

THE EFFECTIVENESS OF GTM PLUS ON STUDENTS' ENGLISH READING ACHIEVEMENT AT JUNIOR HIGH SCHOOL 1 TEGAL

Nur Laila Molla

*English Education Department, Faculty of Teacher Training and Education-
Pancasakti University Tegal*

ABSTRACT

Grammar Translation Method (GTM) is one of teaching methods. The writer discovered a new model of GTM, later called GTM Plus. This research will prove whether this method completely effective to students' achievement. Several experiments are taken to two difference classes. The experiments were held at Junior High School 1 Tegal. There were two sample classes consisting of twenty two students for each, one as experimental class and the other as control class. Experimental class was taught with GTM Plus and the other class without. There were pre-test and post-test for both classes. A true experimental research was held. Test and observation conducted, the writer calculated test validity, reliability, difficulty level and discriminating power. The Sample of students was taken randomly. The test is analyzed and calculated using nonparametric statistic. The result proves 21.6% increasing students' achievement. The pre-test mean of control group is 6.11 and 6.72 for post-test while the pre-test mean of experimental group is 7.07 and 8.56 for post-test. Percentage of score improvement is 21.1%. This means that the implementation of Grammar Translation Method (GTM) Plus gives positive effect to students' achievement on English reading tests and also speaking ability. The results show that mean of experimental group is higher than of control group. This gives positive effect on the implementation of Grammar Translation Method (GTM) Plus at school widely. Analyzing feedback through questionnaire of experimental group also shows 86% acceptance of this teaching method.

Key words: *Grammar Translation Method (GTM) Plus, Achievement, Effectiveness*

INTRODUCTION

International school (SBI) is a national school level in Indonesia with an international quality standard. The process of teaching and learning in this school emphasizes the development of creativity, innovation, and experimentation to stimulate new ideas that have never existed.

SBI development in Indonesia is based on Law no. 20 Year 2003 on National

Education System, Article 50 Paragraph 3 (www.id.wikipedia.org). In this provision, the government is motivated to develop an international educational unit. Articles of SBI have emerged in the country since 2005.

Number of students will be limited to 22-30 per class. Teaching and learning activities use bilingual language. In the first year introductory language is 25 percent English and 75 percent Indonesian. In the

second year, both languages are used with the same percentage. In the third year, the language of instruction is 75 percent English and 25 percent Indonesian.

The study of language is one of the oldest branches of systematic inquiry (Chomsky, 2000:3). English is an international language and systematically inquired; therefore people around the world study the language. Indonesia itself as a part of the world, of course, needs to design a curriculum containing English subject. English is very essential nowadays. Especially in Indonesia, English subject is widely used in major schools especially Junior High Schools and also Senior High Schools.

Because of this important function of English, government of Indonesia, considers that English should be tested in National Final Examination (UAN) beside other subjects. In studying English, there are four areas of skills i.e. speaking, listening, reading and writing. At first grammar is taught as the main area to study, but lately speaking, listening and reading become the main areas to be taught and examined.

There are many kinds of teaching method, they are: (1). The Grammar Translation Method (GTM) is a method whose goals that students will be able to read and translate foreign literary masterpieces and classics. This method was used for the purpose of helping students read and appreciate foreign language literature (Freeman, 2000:11), (2). Direct Method is a method that refrains from using the learners' native language and just uses the target language. It teaches how to communicate in the target language, with the centrality of spoken language (including a native-like

pronunciation). It was revived as a method when the goal of instruction became learning how to use a foreign language for communication (Freeman, 2000:23), (3). Audio-Lingual Method (ALM) is learning how to be able to use target language communicatively. Learners could overcome the habits of their native language and form the new habit required to be target language speakers (Freeman, 2000:35), (4). Silent Way gives beginning-level student's oral and aural facility of the basic element of the target language. The teacher should be silent as much as possible in the classroom but the learner should be encouraged to produce as much language as possible (Richards & Rodgers, 2001:81), (5). Desuggestopedia; the most conspicuous characteristic of Suggestopedia are the decoration, furniture, and arrangement of the classroom, the use of music and the authoritative behavior of the teacher (Richard & Rodgers, 2001:100), (6). Community Language Learning also known as *the Communicative Approach*, emphasizes both the means and the ultimate goal of learning a language. CLL draws on the counseling metaphor to redefine the roles of the teacher (the counselor) and learners (the clients) in the language classroom (Richard & Rodgers, 2001:90), (7). Total Physical Response is built around the coordination of speech and action, it attempts to teach language through physical (motor) activity (Richard & Rodgers, 2001:90).

Communicative English Teaching aims broadly to apply the theoretical perspective of the Communicative Approach by making communicative competence the goal of language teaching and by

acknowledging the interdependence of language and communication (Freeman, 2000:121).

GTM implementation in class is supposed to use English as a medium of teaching, but because of teacher's insufficient capability the result of teaching process is not maximum. The teacher and students need to teach and learn using English more effectively. In fact, GTM in schools is taught in mixed languages that are between English and Indonesian.

GTM has been proven as the most popular teaching method in Indonesia. Problems of speaking arise when the classes enforce the learners and teachers to use English all the time. Can GTM, which originally emphasizes the mother tongue, be used with the other language instruction, or can it be implemented with another means?

Commonly GTM is conducted in mother tongue. The purpose is simply to understand a foreign text of literature and translate it to the L1. The problem arises when the learners are forced to use English all the time. Shall we use Indonesian to instruct translation and also to explain the grammatical items or shall we use English for the language of instruction of translation and teaching grammar in GTM.

This is the theoretical framework that underlies the research. The Grammar Translation Method (GTM) is one of foreign language teaching methods used widely in major schools in Indonesia. The Grammar Translation Method is a foreign language teaching method derived from the classical (sometimes called traditional) method of teaching Greek and Latin. This teaching method is widely used in the world.

Grammar translation is still alive and well in some parts of the world (Richards, 2001:3). The method requires students to translate whole texts, word by word, and memorize numerous grammatical rules and exceptions as well as enormous vocabulary lists. The goal of this method is to be able to read and translate foreign literary masterpieces and classics. Larsen-Freeman (2000:11) states that this method is used for the purpose of helping students read and appreciate foreign language literature. There is a process of understanding of the text. Murcia and Olshtain (2000:124) states that during the reader's processing of the text, the reader moves along a decision-making continuum that is basically seeking answers to such questions.

Since the Direct method is no longer effective for exploring a text, the use of GTM is getting wider and wider each day. GTM is focused on reading and writing skills in mastering English. Grammar Translation Method is a method of teaching which emphasizes on reading and writing ability for students. This method ignores speaking and listening skills.

The principle characteristics of Grammar Translation Method are as follows: (1). The goal is to read foreign literature and translating sentences and texts, (2). Reading and writing are the focus of studying-with little attention to speaking and listening, even next to no relation to speaking and listening, (3). Vocabulary selection is merely based on the reading text used through bilingual words list, dictionary, and memorization, (4). The sentence is the basic unit of teaching and practice, (5). Emphasizing on accuracy students are

expected to have a high standard of translation, (6). Grammar is taught deductively, with grammar rules to be applied to translation, (7). The student's native language is the medium of the instruction and explanation,

Prator and Celce-Murcia in Douglass Brown (2000:15) list the major characteristics of Grammar Translation Method: (1). Classes are taught in the mother tongue, with little active use of the target language, (2). Much vocabulary is taught in the form of lists of isolated words, (3). Long elaborate explanations of the intricacies of grammar, (4). Grammar provides the rule for putting words together, and instruction is often focused on the form and inflection of words, (5). Reading of difficult classical texts is begun early, (6). Little attention is paid to the content of the texts, which are treated as exercise in grammatical analysis, (7). Often the only drills are exercises in translating disconnected sentences from the target language into the mother tongue, (8). Little or no attention is given to pronunciation.

Grammar Translation Method (GTM) has several techniques in its implementation. According to Larsen-Freeman (2000:19-20), there are: (1). Translation of a literary; students translate a reading passage from the target language into their native language. The reading passage then provides the focus for several classes: vocabulary and grammatical structures in the passage are studied in subsequent lesson, (2). Reading comprehension questions; students answer questions in the target language based on their understanding of the reading passage,

(3). Antonyms/synonyms; students are given set of words and are asked to find antonyms in the reading passage, (4). Cognates; students are taught to recognize cognates by learning the spelling or sound patterns that correspond between the languages.,(5). Deductive application of rule; grammar rules are presented with examples. Exception to teach rule are also noted. Once students understand a rule, they are asked to apply it to some different examples, (6). Fill-in-the-blanks; students are given a series of sentences with words missing. They fill in the blanks with vocabulary items or with items of a particular grammar type, such as prepositions or verbs with different tenses, (7). Memorization; students are given lists of target language vocabulary and their native language equivalents and are asked to memorize them, (8). Use words in sentences; in order to show that the students understand the meaning and use of a new vocabulary item; they make up sentences in which they use the new words, (9). Composition; the teacher gives the students a topic to write about in the target language. The topic is based upon some aspect of the reading passage of the lesson.

RESEARCH METHOD

This research is using True Experimental Research measuring the equivalent group as control group and another one as experimental group. Usman and Akbar (2008:5) state that true experimental research means to find possible relationship by giving special treatment to experimental group and then compares with control group. Researcher carries out classroom observation. This is

very important. Similarly, Nunan (1992:92) states the researchers were aware of the importance of collecting data on what actually went on in the classroom, and built into the study systematic classroom observation. In this research, there are two groups, treatment (experimental group) and control group. First of all, pre-test was applied for both. During research, the researcher implemented GTM Plus at experimental group and GTM implemented at control group. In the end of research post-tests were applied for both groups and then compared the result.

The population of this research reflects the goal of the research. Population of every research should be stated in relation with the number of population and research area covered (Usman & Akbar, 2008:42). Population is a group which is treated by researcher as the object to generalize the result of research (Frankel and Wallen, 1960:68)

The population for this research was eight grade students of Junior High School 1 Tegal, consisting of:
Class A, B, C, D, E, F and G consisting of 22 students for each classroom, so the total number of population is 154. The writer took two classes for sample; the researcher took samples randomly class A for experimental group and Class B for control group. Treatment of experimental group used GTM Plus teaching method and control group used GTM. The number of control group is 22 and experimental group is 22 students. Research quality is not only determined by the number of sample, but also by the strength of basic theory, research design and data processing (Nasution,

2008:101). Every sample that gives the same possibility among population, we call it random sampling (Mardalis, 2008:57). The population is homogenous. Because of this condition, the writer chooses random sampling technique.

Determination of variables, which cover independent and dependent variables, is based on the hypothesis formula made before. Inter variables relationship is drawn (Usman & Akbar, 2008:42). The independent variable in this research uses RSBI Grammar Translation Method (GTM) as the teaching method. Whereas, GTM Plus method is applied to experimental group to teach reading in English subject to students of Junior High School.

FINDING AND DISCUSSION

Based on the result analyses of homogeneity and normality tests of descriptive score pre-test and post-test score from both experimental and control groups show that the data distributed normally and the samples are homogenous. The variance does not differ significantly. This means that basically experimental and control group have the same preliminary capability before one of them was taught using different method. The experimental group was taught using Grammar Translation Method type while control group was taught by GTM.

The result of experiment shows the GTM Plus is effective when it is used to reach in students' reading achievements. From the post-test mean result shows that experimental group is higher than control group. Experimental group post-test mean is 8.56, while control group is 6.72. Generally, post-test mean of experimental group is

increased 21.1% from pre-test, while control group increased 10%.

From the result, implies show that there are improvement for both experimental and control group, but there is a significant improvement on variance for experimental group. Although there is improvement on variance of control group but it is lower than that of experimental group.

100% students of experimental group are capable to improve their score above their base scores, while 95.5% students of control group are capable to improve their score above their base score. Only 0.5% student of control group has lower score on post-test. No students gained the same score between pre-test and post-test.

The Result of questionnaire indicates that 19 students agree with the implementation and only 3 students disagree, after being analyzed shows 86% of students' acceptance on application of GTM Plus to them. The questionnaire result gives high effectiveness in Students' English reading achievement.

REFERENCE

- Alexander, L, G.1999. *Developing Skill an Integrated Course for Intermediate Students*. Yogyakarta: Kanisius.
- Arikunto, Suharsimi.2009. *Dasar Dasar Evaluasi Pendidikan (EdisiRevisi)*. Jakarta: Bumi Aksara.
- Bronowsky, J. 1977. *A Moral for an Age of Plenty. In A Sense of the Future; Essays in Natural Philosophy*. Cambridge: The MIT Press.
- Brown, H. Douglas. 2000. *Principles of Language Learning and Teaching*. San Francisco: Oxford.

CONCLUSION

Based on data analysis result and discussion on last part, it can be concluded that: (1). There is a significant difference of English reading and writing achievement between experimental group and control group, (2). The Grammar translation Method (GTM) Plus was proved to be capable of improvement on Students' achievement of English reading and writing skills, (3). Students can improve their own achievement in English reading and writing, (4). The Grammar Translation Method (GTM) Plus is effective in improving students' reading and writing achievement, (5). The GTM Plus is suitable to implement the English teaching method at School in Indonesia. It can be implemented with several modifications especially in the field of translation. The translation must be English to English by giving description of words, (6). Application of GTM Plus can make students enrich more vocabularies than Classic GTM.

From the post test result comparison of control and experimental group, the usage of GTM Plus method is effective in National Final Examination of English subject.

- Brown, H Douglass. 2004. *Language Assessment: Principles and Classroom Practices*. San Francisco: Longman.
- Campbell, S. 1998. *Translation into the second language*. New York: Addison Wesley Longman, Inc.
- Carell, P.L. 1988. *Interactive Text Processing: Implication for ESL/Second Language Reading Classroom*. New York: Cambridge.
- Chomsky, Noam.2000. *New Horizon in the Study of Language and Mind*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Costa, A. & Santesteban, M. 2006. The control of speech production by bilingual speakers: Introductory remarks. *Bilingualism: Language and Cognition*, 9, 115-17.
- Cresswell, John W.1994. *Research Design: Qualitative and Quantitative Approaches*. California: Sage Publication, Inc.
- De Groot, A. M.B. & Christoffels, I.K. 2006. *Language control in bilinguals: Monolingual tasks and simultaneous interpreting*. *Bilingualism: Language and Cognition*, 9, 189-201.
- Djuharie, O Setiawan. 2001. *Pedoman Penulisan: Skripsi-Tesis-Desertasi*. Bandung: Yrama Widya.
- Fajri and Senja. 2000. *Kamus Lengkap Bahasa Indonesia*. Jakarta: Difa Publisher.
- Fraenkel, Jake R. and Wallen, Norman E. 1990. *How to Design and Evaluate Research in Education*. USA: Mc Graw Hill.
- Gass, S.M. & Selinker, L. 2001. *Second Language Acquisition: An Introductory Course* (2ⁿd Ed.). Mahwah, New Jersey: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Inc
- Gerot, Linda. And Wignell, Peter. 1995. *Making Sense of Functional Grammar*. NSW: Antipodean Education Enterprises.
- Hadi, Sutrisno. 2004. *Metodologi Research*. Yogyakarta:Andi.
- Halliday, M. A. K., 1985. *Spoken and Written Language*. Victoria: Deakin University.
- Hammers, J. F. & Blanc, M. H.A. 2000. *Bilinguality and Bilingualism* (2 Ed.). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Jordens, P. 1994. *Acquiring German and French in a Bilingual setting*. In Jurgen M. Meisel (Ed.), *Bilingual first language acquisition: French and German grammatical development*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing Co.

- Kennedy, Crist. 2001. *Theory in Language Teacher Education*. Essex: Pearson Education Limited.
- Larsen, Diane-Freeman. 2000. *Techniques and Principles in Language Teaching: Second Edition*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Legge GE, Mansfield JS, Chung ST.2001. "Psychophysics of reading. XX. Linking letter recognition to reading speed in central and peripheral vision". *Vision Research* 41 (6): 725–43.
- Mannes, M. 1958. *The Half-people. In More in Anger*. New York: J. B. Lippincott.
- Mardalis.2008. *Metode Penelitian: Suatu Pendekatan Proposal*. Jakarta: Bumi Aksara.
- Murcia, Marianne C and Olshtain, Elite. 2000. *Discourse and Context in Language Teaching*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Myers-Scotton, C. 2006. *Multiple voices: An introduction to bilingualism*. Malden: Blackwell Publishing.
- Nasution, S. 2008. *Metode Research*. Jakarta: Bumi Aksara.
- Nunan, D., 1992. *Research Methods in Language Learning*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Richards, Jack C and Rodgers, Theodore S. 2001. *Approaches and Methods in Language Teaching*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Richards, Jack C. 2001. *Curriculum Development in Language Teaching*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Riduwan.2009.*Belajar Mudah Penelitian Untuk Guru-Karyawan dan Peneliti Pemula*. Bandung: Alfabeta.
- Rini, J. E. 2008. *English compositions: Comparing the work of monolinguals and bilinguals in terms of vocabulary and grammar*. Paper presented at CONEST (Conference on English Studies) 5, Atma Jaya Catholic University of Indonesia.
- Saville-Troike, M. 2006. *Introducing Second Language Acquisition*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Subana and Sudrajat.2009. *Dasar Dasar Penelitian Ilmiah*.Bandung: Pustaka Setia.
- Usman, Husaini & Akbar, Purnomo Setiady.2008. *Metodologi Penelitian Sosial*. Jakarta: Bumi Aksara.