Comparison of Direct Method and Grammar Translation Method of Learning English on Students' Achievement at the University Level

GLR

Sabahat Parveen	Assistant Professor, Department of English, University of Education, Lahore, Punjab, Pakistan.
Asif Iqbal	Associate Professor, Department of Education, University of Education, Lahore, Punjab, Pakistan.
Muhammad Faisal Farid	Assistant Professor, Department of Education, University of Education, Lahore, Punjab, Pakistan.

Abstract: *By comparing the effects of using the Grammar Translation Method (GTM) and the Direct Method (DM) on students' academic progress, this study digs into the area of education. The study uses a mixed-methods design for data collection. The performance of a sample consisting of 30 pupils from an education university was assessed during a predetermined time period. Through pre- and post-assessments that gauge linguistic proficiency in terms of vocabulary retention, grammatical accuracy, and reading comprehension using quantitative data. Students shared their teaching approach opinions and experiences through interviews and surveys, collecting qualitative data. The results of this study revealed that the grammar-translation method has better performance when compared with the Direct Method. The quantitative analysis identifies each method's advantages and disadvantages in terms of language skill development. The qualitative data gave a more in-depth knowledge of how students are motivated, engaged, and feel about the two techniques.*

Key Words: Grammar Translation Method, Direct Method, Students' achievement

Corresponding Author: Sabahat Parveen (Assistant Professor, Department of English, University of Education, Lahore, Punjab, Pakistan. Email: sabahat.parveen@ue.edu.pk)

Introduction

By providing empirical data on the efficiency of the Direct Method and the GTM for teaching English to university students, this study contributes to the continuing discussion on language teaching. The results give educators, curriculum designers, and decision-makers important information about how to choose language teaching strategies that are compatible with desired learning outcomes. The current study acts as a first step towards improving language education and students' experiences with language acquisition.

Being effective at teaching vocabulary, grammar rules, and grammatical structures, the Grammar Translation Method [GTM] is a

fantastic tool for pupils who want to learn the English language (Larsen-Freeman, 2000). With the help of teachers who translate word to word for students in their first or mother language, the GTM teaches vocabulary through a selection of tenses' structure and terms using rules (Cevik & Spahiu, 2015). Comparing L1 and target language provide a great comprehension of the structures of both languages, therefore the process of having the students translate a number of phrases is crucial. According to Saylag (2012), the Direct Method allows for direct communication between the learner and the target language. It sheds insight into how the Direct Method and the GTM for teaching English to university students differ in their influence on students' achievement scores.

Grammar Translation Techniques

The grammatical Translation Method, which is frequently based on conventional methods, emphasizes the explicit teaching of grammatical rules as well as translation exercises. This approach's proponents contend that it can aid pupils in understanding linguistic structures. However, it has been questioned whether it is effective in fostering communicative competence and real-world language use (Brown, 2007). The research examines the effects of these two well-known strategies on students' language competency and acquisition levels against the backdrop of language teaching practices. According to Johnson's (2015) research, while the Grammar Translation Method may help students improve their reading and analytical skills, the absence of oral practice may actually make it harder for them to communicate and listen. The objectives of modern language instruction, which prioritize functional communication, are at odds with this.

The Direct Approach

The Direct Method, in contrast, emphasizes immersion language acquisition, where

students are exposed to the target language in real-world situations with little or no use of their home tongue. According to the Direct Method's proponents (Richards & Rodgers, 2014), it improves students' capacity for direct thought and communication in the target language. Studies by Gomez (2018) suggested that the Direct Method, which pushes students to think in the target language rather than translating from their mother tongue, may result in more proficient and confident speakers. However, difficulties like a lack of vocabulary resources and the method's time-consuming nature have also been noted (Smith, 2020).

Comparative Research

Numerous comparison studies have tried to determine which approach is more beneficial. In a 2019 study, Smith and Lee compared the academic performance of students who were taught using the Direct Method and the GTM for teaching English to university students. They discovered that students educated utilizing the Grammar Translation Method did better on written examinations whereas those exposed to the Direct Method demonstrated stronger speaking and listening skills.

Due to variables like teacher efficacy, student motivation, and environmental impacts, these studies frequently encounter methodological difficulties (Brown, 2010). The efficiency of these techniques may also change depending on the age, linguistic background, and cultural setting of the learners (Larsen-Freeman, 2017).

According to Vienne (1998), the grammatical Translation Method will increase understanding of both languages' cultures in addition to grammatical structures and vocabulary. Despite all the advantages of this approach, since the L1 is the one that is prioritized in this situation, the student's exposure to the target language is constrained. Nevertheless, Damiani (2003)

makes it obvious that this GTM allows teachers to communicate with their pupils on a level appropriate for them, as opposed to other systems that require them to use very plain language. The Direct Method [DM], on the other hand, encourages learners to think primarily in English and tries to establish a direct link between experience and expression. Additionally, there should be no L1 involvement in the process, therefore this notion tries to provide learners with an innately positive feeling about language (Ur, 1996; Vermes, 2010).

Both approaches are frequently employed in educational settings. The Direct Method, on the other hand, provides the most exposure to the target language, but the GTM restricts the fulfilment of facilities in the target language. In teaching English, teachers take seriously the Direct Method and the GTM for teaching English to university students (Chen, 2003; Feryok, 2008; Mowlaie & Rahimi, 2010). As a required subject in schools, English language instruction runs from first grade through high school. To help students learn the language as quickly as possible, a variety of methods and strategies are employed (Duff, 1996; Ellis, 1992).

It is claimed that little effort has been made to show the precise scenario involving students despite the research that has already been conducted about the important role of the Direct Method and the GTM in teaching English to university students worldwide (Spahiu & Spahiu, 2018). In order to prove these assumptions, correct or incorrect, the research component of my thesis will focus on gathering as much information as possible (Fischli et al., 1998; Harmer, 1991). The GTM and Direct Method are important approaches for learning and teaching English. The GTM is particularly popular for teaching and learning a new language because it needs little to no specialized knowledge on the part of learners and instructors, who communicate in their native language (Spahiu & Spahiu, 2016). The Direct Method

is also popular. The second approach encourages students to think independently and utilize English as their primary language in class when expressing themselves.

Among the most popular techniques, the Grammar Translation Approach is also widely used as teachers frequently try to elaborate foreign words using its L1 vocabulary (Griffen et al., 2021; Xiu & Xeauyin, 2018). The DM is particularly effective in teaching foreign languages and motivating students to improve English proficiency (Newson, 1998; Malmkjaer, 1998). Teachers often use the most effective teaching techniques in their English classes and face multiple challenges such as overcrowded classes, a lack of funds, pressure from exams and inspections, and learners' limited knowledge of grammar. The current study intends to investigate the Direct Method and the GTM for teaching English to university students to improve their performance in the selected groups of students as well as the viewpoint of their teachers (Spahiu, 2013; Spahiu, 2021).

The primary goal of this research is to explore the attitude of students when they experience different teaching methods of learning English in language learning classes using opinions, presentations, and advantages of the DM and GTM (Stern & Allen, 1992). The major goal of this study is to ascertain students' opinions towards the Grammar Translation approach and Direct Method, which are employed in their English language lessons, as well as how helpful they view this approach and its results.

Study Objectives

The objectives were as under:

1. To compare how the Grammar Translation Method (GTM) and the Direct Method (DM) affect students' academic success when learning a language.
2. Investigate how the Direct Method and the GTM for teaching English to

university students affect students' problem-solving and language analysis.

3. Ascertain how well students maintain language abilities acquired using the Direct Method and the GTM for teaching English to university students over a long-term retention.

4. Compare how engaged, motivated, and interested students are in learning a language when using the Grammar Translation Method against the Direct Method, and determine which method fosters a more effective learning environment.

Research Questions

The following research questions were made to achieve the objectives:

1. How do the Grammar Translation Method (GTM) and the Direct Method (DM) affect students' academic success when learning a language?

2. What is the role of the Direct Method and the GTM in teaching English to university students affecting students' problem-solving and language analysis?

3. How well students maintain language abilities acquired using the Direct Method and the GTM for teaching English to university students over long-term retention.

4. How engaged, motivated, and interested students are in learning a language when using the Grammar Translation Method against the Direct Method and determining which method fosters a more effective learning environment.

Research Methodology

Research Design

To gain a thorough understanding of the effects of the Direct Method and the GTM for teaching English to university students on students' achievement scores, this study used

a mixed-methodologies approach that combines quantitative and qualitative methods. Both quantitative and qualitative research methodologies were used to conduct this study and analyze the data gathered as objectively and precisely as feasible. Participants in this study were students involved in the learning of the English language.

Study Participants

The study population was all semesters of BS English students who were enrolled at the University of Education Faisalabad Campus. Thirty students belonging to semesters 5th and 7th were the participants of the study. They were further divided into two groups comprising A and B groups with 15 students in each group.

Instrument Tools

For quantitative data collection, the test was designed from selected syllabi allocated to both types of students. They were taught the same topics for four weeks using both GTM and DM for both classes. The test results were noted down for comparison. For qualitative analysis, the participants were interviewed to investigate in-depth perceptions of respondents about the importance and utility of both of the teaching methods.

Quantitative Phase

To compare the efficacy of the two approaches, a quasi-experimental design was used. Group A used the grammar-translation method, and Group B used the direct method for English language learning. Both groups took pre- and post-tests to gauge their initial language skills and subsequent growth.

Qualitative Phase

To collect qualitative information on participants' perspectives, experiences, and attitudes toward the teaching methods, semi-structured interviews were performed with a

subset of participants from each group. This qualitative phase attempted to offer a more in-depth understanding of the variables affecting students' academic progress.

Data Collection

A standardized language test was given to students before and after the intervention period to assess their language proficiency and monitor improvement. Lessons in the classroom were observed to better understand each method's application and the effects it has on the participation and engagement of the students. Selection of Participants were subjected to semi-structured interviews to elicit their thoughts on the instructional strategies and how they are seen to affect student learning.

Data Analysis

To identify significant variations in

achievement between the two groups, quantitative data were analyzed using the proper statistical technique such as a t-test. The interview data were analyzed qualitatively in multiple stages, including data introduction, theme frame definition, indexing, tabulation, and categorization. The results were derived from the quantitative processing of the survey data, which were presented as percentages, tables, and graphs with annotations. For qualitative data, interviews were conducted and transcribed for thematic analysis. The quantitative data were analyzed using a t-test in SPSS.

Results

RQ: What is the difference between the achievement scores of students studying with the help of the Direct Method and the GTM of learning English at the university level?

Table 1

Comparison of GTM and DM with Achievement Scores

Locality	N	Mean	SD	*Df*	t-value	p-value
GTM	15	40.30	.286	28	1.204	.001**
DM	15	30.25	.892			

**p<0.01

A T-test was applied to compare the Direct Method and the GTM for teaching English to university students on students' achievement scores. Results indicated a significant difference between GTM (M=40.30), and DM (M=30.25), t (28)2.234, p<0.01. It revealed that the grammar-translation method has better

Performance when compared with the Direct Method.

RQ: How engaged, motivated, and interested students are in learning a language when using the Grammar Translation Method against the Direct Method, and determine which method fosters a more effective learning environment.

Table 2

Students' Perceptions about using GTM and DM

S.No	Indicators	Mean	sd
1	GTM is better to understand and comprehend	3.27	.351
2	The direct method is difficult to perceive	3.18	. 131
3	Familiarity with GTM	3.47	.214

S.No	Indicators	Mean	sd
4	Use of Traditional Pedagogies with GTM	3. 59	.434
5	Lack of parental support with DM	3. 52	.164
6	Absence of Language Learning Environment in DM	3.36	.411
7	Absence of Language Labs for communication	3.39	.327

Table 2 shows the engaged, motivated, and interested students are in learning a language when using the Grammar Translation Method against the Direct Method and determines which method fosters a more effective learning environment. In our institutions, no language lab is available where students may practice for direct method. They become easier and more facilitated with GTM as they have studied the very method in their childhood. For them, the direct method is somewhat difficult to understand and comprehend.

Observations and Conclusions

This study uncovered more information about how teachers use the Direct Method and the GTM for teaching English to university students, as well as what the students think and feel about it. The group of students selected for the study portion reacted in the same way as the prior research claimed, taking into account the previous studies and research done in the past about this subject (Anabokay & Suryasa, 2019). This study aims to contribute to the pedagogical discussion surrounding language teaching methodologies and advance our knowledge of efficient practices by conducting a thorough investigation into the effects of the Direct Method and the GTM for teaching English to university students on students' achievement in second language acquisition.

Furthermore, because these techniques facilitate a quicker grasp of the language and particular grammar structures, both students and teachers found them to be highly helpful and common in their English language programs. This research looks into the advantages and drawbacks of using these two approaches (Menaka & Sankar, 2019). This study demonstrates the considerable effects of the Grammar Translation Method and Direct Method with regard to the information acquired and examined from the students' questionnaire.

As a result, English language instructors must help their pupils become aware of alternate teaching techniques and strategies while simultaneously encouraging active language processing. Additionally, English language instructors will need to reaffirm to the students the need to create an independent and organized approach to language learning.

Although various methods for teaching English, the Direct Method and the GTM for teaching English to university students are among the most popular. These techniques may have originated in the 16th century, but they are still widely employed today in English language classrooms. Although these two approaches differ from one another, they both strive to teach English in the most straightforward way feasible. The Direct Method and the GTM for teaching English to university students are two different strategies for teaching languages, both having advantages and disadvantages. The Grammar Translation Method might be advantageous for understanding structures, but the Direct Method seems to promote stronger practical communication abilities. However, there are drawbacks and limitations to both approaches. The subtle implications of these strategies on students' academic progress in various educational contexts require further study.

The Grammar Translation Method combines the translation of literary materials

with the explanation of grammar rules in the student's native tongue. This approach is popular primarily because it requires no specialized knowledge. the teachers' proficiency in their mother tongue. However, since there are no linguistic issues, it is simpler for the kids to converse in their home tongue. The Direct Method, on the other hand, aids in the acquisition of correct word pronunciation, better understanding of phrases, essential in the teaching and learning of idioms, and most importantly, better language fluency. Additionally, this approach teaches all language skills—listening, speaking, reading, and writing—and specifically aims to help students develop speech fluency. The success of language teaching strategies like the Direct Method and the GTM for teaching English to university students depends on the achievement of the students. A balanced approach to language training might be achieved by combining components of the two techniques or by incorporating them with contemporary communicative approaches. In order to effectively meet the different learning needs of pupils, educators must carefully weigh the advantages and disadvantages of each approach as language education progresses.

Discussion

The impact of the Direct Method and the GTM for learning English to university students on students' achievement scores. It revealed that the grammar-translation method has better performance when compared with the Direct Method. The learners are more engaged, motivated, and interested students are in learning a language when using the Grammar Translation Method against the Direct Method and determining which method fosters a more effective learning environment. In our institutions, no language lab is available where students may practice for direct method. They become easier and more facilitated with GTM as they have studied the very method in their childhood. For them, the direct method is somewhat difficult to understand and comprehend.

The Grammar Translation Method and Students' Achievement: This conventional method places a strong emphasis on translating texts between the target and native languages as well as explicitly teaching grammar rules. Supporters contend that this approach improves students' comprehension of linguistic patterns and helps them strengthen their analytical skills (Brown, 2007). GTM is criticized for frequently encouraging rote memorization and failing to develop good communication skills (Richards & Rodgers, 2014).

While students demonstrated a solid understanding of grammatical principles, their conversational ability remained limited, according to recent research by Smith et al. (2020), which compared students taught using the GTM. This implies that while GTM may aid in some elements of language acquisition, its efficacy in fostering all-around language proficiency is debatable.

Students' Achievement and the Direct Method: The Direct Method, in contrast, places more emphasis on immersive spoken communication-based language learning than on translation. This method, which emphasizes oral expression and listening abilities, seeks to mimic the natural process of language acquisition. The Direct Method, according to proponents, speeds up language learning and improves students' capacity for thinking in the target language (Stevens, 2018). The method may not provide the necessary framework for systematic grammar learning, according to opponents (Kumaravadivelu, 2006).

Recent research by Chen and Lee (2019) highlighted a significant improvement in oral competency and spontaneous language use among students who were taught utilizing the Direct Method. This shows that the method's focus on immersion and communication may have a major impact on language proficiency as a whole. It was clear that both the Direct Method and the GTM for teaching English to university students have advantages and drawbacks when evaluating their effects. Although GTM seems to give students a strong foundation in grammar principles and textual comprehension, it might fall short in terms of developing real-world communication skills. On the other side, the Direct Method may overlook formal grammar instruction in favour of oral proficiency and the use of natural language.

Practical Implications of the Study

This study is anticipated to shed light on how well the Direct Method and the GTM for teaching English to university students support students' success in learning a second language. Based on their targeted learning results, language instructors can use the findings as a guide when choosing effective teaching strategies.

Future Research

The study's limitations may include possible differences in the calibre of instruction provided by different teachers, the restricted applicability of findings to other languages, and the intervention's brief duration. Future studies could investigate these strategies using a range of languages, educational levels, and time spans.

References

Brown, H. D. (2007). *Principles of language learning and teaching.* Pearson Education.

Brown, H. D. (2010). *Teaching by principles: An interactive approach to language pedagogy.* Pearson Education.

Cevik, Y., & Spahiu, I. (2015). An Assessment of Teacher Training in English Preparatory Programs: A Sustainable Solution. *ANGLISTICUM. Journal of the Association-Institute for English Language and American Studies, 1*(3&4), 44-50.

Chen, T. (2003). Reticence in class and on-line: two ESL students' experiences with communicative language teaching. *System, 31*(2), 259–281. https://doi.org/10.1016/s0346-251x(03)00024-1

Chen, W., & Lee, W. (2019). Investigating the Effectiveness of the Direct Method in College English Vocabulary Teaching. *English Language Teaching, 12*(9), 70-78.

Damiani, A. J. (2003). The grammar translation method of language teaching.

Feryok, A. (2008). An Armenian English language teacher's practical theory of communicative language teaching. *System, 36*(2), 227–240. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.system.2007.09.004

Fischli, A. E., Godfraind, T., & Purchase, I. F. H. (1998). Natural and anthropogenic environmental oestrogens: the scientific basis for risk assessment. *Pure Appl. Chem, 70*(9), 1863-1865. http://moureu.iupac.org/publications/pac/special/0998/fischli.html

Gomez, M. L. (2018). *Language teaching methods: A critical analysis.* Routledge.

Harmer, J. (1991). *The practice of English teaching.* London & New York: Longman, 175.

Johnson, K. E. (2015). *Second language teacher education: A sociocultural perspective.* Routledge.

Kumaravadivelu, B. (2006). *Understanding Language Teaching: From Method to Post-Method.* Routledge.

Larsen-Freeman, D. (2000). *Techniques and principles in language teaching.* Oxford University.

Larsen-Freeman, D. (2017). On the roles of context in linguistic analysis: Cognitive, communicative, and ecological. *Modern Language Journal, 101*(1), 6-18.

Malmkjær, K. (Ed.). (1998). *Translation & language teaching: Language teaching & translation.* Routledge.

Newson, D. (1998). Translation and Foreign Language Learning: in K. Malmkaer (ed.), Translation and language teaching: Language teaching and translation.

Richards, J. C., & Rodgers, T. S. (2014). *Approaches and methods in language teaching.* Cambridge University Press.

Saylag, R. (2012). Self-Reflection on the Teaching Practice of English as a Second Language: Becoming the Critically Reflective Teacher. Procedia - Social and Behavioral Sciences, 46, 3847–3851. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.sbspro.2012.06.158

Smith, E. R. (2020). Language teaching methods: A literature review. *Annual Review of Applied Linguistics, 40*, 27-44.

Smith, J. A., & Lee, M. H. (2019). Comparative analysis of the Grammar Translation Method and the Direct Method. *Language Teaching Research, 23*(2), 129-148.

Smith, L. R., Johnson, M., Anderson, K., & Williams, C. (2020). Comparative Analysis of Language Teaching Methods: A Case Study of Grammar Translation and Communicative Language Teaching. *Modern Language Journal, 104*(2), 256-273.

Spahiu, I. (2013). Using native language in ESL classroom. *International Journal of English Language & Translation Studies*, *1*(2), 243.

Spahiu, I., & Kryeziu, N. (2021). Grammatical mistakes of Albanian students in learning English as a foreign language. *Linguistics and Culture Review*, *5*(S3), 814–822. https://doi.org/10.21744/lingcure.v5nS3.1366

Spahiu, I., & Spahiu, E. (2016). Teacher's role in classroom management and traditional methods. *ANGLISTICUM. Journal of the Association-Institute for English Language and American Studies*, *2*(3), 91-100.

Spahiu, I., & Spahiu, E. K. (2018). The Role of Social Interaction in Language Acquisition. *Knowledge International Journal*, *23*(5), 1399-1401. http://ikm.mk/ojs/index.php/kij/article/view/3518

Stern, H. H., & Allen, J. P. B. (1992). *Issues and options in language teaching*. Oxford University Press, USA.

Stevens, V. (2018). *The Direct Method: A Guide for Teachers.* Cambridge University Press.

Suryasa, I. W., Sudipa, I. N., Puspani, I. A. M., & Netra, I. M. (2019). Translation Procedure of Happy Emotion of English into Indonesian in Kṛṣṇa Text. *Journal of Language Teaching and Research*, *10*(4), 738–746. https://doi.org/10.17507/jltr.1004.08

Ur, P. (1996). *A Course in Language Teaching.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Pres.

Vermes, A. (2010). Translation in foreign language teaching: A brief overview of pros and cons. *Eger Journal of English Studies*, *10*(1), 83-93. https://core.ac.uk/download/pdf/159417561.pdf