

Preferences and Attitudes Towards Teaching Methods Among Bosnian English Language Teachers – Case Study of GTM and DM

Haris Delić *

Faculty of Education and Humanities, International Burch University
Francuske revolucije bb, Sarajevo, Bosnian and Herzegovina
E-mail: harisdelic91@gmail.com

Alma Dogan

Faculty of Education and Humanities, International Burch University
Francuske revolucije bb, Sarajevo, Bosnian and Herzegovina
E-mail: alma.dogan@ibu.edu.ba

Hamza Alijagić

Faculty of Education and Humanities, International Burch University
Francuske revolucije bb, Sarajevo, Bosnian and Herzegovina
E-mail: hamza.aliyagic@ibu.edu.ba

Abstract

This quantitative research seeks to examine which of the two methods of teaching English (Grammar-translation method or Direct method) English teachers in primary and secondary schools in Bosnia and Herzegovina (B&H) use more and what are their attitudes and experiences towards these two teaching methods. Analysis of the questionnaire showed that teachers use both methods and that there is no clear distinction between which they prefer to use. Furthermore, there is an indication that sometimes a mixed method of both is used. Attitudes towards both methods are also not fully expressed although there is a greater preference for the Direct method. The work represents the basis for future research in this or a similar way with certain proposals for more comprehensive aspects to be researched.

Keywords: Teaching, Method, Language, English, School

DOI: 10.7176/JLLL/94-03

Publication date: December 31st 2022

1. Introduction

Knowing a language is the key and an essential tool to achieve communication between people. There are over 7,000 known languages around the world that are, or were, used for various purposes (Giunchiglia, Batsuren & Freihart, 2018). One of the most popular and widespread languages in the world is English.

In addition to knowing English for communication and everyday life, another prominent and useful skill is teaching English. English language teaching requires a well-developed and effective method from the teacher if they want their students to successfully adopt and master the language taught. Language teaching methods are in detail studied and designed processes because practice has shown that different approaches and methods led to different results in language acquisition (Anabokay & Suryasa, 2019). Throughout the years, many different ways or methods of language teaching have been discovered. However, some of the most well-known and widespread methods are the Grammar translation method (GTM) and the Direct method (DM).

In this paper the main focus is on the analysis of the preferred method of teaching of Bosnian primary and high school English language teachers. Moreover, the paper examines their attitudes towards the Grammar translation method and the Direct method of teaching, with an emphasis of possible influence of the participants' type of school where they teach, their teaching experience, and gender on these variables.

2. Literature review

2.1. Grammar-translation method and Direct method of language teaching

Grammar-Translation Method is the first and the most basic method when it comes to teaching any language, including English. GTM dominated European and foreign languages from the 1840s to the 1940s (Anabokay & Suryasa, 2019). It started in Germany, specifically in Prussia, at the end of the eighteenth century (Bhatti & Mukhtar, 2017). The main focus of GTM is translating sentences from the native language to the target language and vocabulary (memory & translation). Also, grammar is explained inductively and therefore students, on one hand, develop and progress in grammar and vocabulary (Anabokay & Suryasa, 2019), while on the other hand, poorly develop skills in speaking fluently. In general, GTM, as stated by Katemba & Sormin (2011),

“appears relatively easy to apply and it makes few demands on teachers, which is perhaps the exact reason for its popularity” (p. 11). It is believed that GTM is better when it comes to accuracy but to achieve fluency in speech, the Direct method of language teaching is needed (Chang, 2011).

The Direct Method was developed as a reaction to the Grammar Translation Method. It is believed that with the Direct Method students learn to better use the language, rather than just knowing the rules. This method ensures that the students acquire fluency in the target language by focusing on skills such as listening, speaking, writing, etc. (Spahiu & Kryeziu, 2021). Just as its name suggests, this method serves as a direct link between the speaker and the language itself, as a student shouldn't rely on his native language while using this method. Some key features of this method are: a) native language and translation are not used, b) meaning should be directly acted out or shown through teaching materials, c) a huge focus is put on teaching how to converse, with dialogues being the main part of most classes, d) students first learn to speak and only then to read and write, and e) grammar is not heavily analyzed (Anabokay & Suryasa, 2019).

In short, it can be stated that GMT, the more traditional method, is more teacher-centred, while DM centers around the students and their learning. The traditional methods are more passive, while the newer ones are more interactive, as the students need more care and the teacher's attention (Pavić, 2019). Even though it is believed that the Direct method is more efficient than the Grammar Translation method, many studies have shown that both need to be used in the classroom to ensure students' learning and those teachers should strive to find activities that will not bore their students and often those activities may belong to a few different teaching methods. (Bhatti & Mukhtar, 2017; Djauhar, 2021).

The use and effectiveness of these two methods have been analyzed in a great number of studies. For example, Bhatti & Mukhtar (2017) and Usman, Ayoub & Awan (2018) conclude that college teachers mostly use GTM and that female teachers are “more curious about the effectiveness” (p. 66) of this method, while with the Direct method this difference between the genders of teachers is not noticed. Bhatti & Mukhtar (2017) also conclude that the results and teaching effectiveness of teachers would increase significantly if they used a combination of these two methods, which is an attitude supported by other researchers in this field (Usman, Ayoub & Awan, 2018). Moreover, a study by Katemba & Sormin (2011) showed that pupils' vocabulary is significantly more improved when teachers use GTM rather than the Direct method. This fact is confirmed by the findings cited by Anabokay & Suryasa (2019) and Izhar & Hashim (2022) and that GTM is mainly used for writing activities and vocabulary learning and that DM is mostly used for speaking and listening (p. 22).

For the analysis of the use and preferences of one of these methods, teachers' attitudes towards them are also important. The choice of methods that will be used, as well as the degree of effectiveness of their use, may depend on teachers' attitudes. First of all, there should be stated that, as Marinac & Barić (2018) point out, even though teachers may favor various teaching methods, their attitudes and beliefs towards certain methods are usually shaped by their actual teaching experience, e.i., by a certain method they use. This fact is supported by certain studies. For example, a study conducted by Pym et al. (2013) revealed that Croatian teachers hold a relatively positive attitude toward the Grammar-translation method and that they primarily use it for checking grammar and vocabulary. In line with this study are the results of Marinac & Barić (2018) who also found out that Croatian foreign language teachers have a positive attitude toward translation methods and that they use it in their language classes (p. 911). Similarly, teachers at secondary schools in Bangladesh also share positive attitudes toward the Grammar-translation method and believe that it is a suitable method to teach languages at that level (Mondal, 2012). On the other hand, a study in Pakistani schools showed that teachers have less favorable or neutral attitudes towards grammar translation and that in such results gender was not a significant factor (Zeeshan, 2013).

2.2 English language in B&H

As a mandatory second language in the Bosnian educational system¹The English language is taught and studied in B&H and, alongside the Bosnian language, English seems to be widely used as a common means of communication (Skopljak & Dubravac, 2019, p. 149). Various researchers have investigated different aspects of the English language's role and significance in B&H, learning preferences, learning strategies, and factors of learning effectiveness of English (e.g., Bal, 2012; Bećirović, Brdarević-Čeljo & Polz, 2021; Delibegović - Džanić & Imamović, 2016a, 2020b; Imamović, 2017; Kešetović, 2017; Mašić & Tarabar, 2021; Šehović, 2009;). Bosnian speakers, especially younger ones, hold a positive attitude towards the English language and regard it as modern, practical, associated with success, wealth, friendship, peace, order, progress, employment, and, in addition, considered it as an intellectual wealth and language of the future (Šehović, 2009). Investigating Bosnian students' EL learning through the analyses of computer-assisted language learning, Delibegović -

¹English is taught in all parts of B&H in the nine-grade primary schools starting from the third (in some regions/cantons) or, as is the case in Sarajevo Canton, from the first grade and continued to be taught as a mandatory first foreign language in high schools as well (Imamović & Delibegović-Džanić, 2016; Ministry of Education, 2016, as cited in Kovačević, Brdarević-Čeljo & Bećirović, 2018).

Džanić & Hasanspahić (2020) claim that the English language proficiency of Bosnian students signifies a general improvement when modern information technologies are used in the language learning process. Similarly, Mašić & Tarabar (2021), in their investigation of the technology impact and playing games on the English language vocabulary development of Bosnian high students, found out that online game playing contributes to language acquisition.

However, even though it is a common foreign language taught through the years of primary and secondary schools, according to Kovačević, Brdarević-Čeljo & Bećirović (2018), students are not satisfied with the EL teaching methods, lacking more focus on speaking and reading skills instead of grammar and translation. Since very little has been done in the past to investigate how Bosnian students are taught the English language, this study will examine which method or methods English language teachers in several Bosnian primary and secondary schools prefer and how they see their students' preferences for the two most common and used language teaching methods (Grammar-translation method and Direct method).

3. Methodology

3.1. Aim of the research

Bearing in mind that the method of teaching a foreign language, including English, is important for students but also for teachers who teach and that the method of teaching may depend on the result of learning and acquiring a language, this paper aims to examine which of the two most commonly used methods of teaching language (Grammar-translation method or Direct method) is more used in ELT practice in primary and secondary schools in BiH. In addition, the goal is to determine the teachers' attitudes towards these two methods and what influences them. Therefore, these goals are formulated in the following research questions:

RQ1. Do Bosnian EL teachers prefer the Grammar-translation method or the Direct method in their teaching practice? Does the preference vary in terms of the type of school where they teach and their teaching experience?

RQ2. What are the Bosnian EL teachers' attitudes towards the Grammar-translation method and the Direct Method of teaching English? Do the attitudes differ in terms of the type of school where they teach, their teaching experience, and their gender?

3.2. Participants

Participants from eight Bosnian cities (Bihać, Breza, Ilijaš, Kiseljak, Olovo, Sarajevo, Tuzla, and Visoko), both males (n=10) and females (n=38), randomly chosen, were a sample of the current research. The majority (n=34, 79.2%) were English language teachers in primary schools, while others (n=14, 29.2%) were teachers in secondary schools. A small proportion of the participants (n=5, 10.4%) were beginner teachers with up to three years of teaching experience, 14 of them (29.2%) had between three and nine years of teaching experience, while 29 (60.4%) of them were English language teachers with more than ten years of teaching experience. (Table 1 below)

Table 1. Participants' characteristics

	Gender		Type of school		Teaching experience (in years)		
	Male	Female	Primary	Secondary	0-3	3-9	10 and more
Frequency	10	38	34	14	5	14	29
%	20.8	79.2	70.8	29.2	10.4	29.2	60.4

3.3. Instrument and procedure

For this quantitative research project, the questionnaire, taken from Lišková (2017), was used. It consisted of three parts; the first gathering the participants' demographic information; the second containing the statements of ELT practice; and the third containing the statements of attitudes towards the two types of teaching methods (Grammar-translation and Direct method). The questionnaire was sent online, via google forms survey, through the participants' e-mail or Viber addresses. Once collected, the responses were processed through the SPSS software and, according to the research questions, analyzed and interpreted. The questionnaire's reliability coefficient was checked using Cronbach's alpha.

4. Results

The first research question aimed to investigate do Bosnian EL teachers prefer the Grammar-translation method or the Direct method in their teaching practice. Specifically, the type of school where the teachers teach (primary and high school), as well as their teaching experience (in years), were taken as indicators of possible preferences towards one of the methods. For this purpose, three statements indicating the level of translating the English texts, using the pupils' mother tongue, and the ways of explaining the grammar rules to students were

examined.¹

Thus, in terms of translating texts and task instructions in the textbooks with pupils, there was an insignificant difference obtained by a t-test at $p < .05$, $=.825$ between primary and secondary school teachers. They do not translate all texts and instructions but they do it often or rather occasionally. One-third of both primary and secondary school teachers never or rarely translate texts. However, in terms of using pupils' mother tongue in the classroom, there was a statistically significant difference of a t-test at $p < .05$, $=.005$ between primary and secondary school teachers. While more than half of the primary school teachers (55.9%) stated that they use their mother tongue only to explain complex grammar to make it easier for pupils to understand, only 7.1% of secondary school teachers claimed to do so. Additionally, while for 32.4% of primary school teachers the use of the mother tongue is limited by both teacher and students and the target language is preferred, by all means, the majority of secondary school teachers (85.7%) claimed so. Finally, in terms of grammar rules explanation to their students, teachers again did not differ in their responses and an insignificant difference of a t-test at $p < .05$, $=.540$, was found. More than half of them firstly explain grammar rules and then practice while around 20% of them firstly let their students discover the rules by themselves from given examples.

In conclusion, primary and secondary school teachers usually translate their instruction. The use of the pupils' mother tongue is more frequent in classrooms of the primary school teachers while in the secondary school classrooms teachers prefer the target language. Finally, the majority of teachers firstly explain grammar rules and then practice them through examples with their students.

Table 2. Descriptive analyses and t-test of teaching methods according to school type

STATEMENT 1		Do you translate texts and task instructions in the textbooks with pupils?			
Response options:	Never or very rarely. Pupils are led to understand the target language.	Occasionally.	Often. We translate most of the texts and task instructions for better understanding.	All texts and instructions are being translated into a mother tongue.	
Type of school	<i>Number of responses</i>				
Primary (n=34)	10 (29.4%)	12 (35.3%)	12 (35.3%)	0 (0.0%)	
Secondary (n=14)	4 (28.6%)	7 (50.0%)	2 (14.3%)	1 (7.1%)	
Sig. ($p < .05$) .825					
STATEMENT 2		Use of the pupil's mother tongue in the classroom.			
Response options:	Instruction is given in the native language of the students.	Mother tongue is used only to explain complex grammar to make it easier for pupils to understand.	Use of the mother tongue is limited for both teacher and students. The target language is preferred by all means.	Use of the mother tongue is not permitted or very limited.	
Type of school	<i>Number of responses</i>				
Primary (n=34)	4 (11.8%)	19 (55.9%)	11 (32.4%)	0 (0.0%)	
Secondary (n=14)	1 (7.1%)	1 (7.1%)	12 (85.7%)	0 (0.0%)	
Sig. ($p < .05$) .005					
STATEMENT 3		Do you explicitly explain grammar rules to your students?			
Response options:	Yes, always. I always first explain the piece of language, grammar (e.g., form and use of present simple tense) and then we practice it.	Yes, most of the time I first explain the grammar rule which we practice in exercises.	No, not usually. I let students discover the rules by themselves from given examples.	No, never. Students always discover the rules from texts or exercises containing the target piece of grammar.	
Type of school	<i>Number of responses</i>				
Primary (n=34)	19 (55.9%)	7 (20.6%)	8 (23.5%)	0 (0.0%)	
Secondary (n=14)	8 (57.1%)	1 (7.1%)	4 (28.7%)	1 (7.1%)	
Sig. ($p < .05$) .540					

¹ Table 2 below contains a representation of these responses. Due to an unequal number of primary and high school teachers, percentages rather than a number of responses are worth considering.

Furthermore, the analysis of the preferences of these two methods was examined in terms of the teachers' teaching experience. While filling in the survey they were asked to indicate whether they teach between 0 and 3 years, between 4 and 9 years, and 10 and more years. Thus, these three groups of teaching experiences were considered in the comparison of teaching methods.

According to the results of a One-way ANOVA, there was an insignificant difference at $p < .05$, $=.556$ between the teachers of different teaching experience and their experiences in text and task instruction translations. Approximately one-third of each group never or rarely translates texts and instructions while others do it occasionally or often. The most important issue is that they do not always translate it. When it comes to the usage of the students' mother tongue in the classroom, there was again a statistically significant difference of a One-way ANOVA at $p < .05$, $=.002$ between these three groups of teachers. The teachers with a minimum of experience (0 – 3 years) usually give their instructions in the native language of students while more experienced teachers limit it and do it only when explaining complex grammar. Finally, in terms of explaining grammar rules to their students, an insignificant difference of a One-way ANOVA at $p < .05$, $=.664$, was found. The majority of teachers from all three groups firstly explain grammar rules and then practice them. A small proportion of them (around 20% from each group) let their students discover the rules from the examples they do.

In conclusion, teaching experience does not determine the amount of text and instruction translations and grammar explanations in EL teaching. Contrary, it only determines the amount of the usage of the students' mother tongue. The results showed that the less experienced teachers use the students' mother tongue more frequently than the more experienced teachers. Table 3 below contains a detailed representation of the presented results.

Table 3. Descriptive analyses and ANOVA of Teaching methods according to teaching experience

STATEMENT 1		Do you translate texts and task instructions in the textbooks with pupils?			
<i>Response options:</i>	Never or very rarely. Pupils are led to understand in target language	Occasionally	Often. We translate most of the texts and task instructions for better understanding	All texts and instructions are being translated into a mother tongue	
Teaching experience (in years)	<i>Number of responses</i>				
0 – 3 years (n=5)	1 (20.0%)	1 (20.0%)	3 (60.0%)	0 (0.0%)	
4 – 9 years (n=14)	4 (28.6%)	7 (50.0%)	3 (21.4%)	0 (0.0%)	
10 and more (n=29)	9 (31.0%)	11 (37.9%)	8 (27.6%)	1 (3.4%)	
Sig. ($p < .05$) .556					
STATEMENT 2		Use of pupils' mother tongue in the classroom.			
<i>Response options:</i>	Instruction is given in the native language of the students.	Mother tongue is used only to explain complex grammar to make it easier for pupils to understand.	Use of the mother tongue is limited for both teacher and students. The target language is preferred by all means.	Use of the mother tongue is not permitted or very limited.	
Teaching experience (in years)	<i>Number of responses</i>				
0 – 3 years (n=5)	4 (80.0%)	0 (0.0%)	1 (20.0%)	0 (0.0%)	
4 – 9 years (n=14)	1 (7.1%)	5 (35.7%)	8 (57.1%)	0 (0.0%)	
10 and more (n=29)	0 (0.0%)	15 (51.7%)	14 (48.3%)	0 (0.0%)	
Sig. ($p < .05$) .002					
STATEMENT 3		Do you explicitly explain grammar rules to your students?			
<i>Response options:</i>	Yes, always. I always first explain the piece of language, grammar (e.g., form and use of present simple tense) and then we practice it.	Yes, most of the time I first explain the grammar rule which we practice in exercises.	No, not usually. I let students discover the rules by themselves from given examples.	No, never. Students always discover the rules from texts or exercises containing the target piece of grammar.	

Teaching experience (in years)	Number of responses			
	0 – 3 years (n=5)	3 (60.0%)	1 (20.0%)	1 (20.0%)
4 – 9 years (n=14)	9 (64.3%)	2 (14.3%)	3 (21.4%)	0 (0.0%)
10 and more (n=29)	15 (51.7%)	5 (17.2%)	8 (27.6%)	1 (3.4%)

Sig. ($p < .05$) .664

The second research question investigated the Bosnian EL teachers' attitudes toward the Grammar-translation method and the Direct Method of teaching English. Specifically, it aimed to check whether these attitudes differ regarding the type of school where they teach, their teaching experience, and their gender.

Overall, teachers from both types of schools and regardless of their teaching experience almost equally answered the attitudes statements, thus showing an insignificant difference at $p < .05$. They have a rather neutral attitude regarding whether their students like learning grammar rules. The answers to the other two questions are somewhat clearer. They are closer to agreeing that their students like the sentences drilling and repeating and that they prefer when their mother tongue is used more, although they do not completely agree with these attitudes. (Table 4)

Table 4. Descriptive analyses, t-test, and ANOVA of teachers' attitudes towards Grammar-translation method

		STATEMENTS					
		My students like learning grammar rules in English class		My students like sentence drilling and repeating sentences in my English class.		My students like it when I mostly use B/S/C in my English lessons	
		<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>
Type of school	Primary (n=34)	3.09	.93	3.35	.98	3.24	1.01
	Secondary (n=14)	2.57	.93	3.00	.98	2.93	1.01
		.088		.281		.345	
Teaching experience	0 – 3 years (n=5)	3.20	1.30	2.60	1.51	3.40	1.14
	4 – 9 years (n=14)	2.71	.91	3.00	.87	3.00	.78
	10 and more (n=29)	3.00	.92	3.48	.94	3.17	1.10
		.540		.111		.739	
		<i>p</i>		<i>p</i>		<i>p</i>	

Regarding the attitudes towards the direct method, the teachers did not show a statistically significant difference at $p < .05$ in attitudes here either. All teachers agree that their students like activities in which they interact in English with classmates and agree that their students like English class to be focused on communication, with grammar explained when necessary. However, they are not quite sure and mostly disagree that their students do not like when they need to translate from/to English in class. So, according to these results, teachers reported their students' English language orientation more through the Direct method even though they like some aspects of the Grammar-translation method, such as translating from/to the English language. (Table 5)

Table 5. Descriptive analyses, t-test, and ANOVA of teachers' attitudes towards the Direct method

		STATEMENTS					
		My students do not like when they need to translate from/to English in class		My students like activities in which they interact in English with classmates		My students like English class to be focused on communication, with grammar explained when necessary	
		<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>
Type of school	Primary (n=34)	2.71	.76	3.94	1.12	3.88	.94
	Secondary (n=14)	2.50	.94	4.14	.86	4.29	.72
		.430		.552		.160	
Teaching experience	0 – 3 years (n=5)	3.00	1.00	3.80	1.09	4.20	.44
	4 – 9 years (n=14)	2.36	.84	4.29	.46	3.86	1.09
	10 and more (n=29)	2.72	.75	3.90	1.23	4.03	.86
		.228		.483		.733	
		<i>p</i>		<i>p</i>		<i>p</i>	

Finally, an overall comparison of these two methods between the listed characteristics of teachers, including their gender, was made. Statistically insignificant differences were shown in the attitudes of both methods between all characteristics. What is significantly noticeable is that the attitudes toward the Direct method are stronger than the attitudes toward the Grammar-translation method and all teachers believe that the first method is more common among their students than the second. (Table 6)

Table 6. Overall analysis of attitudes towards GTM and the Direct method

		Overall attitudes towards Grammar-translation method		Overall attitudes towards the Direct method	
		<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>
Type of school	Primary (n=34)	3.22	.66	3.50	.65
	Secondary (n=14)	2.83	.65	3.64	.54
	<i>p</i>	.067		.508	
Teaching experience	0 – 3 years (n=5)	3.06	.79	3.66	.66
	4 – 9 years (n=14)	2.90	.59	3.50	.51
	10 and more (n=29)	3.21	.69	3.55	.69
	<i>p</i>	.364		.881	
Gender	Male (n=10)	3.05	.67	3.61	.65
	Female (n=38)	3.11	.67	3.54	.62
	<i>p</i>	.246		.159	

5. Discussion

The aim of the study was to investigate which method of language teaching is more used by English teachers in primary and secondary schools in Bosnia and Herzegovina and what are the attitudes of teachers towards each of the two methods that are the subject of study.

As for the first research question, we saw that neither of the two methods, the use of which we examined, was fully used. Teachers do not translate everything they do from English to the students' native language, but they do not fully use the Direct Method either. However, in most cases, teachers in both primary and secondary schools, regardless of years of teaching experience, first explain grammar and language structure and then practice. They mostly translate texts as well as instructions for tasks that students should do, and in this practice, there is no statistically significant difference between teachers. However, what showed the difference between the teachers was the use of the pupils' mother tongue in the classroom. Primary school teachers with more teaching experience use the pupils' mother tongue less than secondary school teachers and beginning teachers.

These results indicate several facts. Firstly, in line with Bhatti & Mukhtar (2017) and Usman, et al. (2018), Bosnian teachers also mostly use GTM instead of DM although it can be said that they try and use DM. The preference for GT methods may mean that teachers resort to an easier and simpler method, and this may further affect the quality of teaching and the learning outcomes of students. For example, being exposed to the Grammar-translation method, students often attend classes learning *about* the English language but do not necessarily use it. English is often used very little other than just translating, learning grammar rules, and memorizing words. In this way, students are not exposed to English but rather learn about it. This fact is in line with the investigations of Kovačević, Brdarević-Čeljo & Bećirović (2018), who, concerning the way the English language is taught in B&H, found that the students are not satisfied with the teaching methods, indicating that more focus should be placed on speaking and reading skills instead of grammar and translation.

Moreover, the preference for the GT method can also mean backwardness and insufficient modern education and incompetence of teachers. It seems that more modern but also challenging methods such as the Direct Method are not the first methodological approach for teachers in Bosnia, probably because they are not sufficiently trained, but also because of curricular programs that do not require such methods from them (Kešetović, 2017). Also, a reason for this may be a still widely present traditional teacher-centered educational style (Lunn, 2016) which supports the above-mentioned assumptions. Thus, based on these results, the grammar-translation method in teaching English seems to be more common and used more than the Direct method, that is, from the greater use of English in English classes. It is noticeable that the teachers do not fully use the mother tongue and do not use the GT method fully, but the results indicate that there is still a significant level of translation. This is consistent with what Zeeshan (2013) states that traditional teaching methods can stop teachers' creativity forcing them to complete lengthy courses, traditional examinations, and so forth. In essence, it can be concluded that there is a kind of mixed method of teaching that is created by using both of these methods together.

As for the second research question, regarding the teachers' attitudes towards the direct method, the results do not show clear determinants according to the statements from the questionnaire. An overall look at the arithmetic values of the answers and the insignificant difference between the teachers in those answers show either that they are not sure or that they do not know if their students like translation, sentence drilling, and the use of the mother tongue in class. Now, when we look at these rather neutral attitudes and the rather unclear teaching method that we found in the results, we can agree with the above-mentioned conclusion from Marinac & Barić (2018), who stated that attitudes and beliefs towards certain methods are usually shaped by their actual teaching experience, e.i., by a certain method they use. Therefore, from a vague determination towards the use of

a certain method, an unclear attitude towards the method also arises.

The situation is similar in the case of attitudes towards the Direct Method. Teachers do not differ in their attitudes towards the Direct Method, mostly showing a certain preference towards this method, but these attitudes are not so expressed, that is, they are not in complete agreement with the statements offered. However, the results of the study further suggest that, nevertheless, attitudes towards the Direct Method are more pronounced and teachers show a greater preference for it than for the GT method, which is not in accordance with the findings cited above (Pym et al., 2013; Mondal, 2012). We see this in the overall analysis of attitudes towards them. In contrast to the Direct method, where we have a clear agreement with the statements about attitudes towards it, we did not have clear agreements with the GT method. Although, on the other hand, these differences are not statistically significant, they may be a certain indicator that teachers are turning towards the Direct Method or at least that, as in the case of use, they are beginning to take it more into consideration.

6. Conclusion

The aim of the present research was to delve into analysis of the Bosnian primary and secondary school teachers' preferences between the two of the most famous language teaching methods (the Grammar-translation method and the Direct method). The results have revealed that none of these methods are fully used, although a greater use of GT methods is noticeable. Moreover, the results have also proven that in their attitudes towards these two methods, teachers lean more towards the Direct Method, but that their attitudes towards both methods are still unclear and not fully expressed. The assumption that teachers could differ in terms of use and attitudes towards these two methods in terms of the type of school they work in, experience in teaching, and gender turned out to be incorrect. These characteristics were found to be non-significant in this analysis except in the case of teaching experience and use of the mother tongue in the classroom where teachers with more experience were found to use the mother tongue less in the classroom.

The present study is not without certain limitations. The scope of schools and the number of teachers that were examined are not sufficient for more general conclusions and the wider population. Also, other methods likely to be used could be examined through such a study. In addition, it could be examined whether and to what extent a mix of these methods is used in practice, because the results showed that there is a tendency to use them interchangeably, that is, under the situation. Thus, the present research can serve as a base for such studies.

In addition to the fact that GTM is mainly used for writing activities and vocabulary learning and that DM is mostly used for speaking and listening mentioned earlier, it would be interesting to investigate whether the use of these two methods has anything to do with the type of curriculum used in schools because, according to Anabokay & Suryasa (2019), GTM is more used in traditional-national curricula while DM is more used in contemporary curricula, such as the Cambridge program. Moreover, one could even try to adopt a certain hybrid teaching method that would summarize these two and other methods together. To achieve this, it is suggested to take into consideration which school it is taught in, who the students are and what their level of knowledge of the English language is, and whether the teachers are sufficiently prepared for such challenges.

References

- Anabokay, Y., & Suryasa, I. (2019). TEFL methods in Indonesia. *International Journal Of Linguistics, Literature And Culture*, 5(2), 13-24. <https://doi.org/10.21744/ijllc.v5n2.612>
- Bal, M. (2012). English language and literature in the post-war Bosnia and Herzegovina: Challenges and experiences of a transcultural academic adaptation. *English Teaching: Practice and Critique*, 11(4), 178-189.
- Bećirović, S., Brdarević-Čeljo, A., & Polz, E. (2021). Exploring the Relationship Between Language Learning Strategies, Academic Achievement, Grade Level, and Gender. *Journal of Language and Education*, 7(2), 93-106. <https://doi.org/10.17323/jle.2021.10771>
- Bhatti, M., & Mukhtar, R. (2017). Analyzing the utility of Grammar translation method and Direct method for teaching English at intermediate level. *IJAEDU- International E-Journal of Advances in Education*, 3(7), 60-60. <https://doi.org/10.18768/ijaedu.309803>
- Chang, S. (2011). A contrastive study of Grammar translation method and communicative approach in teaching English grammar. *English Language Teaching*, 4(2), 13-24. <https://doi.org/10.5539/elt.v4n2p13>
- Delibegović – Džanić, N. & Imamović, A. (2016). *The Status of English in Bosnia and Herzegovina: Past and Present*. In: The Status of English in Bosnia and Herzegovina. Chapter: The Status of English in Bosnia and Herzegovina: Past and Present. Publisher: Multilingual Matters. Editors: Louisa Buckingham.
- Delibegović - Džanić, N. & Hasanspahić, A. (2020). Computer Assisted Language Learning in English Language Classrooms in Bosnia and Herzegovina. *ExELL (Explorations in English Language and Linguistics)* 8(1), 14-46. <https://doi.org/10.2478/exell-2020-0012>
- Djauhar, R. (2021). The Grammar Translation method, the Direct method, and the Audio-Lingual method. *Lingua: Journal of Linguistics, Literature, and Language Education*, 4(1), 84-88.

- <https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.4642999>
- Izhar, F., & Hashim, M. A. (2022). Comparative analysis of Direct method and Grammar translation method on student learning in English among secondary school. *Global Educational Studies Review*, 7(1), 347-359. [https://doi.org/10.31703/gesr.2022\(VII-I\).34](https://doi.org/10.31703/gesr.2022(VII-I).34)
- Katamba, C. V. & Sormin, E. R. (2011). A comparison between Grammar-translation Method and Direct method in improbing pupil's vocabulary achievement. *Journal of Language Pedagogy*, 1(1), 1-12.
- Kešetović, S. (2017). Early foreign language education in Bosnia and Herzegovina - a historical overview. *DHS* 3, 95-106.
- Kovačević, F., Brdarević-Čeljo, A., Bećirović, S. (2018). Opportunities and Challenges Facing Bosnian High-School EFL Learners. *European Researcher*, 9(4). <https://doi.org/10.13187/er.2018.4.298>
- Lišková, M. (2017). Methods and Approaches in Teaching English at a Lower Secondary School Level. (Diploma Thesis). Univerzita Hradec Králové
- Lunn, S. (2016). Intercultural communicative education: Bosnia as a case study. <https://wmbosniaproject.files.wordpress.com/2018/06/bosniaproject2016-finalpaper.pdf>
- Marinac, M., & Barić, I. (2018). Teachers' attitudes toward and use of translation in the foreign language classroom at institutions of Higher Education in Croatia. *Theory and Practice in Language Studies*, 8(8), 906. <https://doi.org/10.17507/tpls.0808.02>
- Mašić, A., & Tarabar, A. (2021). The Influence of Online Games on Learning English Vocabulary in High Schools in Bosnia and Herzegovina. *MAP Education and Humanities*, 1(1), 28-37. <https://doi.org/10.53880/2744-2373.2021.1.1.28>
- Mondal, N. K. (2012). English teachers' attitude towards Grammar-translation method at secondary education: Bangladeshi context. *Researcher*, 4(2), 64-68.
- Pavić, M. (2019). *Tradicionalne i suvremene metode poučavanja stranog jezika u ranoj dobi* (Undergraduate thesis). University of Rijeka. <https://urn.nsk.hr/urn:nbn:hr:189:814471>
- Pym, A., Malmkjaer, K. & Gutierrez-Colon, M. (2013). Translation and language learning: The role of translation in the teaching of languages in the European Union. Luxemburg: Publications Office of the European Union.
- Spahiu, I., & Kryeziu, N. (2021). A contrastive study of grammar translation method and direct method in teaching of English language to primary school pupils. *Linguistics and Culture Review*, 5(S2), 1022-1029. <https://doi.org/10.21744/lingcure.v5nS2.1663>
- Šehović, A. (2009). Mjesto i funkcija anglicizama u savremenom bosanskom jeziku [The place and role of anglicisms in contemporary Bosnian]. In: *Pismo: Journal for linguistics and Literary Studies*, 7(1), 122-138.
- Usman, M, Ayoub, M. T. & Awan, A. (2018). A contrastive study of Grammar translation method and Direct method in teaching of English language at the secondary level in the district of Vehari-Pakistan. *Global Journal of Management, Social Sciences and Humanities*, 4(4), 892-932.
- Zeeshan, M. (2013). Pakistani Government Secondary School Teachers' and Students' Attitudes towards Communicative Language Teaching and Grammar Translation in Quetta, Balochistan. (Unpublished Master's Thesis). California State University, Los Angeles ProQuest Dissertations Publishing