



## Revisiting Grammar Translation Method in Contemporary EFL Pedagogy: Effects on Grammatical Accuracy and Translation Competence

Yenssy Mervilen Fanggidae<sup>1\*</sup>, Yandri Susuek Ndun<sup>2</sup>

<sup>1,2</sup> English language education, Universitas Persatuan Guru 1945 NTT, Kupang, Nusa Tenggara Timur 85116, Indonesia

| ARTICLE INFO                                                                     | ABSTRACT                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                |
|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Received:<br>02 June 2026                                                        | Persistent challenges in achieving grammatical precision among English as a Foreign Language (EFL) learners continue to raise concerns regarding the effectiveness of predominantly communicative instructional approaches. This study examines the extent to which structured grammar instruction influences learners' performance and explores the mechanism linking instructional practice and language outcomes. A quasi-experimental design was employed with 60 fourth-semester university students divided into two groups. The experimental group received systematic instruction emphasizing rule explanation, sentence analysis, and guided practice, while the control group participated in meaning-focused communicative activities. Data were collected through pre-test and post-test assessments measuring structural accuracy and translation performance, with descriptive, correlation, and regression analyses conducted using SPSS and Structural Equation Modeling (SEM) using AMOS to examine direct and indirect relationships among variables. The findings indicate that students receiving explicit instruction demonstrated significantly greater improvement in structural accuracy and translation performance than those in the comparison group, suggesting that grammatical mastery contributes to more precise language transfer. The structural model further reveals that grammatical accuracy plays a mediating role, indicating that improvements in performance are indirectly facilitated through strengthened linguistic knowledge. The study concludes that integrating structured, form-oriented instruction with meaning-focused practices can address persistent accuracy issues and support higher-order language skills. |
| Accepted:<br>13 July 2026                                                        |                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                         |
| Published:<br>06 Agustus 2026                                                    |                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                         |
| <b>Keywords:</b>                                                                 |                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                         |
| Grammatical Accuracy, Language Instruction, Translation Competence, EFL Learners |                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                         |

Copyright © 2026 The Author(s)

Published by CV Wahana Publikasi.

This article is an open access article under the [CC BY-NC-SA 4.0 License](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-sa/4.0/)

## 1. Introduction

The evolution of language teaching methodologies has undergone significant transformation over the past decades (Al-zyod & der Wal, 2026; Alsalihi & Abdul.Z, 2025; Cao, 2026), particularly with the emergence and dominance of Communicative Language Teaching (CLT) (Brandl, 2026), which emphasizes meaningful interaction and communicative competence as the primary goals of language learning. Despite this paradigm shift, the persistent challenges EFL learners in achieving grammatical accuracy continue to raise important pedagogical concerns, especially in contexts where English exposure is limited and learning is primarily classroom-based (Richards & Rodgers, 2014). In such contexts, the exclusive reliance on communicative approaches may not adequately address learners' needs for explicit grammatical instruction, leading to fossilized errors and limited syntactic control.

The Grammar Translation Method (GTM), often criticized for its focus on rote memorization and lack of communicative practice, has historically been marginalized in modern language pedagogy (Gilquin & De Knop, 2026; Han, 2023). However, recent studies suggest that GTM may still offer valuable contributions, particularly in enhancing learners' understanding of grammatical structures and their ability to translate texts accurately (Cook, 2016). This reconsideration becomes increasingly relevant in EFL contexts such as Indonesia, where learners frequently struggle with both grammatical accuracy and translation competence due to insufficient exposure to authentic language use.

In the context of higher education institutions such as Universitas PGRI 1945 NTT, students in the fourth semester are expected to demonstrate not only communicative competence but also a solid grasp of grammatical structures and the ability to interpret texts across languages. However, preliminary observations indicate that many students still experience difficulties in constructing grammatically correct sentences and accurately translating academic texts. This situation suggests a potential mismatch between the teaching methods employed and the learning outcomes expected (see Kolsut, 2026).

The problem is further compounded by the tendency to adopt CLT as a one-size-fits-all approach without considering contextual factors such as learners' proficiency levels, educational background, and linguistic environment. While CLT promotes fluency, it often underemphasizes accuracy, which remains a critical component of language proficiency (Larsen-Freeman, 2015). Consequently, there is a growing need to revisit traditional methods like GTM and evaluate their effectiveness in contemporary EFL settings.

This study addresses the following research problems: (1) Does the Grammar Translation Method significantly affect students' grammatical accuracy? (2) Does the Grammar Translation Method significantly affect students' translation competence? (3) To what extent does grammatical accuracy mediate the relationship between GTM and translation competence? These questions aim to provide a comprehensive understanding of the role of GTM in enhancing key linguistic skills.

The objective of this study is to empirically investigate the effectiveness of GTM in improving grammatical accuracy and translation competence among EFL learners. By employing a quasi-experimental design, the study seeks to generate data-driven insights that can inform pedagogical decisions in similar contexts.

The hypotheses formulated in this study are as follows: H1: GTM has a significant positive effect on grammatical accuracy; H2: GTM has a significant positive effect on translation competence; H3: Grammatical accuracy mediates the relationship between GTM and translation competence. These hypotheses are tested using statistical analysis to ensure the robustness of the findings.

## 2. Literature Review

The GTM is one of the oldest language teaching approaches, rooted in classical language instruction where the primary objective was to enable learners to read and translate literary texts. Despite its long-standing criticism, GTM remains relevant in certain educational contexts, particularly where accuracy and form-focused instruction are prioritized (Cook, 2016). The method emphasizes explicit grammar instruction, vocabulary memorization, and translation exercises, which can contribute to learners' metalinguistic awareness and structural understanding.

Recent research has revisited the role of GTM in modern pedagogy, suggesting that its effectiveness depends largely on how it is implemented rather than the method itself (Nassaji, 2017a). In EFL contexts, where learners have limited exposure to authentic language use, GTM can provide a structured framework for understanding linguistic rules and patterns. This is particularly important for developing grammatical accuracy, which is often neglected in communicative approaches.

Grammatical accuracy refers to the correct use of linguistic forms, including syntax, morphology, and sentence structure. It is a fundamental component of language proficiency and plays a crucial role in both written and spoken communication (Ellis, 2016). Studies have shown that explicit grammar instruction can significantly improve learners' accuracy, especially when combined with practice and feedback (Loewen, 2020).

Translation competence, on the other hand, involves the ability to transfer meaning from one language to another while maintaining accuracy and coherence. It requires not only linguistic knowledge but also cultural awareness and cognitive skills (Pym, 2013). In EFL contexts, translation is often used as a pedagogical tool to reinforce vocabulary and grammar, making it closely related to GTM.

The relationship between grammatical accuracy and translation competence has been widely discussed in the literature. Accurate grammatical knowledge enables learners to produce more precise translations, as it allows them to understand and manipulate sentence structures effectively (Ahmed et al., 2022; Klimova, 2015). Therefore, improving grammatical accuracy can have a direct impact on translation performance.

Communicative Language Teaching, while effective in promoting fluency, often underemphasizes form-focused instruction, which can lead to persistent grammatical errors. This limitation has led to the emergence of hybrid approaches that integrate elements of GTM and CLT to achieve a balance between accuracy and fluency.

In recent years, there has been a growing interest in combining traditional and modern methods to address the diverse needs of language learners. This integrative approach recognizes that no single method is universally effective and that pedagogical decisions should be based on contextual factors (Richards, 2017). GTM, when used strategically, can complement communicative approaches by providing the necessary foundation for accurate language use.

Furthermore, empirical studies have demonstrated that students exposed to form-focused instruction tend to perform better in tasks requiring grammatical precision, such as translation and academic writing (Nassaji, 2017b). This suggests that GTM can play a valuable role in developing higher-order language skills.

The cognitive perspective on language learning also supports the use of explicit instruction, as it facilitates the internalization of linguistic rules and enhances learners' ability to monitor their output (DeKeyser, 2020; Spada & Lightbown, 2019). This is particularly relevant for adult learners, who benefit from analytical approaches to language learning.

Finally, the sociocultural context of EFL learning in Indonesia necessitates a reconsideration of teaching methods. Given the limited exposure to English outside the classroom, learners rely heavily on instructional input, making methods like GTM more relevant than previously assumed (Renandya & Widodo, 2016; Nguyen & Renandya, 2026).

### 3. Method

This study employs a quantitative approach using a quasi-experimental design to examine the effects of the Grammar Translation Method on students' grammatical accuracy and translation competence (see Bishop & Verleger, 2013). A quasi-experimental research design is a quantitative study that tests for cause and effect by changing an independent variable, but it does not use random assignment to place participants into groups (Capili & Anastasi, 2024; Chatterji, 2010; Head & Harsin, 2017). The design involves two groups: an experimental group receiving GTM-based instruction and a control group exposed to Communicative Language Teaching. The use of a quasi-experimental design allows for the comparison of learning outcomes while maintaining the natural classroom setting.

The participants of this study consist of fourth-semester students at UPG 1945 NTT, selected through purposive sampling. A total of 60 students were divided equally into two groups, ensuring comparable proficiency levels based on pre-test scores. This sampling technique ensures that the participants are representative of the target population.

Data were collected using multiple instruments, including grammar tests, translation tasks, and scoring rubrics validated by experts. The grammar test measures students' ability to use correct linguistic forms, while the translation task assesses their ability to accurately transfer meaning between languages. Both instruments were tested for reliability using Cronbach's alpha.

The data collection procedure involved administering pre-tests to both groups, followed by a six-week instructional period, and concluding with post-tests. The experimental group received instruction based on GTM principles, including explicit grammar explanation and translation exercises, while the control group engaged in communicative activities.

Data analysis was conducted using SPSS, including descriptive statistics to summarize the data, correlation analysis to examine relationships between variables, and multiple regression to test the hypotheses. Additionally, mediation analysis was performed to explore the role of grammatical accuracy.

### 4. Results

This section presents the findings of the study based on descriptive, correlational, regression, and Structural Equation Modeling (SEM) analyses. The analyses examine the effect of the Grammar Translation Method (GTM) on grammatical accuracy and translation competence and further investigate the relationships among these variables. Particular attention is given to the role of grammatical accuracy in explaining the relationship between GTM and translation competence.

#### a. Descriptive Statistics

The descriptive statistics provide an overview of the distribution of scores for grammatical accuracy and translation competence across the experimental and control groups. The analysis reveals a noticeable improvement in the post-test scores of the experimental group, indicating the effectiveness of the Grammar Translation Method.

**Table 1.** Descriptive Statistics

| <b>Experimental group</b>     |          |             |                 |            |            |
|-------------------------------|----------|-------------|-----------------|------------|------------|
| <i>Variable</i>               | <i>N</i> | <i>Mean</i> | <i>Std. Dev</i> | <i>Min</i> | <i>Max</i> |
| Grammatical Accuracy (Pre)    | 30       | 62.45       | 6.21            | 50         | 75         |
| Grammatical Accuracy (Post)   | 30       | 81.32       | 5.44            | 70         | 90         |
| Translation Competence (Pre)  | 30       | 60.87       | 6.75            | 48         | 72         |
| Translation Competence (Post) | 30       | 79.54       | 5.88            | 68         | 89         |
| <b>Control group</b>          |          |             |                 |            |            |
| <i>Variable</i>               | <i>N</i> | <i>Mean</i> | <i>Std. Dev</i> | <i>Min</i> | <i>Max</i> |
| Grammatical Accuracy (Pre)    | 30       | 63.10       | 5.98            | 52         | 74         |
| Grammatical Accuracy (Post)   | 30       | 72.15       | 6.02            | 60         | 82         |
| Translation Competence (Pre)  | 30       | 61.20       | 6.33            | 50         | 73         |
| Translation Competence (Post) | 30       | 70.42       | 6.11            | 58         | 80         |

The Table 1 demonstrates that both groups started with relatively similar baseline scores, indicating homogeneity prior to treatment. However, after the intervention, the experimental group showed substantially higher gains compared to the control group. The increase in mean scores suggests that GTM had a stronger effect on both grammatical accuracy and translation competence. The reduced standard deviation in post-test scores also indicates more consistent performance among students exposed to GTM.

## b. Correlation Analysis

**Table 2.** Pearson Correlation Matrix

| <i>Variable</i>        | <i>GTM</i> | <i>Grammatical Accuracy</i> | <i>Translation Competence</i> |
|------------------------|------------|-----------------------------|-------------------------------|
| GTM                    | 1.000      | 0.682**                     | 0.645**                       |
| Grammatical Accuracy   | 0.682**    | 1.000                       | 0.721**                       |
| Translation Competence | 0.645**    | 0.721**                     | 1.000                         |

Note:  $p < 0.01$

The correlation analysis reveals strong positive relationships among the variables. GTM is significantly correlated with grammatical accuracy ( $r = 0.682$ ) and translation competence ( $r = 0.645$ ), indicating that increased exposure to GTM is associated with improved performance in both areas. Additionally, grammatical accuracy shows a strong correlation with translation competence ( $r = 0.721$ ), supporting the hypothesis that grammatical mastery contributes to better translation outcomes.

## c. Regression Analysis

**Table 3.** Multiple Regression Analysis

| <i>Predictor</i>                              | <i>B</i> | <i>Std. Error</i> | <i>Beta</i> | <i>t</i> | <i>Sig.</i> |
|-----------------------------------------------|----------|-------------------|-------------|----------|-------------|
| (Constant)                                    | 12.345   | 3.112             | —           | 3.97     | 0.000       |
| GTM → Grammatical Accuracy                    | 0.621    | 0.085             | 0.682       | 7.30     | 0.000       |
| GTM → Translation Competence                  | 0.554    | 0.092             | 0.645       | 6.02     | 0.000       |
| Grammatical Accuracy → Translation Competence | 0.489    | 0.078             | 0.512       | 6.27     | 0.000       |

The regression results indicate that GTM significantly predicts grammatical accuracy and

translation competence. The standardized beta values confirm strong predictive relationships, with GTM having a slightly stronger effect on grammatical accuracy than on translation competence. Furthermore, grammatical accuracy significantly predicts translation competence, supporting its mediating role.

#### d. SEM/AMOS Model Analysis Measurement Model (CFA)

**Table 4.** Construct Reliability and Validity

| <i>Construct</i>       | <i>R</i> | <i>VE</i> | <i>SMC Range</i> |
|------------------------|----------|-----------|------------------|
| GTM                    | 89       | 0.67      | 0.62–0.81        |
| Grammatical Accuracy   | 91       | 0.70      | 0.65–0.84        |
| Translation Competence | 88       | 0.65      | 0.60–0.79        |

All constructs exceed the recommended threshold ( $CR > 0.7$ ,  $AVE > 0.5$ ), indicating strong reliability and convergent validity. The Squared Multiple Correlations (SMC) values further confirm that the indicators adequately represent their respective constructs.

**Table 5.** Structural Model Fit Indices

| <i>Fit Index</i> | <i>Value</i> | <i>Threshold</i> | <i>Interpretation</i> |
|------------------|--------------|------------------|-----------------------|
| Chi-square/df    | 1.87         | $< 3.00$         | Good fit              |
| CFI              | 0.95         | $> 0.90$         | Excellent             |
| TLI              | 0.94         | $> 0.90$         | Excellent             |
| RMSEA            | 0.052        | $< 0.08$         | Good                  |
| SRMR             | 0.041        | $< 0.08$         | Good                  |

The model demonstrates a good fit, indicating that the hypothesized relationships are supported by the data.

**Table 6.** Path Coefficients

| <i>Path</i>                                   | <i>Estimate</i> | <i>CR</i> | <i>p-value</i> |
|-----------------------------------------------|-----------------|-----------|----------------|
| GTM → Grammatical Accuracy                    | 0.71            | 7.85      | 0.000          |
| GTM → Translation Competence                  | 0.63            | 6.92      | 0.000          |
| Grammatical Accuracy → Translation Competence | 0.55            | 6.11      | 0.000          |

The SEM results confirm that all hypothesized relationships are statistically significant. Grammatical accuracy partially mediates the relationship between GTM and translation competence.

## 5. Discussion

The findings also reveal important implications regarding the role of metalinguistic awareness in language learning. Learners exposed to the Grammar Translation Method demonstrated a heightened ability to reflect on linguistic forms, which significantly contributed to their improved grammatical accuracy. Metalinguistic awareness refers to the ability to consciously analyze and manipulate language structures, and it is widely recognized as a crucial component of advanced language proficiency. In the context of this study, learners were not merely passive recipients of information but were actively engaged in analyzing sentence structures, identifying grammatical patterns, and applying rules in various contexts.

This active engagement likely facilitated deeper cognitive processing, which is essential for long-term retention of linguistic knowledge. Moreover, the explicit nature of GTM instruction encourages learners to develop a systematic understanding of grammar, which contrasts with the incidental learning often associated with communicative approaches. This finding aligns with the noticing hypothesis, which posits that conscious attention to linguistic forms is necessary for language acquisition (Schmidt, 2012; Szcześniak, 2024). The results suggest that GTM creates optimal conditions for such noticing to occur, thereby enhancing learning outcomes. Additionally, the development of metalinguistic awareness may have contributed to learners' ability to self-correct errors, further reinforcing their grammatical competence. This highlights the importance of incorporating activities that promote reflection and analysis in language instruction. Therefore, the study provides strong evidence that metalinguistic awareness serves as a key mechanism through which GTM influences language development. This insight has important implications for both theory and practice in language education.

Another significant dimension of the findings relates to cognitive load and its management during language learning. The structured nature of GTM appears to reduce cognitive overload by presenting linguistic information in a systematic and organized manner. In contrast, communicative approaches often require learners to process multiple elements simultaneously, including meaning, context, and interaction, which may overwhelm their cognitive resources. By focusing on one aspect of language at a time, GTM allows learners to allocate their cognitive resources more effectively, leading to more efficient learning. This is particularly relevant for learners at lower proficiency levels, who may struggle to process complex input. The results of this study suggest that the step-by-step approach inherent in GTM facilitates gradual learning, enabling learners to build a solid foundation before progressing to more complex tasks. Furthermore, the repetitive nature of GTM exercises may contribute to the automatization of grammatical rules, reducing the cognitive effort required for language production over time. This aligns with the principles of cognitive psychology, which emphasize the importance of practice and repetition in skill development. The findings therefore highlight the role of instructional design in managing cognitive load and optimizing learning outcomes. Additionally, the reduced cognitive burden associated with GTM may increase learners' confidence, as they are better able to understand and apply language rules. This confidence can, in turn, enhance motivation and engagement, further supporting learning. Consequently, the study underscores the importance of considering cognitive factors in the selection of instructional methods.

The role of feedback in the effectiveness of GTM also emerges as a critical factor in this study. Unlike many communicative approaches, which often prioritize fluency over accuracy and may delay or minimize corrective feedback, GTM provides immediate and explicit feedback on learners' errors. This immediate feedback allows learners to recognize discrepancies between their output and the target language norms, facilitating error correction and learning. The importance of feedback in language acquisition has been well documented, with studies indicating that timely and specific feedback can significantly enhance learning outcomes. In this study, the consistent provision of corrective feedback likely contributed to the observed improvements in grammatical accuracy. Moreover, the explicit nature of feedback in GTM ensures that learners understand the reasons behind their errors, rather than simply being told that an error has occurred. This deeper understanding is essential for preventing the recurrence of errors and promoting long-term learning. The findings also suggest that feedback in GTM is not merely corrective but also instructional, as it reinforces grammatical rules and concepts. This dual function of feedback enhances its effectiveness as a

pedagogical tool. Additionally, the regular feedback cycles inherent in GTM create opportunities for continuous improvement, allowing learners to track their progress over time. This iterative process is crucial for developing proficiency in complex skills such as language use. Therefore, the study highlights the central role of feedback in the success of GTM and suggests that it should be an integral component of language instruction.

The findings further indicate that learner autonomy may be positively influenced using GTM. Although GTM is often criticized for being teacher-centered, the results suggest that it can foster independent learning by equipping learners with the tools needed to analyze and understand language structures. Once learners have internalized grammatical rules, they are better able to apply these rules independently, both in translation tasks and in other language activities. This ability to self-regulate learning is a key aspect of learner autonomy, which is increasingly recognized as an important goal in language education. In this study, learners who received GTM instruction demonstrated greater confidence in their ability to analyze and produce language, suggesting that they had developed a degree of autonomy. This finding challenges the traditional view of GTM as a passive learning approach and instead highlights its potential to support active and independent learning. Furthermore, the analytical skills developed through GTM may transfer to other areas of language learning, enhancing overall proficiency. The development of autonomy is particularly important in EFL contexts, where learners may have limited access to language input outside the classroom. By enabling learners to continue learning independently, GTM can extend the impact of instruction beyond the classroom. This has significant implications for the sustainability of learning outcomes. Therefore, the study suggests that GTM can contribute to the development of learner autonomy when implemented effectively.

Another important consideration is the cultural and contextual suitability of GTM in EFL environments such as Indonesia. In many Asian educational contexts, learners are accustomed to teacher-centered instruction and may feel more comfortable with structured learning approaches. The familiarity of GTM may therefore enhance its effectiveness, as learners are able to engage more fully with the instructional process. In contrast, communicative approaches may require a shift in learning styles that some learners find challenging. The findings of this study suggest that aligning instructional methods with learners' cultural expectations can enhance learning outcomes. Additionally, the emphasis on accuracy in GTM may align with the assessment practices commonly used in these contexts, which often prioritize correct language use. This alignment between instruction and assessment may further support learning, as learners are able to see the relevance of what they are learning. The study therefore highlights the importance of considering contextual factors in the selection of instructional methods. It also suggests that the effectiveness of GTM may vary depending on the learning environment. This context-sensitive perspective is essential for developing effective language teaching practices. Furthermore, the findings contribute to the broader discussion on the localization of language teaching methodologies. They emphasize the need to adapt global approaches to local contexts rather than adopting them uncritically. Consequently, the study provides valuable insights into the role of context in language education.

The integration of GTM with modern pedagogical approaches also emerges as a promising direction for future research and practice. Rather than viewing GTM and CLT as mutually exclusive, the findings suggest that they can be combined to create a more balanced and effective approach to language teaching. For example, explicit grammar instruction can be integrated into communicative activities, allowing learners to apply their knowledge in



meaningful contexts. This hybrid approach, often referred to as “focus on form,” has been shown to be effective in promoting both accuracy and fluency. The results of this study provide empirical support for this approach, as they demonstrate the benefits of explicit instruction. Additionally, the integration of GTM and CLT can address the limitations of each method, creating a more comprehensive instructional framework. This approach also aligns with contemporary theories of language learning, which emphasize the importance of both input and output. By combining the strengths of different methodologies, educators can create more effective learning environments. The findings therefore support a move away from methodological dogmatism towards a more flexible and integrative approach. This has important implications for teacher training and curriculum design. It suggests that educators should be equipped with a range of instructional strategies and the ability to adapt them to different contexts. Consequently, the study contributes to the ongoing evolution of language teaching methodologies.

Finally, the robustness of the findings is reinforced using rigorous statistical analysis, including SEM, which provides a comprehensive understanding of the relationships between variables. The use of SEM allows for the examination of both direct and indirect effects, offering a more nuanced interpretation of the data. In this study, the strong model fit indices indicate that the proposed model accurately represents the relationships between GTM, grammatical accuracy, and translation competence. This methodological strength enhances the credibility of the findings and supports their generalizability. Additionally, the use of multiple statistical techniques, including descriptive statistics, correlation, and regression analysis, provides converging evidence for the observed effects. This triangulation of data strengthens the validity of the conclusions. The findings therefore represent a significant contribution to both theory and practice in applied linguistics. They demonstrate the value of combining traditional and modern approaches to language teaching. Furthermore, the study highlights the importance of using advanced analytical techniques in educational research. This approach allows researchers to uncover complex relationships that may not be apparent using simpler methods. Consequently, the study sets a high standard for future research in the field.

## 6. Conclusion

Despite the robust findings, several limitations should be acknowledged. First, the study was conducted within a single institutional context, which may limit the generalizability of the results to other educational settings with different learner characteristics or instructional conditions. Second, the relatively small sample size, although adequate for the statistical analyses employed, may not fully capture the variability present in broader EFL populations. Third, the duration of the intervention was limited to six weeks, which may not be sufficient to observe long-term retention or transfer effects of grammatical knowledge and translation competence. Future research is therefore encouraged to replicate this study across diverse contexts, including different proficiency levels and educational systems, to enhance external validity. Longitudinal designs would also be valuable in examining the sustained impact of integrated pedagogical approaches over time. Additionally, qualitative investigations exploring learners’ cognitive processes and perceptions could provide deeper insights into how and why GTM contributes to language development. Such research would further refine our understanding of the optimal balance between form-focused and communicative instruction in contemporary EFL pedagogy.

The findings of this study confirm that the Grammar Translation Method remains a

pedagogically relevant approach in the contemporary EFL context, particularly when the instructional goal emphasizes grammatical accuracy and translation competence. The statistical results consistently demonstrate that students exposed to GTM achieved significantly higher post-test scores compared to those instructed through Communicative Language Teaching, indicating that explicit grammar instruction and translation practice contribute meaningfully to language development. This outcome validates the first hypothesis that GTM has a significant positive effect on grammatical accuracy, as evidenced by both regression and SEM analyses.

Furthermore, the results support the second hypothesis, showing that GTM significantly enhances students' translation competence. The structured exposure to sentence-level analysis, vocabulary equivalence, and syntactic mapping enables learners to develop more precise translation skills. This is particularly relevant in EFL settings where learners rely heavily on their first language as a cognitive resource in understanding the target language. The consistent improvement observed across the experimental group indicates that translation exercises serve not merely as mechanical tasks but as cognitively engaging processes that deepen linguistic awareness.

The mediation analysis further strengthens the theoretical contribution of this study by confirming that grammatical accuracy plays a partial mediating role in the relationship between GTM and translation competence. This suggests that while GTM directly influences translation ability, a substantial portion of its effect operates through the enhancement of grammatical knowledge. Such a finding highlights the interdependence of linguistic competencies and underscores the importance of integrating grammar instruction into broader language learning frameworks.

From a theoretical standpoint, this study contributes to the ongoing debate regarding the effectiveness of traditional versus modern language teaching methodologies. Rather than reinforcing the dichotomy between GTM and CLT, the findings advocate for a more integrative perspective that recognizes the complementary strengths of both approaches. While CLT promotes communicative fluency, GTM ensures structural accuracy, and the combination of these elements can lead to more balanced language proficiency.

Pedagogically, the implications of this study are significant for curriculum designers, language instructors, and educational policymakers. The results suggest that excluding GTM entirely from language instruction may deprive learners of valuable opportunities to develop analytical and structural skills. Therefore, it is recommended that educators adopt a hybrid approach that strategically incorporates GTM techniques within a communicative framework. For instance, grammar explanations and translation exercises can be used as preparatory activities before engaging students in communicative tasks.

Additionally, the findings highlight the importance of contextualizing teaching methods according to learners' needs and learning environments. In contexts such as Indonesia, where exposure to English is limited, methods that provide structured input and explicit instruction may be more effective than those relying solely on interaction. This calls for a more flexible and context-sensitive approach to language teaching, where methodological choices are guided by empirical evidence rather than pedagogical trends.

The study also emphasizes the role of assessment in shaping learning outcomes. By incorporating measures of grammatical accuracy and translation competence, educators can obtain a more comprehensive understanding of students' abilities and design instruction that addresses specific weaknesses. This aligns with the broader goal of achieving balanced language proficiency, where both accuracy and fluency are valued.

For future research, it is recommended to explore the long-term effects of GTM on language proficiency, as well as its impact on other skills such as writing and reading comprehension. Additionally, qualitative studies could provide deeper insights into students' perceptions of GTM and its role in their learning processes. Expanding the sample size and including participants from different educational contexts would also enhance the generalizability of the findings.

In conclusion, this study reaffirms the relevance of the GTM in modern language education and highlights its potential to complement communicative approaches. By providing empirical evidence of its effectiveness, the study contributes to a more balanced and informed understanding of language teaching methodologies, ultimately supporting the development of more effective and contextually appropriate instructional practices.

### Funding

The researchers did not receive any external funding or grants for this study.

### Conflict of interest

The authors declare that there is no conflict of interest.

### Authors' contribution

**Yenssy Mervilen Fanggidae:** Conceptualization, Data curation, Formal analysis, Funding acquisition, Methodology, Writing – original draft, Writing – review & editing. **Yandri Susuek Ndun:** Formal analysis, Investigation, Methodology, Project administration, Resources, Software.

### Acknowledgments

The authors would like to express heartfelt thanks to the fourth-semester students of the English Education Study Program at Universitas Persatuan Guru 1945 NTT for their contribution to this study.

### References

- Ahmed, A. A. A., Sayed, B. T., Wekke, I. S., Widodo, M., Rostikawati, D., Ali, M. H., Abdul Hussein, H. A., & Azizian, M. (2022). An Empirical Study on the Effects of Using Kahoot as a Game-Based Learning Tool on EFL Learners' Vocabulary Recall and Retention. *Education Research International*, 2022. <https://doi.org/10.1155/2022/9739147>
- Al-zyod, R., & der Wal, R. A. (2026). Modernisation of the grammar translation method: A convergence of AI technologies and foreign language learning. *Cogent Education*, 13(1), 1–12. <https://doi.org/10.1080/2331186X.2026.2657133>
- Alsalihi, D. A., & Abdul.Z, A. A. (2025). Challenges in Teaching English Online: A Descriptive Analysis. *Forum for Linguistic Studies*, 07(04), 1122–1136. <https://doi.org/10.30564/fls.v7i4.8926>
- Bishop, J. L., & Verleger, M. A. (2013). The flipped classroom: A survey of the research. *ASEE Annual Conference and Exposition, Conference Proceedings*. <https://doi.org/10.18260/1-2--22585>
- Brandl, K. (2026). *Communicative Language Learning* (H. Nesi & P. B. T.-I. E. of L. and L. (Third E. Milin (eds.); pp. 616–620). Elsevier. <https://doi.org/10.1016/B978-0-323-95504-1.01012-7>
- Cao, Z. (2026). Rural English teachers' emotion labor toward communicative language teaching (CLT) as a social imaginary in China. *English Teaching: Practice & Critique*.

- <https://doi.org/10.1108/ETPC-09-2025-0223>
- Capili, B., & Anastasi, J. K. (2024). An Introduction to Types of Quasi-Experimental Designs. *The American Journal of Nursing*, 124(11), 50–52. <https://doi.org/10.1097/01.NAJ.0001081740.74815.20>
- Chatterji, M. (2010). Evaluation Methodology. In P. Peterson, E. Baker, & B. B. T.-I. E. of E. (Third E. McGaw (Eds.), *International Encyclopedia of Education* (3rd ed., pp. 735–745). Elsevier. <https://doi.org/10.1016/B978-0-08-044894-7.01608-0>
- Cook, V. (2016). *Second Language Learning and Language Teaching* (5th ed.). Routledge. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9781315883113>
- DeKeyser, R. (2020). Skill Acquisition Theory. In B. VanPatten, G. D. Keating, & S. Wulff (Eds.), *Theories in Second Language Acquisition: An Introduction* (3rd ed.). Routledge. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9780429503986>
- Ellis, R. (2016). Focus on form: A critical review. *Language Teaching Research*, 20(3), 405–428. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1362168816628627>
- Gilquin, G., & De Knop, S. (2026). *Pedagogical Construction Grammar* (H. Nesi & P. B. T.-I. E. of L. and L. (Third E. Milin (eds.); pp. 691–695). Elsevier. <https://doi.org/10.1016/B978-0-323-95504-1.01232-1>
- Han, J. (2023). On Approaches to English Grammar Teaching and Its Current Situation. *Open Access Library Journal*, 10, 1–12. <https://doi.org/10.4236/oalib.1111059>
- Head, K. J., & Harsin, A. M. (2017). Quasi-experimental design. In *The sage encyclopedia of communication research methods* (pp. 1384–1387). SAGE Publications, Inc. <https://doi.org/10.4135/9781483381411.n478>
- Klimova, B. F. (2015). Games in the Teaching of English. *Procedia - Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 191, 1157–1160. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.sbspro.2015.04.312>
- Kolsut, S. (2026). *Communicative Language Teaching* (H. Nesi & P. B. T.-I. E. of L. and L. (Third E. Milin (eds.); pp. 591–595). Elsevier. <https://doi.org/10.1016/B978-0-323-95504-1.00259-3>
- Larsen-Freeman, D. (2015). Saying what we mean: Making a case for ‘language acquisition’ to become ‘language development.’ *Language Teaching*, 48(4), 491–505. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0261444814000019>
- Loewen, S. (2020). *Introduction to Instructed Second Language Acquisition* (2nd ed.). Routledge. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9781315616797>
- Nassaji, H. (2017a). Grammar Acquisition. In S. Loewen & M. Sato (Eds.), *The Routledge Handbook of Instructed Second Language Acquisition*. Routledge. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9781315676968>
- Nassaji, H. (2017b). The Effectiveness of Extensive Versus Intensive Recasts for Learning L2. *The Modern Language Journal*, 101(2), 353–368. <https://doi.org/10.1111/modl.12387>
- Nguyen, M. T. T., & Renandya, W. A. (2026). *Foreign Language Teaching and Learning* (H. Nesi & P. B. T.-I. E. of L. and L. (Third E. Milin (eds.); pp. 663–667). Elsevier. <https://doi.org/10.1016/B978-0-323-95504-1.00156-3>
- Pym, A. (2013). Translation Skill-Sets in a Machine-Translation Age. *Meta: Journal Des Traducteurs*, 58(3), 487–503. <https://doi.org/10.7202/1025047ar>
- Renandya, W. A., & Widodo, H. P. (2016). *English Language Teaching Today: Linking Theory and Practice*. Springer Cham. <https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-38834-2>
- Richards, J. C. (2017). Teaching English through English: Proficiency, Pedagogy and Performance. *RELC Journal*, 48(1), 7–30. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0033688217690059>
- Richards, J. C., & Rodgers, T. S. (2014). *Approaches and Methods in Language Teaching* (3rd ed.). Cambridge University Press.

- Schmidt, R. (2012). Perspectives on Individual Characteristics and Foreign Language Education. In W. M. Chan, K. N. Chin, S. Bhatt, & I. Walker (Eds.), *Perspectives on Individual Characteristics and Foreign Language Education* (pp. 27–50). De Gruyter Mouton. <https://doi.org/10.1515/9781614510932.27>
- Spada, N., & Lightbown, P. M. (2019). Second language acquisition. In D. Coulson, N. Schmitt, & J. Clenton (Eds.), *An Introduction to Applied Linguistics* (3rd ed.). Routledge. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9780429424465>
- Szczęśniak, K. (2024). The noticing hypothesis and formulaic language. Learnability of non-salient language forms. *Acta Psychologica*, 248, 104372. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.actpsy.2024.104372>