

THE USE OF ENGLISH TEACHING METHODS IN A SECONDARY SCHOOL IN KARAWANG

Fina AUFAR Laela Ibrahim*

State University of Jakarta
alifnafina@gmail.com

To cite this article: Ibrahim, F. A. L. (2018). The use of English teaching methods in a secondary school in Karawang. *ELT in Focus*, 1(2), 75-78.

Abstract

This study focused on the related analysis of English language teaching methods implemented by teachers in a secondary school in Karawang regency. This study used survey research method, utilising mailed-questionnaire technique. The primary participants of this study were 4 questionnaire responses from English Teachers in a secondary school in Karawang regency. The result of the study indicated that most teachers in a secondary school in Karawang regency implement Communicative Language Teaching (CLT) method, in contrast none of them implement the Project-Based Language Learning (PBL). It can be derived from the findings that they have got good understanding in designing the meaningful activities and have met the requirement for teaching English in the current era.

Keywords : *English Teaching Methods, Implementation, Survey Research Method*

INTRODUCTION

English is one of substantial subject matter in the various levels education. As explained in Emilia (2005), it is a compulsory foreign language teaching throughout Indonesia, as the highest proportion of teaching periods for English in teaching program, it is taught in four teaching periods a week.

The way English taught tends to influence the learners academic achievement, particularly at higher secondary level (Abbasi, 2011). The impact is caused by the collaboration between teacher and the learners. The teacher`s role is significantly required in the process of building the willingness of learners, since the teachers are responsible to transmit the objectives, the concepts, the topics and the materials in the curriculum into the meaningful activities and materials (Robinson, cited in Oyetunde, 2004; see also Adelabu & Matthias, 2013).

Tomlinson (2008) added that the more meaningful the materials and the tasks are for the learners involved the better the outcome will be (Nunan, 1998; see Abbasi, 2011).

In order to realize those activities, the teachers are mandatory being creative and innovative (Emilia, 2005). They are supposed to facilitate the learners any various stimulating methods. Nonetheless, currently, almost all of the teachers still depend on the text-book method, lecture method and other boring and out-date methods. Yet in some circumstances, they still implement the alternative methods, for instance grammar translation methods, audiolingual, communicative language teaching, project-based methods and so on.

There were some researchers conducting the similar study using survey methods, such as Adelabu and Matthias (2013) investigated the commonly and rarely used methods of teaching English and literature used by secondary school

teachers in Benue State. Afrin (2014) tried to find out the significant ways of teaching English language suitable for elementary level students and discussed the practical implementation of these ways. Abbasi (2011) investigated teaching strategies applied by English language teachers for the development of linguistic abilities of ESL learners at intermediate level in Pakistan.

Based on the phenomenon above, the researcher intends to investigate the frequency of English teaching methods implementation among the English teachers in a secondary school in Karawang regency.

METHODOLOGY

The method employed in this study was cross-sectional surveys method. This method permits to gather information from a large sample of people relatively quickly and inexpensively. In addition, this method tends to be able to gather the data at one point in time (Ary, Jacobs & Sorensen, 2010).

In this study, four English language teachers in a secondary school in Karawang regency were selected as the participants. In addition, this study also utilized a self-constructed questionnaire as the instrument. This questionnaire, afterward, is divided into two parts. The first part was requesting information about the respondent's profile – name of teacher, teaching experience, and name of school. The second part was to find out how frequent they have been utilizing the methods. It has a four scale response of “Very Frequently”, “Frequently”, “Not Frequently” or “Never Used”. ‘Very Frequently’ and ‘Frequently’ were added together to mean ‘Frequently’.

FINDINGS AND DISCUSSION

This section presents what methods are mostly implemented by teachers. The findings are listed according to the amount of teacher questionnaire responses, and summarized in Table 1:

Table 1. *Teacher questionnaire responses towards the frequency of implemented methods*

Methods	Never used	Not Frequently	Frequently
GTM	1	10	1
Audiolingual		2	2
Direct Method	2	2	4
CLT	2	3	7
TPR		3	1
Reading Approach	3	1	
Discussion	2	4	2
Project-based	4		
Problem-solving	2	6	
Dramatization	1	2	1

The following table indicates that there are three major possibilities about the English Methods Implementation among Teachers in MAN 1 Karawang. First, mostly teachers implemented role playing activities to encourage the learners' communication, while two of them are indicated to never use authentic texts and communication activities which

accommodate real life language use. Both strategies literally aimed to make the students communicatively competent (Larsen-Freeman, 2000; Richards et al, 2000). It means the teachers implemented the Communicative Language Teaching, as well.

Second, it is occurred the balancing among teachers to teach grammar by not providing explicit grammar rules but through examples and drills. Two of them frequently implement that activities and the rest does not frequently implement the activities. Grammar ability is taught explicitly through drilling is one of activities to teach English through Audiolingual Method (Richards & Rodgers, 2001; Larsen-Freeman, 2000; Abbasi, 2011).

Last, all of teachers never allow the learner to select the materials, to do the planning and to logically execute the project, whereas it is in line with the characteristics of project-based method as proposed by Adelabu & Matthias (2013).

CONCLUSION

In sum up, referring to the ten alternative and stimulating methods described in this study, mostly teachers in MAN 1 Karawang implemented Communicative Language Teaching Method. It can be concluded that they have well-comprehension in designing the meaningful activities, it is due to the requirement in this current era that concern not only what is language but also how to use the language. In the other words, the requirement seems to get done through implementation Communicative Language Teaching method.

Furthermore, in teaching and learning process the learner does not select the materials, do the planning or execute the project. Whereas, those activities are included in Project-Based Language Learning methods and it is another significant and stimulating methods to be implemented.

REFERENCES

Abbasi, A. M. (2011). A survey of teaching strategies in ESL classroom. *Language in India* 11, 313-329.

Adelabu, B., & Matthias, N. (2013). Survey of methods of teaching English and literature among secondary school teachers in Benue State. *International J. Soc. Sci. & Education* 3(3): 847-858.

Afrin, S. (2014). *Teaching methods and approaches in ESL classrooms in Dhaka: A comparative study between English and Bangla medium schools* (Ph.D. Undergraduate). BRAC University.

Anderson, N. J. (2005). Fluency in L2 reading and speaking. *TESOL 2005 colloquium*

Ary, D., Jacobs, L. C., & Sorensen, C. (2010). *Introduction to research in education* (8th ed.). California: Wadsworth Cengage Learning.

Brown, H. D. (2000). *Teaching by principles*. New York: Longman Person Education.

Emilia, E. (2005). *A critical genre-based approach to teaching academic writing in a tertiary EFL context in Indonesia*. (An unpublished dissertation). University of Melbourne.

Creswell, J. W. (2009). *Educational research: Planning, conducting, and evaluating quantitative and qualitative research*. Edward Brothers.

Fraenkel, J. R., Wallen, N. E., & Hyun, H. H. (2012). *How to design and evaluate research in education*. New York: Mc. Graw Hill.

Krashen, S. (1985). *Insights and inquiries* (1st ed.). Hayward, CA: Alemany Press.

Larsen-Freeman, D. (2004). CA for SLA? It all depends. *Modern Language Journal*, 88(4), 603-607.

Larsen-Freeman, D., & Anderson, M. (2016). *Techniques and principles in language teaching* (1st ed.). Oxford: Oxford University Press.

McMillan, J. H., & Schumacher, S. (2001). *Research in education: A conceptual introduction* (5th ed.). New York: Longman.

McNamara, T. F. (2000). *Language testing* (1st ed.). Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Nation, I. S. P. (2001). *Learning vocabulary in another language*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Nunan, D. (1998). *Language teaching methodology: A textbook for teachers*. New York: Prentice Hall.

Oyetunde, T. O. (2004). Understanding Teaching And Learning Process. In C. A. Andayi, Y. A. Mallum, and T. O. Oyetunde (Eds.), *The Practice of Teaching: Perspective and Strategies* (pp. 11-30). Jos: LECAPS Publishers.

Richards, J. C., & Rodgers, T. S. (2015). *Approaches and methods in language teaching*. (1st ed.). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Tomlinson, B. (2010). *English language learning materials* (1st ed.). London: Continuum.