

Grammar-Translation and Direct Methods in Teaching English in the Educational Institution with Specific Conditions of Study

Olena B. Shenderuk*

Foreign Languages Department, Academy of the State Penitentiary Service, Chernihiv, Ukraine

Olha L. Tamarkina

Foreign Language Department, Biotechnological Faculty, Sumy National Agrarian University, Sumy, Ukraine

Tetiana P. Pernarivska

Department of Modern European Languages, University of State Fiscal Service of Ukraine, Irpin, Ukraine

Abstract

Knowledge of foreign languages to a great extent depends on a teacher's methods and methodological approaches. Among the number of certain methods we choose grammar-translation and direct methods. In spite of the fact that these methods were popular last century, they are still widely used nowadays. The usage of them presented their fundamental advantages and some disadvantages, used in our practice. This paper was written on the basis of theoretical aspects' research of the problem, on analysis and synthesis of scientific literature and on personal experience of teaching English during nearly one year in Chernihiv Academy of the State Penitentiary Service (Ukraine). During this period of time we were observing the problem of teaching English with the help of grammar-translation and direct methods by the students and cadets who were taught with the help of these methods. Studying the problem of grammar-translation and direct methods in teaching English is acute because of increasing role of English, on the one side, and demands which are promoted to future law specialists, on the other hand. The significance of this issue arises in detection of peculiarities in teaching English in the educational institution with specific conditions of study. Solving this problem with the help of differentiated approach to teaching English to students and cadets facilitates high qualitative changes. Novelty is in applying famous methods such as grammar-translation and direct methods in the new surroundings. The results of our work were described and compared in this paper. The findings revealed the implementation of the mentioned methods in the high institution with specific conditions of studying. The described methods can be admitted by other foreign language teachers. However, we reached a conclusion that the mentioned methods may be modified.

Keywords: English teaching methods; Approaches; Advantages and disadvantages; Cadets and students; Peculiarities of study.



CC BY: [Creative Commons Attribution License 4.0](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/)

1. Introduction

Needless to say, the role of foreign languages has a vital importance nowadays (Fazal *et al.*, 2016). It holds a dominant position in all spheres of human activity. To update your knowledge and learn about new intentions you should learn English well (Reddy, 2012; Shatrova, 2014). The increasing role of English made the issue of various methods, techniques and approaches very actual. So, nowadays there are many different approaches for studying and teaching foreign languages. The analysis of the literature allows us to highlight different strategies for learning foreign languages that is: according to Karatas *et al.* (2017), there are 3 sub-dimensions of learning and studying approaches. These are deep approach, surface and strategic one (Karatas *et al.*, 2017).

Besides, there is a wide-angle approach to teach English for Academic Legal Purposes and a narrow-angled approach. The first one means that courses focus on common core of skills. The teacher gives general academic skills. A narrow-angled approach means a genre-based approach developed around Cases (Karatas *et al.*, 2017). Problem-Question: Made-up legal problem. Students are expected to offer several possible solutions using legal arguments and counterarguments. It can be based on co-operation, collaboration and team-teaching.

Other researchers in the field of approaches of teaching foreign languages highlight such of them:

1. The Humanistic Tradition. The main principles of it, to his point of view, that success or failure in language teaching depend not so much on whether one adopts inductive or deductive techniques for teaching grammar, no one engages in meaningful practice rather than in pattern drills, but in the extent to which one caters to the learner's affective domain.
2. Community language learning. The primary aim of it is to create a genuinely, warm and supportive 'community' among the learners and move them from complete dependence on the teacher to complete autonomy.
3. The Silent way. It was devised that the learning of a first and subsequent languages is a mysterious process. He also thought that it is necessary to develop in learners an autonomy from the teacher. But this method is highly controlled and manipulative of the students.

4. Suggestopedia. Under this strategy communication is a two-plane process. Language is the first of the two planes. In the second plane, there are factors, which influence the linguistic message (the way one dresses, non-verbal behaviors that affect the linguistic message).
5. The Second Language Acquisition Tradition. It means the acquisition and learning processes. The acquisition process is very similar to what goes on in first language acquisition, whereas learning is a conscious process that helps the learner cope with the target language in the short term. Here are some subdivisions of this methodology such as the natural approach and the total physical response (Holubnycha, 2017).
6. Task-based learning (a form of communicative language teaching as communicative activities based on meaningful interaction among learners and some focus on grammar).
7. Communicative language learning (very close to task-based one, but the accent is made on story-telling, questions are central focus of the class) (Ngai and Janusch, 2018; Sandorova, 2016).
8. Comprehension (comprehensible input but little interaction, no attention to grammar).
9. Content-based language teaching (has a subject in the target language such as immersion, bilingual, or content and Language Integrated Learning programs).
10. Grammar-translation (focused on grammar).
11. Direct method (emphasis on correct pronunciation and classroom activities are in the target language).
12. Eclectic method (focused on vocabulary) (Katemba and Hulu, 2013).
13. Method of second language acquisition (Dewaele, 2015).
14. Method of enacting the stories, games, conversation, competitions, creative assignments, multimedia (Anburaj *et al.*, 2014; Cho *et al.*, 2018; Ozer and Kilic, 2018).

2. Materials and Methods

This is an exploratory research which focuses on grammar-translation and direct methods in teaching English in the educational institution with specific conditions of study. The research process started with a review of existing literature. Then we used Approach to Learning and Studying Inventory, one-way ANOVA test, Independent test, Pearson the correlation analysis and Haddock's table for comparison the results of students and cadets who were taught with grammar-translation and direct methods.

High educational establishments in different countries utilize different methods and approaches for teaching foreign languages. We suppose there is a difference in the meaning of the term "method" and "approach". We strongly agree with the point of view of the researches who consider that the main thing you should take into consideration while choosing the method is educational objectives, efficiency of teacher, size of class, learning needs and resources (Manjula, 2017). In our paper we deal with grammar-translation and direct methods. The literature provides for and against arguments for both methods, but the researches do not seem to get sufficient attention to the issue of grammar-translation and direct methods in the terms of high educational institution with specific conditions of study.

Analysis of recent research and publications relevant to the specified topic shows that scientists studied its different aspects. Thus, some scientists underlined the importance of different approaches and methods of studying English (Anburaj *et al.*, 2014; Anwar and Fitriani, 2016; Asl, 2015; Fazal *et al.*, 2016; Holubnycha, 2017; Karatas *et al.*, 2017; Karunakaran and Babu, 2013; Katemba and Hulu, 2013; Kohli, 1984; Manjula, 2017; Ölçer, 2014; Rahman, 2012; Reddy, 2012; Siregar, 2018). Some researchers studied certain methods of teaching English in certain education, such as Malaysia (Thai, n.d.), Turkey (Shatrova, 2014). Others emphasized the differences between civilian and military cadets in the methodological approach (Bartone *et al.*, 2007), some others made research concerning the process of socialization of professional officers of the military academies (Caforio, 1998). Language and cultural link was described by Kitishat *et al.* (2015). Modern techniques and methods of learning foreign language in high educational establishment were examined by Voronova (2014). Such aspect of learning English as linguodidactical peculiarities of individualization while studying in a military high establishment was discovered by Syssoyev (2013).

Therefore, knowing the point of view of practitioners might help in better understanding of problems and challenges teachers of English face now, in general, and legal education with specific conditions of study in particular.

So, the purpose of this paper was to examine the usage of grammar-translation and direct methods in English classes in terms of high educational institution with specific conditions of study.

3. Results and Discussion

What are the differences between grammar-translation and direct methods in the term of high educational institution with specific conditions of study?

Grammar-translation method derived from the classical or traditional one of teaching Greek and Latin. It is a classical way of teaching English (Anwar and Fitriani, 2016). The main idea of this method was learning grammar rules and then applying them by translating sentences. It was predominant method in Europe in the 19th century. It is focused on reading and writing. Vocabulary is based solely on the text used. The words are introduced through word lists dictionary and memorization. The grammar rules are presented. The translation of vocabulary is also presented. Grammar is taught inductively. This method was in use from 1840 to 1940 (Anburaj *et al.*, 2014; Dewaele, 2015; Fazal *et al.*, 2016; Karunakaran and Babu, 2013; Katemba and Hulu, 2013). Among advantages of this method are

the following ones: it suits average and below average teacher; communication does not cause linguist problem; it is useful in overcrowded classrooms (Manjula, 2017). The negative side effects of this method were described by Ölçer (2014). The researcher Khan (2016) examined the effectiveness and use of Grammar-translation method in English colleges; Biplab (2018) analyzed its use in Bangladesh EFL Classrooms. Such system of learning a language was very rigid and learning in this way students were not able to embrace the variety and richness of the spoken language (Tamura, 2006). Siregar (2018), in his article elaborated on the use of Grammar-translation method in teaching translation to students of Economics and Engineering Departments. Prastyo (2015), stated the importance of using this method for teaching linguistics competence. Teaching English combining classical Grammar-translation and modern communicative language teaching was highlighted by Kaharuddin (2018). Mondal (2012) investigated Grammar-translation and communicative language teaching for learning English in Bangladesh, drawing our attention to the fact that among other methods this one is used with its full prestige. Abdullah (2013), concluded that this method was very valuable because all other methods sprang from it.

Direct method was established in Germany and France around 1900, as a response to Grammar-translation one, is an encouragement for speaking in real life situations (Stoter, 2006). The English teachers focus on speaking and listening, practicing vocabulary, using new words in sentences and situations. Grammar is taught inductively. Translation is allowed in rare cases. To our point of view this method has certain advantages as to compare with other ones (Table 1). More emphasis on oral work, speaking is provided. Besides, new vocabulary makes learning English interesting and lively that motivates the students. It is a good conversation practice and speaking is the most important skill in learning foreign languages. Moreover, the role of a student is more active than in the grammar-translation method, for example (Anwar and Fitriani, 2016; Holubnycha, 2017; Karatas et al., 2017; Karunakaran and Babu, 2013; Kohli, 1984; Manjula, 2017; Reddy, 2012; Thai, n.d.; Voronova, 2014).

Table-1. The differences between grammar-translation and direct methods (Holubnycha, 2017; Karunakaran and Babu, 2013; Katemba and Hulu, 2013; Manjula, 2017; Ölçer, 2014)

	Grammar-translation method	Direct method
Theory of Language	Language as a system of rules	No single theory
Theory of Learning	Didactic, ‘jug and mug’ theory	Natural, like a child learning mother tongue
Goals	Academic knowledge, learning about the language, literature, etc.	Rapid, practical command of language
Main Skills Focus	Reading and writing	Speaking
Typical Exercise Types	Drilling	Dialogues
Typical Forms of Interaction	Interaction with the language system, embodied in controlled materials	Interaction with other people in pair and group work
Role of Teacher	The teacher dominates and wholly controls the learners	The secondary role, coordinator, consultant
Attitude to Errors	Errors must be prevented at all costs	Errors are viewed as learning steps
Attitude to use of Mother Tongue	Use of native language	No using mother tongue
Criticism of the Method	It failed to produce oral fluency in English; no link between text words and real life situations; little attention to speaking; undermining the effectiveness of the learning by using L1 as a focus language; wrong idea of what language is; less learners’ autonomy and motivation; rather boring; actual meaning is diverted	Little systematic structural practice; the risk of inducing incorrect rules; can be effectively used only by teachers who are native speakers; a great deal of teacher-energy is required; less attention to reading and writing; expensive method; needs only competent teachers; is not suitable for rural areas

Hypotheses:

- 1) There is a difference in the results of students and cadets who were taught with different methods (grammar-translation and direct methods). Those who were taught with direct method must have demonstrated better results.
- 2) There is a difference between the students and cadets who taught with grammar-translation and direct methods in honor of the students. The supposition was the students studied better because they have more opportunities for it, studying in the institution with special conditions of training.

Experiment: The experiment took place at the Academy of the State Penitentiary Service in Chernihiv (Ukraine), the institution with specific conditions of studying. Cadets and students study at full-time and correspondence departments. Cadets get free education at the Academy, students must pay tuition fee. About 1,500 future specialists get their training here. Cadets and students major in law, law enforcement and psychology and economics. Firstly, two groups of students took part in the experiment. The first group of students was taught with the grammar-translation method and the second one with direct method during a year in classes of English. Then the

similar research was made with two groups of cadets who were taught with the grammar-translation and direct method during a year. After that the results of students and cadets were compared. This study was conducted during 2017-2018 academic year with 20 students taught with grammar and translation method and 19 students taught with direct method. Then the similar survey was performed with 46 cadets who were taught with the help of grammar and translation method and 112 with direct one.

In our survey we used Approach to Learning and Studying Inventory (ALSI) which consists of five-factor components: Surface Learning (4 items), Deep Learning (6 items), Monitoring Studying (4 items), Effort Management (2 items and Organized Studying (2 items). Participants choose the answer they feel most represents to extent to which a statement is true of them (1=Not at all true of me to 5=Very true of me) (Karatas *et al.*, 2017).

Later we used One-way ANOVA test for comparison the results of work in two groups of students and cadets who were taught with different methods: one group with grammar and translational method and the other one was taught with direct one. We have chosen this method to define whether there were any differences in students and cadets' studying approaches in terms of their Academy.

Besides, Independent test and Pearson correlation analysis were used to determine whether there is statistical evidence that the associated population means are significantly different and to see if the two variables have a systematic relationship. Finally, we used Haddock's table to measure the distinct evaluation of force in correlation communication (Hastie *et al.*, 2008).

Table 2 and 3 demonstrate the descriptive statistics and findings of One-Way ANOVA analysis.

Table-2. Means, standard deviations and scores of students' who were taught with grammar-translation and direct method

Approach	Sub-dimensions	Method	N	Mean	S.D.	t	p
Surface	Surface Learning	Grammar-translation	20	4.32	2.20	-27	-4
		Direct	19	4.37	2.04		
Deep	Deep Learning	Grammar-translation	20	2.03	3.22	-29	-2
		Direct	19	2.36	1.08		
	Monitoring Studying	Grammar-translation	20	3.01	1.00	-11	-6
		Direct	19	2.06	1.73		
Strategic	Effort Management	Grammar-translation	20	2.25	0.86	-29	-6
		Direct	19	2.09	0.94		
	Organized Studying	Grammar-translation	20	2.35	1.29	-26	-8
		Direct	19	2.16	1.50		

Table-3. Means, standard deviations and scores of cadets' who were taught with grammar-translation and direct methods

Approach	Sub-dimensions	Method	N	Mean	S.D.	t	p
Surface	Surface Learning	Grammar-translation	46	13.37	2.30	-37	-14
		Direct	112	13.61	2.04		
Deep	Deep Learning	Grammar-translation	46	11.05	3.42	-39	-42
		Direct	112	11.38	3.08		
	Monitoring Studying	Grammar-translation	46	7.07	2.14	-21	-16
		Direct	112	6.92	1.73		
Strategic	Effort Management	Grammar-translation	46	4.25	1.86	-39	-56
		Direct	112	4.09	1.94		
	Organized Studying	Grammar-translation	46	5.25	1.29	-36	-28
		Direct	112	5.06	1.50		

Hypothesis 1: predicted that students who were taught by the mean of direct method had better results than the ones who did it with grammar-translation method. The results can be seen in Table 2.

The mean difference is significant at the 0, 5 levels. The Table 2 demonstrated the differences between the results of students who were taught by mean of grammar-translation and direct methods. According to analyzed date, it can be seen that there is no significant difference between those who were taught with different methods. So, it can be suggested that method is not a significant variable on students' studying approaches.

Then we made the same comparison with cadets.

And we saw practically the same results which did not prove our hypothesis.

Finally, we compared the obtained results to confirm or disprove the second hypothesis.

As it is observed in Table 4, there is statistically significant difference between students and cadets in terms of studying methods ($t= 65$; $p<0, 05$). Accordingly, it can be supposed that status is a significant variable on learners' methods. So, the hypothesis stating that academic status of a learner had an impact on results of studying methods of English was confirmed. It means that both students and cadets differ in their results concerning methods of teaching English.

Table-4. Differences between students and cadets in terms of studying methods (grammar-translation and direct)

	Status	N	Mean	S.D.	t	p
Grammar-translation and direct methods	Student	56	2.80	1.57	-65	0,4
	Cadet	122	2.95	1.43		

*The main difference is significant at the 0,5 level.

4. Conclusions

So, it may be noted that both methods of teaching English (grammar-translation and direct ones) have advantages and disadvantages. From the results it is concluded that there is no difference what method of studying is used to teach English. The obtained results did not prove our first hypothesis. So, we predicted that the students who were taught by the mean of direct method had better results as to compare the similar group what was taught with grammar-translation method. But the results demonstrated that there was no significant difference in the chosen method. Practically the same result we obtained comparing two groups of cadets who were taught with direct and grammar-translation method. Our second hypothesis was proved and the comparison of the students and cadets' results demonstrated their difference. So, we can say that specific conditions of studying in the Academy influence on its learners results. Students have more free time to prepare for English classes in comparison with cadets. Moreover, cadets have strict regime and too little time they can allow themselves for studying foreign language. But, as we know, any foreign language demands constant practice. Personal qualities and characteristics, motivation and professionalism of a teacher are the main factors of this issue. Thus, teachers of English should find rational ways out of this situation. They should think how to motivate the learners, help them overcome the language barrier in certain specific conditions of our educational institution and a small number of academic hours for teaching foreign language.

References

- Abdullah, S., 2013. "A contrastive study of the grammar translation and the direct methods of teaching." In *3rd International Conference on Business, Economics, Management and Behavioral Sciences (ICBEMBS'2013)*, 26-27 January, 2013, Hong Kong; China. pp. 124-28.
- Anburaj, G., Christopher, G. and Ming, N. (2014). Innovative methods of teaching English language. *Journal of Humanities and Social Science*, 19(8): 62-65.
- Anwar, C. and Fitriani, D. (2016). Total physical response and direct method in students' vocabulary mastery learning. *Shahih*, 1(1): 83-97.
- Asl, E. (2015). Comparative study of grammar translation method (GTM) and communicative language teaching (CLT) in language teaching methodology. *International Journal of Science and Research Methodology*, 1(3): 16-25.
- Bartone, P., Snook, S., Forsythe, G., Lewis, P. and Bullis, R. (2007). Psychosocial development and leader performance of military officer cadets. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 18(5): 490-504.
- Biplab, A. (2018). Use of grammar translation method in Bangladesh EFL classrooms. Available: http://dspace.bracu.ac.bd/xmlui/bitstream/handle/10361/10767/16163003_ENH.pdf?sequence=1&isAllowed=y
- Caforio, G. (1998). The European cadet: Professional socialization in Military Academies, A cross national study. Available: https://www.academia.edu/835131/The_European_cadet_professional_socialisation_in_military_academies_a_crossnational_study
- Cho, K., Lee, S., Joo, M. and Backer, B. (2018). The effects of using mobile devices on students' achievement in language learning, A meta-analysis. *International Journal of Higher Education*, 5(3): 20-31.
- Dewaele, J. (2015). On emotions in foreign language teacher. *The Leanguage Teacher*, 39(3): 13-15.
- Fazal, S., Majoka, M. and Ahmad, M. (2016). Integration of grammar translation method with communicative approach: A research synthesis. *International Research Journal of Arts and Humanities*, 44(44): 121-30.
- Hastie, T., Tibshirani, R. and Friedman, J. (2008). The elements of statistical learning data mining, inference, and prediction. Available: <https://web.stanford.edu/~hastie/Papers/ESLII.pdf>
- Holubnycha, L. (2017). Experience of teaching English basing on educational partnership in non-language Universities. *Journal of Linguistics and Literature*, 1(1): 1-5.
- Kaharuddin, A. (2018). The communicative grammar translation method: A practical method to teach communication skills of English. *ETERNAL*, 4(2): 232-54.
- Karatas, H., Alci, B., Balyer, A. and Bademcioglu, M. (2017). An examination of university students' learning and studying approaches. *New Trends and Issues Proceedings on Humanities and Social Sciences*, 4(1): 344-51.
- Karunakaran, T. and Babu, S. (2013). English language teaching methods, An over view. *The Dawn Journal*, 2(2): 519-35.

- Katemba, C. and Hulu, G. (2013). Comparison of grammar translation method and eclectic method in enhancing students' vocabulary achievement. *Journal of Education and Practice*, 4(5): 28-38.
- Khan, A. (2016). The effectiveness of grammar translation method in teaching and learning of English language at intermediate level. *International Journal of Institutional and Industrial Research*, 1(1): 22-25.
- Kitishat, A., Kayed, M. and Allah, H. (2015). Second language learning and the cultural knowledge, the inseparable process: A case study of studying English at Jordanian Universities. *Journal of Literature, Language and Linguistics*, 11(2015): 88-96.
- Kohli, A. K. (1984). *Techniques of teaching English*. Dhanpat Rai & Sons: Delhi.
- Manjula, R. (2017). Methods of teaching English, A survey. *International Journal of Engineering Technology Science and Research*, 4(5): 295-98.
- Mondal, N. (2012). English language through the combination of grammar translation method and communicative Language teaching. *Academia Arena*, 4(6): 20-24.
- Ngai, P. and Janusch, S. (2018). Professional development for TESL Teachers, A Course in transcultural pragmatics. *The Electronic Journal for English as a Second Language*, 22(3): 1-26.
- Ölçer, A. (2014). The negative aspect of the grammar-translation method (GTM) in language teaching. Available: http://www.academia.edu/32375069/The_Negative_Aspect_of_the_Grammar-Translation_Method_GTM_in_Language_Teaching_in_2014
- Ozer, O. and Kilic, F. (2018). The effect of mobile-assisted language learning environment on EFL students' academic achievement, cognitive load and acceptance of mobile learning tools. *EURASIA Journal of Mathematics, Science and Technology Education*, 14(7): 2915-28.
- Prastyo, H. (2015). The implementation of grammar translation method (GTM) and Communicative Language teaching (CLT) in teaching integrated English. *Indonesian EFL Journal*, 1(2): 170-82.
- Rahman, F. (2012). Grammar translation method (GTM). Available: https://www.academia.edu/32853908/GRAMMAR_TRANSLATION_METHOD_GTM
- Reddy, S. (2012). Importance of English and different methods of teaching English. *Journal of Business Management and Social Sciences Research*, 1(3): 25-28.
- Sandorova, Z. (2016). The intercultural component in an EFL course-book package. *Journal of Language and Cultural Education*, 4(3): 178-203.
- Shatrova, Z. (2014). Teaching English to engineering students in the contemporary world: A case study on a Ukrainian and Turkish Universities. *Journal of Education and Practice*, 5(11): 149-56.
- Siregar, R. (2018). Grammar based translation method in translation teaching. *International Journal of English Language and Translation Studies*, 2(6): 148-54.
- Stoter, M. (2006). *The Direct method in foreign language teaching in the Netherlands*. Master Thesis.
- Syssoyev, V. (2013). Linguodidactic features of individualization of teaching the English language in military higher education institution. Available: <https://www.academia.edu/29735833>
- Tamura, E. (2006). Concepts of the methodology of teaching English. *The Economic Journal of Takasaki City University of Economics*, 48(3): 169-88.
- Thai, A. (n.d.). Methods of teaching English. Available: https://www.academia.edu/4411247/Methods_of_Teaching_English
- Voronova, E. (2014). Modern technologies and methods of teaching foreign language in higher educational institution. *Science and Educational Perspectives*, 7(1): 189-94.