A COMPARISON BETWEEN GRAMMAR-TRANSLATION METHOD AND DIRECT METHOD IN IMPROBING PUPIL'S VOCAB ULARY ACHIEVEMENT

Caroline V.Katemba & Elizabeth Riana Sormin
Departmen of English Education, Universitas Advent Indonesia,
Bandung, Indonesia

ABSTRACT

Nowadays, many language teachers use different kinds of teaching method. Applying a certain method is one of the important factors in language teaching, especially in teaching vocabulary. Vocabulary is one of the most important parts in learning a language. Therefore, teacher has to be more concern on the method for the effectiveness of the process itself.

From the above reason, this study entitled "°A Comparison between Grammar-Translation Method and Direct Method in Improving Students' Vocabulary Achievement" was employed to examine their difference in teaching vocabulary to the pupils.

The participants were grade 6 pupils of Karyawangi Elementary School Parongpong, Bandung. This study was divided into three sessions: the pre-test, the implementation of Grammar-Translation Method and Direct Method, and the post-test. In the pre-test and post-test, the multiple-choice test was administered to them. In the treatment session, the researcher taught Grammar-Translation Method (GTM) to one group and the other group with the Direct Method (DM).

The data obtained as follows: n1 (GTM group population) = 31, n2 (DM group population) = 27, a = 0.05. The mean of the pre-test of GTM group was 29.61 and the mean of Direct Method was 36.37. After the treatments, the mean of the post-test of GTM group was 46.45 while the mean of the post-test of DM group was 46.22. The range mean of GTM group was 16.84 while the DM group was 9.85. It means that there is a significant difference on the pupils' vocabulary improvement. It can also be concluded that Grammar-Translation Method is better than Direct Method in improving pupils' vocabulary achievement.

Keywords: Grammar-translation, Direct method

Background of Study

English is much needed nowadays. People around the world use English to communicate with each other. Communication is an essential part of human interaction. One gets many benefits in his personal and professional life if he masters effective communication. On the other hand, ineffective communication can give problems and misunderstanding. Mastering communication, one needs to know many words. The more words one knows, the more he will be able to communicate his ideas to people. Cate (2007) cited in Whorf

(1956) said: "Your ability to think a thought depends on knowing words capable of expressing the thought. If you do not know the words, you cannot express the thought and you might not even be able to formulate it."

In line with it, Zimmerman (1997) stated: "Vocabulary is central to language and of critical importance to the typical learner. Lack of vocabulary knowledge will result in lack of meaningful communication." Meara (2001) said, "My own view is that word lists have an important role to play in the acquisition of a new language, and that this role is particularly important at the beginning stages of learning a new language." Nation (2001) believed that a large amount of vocabulary can be acquired with the help of vocabulary learning strategies and that the strategies prove useful for students of different language levels.

Therefore, teachers have to be more concerned and pay more attention in teaching vocabulary to the students in the early stage. Students start to want to know everything and want to learn it. Vocabulary is basic in learning English. According to Baker, *et. al.* (1998) said, "Learning, as a language based activity, is fundamentally and profoundly dependent on vocabulary knowledge" as cited by Bauman *et. al.* (2007). The National Research Council (1998) cited in Bauman, *et. al.* (2007) concludes that vocabulary development is a fundamental goal for students in the early grades. In the same citation Baker, *et. al.* (1997) described: "Children who enter with limited vocabulary knowledge grow much more discrepant over time from their peers who have rich vocabulary knowledge." Finocchiaro (1972) commented: "At the beginning level, we should concentrate on the function words and the more frequently used vocabulary items which are needed to give practice in the basic structures and sounds of the language."

Florander and Jahnsen (2005) noted: "Children can learn to talk any language at a very young age. Throughout the world, moreover, children learn to speak the language used locally through imitation and repetition. Language teaching, therefore, should be introduced at an early age." Barb (2009) listed needs in teaching English in early stage: (1) The need to expose children from an early age to an understanding of foreign cultures (2) The need to link communication to the understanding of new concepts (3) The need for maximum learning time for important languages - the earlier you start the more time you get.

From the explanation above, the researcher wants to study the two methods between Grammar-Translation Method and Direct Method. The researcher wants to know which method is more effective and efficient in improving pupils' vocabulary.

This study is to find out a comparison between Grammar-Translation Method and Direct Method in improving pupils' vocabulary achievement. It is focused to answer the questions:

This study is to find out a comparison between Grammar-Translation Method and Direct Method in improving pupils' vocabulary achievement. It is focused to answer the

"Is there any significant difference on the pupils' vocabularyimprovement taught using Grammar-Translation Method and Direct Method?"

Hypothesis

The researcher has the assumption that there is a significant difference of vocabulary achievement by using Grammar-Translation Method or Direct Method.

Null hypothesis
H_om If the null hypothesis is accepted, then there is no significant difference of vocabulary pupils' achievement who were taught using Grammar-Translation Method and those who were taught using Direct Method.

Alternative Hypothesis
Ha = If the null hypothesis is rejected, then there is a significant difference of vocabulary pupils' achievement who were taught using Grammar-Translation Method and those who were taught using Direct Method.
          t-counted and t-table
If t-counted $<$_ t-table = it means that H_o is accepted and H_a is rejected. If t-counted $>$ t-table = it means that H_o is rejected and H_a is accepted.

METHODOLOGY

The chapter explains the location and time of the research, population and sample, research instrument, and data gathering.
 Research design
This study is a quantitative research. The aim in quantitative research is to determine the relationship between one thing (an independent variable) and another
(a dependent or outcome variable) in a population. Pre-test and post-test were compared to know the result of pupils' vocabulary achievement.

Pre-test	Treatment	Post-test
Al	X	A2
B1	X	B2

A: Grammar-Translation Method group
X: Implementation of the method
B: Direct Method group

 The participants

The participants of this study were the pupils of SDN Karyawangi Parongpong, they were divided into 2 groups. The grade 6A pupils were taught using Grammar-Translation Method and the grade 6B pupils were taught using Direct Method in SDN Karyawangi Parongpong, Bandung.
The researcher chose sixth grade pupils at Karyawangi Elementary School because they were in the early stage. They had to master in vocabulary.

Research instrument

The instrument used in gathering the data was vocabulary test. It is used to measure pupils' comprehension of word meanings.
The test was given at the beginning and at the end of the treatment to find out the pupils' achievement in vocabulary that was taught by Grammar-Translation Method and Direct Method.

Data gathering

There are some procedures in gathering the data:
3.4.1: Pre-test
The pre-test for 6A pupils was administered on October 23, 2009 while the
pretest for 6B pupils was administered on October 22, 2009. It consisted of 40 items and was
designed in the form of multiple-choice. The 40-item has represented the lessons that were
given by the researcher.
3.4.2. Treatment

Procedures in teaching vocabulary through Grammar-Translation Method:

1. The researcher gives a short story appropriate to the topic.
2. Students are asked to read the story out aloud and translate them into themother language.
3. The researcher explains the new words in the mother language.
4. The researcher teaches the new grammar with deductive method.
5. Students are asked to write the answers to the questions about the readingpassage.
6. The researcher gives list of vocabularies.
7. Students are asked to memorize it.

Procedures in teaching vocabulary through Direct Method:

1. The researcher asks questions of any nature and the students answer.
 2. The researcher gives a short story and reads the text aloud.
3. Students take turn reading sections of a passage, play or dialog out loud.
4. The researcher uses gestures, pictures, realia, examples, or other means
to make the meaning of the section clear.
5. The researcher asks comprehension questions about the text.
6. The researcher gives written work.

Post-test

The post-test for 6A pupils was administered on December 4, 2009 while post-test for 6B
pupils was administered on December 3, 2009. Posttest was done to measure the
improvement of pupils' vocabulary after the treatment.

 Data processing procedure

The researcher used t-test to prove whether the achievement of the pupils who were taught by
using Grammar-Translation Method is different from those who were taught by using Direct
Method.
To examine the data, the researcher compared means of the tests between two the dependent
data groups which was done by using statistical analysis or t-test.
Equal variances test would be done to determine the t-test that was used. Equal variances test
was done by using t-test.

 Data Gathering

In gathering the data, the researcher used the following procedures:
1. Conducting the pre-test: The researcher gave a multiple choice test which was consisted of 40items and administered to 58 pupils.
2. Applying the treatment: The researcher gave the different implementations for each group. Grammar-Translation Method for GTM group and Direct Method for DM group.
3. Administering the post-test: After the treatments, the researcher conducted the post-test and used the same procedures as the pre-test. The post test was administered to 58 pupils.
4. Scoring: The score was given based on the participants' correct answer. The perfect score was 100.
5. Interpreting the score: The researcher used t-test to find the significant difference between pre-test and post-test.

Table 4.1
GTM Achievement

No Name	Pre-test (%)	Post-test (%)
1Adehani	23	28
2Ahrul	33	33
3Angga	30	40
4Asep	38	23
5Cecep	25	53
6 Denden	13	35
7Dicky	23	40
8Fajar	33	68
9Firmanudin	23	45
10 Hasan	18	38
11Herlina	38	75
12Hilman	35	50
13Jejen	23	30
14Joan	48	55
15Karisna	43	68
16Meissy	18	33
17 Nadiansah	25	33
18Nurcahyati	25	65
19Resti	33	50
20 Reza	28	45
21 Ricka	35	43
22 Rima	18	25
23 Rini	30	25
24 Rusniawati	23	43

25 Sagita	23	65
26 Silvi	28	50
27 Sinta	30	43
28 Siti	33	53
29 Tania	33	68
30 Tartan	40	68
31 Yosi	50	50
Total	832	1440
Mean	29.61	46.45
Mean Difference	16.84	

Table
DM Achievement

No Name	Pre-test (%)	Post-test (%)
1Agung	30	38
2 Ahmad	28	30
3Aisha	45	65
4Andika	38	35
5Ani	40	55
6Febri	30	35
7 Hanna	38	45
8Ikbal	23	30
9Joel	28	35
10 Kamilah	43	50
11 Kharen	50	75
12 Karerin	48	78
13 Melly	40	85
14 Memey	38	48
15 Meri	23	35
16 Muhamad Harridan	50	43
17 Nugi	25	33
18 Nuryani	38	35
19 Nurul	38	33
20 Putri	45	60
21 Rian	38	38

22 Rifky	30	28
23 Rush	43	55
24 Syifa	*55*	*50*
25 Wawan	30	43
26 Wiwin	35	58
27 Yayan	13	33
Total	982	1248
Mean	36.37	46.22
	Mean Difference	**9.85**

It was found from the result of the pre-test that the highest score for GTM group was 50 and the lowest was 13, while the highest score of the post-test was 75 and the lowest was 25. For DM group, the highest score of the pre-test was 55 and the lowest was 13, while the highest score of the post-test was 85 and the lowest was 28.

25
Data Analyzing and Processing

The following procedures in analyzing and processing the data:
 I. Normality
Testing normality of data was examined to observed probability distribution. SPSS was used to calculate the normality of data. The researcher examined normality of the pre-test and post-test in each group.

Table 4.3
GTM Normality

Kolmogorov-Smirnov*	Shapiro-Wilk			
Df	Sig.	Statistic	Sig.	
		df		
Pre-test 31	.200*	.967	31	.452
Post-test 31	.200*	.951	31	.162

a. Lilliefors Significance Correction

Table 4.4
DM Normality

	Kolmogorov-Smirnov[a]			Shapiro-Wilk		
	Statistic	df	Sig.	Statistic	df	Sig.
Pre-test	.159	27	.078	.976	27	.762
Post-test	.182	27	.02	.884	27	.006

a. Lilliefors Significance Correction

Criteria of normality:

1. Data is normal if significance score is bigger than a score. a = 0.05.
2. Data is not normal if significance score is smaller than a score.
According to the result (Table 4.3. and Table 4.4), data is normal because the significance score of the pre-test for GTM group is 0.452 while the post-test is 0.162. The significance score of the pre-test for DM group is 0.762. It means that the datarepresents the population.
26

II. Gain Score
To find the result of the research, the researcher found the gain scores. Gain score was obtained from the difference between the pre-test and post-test score.

Table 4.5
GTM Gain

No Name	Pre-test (%)	Post-test (%)	Gain (%)
1Adehani	23	28	5
2 Ahrul	33	33	0
3 Angga	30	40	10
4 Asep	38	23	-15
5 Cecep	25	53	28
6 Denden	13	35	22
7 Dicky	23	40	17
8 Fajar	33	68	35
9 Firmanudin	23	45	22
10 Hasan	18	38	20
11 Herlina	38	75	37
12 Hilman	35	50	15
13 Jejen	23	30	7
14 Joan	48	55	7
15 Karisna	43	68	25
16 Meissy	18	33	15
17 Nadiansah	25	33	8
18 Nurcahyati	25	65	40
19 Resti	33	50	17
20 Reza	28	45	17
21 Ricka	35	43	8
22 Rima	18	25	7
23 Rini	30	25	-5
24 Rusniawati	23	43	20
25 Sagita	23	65	42
26 Silvi	28	50	22
27 Sinta	30	43	13
28 Siti	33	53	20
29 Tania	33	68	35
30 Tantan	40	68	28
31 Yosi	50	50	0

Total	<u>522</u>		

Table 4.6 DM Gain

No	Name	Pre-test (%)	Post-test (%}	Gain (%}
1	Agung	30	38	8
2	Ahmad	28	30	2
3	Aisha	45	65	20
4	Andika	38	35	-3
5	Am	40	55	15
6	Febri	30	35	5
7	Hanna	38	45	7
8	Ikbal	23	30	7
9	Joel	28	35	7
10	Kamilah	43	50	7
11	Kharen	50	75	25
12	Karerin	48	78	30
13	Melly	40	85	45
14	Memey	38	48	10
15	Meri	23	35	12
16	Muhamad Hamdan	50	43	-7
17	Nugi	25	33	8
18	Nuryani	38	35	-3
19	Nurul	38	33	-5
20	Putri	45	60	15
21	Rian	38	38	0
22	Rifky	30	28	-2
23	Rush	43	55	12
24	Syifa	55	50	-5
25	Wawan	30	43	13

| 26 | Wiwin | 35 | 58 | 23 |
| 27 | Yayan | 13 | 33 | 20 |

Table 4.7

Gain Score

Levene's
Test for
Equality of
Variances   t-test for Equality of Means
5% Confidence
Interval of the
Difference
Sig.
(2
taile Mean   Std. Error
F   Sig.   t   df   d)   Diff.   Difference   Lower
Upper
Gain   Equal   .411 .524   -2.081 56   .042 -6.987 3.358
-13.714 -.260 GTM variances
DM   assumed
Equal -2.097 55.947 .041   -6.987 3.332   -13.663 -.311
variances
not
assumed

a. To know whether the two assumed variety are acceptable, the
following formula is used:
H_0: $\sigma_1^2 = \sigma_2^2$
H_1: $\sigma_1^2 \neq \sigma_2^2$
where σ_1^2 = variance group 1
     σ_2^2 = variance group 2

p-value = 0.524 > α = 0.05, so H_0: $\sigma_1^2 = \sigma_2^2$ is accepted.

It means that equal variances assumed are not acceptable.
b. The researcher used equal variances not assumed, the hypotheses are:
$H_0 \mu_1 = \mu_2$

c.
H_0: $\mu_1 \neq \mu_2$
p-value (2-tailed) = 0.041 < α = 0.05 so H_0 : $\mu_1 = \mu_2$ is rejected.
It can be concluded that the improvement of GT. group and DM
group is different.

III. t-test

Table 4.8
The Range Mean GTM & DM

	GROUP	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
Gain_GT_DM dm		27	9.85	11.993	2.308
_gtm		31	16.84	13.384	2.404

The result is shown that H_0 is rejected. It means that there is any significant difference of the pupils' vocabulary improvement taught using Grammar-Translation Method and Direct Method. The mean of the pre-test of GTM group was 29.61 and the mean of the post-test was 46.45. For DM group, the mean of the pre-test was 36.37 and the mean of the post-test was 46.22. The range mean of GTM group was 16.84 while the DM group had 9.85. It can be concluded that the range mean of Grammar group was higher than the mean of Direct group. There are some studies that support Grammar-Translation Method and it is still used in many schools in the world. According to Aili (2009), there are several reasons why the traditional Grammar-Translation Method is still being used. (1) Grammar-Translation Method is chiefly responsible to teach English. It has been dominating English teaching in China since English became the first foreign language and a course in secondary schools in China, (2) The teacher is a translator rather than an instructor to the students, (3) Students find it much easier to understand English with the help of Chinese, (4) Quite a number of teachers andsenior students want to stay with the Grammar-Translation Method because they think learning language syntax and grammar in translation is a more academic way of learning English.Liu Qing-xue & Shi Jin-fang (2007) state that Grammar-Translation Method is still widely practiced because there is no inherent contradiction between grammar instruction and communicative approach, and a sort of explicit grammar instruction can complement communicative language teaching to raise learners' conscious awareness of the form and structure of the target language. Moreover, the first language, as a reference system, can dismiss the misunderstanding in the process of the second language learning. Then, thinking about formal features of the second language and translation as a practice technique put the learner into an active problem-solving situation. Finally, Grammar-Translation Method appears relatively easy to apply and it makes few demands on teachers, which is perhaps the exact reason of its popularity.

BIBLIOGRAPHY
Ailia, Xiao. (2009). http://eca.state.gov/. Accessed on 8 January 2010. Barb, Monique. (2009).
        http://articles.famouswhy.coml. Accessed on 16 June 2009
Bauman, Kame'enui, and Ash (2007). http://idea.uoregon.edu/. Accessed on 4 June 2009.

Best. (1981). http://www.lotsofessays.com/. Accessed on 25 August 2009.

Bliss, Francess. Journal of Adventist Education. April/May 2006. http://circle.adventist.org/. Accessed on 16 June 2009.

Brown. (1994). http://oswaldoipc.wordpress.com/. Accessed on 7 May 2009.

Cate, Henry. (2007) http://whyhomeschool.blogspot.com/. Accessed on 11 June 2009.

Dash, Neena & M. Dash. (2009). *Teaching English as an Additional Language*
        . http://books.google.com/books. Accessed on 31 August 2009.
Ediger, Marlow. (1999). Journal of Instructional Psychology, March. Available at
        http://findarticles.coml. Accessed on 16 June 2009.

Florander, Jesper. and M. Jahnsen (2005). Research On Teaching English In Danish Schools.
        http://www. springerlinle.com/. Accessed on 25 August 2009.
Freeman, Diane L. (2009). *Techniques and Principles in Language Teaching.*
        http://books.google.com/books. Accessed on 31 August 2009.
Hermits, Yesica. (2009). *Grammar Translation Method and Direct Method in Teaching Reading*
        at LPIA Margonda Depok. Jakarta. Available at httpa/library.gunadarma.ac.id/. Accessed
        on 11 November 2009.
Hopkins, Will. (2000). http://www.sportsci.org/.Accessed**on** 18 June 2009.

Kartikasari, Deni. (2008). *Teaching Vocabulary using Direct Method to the Sixth Year Students*
        of SDN I Tulas Karangdowo Klaten. http://etd.eprints.ums.ac.id/. Accessed on 1 February
        2010.
Kurniawati, Eti. (2005). *The Effectiveness of Eclectic Method and GrammarTranslation Method*
        of Teaching English in Enhancing Students Vocabulary