of evaluation.

The post-test was conducted after the treatment which aimed to identify whether there was improvement or not on students' ability to communicate by the assistance of pictures or flashcards.

**Observation Sheet**

This instrument was used to observe the teacher and students' activities during the lesson. It was also used to detect the condition, participation, interaction patterns and students' attitude towards the teaching learning process making use of the combinations of Drills and TPR.

**Questionnaire**

The questionnaire was distributed to the students to know their response towards the teaching learning activities using the combination of Drills and TPR.

### Tape Recorder

The tape recorder was used to record the students' oral communicative competence with the assistance of pictures or flashcards at the end of the cycle, so that the evaluation of their speaking ability could be made more objective.

### Data Analysis

The obtained data were analyzed descriptively. The data gained from the test were calculated to determine the mean score which assessed 5 variables mentioned by Harries (1984). The formula used is as follows:

$$\text{Mean} = \frac{\text{the total scores of all subjects}}{\text{the number of subjects}}$$

The result was then interpreted qualitatively to determine the achievement. Furthermore, the data obtained from the questionnaire were analyzed to determine the percentage of the number of students to select a certain statement. Below is the formula used:

$$\text{Percentage} = \frac{\text{the number of subject selecting an item}}{\text{the number of subjects}} \times 100\%$$

## RESEARCH RESULT AND DISCUSSION

### Research Result

**Table 01: The Mean Score of Oral Communicative Competence**

Aspect	Pre-Test		Post-Test 1		Post-Test 2	
	Total Score	Mean Score	Total Score	Mean Score	Total Score	Mean Score
Pronunciation	2338	54.37	3223	74.95	3396	78.98
Grammar	2433	56.58	3743	87.05	3884	90.33
Vocabulary	2463	57.28	3462	80.51	3695	85.93
Fluency	2507	58.30	3432	79.81	3506	81.53
Comprehension	2794	64.98	3599	83.70	3711	86.30
Total Mean Score	2498.2	58.10	3420.8	81.20	3638	84.62
Category	Sufficient		Good		Good	

The table above shows that the students' oral communicative competence before treatment was categorized as sufficient which can be seen from the total mean of 5 aspects, that is 58.10. This achievement was still less than the minimum requirement (70%). Thus, all aspects of evaluation needed to be improved. Taking a closed look from the achievement of each student, only 5 students (11.63%) who got score 70.0 and above, 23 students (53.49%) gained score from 55.0 to 69.0, 10 students (23.25%) got score from 45.0 to 54.0, and even 5 students got score below 45.0.

The result of post-test 1 further proved that the students' oral communicative competence at the end of the cycle I gained significant improvement, which can be seen from the mean score 81.20 which was under good category. From 5 aspects of evaluation, the ability of students in using grammar improved significantly well, which was under a very good category. However, the other four aspects were categorized as good. From the analysis of test among 43 subjects, 8 students (18.60%) gained score from 85.0 to 100, 34 students (79.07%) gained score from 70.0 to 84.0, meanwhile only 1 student gained score 67.8.

Regarding the result of post-test 2, it can be seen that the students' oral communicative competence was good with the achievement of mean score 84.62. From 5 aspects of evaluation, grammar achieved the highest score (90.33), comprehension and vocabulary gained mean score 86.30 and 85.93 respectively. These three aspects were categorized as very good. Two other aspects, namely fluency and pronunciation were categorized as good.

### Discussion

From 43 subjects under study, the result of pre-test proved that they had problems in oral communication, so that their communicative competence should be improved. The data show that their prior oral communicative competence was regarded as low in five variables of communication, which could be seen from the obtained mean score which was less than 70.0

(58.10). The topics which had been taught before the pre-test were *weather, pets, days, and months*. Thus, in the pre-test, those topics were tested.

The data in detail regarding the achievement of the students can be shown as follows: 5 students (11.63%) achieved the score from 70.0 to 100, 23 students (53.49%) achieved the score from 55.0 to 69.0, 10 students (23.25%) achieved scores from 45.0 to 54.0, and 5 others (11.63%) achieved score below 45.0. Hence, it can be concluded that the majority of students (88.37%) still had problems and were essentially assisted to improve their oral communicative competence.

Below are the examples of mistakes the students conducted in all language aspects under evaluation taken from the result of pre-test.

**Table 02: Mistakes of Pronunciation in Pre-test**

No	Mistakes	Correct Forms
1	bird /b r:/	/b :d/
2	Saturday /'s t rde/	/'s t rdi/
3	color /kolor/	/'k l (r)/
4	likes /leks/	/laik/
5	today /todai/	/t 'dei/
6	giraffe /giraf/	/jI'ra:f/
7	fishes /fises/	/fi is/
8	green /gren/	/gri:n/
9	goat /got/	/g /
10	tiger /tig r/	/'taig (r)/

From the above examples, there were still many words which could not be pronounced correctly by the students. There was a tendency that the students pronounced the words in English the way they did in their mother tongue. In line with the mistakes of grammar, below are the examples:

**Table 03: Mistakes of Grammar in Pre-test**

No	Mistakes	Correct Forms
1	It <u>was</u> sunny <u>today</u> .	It <u>is</u> sunny <u>to-day</u> .
2	I <u>am</u> <u>has</u> a pet.	I <u>have</u> a pet.

3	My rabbit color is white.	My rabbit's color is white.
4	It <u>like</u> to jump.	It <u>likes</u> to jump.
5	It is Wednesday and weather ___ sunny.	It is Wednesday and the weather is sunny

From the above table, it is shown that the mistakes often conducted by the students were related to tenses and word order.

The examples of mistakes on the use of vocabulary are presented below:

**Table 04: Mistakes of Vocabulary in Pre-test**

No	Mistakes	Correct Forms
1	He <u>have</u> <u>catch</u> fish.	He <u>catches</u> fish.
2	My cat is <u>color</u> white and orange.	My cat's <u>colors</u> <u>are</u> white and orange.
3	It is <u>month</u> sunny.	It is sunny <u>this month</u> .
4	Yuda <u>give</u> breakfast <u>has</u> <u>a hen</u> corn.	Yuda gives the hen corn for breakfast.
5	<u>In the color</u> black.	<u>The color</u> is black.

In the first example, the students used double verbs *have* and *catch*, and its structure was also wrong, which was supposed to use the suffix *-es*. Meanwhile, in the second example, the students made mistakes in the use of possession and plurality, and in terms of structure, it was also wrong which was shown from the use of *to be*.

In accordance with fluency, almost all students were not fluent in their speech, even some of them were frightened to speak. Their fluency was hindered by their inability to express their idea. They spoke with several pauses which made it difficult to understand. Regarding the findings in the pre-test, the researcher made use of the combination of Drills and TPR to help the students to improve their oral communicative competence.

In cycle I, the theme of the teaching content was *Things around School*, there were two kinds of words which had to be introduced, nouns and

adjectives. The nouns consisted of words, such as *book, pen, ruler, pencil case, box, pencil sharpener*, and the like, while the adjectives included the words, such as *long, short, tall, big, small, thin, thick, old*, and *new*. In executing the combination of Drills and TPR techniques, the classroom activities were: (1) listening to *jazz chant* and doing the *drill* instructed by the teacher, (2) doing the imperatives to show the actions of some action verbs, (3) working in pairs to ask and answer questions by the assistance of *flashcards* provided by the teacher, and (4) working in groups to discuss and describe activities shown in the cards and writing the result of group discussion on the board.

After the treatment, the result of post-test 1 shows a significant progress that is proven by the students' mean score of their oral communicative competence which increased to 81.20, which was categorized as good. Things supported this improvement can be seen from the five aspects under evaluation. The grammar gained the highest mean score, 87.05 which was categorized as very good, comprehension gained mean score, 83.70. This means that the students' comprehension on the material about *Things around School* was categorized as good after being assisted with the use of *Jazz Chants* and *Flashcards*. The other three aspects, namely pronunciation, vocabulary, and fluency also experienced improvement. Students' pronunciation was mainly acceptable however they were less able to pronounce the sound "th"/ / . The improvement from the result of pre-test 58.10 into 80.21 proved that the techniques of teaching implemented were effective to improve the students' oral communicative competence. Taking a look at the minimum criteria of success (70%), this study can be actually finalized, but the researcher found it necessary to continue the study on the basis of the planning in order to confirm the effectiveness of the techniques implemented. The students' achievement in post-test 1 can be described in detail as follows: 1 student achieved score below 55.0, 1 student achieved 67.8, 34 students (79.07%), students achieved score from 70.0 to 84.34. The rest, 8 students (18.60%) gained score between 85.0 and 100. This means that

almost all students (97.67%) improved their oral communicative competence. Regardless of the improvement, few mistakes were found after the treatment in cycle I as presented below:

**Table 05: Mistakes of Pronunciation in Post-test 1**

No	Mistakes	Correct Forms
1.	pencil /pensil/	/'pensl/
2.	case /kes/	/keis/
3.	thick /tik/	/ ik/
4.	dictionary /dik n ri/	/'dik nri/
5.	book /bok/	/b k/
6.	tall /tal/	/to:l/
7.	small /small/	/smo:l/

The table above shows that the students still conducted some mistakes in pronouncing some words, such as *thick / ik/*, *pencil /pensl/*, *book /b k/*, *tall /to:l/*, and *small /smo:l/*. In accordance with the achievement on grammar, it gained the highest score. The majority of students, 31 from 43 students (72.09%) obtained score from 85.0 to 100 and the rest, 11 students (25.58%) got score from 70.0 to 84.0. Only 1 student (2.32%) got score 68.0. This means that the students' ability to use grammar was effectively assisted by the combination of Drills and TPR. However, there were still some mistakes conducted by the students as follows:

**Table 06: Mistakes of Grammar in Post-test 1**

No	Mistakes	Correct Forms
1.	This is ___ thin book.	This is <u>a</u> thin book.
2.	This is ___ short pencil.	This is <u>a</u> short pencil.
3.	This is ___ big bag.	This is <u>a</u> big bag.
4.	This is ___ long ruler.	This is <u>a</u> long ruler.
5.	This is ___ small chalk.	This is <u>a</u> small chalk.
6.	This is a <u>brown and black dustbin</u> .	These are brown and black <u>dustbins</u> .
7.	It is a <u>short ruler and small pen</u> .	These are <u>short ruler and small pens</u> .

The table above shows that some mistakes conducted by the students in terms of grammar were mainly on the use of article “a” in singular noun. Meanwhile, the mistakes in examples 6 and 7 were on the use of plural demonstrative noun “these”.

Additionally, the ability of the students to use good and correct vocabulary was regarded as good with the mean score 80.1. This achievement was supported by the findings that 35 students (81.40%) achieved score from 70.0 to 84.0, 8 students (18.60%) achieved score from 85.0 to 100. However, few mistakes done by the students in terms of vocabulary can be seen as follows:

**Table 07 : Mistakes of Vocabulary in Post-test 1**

No	Mistakes	Correct Forms
1	This is a <u>smaller</u> rubber.	This is a small rubber
2	This is a big <u>tas</u> .	This is a big bag.
3	This is a <u>small</u> pencil.	This is a short pencil
4	This is a <u>tall</u> pencil.	This is a long pencil

From the table above, example 1 shows that the student was not able to use the correct vocabulary. He had to use *small* instead of *smaller*. In the example 2, the students was unable to provide the English noun, meanwhile in the examples 3 and 4, the students used the inaccurate words.

In line with fluency, the mean score in post-test I was 79.81, 32 students (74.42%) achieved score from 70.0 to 84.0, 8 students (18.60%) achieved score from 85.0 to 100, and 3 students (6.98%) achieved score from 55.0 to 69.0. Their fluency was still problematic since some of the students sometimes paused to remember the words that should be spoken up. They used the *filler* “em, ee” while thinking.

Regarding the comprehension of the theme, the students’ ability was categorized as good with the mean score 83.70. This finding was supported

by the findings that 26 students (60.47%) achieved score from 85.0 to 100, and 17 students (39.53%) achieved score from 70.0 to 84.0.

On the basis of the findings in cycle I, important things that can be reflected are: (1) The students experienced improvement in their oral communicative competence which was shown from aspects under evaluation, (2) The students were enthusiastic to work on dialogue activity done in pairs and to describe the flashcards I groups, (3) Some of the students still had problems in pronouncing English words accurately, (4) Some students often forgot the rules of certain grammar, and (5) High achiever students got bored when the teacher repeatedly drilled the words.

Regarding the above reflections, in cycle II the researcher planned activities such as: (1) The combination of Drills and TPR was still used, (2) Pronouncing activity was intensified and the students who were able to pronounce the words correctly were instructed to give example to their friends, (3) The teacher gave emphasis on the grammatical concept and asked the students to make example of sentences individually, and (4) The teacher gave the responsibility to the students who had mastered the words to drill their members of the group.

The theme being taught in cycle II was *Things in the House*. The nouns which were the focus of the lesson were *bed, television, sofa, radio, clock, refrigerator*, and others which were in line with different rooms found in the house. Meanwhile, the concept of grammar under consideration was *singular* and *plural* of demonstrative nouns: “*this is, these are*”.

In general, the phases of teaching taken in this cycle was almost the same as the ones used in cycle I, some modifications which were done include: (1) intensifying the students’ pronunciation by asking the high achievers to give examples to their peers, (2) focusing on grammatical concept by asking the students to make examples individually, and (3) giving the responsibility to the high achievers and those who have mastered the words to drill their own group.



In accordance with the treatment given, the result of post-test 2 in cycle II shows an improvement which can be seen from table 01 above. The improvement can be seen from the gained mean score 83.84, which was categorized as good. This achievement was supported by the achievement in each aspect under evaluation. Grammar gained score 90.33, in which 37 students (86.05%) obtained score from 85 to 100, and 6 others (13.95%) got the score between 70.0 and 84.0. However, there were small mistakes conducted by the students which are shown as follows:

**Table 08: Mistakes of Grammar in Post-test 2**

No	Mistakes	Correct Forms
1	This is <u>a</u> old ruler.	This is <u>an</u> old ruler.
2	<u>These</u> are <u>a</u> big bag.	<u>These</u> are <u>big</u> bags.
3	<u>These</u> are <u>a</u> clock.	<u>These</u> are <u>clocks</u> .
4	This is ___ table.	This is <u>a</u> table.
5	<u>There</u> are <u>two</u> plate.	<u>There</u> are <u>two</u> plates.

Example 1 above shows that the student's mistake lies on the use of indefinite article "a" which was supposed to be "an". In examples 2, 3, and 5 the students used singular nouns which should be plural, meanwhile in example 4 the student deleted the use of article.

In terms of comprehension, the students mastered the lesson about *Things around the House*. This is proved from the mean score achieved, 86.30. This finding was supported by the achievement of each student. There were 38 students (88.37%) gained score from 85.0 to 100 and 5 others (11.63%) obtained score from 70.0 to 84.0.

The students' achievement in vocabulary was regarded as very good which was shown from the mean score 85.93. The students could use accurate diction when speaking. It can be reported that 32 students (74.42%) obtained score from 85.0 to 100,

and 11 others (25.58%) gained score from 70.0 to 84.0. However, there were still some mistakes conducted by the students, which can be seen below:

**Table 09: Mistakes of Vocabulary in Post-test 2**

No	Mistakes	Correct Forms
1	This is <u>fit</u>	This is .....
2	These are seven <u>tens</u>	These are seven .....
3	This is a <u>long</u> book.	This is a thick book
4	This is a <u>short</u> dipper.	This is a small dipper.

In examples 1 and 2, the two words used by the students could not be interpreted by the researcher, while in examples 3 and 4 the students' use of the words was less accurate.

In line with fluency, the mean score achieved by the students in cycle II was 81.53. Some students still had problems in fluency as they paused during speaking using the fillers "em, ee". While, pronunciation underwent improvement from 74.95 in post-test 1 to 78.98 in post-test 2. Below are some examples of mistakes in pronunciation:

**Table 10: Mistakes of Pronunciation in Post test 2**

No	Mistakes	Correct Forms
1	these /des/	/ 'ði:z/
2	three /tri/	/ ri:/
3	vase /vas/	/va:z/
4	refrigerator /refrijiretor/	/ri'frid reit (r)/
5	televisions /telivesions/	/ 'telivi ns/

In example 1, the students could not accurately pronounce the sound "th" and "s" for the word "these" / 'ði:z/, as well as in example 2.

The analysis on the result of questionnaire after cycle II proved that the majority of the students (76.74%) stated that they agreed to the focus of teaching on speaking ability. Most of them

(86.05%) declared that they were happy being given speaking activity using dialogue with the assistance of flashcards. Additionally, almost all students (93.02%) affirmed that the use of drills and actions in imperatives could help them to improve their speaking ability. Furthermore, 37 students (86.05%) confirmed that the lesson was easier to comprehend using drills and acting out teacher's pronunciation. The students (88.37%) also felt that their brevity and creativity in speaking increased, and almost all of them (90.70%) stated that the use of flashcards helped them to speak. In terms of motivation, most students (88.37%) said that they became highly motivated in following the lesson.

## CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATION

### Conclusion

In line with the research results which have been clarified above, it can be concluded that the fifth graders' oral communicative competence at SD LAB Undiksha Singaraja could have been improved significantly through the application of Drills and TPR. The improvement was supported by the enhancement of achievement in all five

language aspects under investigation. They are pronunciation, grammar, vocabulary, fluency, and comprehension.

### Recommendation

Some recommendations which need to consider are (1) English teachers in elementary schools are recommended to optimize the use of the combination of drills and TPR by making advantages of jazz chants and flashcards in speaking instruction. The techniques utilized do not only dominate the lesson with speaking activities, but also integrate other skills, such as listening, reading, and writing. The strength of the combination of these two techniques lies on the use of chants which can increase the students' enthusiasm in studying in a fun atmosphere. As well, flashcards also add the strength in accordance with the visualization of the concept by utilizing colorful pictures, (2) English teachers are also suggested to pay attention to language aspects related much to language skills, such as vocabulary, grammar and pronunciation, and (3) further related research can be conducted to strengthen the findings.

## REFERENCE

- Brown, H. Douglas. 2001. *Teaching by Principles. An Interactive Approach to Language Pedagogy*. New York: Addison Wesley Longman, Inc.
- Canale, Michael, and Merrill Swain. 1980. "Theoretical Basis of Communicative Approaches to Second Language Teaching and Testing." *Applied Linguistics* 1.1: 1-47.
- Direktorat PLP. 2002. *Pendekatan Kontekstual (Contextual Teaching and Learning (CTL))*. Jakarta: Depdiknas.
- Harries, David P. 1984. *Testing Language as a Second Language*. New York: Addison Publishing Company, Inc.
- Klein, Kerstin. 2005. "Teaching Young Learners". *English Teaching Forum* Vol. 43 No.1, January: 12-17.
- Larsen-Freeman, Diane. 1986. *Techniques and Principles in Language Teaching*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Littlewood, William. 1981. *Communicative Language Teaching. An Introduction*. Cambridge : Cambridge University Press.
- Richards, Jack C. dan Theodore S. Rodgers. 2003. *Approaches and Methods in Language Teaching. A Description and Analysis*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Savignon, Sandra J. 2002. "Communicative Curriculum Design for the 21st Century." *English Teaching Forum* Vol. 40 No. 1, January: 2 – 7.