
COURSE REVIEW HORAY, EXPLANATION, AND CRITICAL THINKING SKILLS: THEIR INTERACTION EFFECT ON EFL LEARNERS' GRAMMAR COMPETENCE

MUKMINATUS ZUHRIYAH

Universitas Hasyim Asy'ari Tebuireng, Jombang

Corresponding Author: zoehrea@gmail.com

MASKHURIN FAJARINA

Universitas Hasyim Asy'ari Tebuireng Jombang

Abstract

The purpose of this study was to look at whether or not there was an interaction effect among CRH, the explanation, and the students' CTS implementation toward the learners' grammar competence. The sample of this factorial 2x2 study was the second-semester students of two non-English department classes of education faculty of a university in Jombang. The instruments used were an argumentative essay test for classifying the students' CTS and the grammar test for measuring their grammar competence in CRH and the explanation classes. The students' grammar scores from both classes were analyzed using ANOVA and TUKEY tests. The results showed that CRH, the explanation, and the students' CTS had an interaction effect on the EFL learners' grammar competence.

Keywords: course review horay, critical thinking skills, EFL learners' grammar competence, explanation, online grammar teaching

Manuscript submitted: September 30, 2021

Manuscript revised: November 14, 2021

Accepted for publication: November 28, 2021

Introduction

COVID-19 pandemic has changed the ways of teaching and learning in Indonesia from face-to-face or blended face-to-face and online learning to full online learning (Nugroho et al., 2021). This happens to all education levels starting from the kindergarten level up to the university level. This condition forces all the teachers including EFL teachers to conduct their emergency remote teaching. As a result, all Indonesian EFL students have to study their courses online. Dealing with this, Amin and Sundari (2020) and Hendrawaty et al. (2021) state that the students prefer using WhatsApp Group and Google Classroom most on their online learning during this COVID-19 outbreak. Whatever the platform is used, the EFL teaching and learning process including grammar class must go on in this pandemic of COVID-19.

Learning grammar cannot be avoided when people learn an English language. It is because when learning all four English skills, automatically, the learners have to study the English grammar. Indeed, those four English skills and English grammar have close relations. The existence of grammar in those four skills of English is very important. Grammar has important roles in listening, speaking, reading as well as writing. Regarding this, Kaur & Niwas (2016) state that grammar is beneficial to increase the learners' language skills. Therefore, the grammar teaching must not be ignored in this pandemic era. Online grammar teaching should be conducted.

Unfortunately, the grammar competence of the students in the second-semester of non-English departments in a private university located in Jombang, Indonesia was still low since the online learning has been held because of this COVID-19 pandemic. It was known from the documents of the students' grammar scores when the final test in the first semester and the midterm test in the second semester. In the final test of the first semester, their average score was 68 and their mean score in the midterm test of the second semester was 65. Based on the questionnaires administered to the students in the preliminary study, it was known that in teaching grammar, the lecturer used an explanation model. However, it was the same style as other lecturers of other courses had done on their online teaching so that the students were not encouraged by this online grammar class. This made the students less motivated and enthusiastic in their online learning. It was the same condition as it was found by Nugroho et al. (2021) and Yulianto & Mujtahid (2021) explaining that the students got less motivation and enthusiasm during this remote teaching. This situation caused their low grammar knowledge at last and their low competence on grammar.

Related to teaching English grammar online, several studies have been conducted by the former researchers. Harun et al., (2018) in their study found that the use of the platform of grammar online learning @Concept-Based Instruction (GLOw@CBI) could enhance the learners' grammar mastery because this platform provided the in-depth understanding of grammar materials. The next is a study by Azevedo and Matias (2019) finding that teaching English grammar through youtube videos could be one alternative model in the teaching and learning grammar because it was not time-consuming. Meanwhile, Purgina et al. (2020) investigated teaching grammar using gamification especially mobile application called as WordBricks and found that the use of WordBricks game could increase the students' grammar competence because the WordBricks let the users combine words into grammatically sentences. Then, the study result of Nawir (2021) showed that teaching pedagogical grammar could be done online using the platform of zoom meeting.

Those five previous studies proved that grammar materials can be taught online. However, the first four studies implied that there was no interaction between the students and the teachers in the teaching and learning of grammar on those four studies. Meanwhile, the last study indicated that the interaction between the students and the teacher existed in the class of zoom meeting. To fill the research gap which is the scarcity of the students' and the teachers' interaction in the online grammar teaching, this present study implemented Course Review Horay (CRH) model to teach grammar via Google Meet. Zoom application was not chosen to be used but Google Meet because of its security. Pratama et al. (2020), state that there is a doubt about the security of zoom application in some countries. Dealing with the implementation of CRH in the EFL classrooms, some former researchers have proved that CRH could enhance the students' English skills. Halmi (2018) found that the students' English learning outcome got improvement after they were taught English using CRH. Meanwhile, Nur (2018) and Pakpahan (2020) found that CRH could improve the students' reading comprehension. Then, the study results of Fauziyyah (2018) and Musdalipa (2020) concluded that the use of CRH could boost the students' grammar mastery. They found that

the students' grammar mastery especially on English tenses increased after they were taught tenses using CRH. Because the scarce studies investigated the use of CRH in the grammar classes, the researchers implemented CRH in their present study. Afterward, the other reason of choosing CRH for this study was that this model provides independent learning and quizzes inside its teaching procedures. In line with this, Permatasari & Oktiawati (2021) explain that the students prefer the teaching method giving the well prepared materials, providing time to learn independently and providing quizzes and virtual discussion in this pandemic era. Besides, CRH could create a fun and meaningful learning atmosphere and make the students active and creative in the teaching and learning (Setiyawan & Abdillah, 2019).

In addition, for this present study, the researchers also explored the use of students' critical thinking skills in this online grammar class. Critical thinking skills (CTS) can help the students to be successful in their learning because the students think of the materials being learned critically. According to Tosuncuoglu (2018), CTS helps the students to overcome the problems, take the right decision, and gain the goals of learning. Meanwhile, Bagheri (2015) states that there is a positive correlation between the EFL students' CTS and their use of language learning strategies. It can be said that the more the students use their CTS, the more they can use appropriate EFL learning strategies in their EFL learning including grammar so that they are easy to reach their grammar learning goals. Furthermore, the research result by Zarei and Haghgoo (2012) indicated that there was a strong trend towards a positive relationship between critical thinking and grammar. Additionally, Erdoğan (2019) asserts that by implementing critical thinking in EFL classrooms, the grammar lesson can be turned into a magical material where the EFL teachers become facilitators and the students become the self-guided learners. Based on the previously theories explained, therefore, this present study was conducted with the purpose of knowing whether or not there was an interaction effect among CRH, the explanation model, and the students' CTS toward the students' grammar competence.

Literature Review

Roles of grammar competence in language learning

Grammar is a set of rules which consist of the patterns in forming sentences. Alhaysony and Alhaisoni (2017) argue that grammar is the rules which comprise of word form changing and how to combine those words into sentences. Grammar knowledge is very essential because the learners will be able to utter the language items integrated with their functions when they have some grammar understanding (Cam & Tran, 2017). Besides, Dehghani et al. (2016) explain that having grammar knowledge has some benefits, such as letting the communication become clear, making communication with others become reputable, enabling the people to get their self-confidence, and influencing other skill learning. By understanding grammar, the learners can guess the meanings of the words that they are hearing. According to Ahmadi (2016), aural grammar is one of the components that is connected to the process between sound and meaning form in listening. It has been known that there are many English words that have similar pronunciations so that the listeners with the good grammar knowledge will be able to predict which word that exists in the listening text being heard. Their grammar competence makes them easy in identifying what word having been said by the speakers.

When the students have good knowledge of grammar, they will get easy to express their ideas or opinions in speaking. The sentences that they produce can be well understood by their speaking partners. There will be no misunderstanding in their conversations. On the contrary, if their knowledge of grammar is not good, their partners in speaking will get confused about what they are discussing. Finally, the partners will ask for clarifications to the speakers about what they have caught in their discussions. It will take more time for discussion in explaining what they are talking about. This can be a proof that the good knowledge of grammar is needed very much in speaking skill. Demir and Erdogan (2017) support this by stating that the rules of grammar of a language direct the people to speak that language more correctly and consciously.

When reading English texts, the readers with enough grammar knowledge will be easy to understand the meanings of the sentences in their texts. Steinlen (2017) argues that the success of the readers to comprehend the texts depends on their grammar knowledge. They will be able to guess the meaning of the words that they do not know in their texts when they have sufficient knowledge of grammar. Without enough grammar knowledge, it will be hard for them to comprehend the meanings which are expressed in the texts being read. In short, it can be said that the readers have to have good grammar competence in order that they are able to comprehend the text meaning appropriately. When the learners are doing writing, they also have to have good competence of grammar. It is strengthened by Solikhah (2017) who explains that good grammar is required for good writing. In order to express the writers' ideas or argumentations, they need to use the correct grammar. When their grammar is correct, their writing will be able to deliver their messages to the readers correctly. For instance, when the writers want to tell about their last vacation in their writing, they must use the pattern of simple past tense for their sentences. If they write their sentences in simple present tense, the readers will think that what the writers have written is their daily activity. This example can make it clearer about the function of grammar in writing.

Course review horay

Course Review Horay (CRH) is a learning model whose emphasis is on the comprehension of the students to answer the questions given by the teacher (Putri et al., 2017). Besides, Puspitaningrum & Arlianty (2019) argue that CRH contains a game inside its learning process. Related to the implementation of CRH in the teaching and learning process, Kamarudin et al. (2018) and Masruddin (2019) present the steps to be done by the teachers as follows. First of all, the teacher should set the learning goal. After that, the materials to be studied are presented to the students. It is followed by creating students' groups of discussion and continued by delivering some questions based on what has been studied. Then, the students are asked to find the answers with their group members and the groups possessing the right answers to shout "horay." Afterward, the teachers determine one group getting the most correct answer and close the teaching and learning. Meanwhile, Rahmawati & Prasetyo (2018) mention that course review horay has some strengths, namely: being able to make the students more active in the teaching and learning process, creating the fun learning, and training the students to cooperate with their group members. CRH has an orientation to increase the students' activities and achievement (Eliyah et al., 2018).

Explanation model

Explanation model is a kind of teaching model in which the lecturer explains the materials more to the students. Odora (2014) presents four criteria of a good explanation as a teaching model, such as: orientation, key, summary, and communication skills. Orientation refers to the lecturers or the teacher's expression and examples when explaining the materials. The expression must be clear as well as the examples that they use in their explanation must attract the students and be relevant with the materials being studied. Then, the key tells about the clues that the lecturers or the teachers use when they explain the material. Next, the summary means that the lecturers must give a clear summary in every explanation that they tell to the students. Finally, the lecturers must have good communication skills in explaining the materials so that the students are able to understand their explanation. In addition, according to Subaidi & Haryanto (2015), the rules of grammar become the focus of the teachers in this explanation model so that the teachers explain the explicit rules of grammar in their class. It is ended with the grammar exercises given based on the materials that have been explained by the teachers.

Critical thinking skills

Critical thinking skills are the abilities to think critically. Critical thinking is the directed judgment about what has to be believed or what has to be done after observing, experiencing or knowing the spoken or written arguments (Adeyemi, 2012). In addition, Adinda & Hamka (2019) state that CTS are necessary to be owned because someone who can think critically is able to overcome either simple or complex problems which are faced in the life. Dealing with this, Fitriani et al. (2018) explain that critical thinking skills are usually used with the following steps: analyzing the argument and the interpretation, understanding the assumptions, formulating the problems, drawing the right conclusion and making the correct decision.

Methodology

Research design and participants

This study employed an experimental research using a factorial design. Gall et al. (2003), state that a factorial design as one of the experimental designs is used to determine the interaction effect of two or more independent variables on the dependent variable. Meanwhile, this study determined the effect of the interaction among two independent variables, such as teaching models and the students' CTS on one dependent variable which was the students' grammar competence. Then, the teaching models used were CRH and the explanation. Additionally, the students' CTS were also divided into low and high CTS. Therefore, a 2x2 factorial design was used to get the answer of the research problem in this study. This factorial experimental research was conducted in the students of semester two of non-English departments of education faculty in a private university located in Jombang, Indonesia. Four classes of non-English departments in education faculty became the population of this research. The students in these four non-English departments were the students who took the intensive English course for two semesters. The researchers used cluster random sampling to take the sample. According to Gall et al.(2003), random sampling

should be used when employing the factorial experiment. To take the sample of this study, there were some steps that the researchers did. First, the researchers wrote the four names of those classes on pieces of paper and dropped two pieces of paper in order to get two classes as the sample for this study. Then, the lottery was used to get the class of experiment and the control class. Class A was as an experimental class and class B became the control class. Each class consisted of twenty-two students.

Research instruments

This study used two kinds of tests as the research instruments. They were a writing test of an argumentative essay written in *bahasa* Indonesia and a grammar test. The argumentative essay writing test was tested to the students in the experimental and control classes to measure whether they were categorized as the students with high CTS or low CTS. Then, the grammar test was to know the students' grammar competence. This grammar test consists of ten grammar questions which were in the form of multiple choices. However, the writing test of an argumentative essay was tested its validity and readability and the grammar test was tested its validity and reliability before being administered to the research sample. The argumentative essay writing test was validated by two *bahasa* Indonesia lecturers. According to Creswell (2012), test content validity is applicable when it is to measure the achievement by asking the experts to validate the test content. In addition, the question in the argumentative essay writing test was also tested its readability. Based on the results of the validation from *bahasa* Indonesia lecturers, both of them explained that the argumentative essay writing test was valid and could be used as the research instruments. Next, the students' responses on the argumentative essay writing test readability showed that 96% of the respondents could understand well the instructions on the test. Thus, this argumentative essay writing test was considered valid and readable. Afterward, the grammar test was tried out to the students to the class which was not being researched to know its validity and reliability. The students' scores from this try out were calculated using SPSS to know the validity and the reliability of the grammar test. The results revealed that all ten questions on the grammar test were valid and reliable.

Data collection and analysis

After getting the experimental and control classes, the test of critical thinking skills was administered to both of the classes. An argumentative essay writing test was used to test the students' CTS. Because the students of both classes were from non-English department students, so that they were asked to write the argumentative essay test by using *bahasa* Indonesia. The test scores of this argumentative essay writing were used to classify the students into high and low CTS. The measurement of high and low CTS was based on the median of the score gained in those classes. The score which was under the median was classified into low CTS. Next, the high CTS were the scores which were higher than the median.

When the level of the students' CTS had been known, the researchers started to give the treatments. Google Meet was used as a tool to implement the treatments in this study. CRH was implemented in the experimental class and explanation model was used to teach grammar in the control class. The teaching and learning grammar for this study was conducted for six meetings. After those six meetings of treatment, the students in both of the classes did a grammar test. This

grammar test was to measure the students' grammar competence and the scores of this test became the data in this study. After the grammar scores from both of the experimental and the control classes were collected, the normality and the homogeneity of this data were, then, calculated. The data were in the normal distribution if $L_o < L_t$ or L_o was lower than L_t . Meanwhile, the data were said homogeneous if χ_o^2 was lower than than χ_t^2 . All the calculations of both the normality and the homogeneity tests were done manually. The next step after the normality and the homogeneity were gained was calculating the data by using ANOVA and TUKEY tests manually through a series of manual formulations. These tests were to know the interaction effect of the implementation of course review horay, the explanation model, and the critical thinking skills of the students in the teaching and learning grammar.

Findings

The result of ANOVA test for interaction

After six meetings of treatments, the students in the experimental class and the control class were given the test of grammar. After all the scores were collected, the researchers calculated the average scores of the students' scores from that grammar test. The results of this calculation can be described as follows. The students having high CTS in the class of CRH had the highest grammar average score which was 83.18. Meanwhile, the students who had low CTS and learned grammar in the explanation model class gained the mean score, 75.63. Next, the students having high CTS and studied grammar in the CRH class obtained the average score, 61.54. Then, the students with low CTS were low and taught grammar by using explanation model got the mean score, 61.909. After calculating the average scores of the students' grammar test, the researchers continued calculating the normality test of the data. The results of the normality test can be seen in the table below.

Tabel 1. *The summary of normality test results*

No	Data	L_o	Number of Sample	L_t	Alfa (α)	Distribution
1	High CTS in CRH class	0.152	11	0.249	0.05	normal
2	Low CTS in CRH class	0.105	11	0.249	0.05	normal
3	High CTS in the explanation model class	0.175	11	0.249	0.05	normal
4	Low CTS in the explanation model class	0.132	11	0.249	0.05	normal

Table 1 shows that all L_o s (L_o obtained) were lower than L_t s (L_t table) at the level of significance $\alpha=0.05$ on Liliefors so all the samples were in the normal distribution. After knowing that all the samples were in the normal distribution, the researchers calculated the homogeneity test of the data. To test homogeneity of data, chi-square (X^2) test was used. The result was that X_o^2 (2.25) was lower than X_t^2 (7.815) at the level of significance $\alpha=0.05$, it could be concluded that the data were homogeneous.

Since the requirements of normality and homogeneity were fulfilled, the researchers analyzed the data by using ANOVA test. It was done to know the interaction effect between teaching models (CRH and the explanation model) and the students' CTS on the students' grammar competence. In line with this, Creswell (2012) states that one of the results of analysis of variance (ANOVA) is to find out the interaction effect of two or more independent variables on one dependent variable. The following table presents the result of the ANOVA test for the interaction effect.

Table 2. *The summary of anova test result for interaction effect*

Source of variance	Sum square	df	Mean square	F _o	F _t (0.05)
Columns by rows (interaction)	172.03	1	172.03	5.812	4.08

Table 2 shows that F_o interaction (5.812) is higher than F_t (4.08) at the significance level of $\alpha = 0.05$. It reveals that there was an interaction effect between the two variables, the teaching models (CRH and explanation model) and the level of CTS. It can be said that the effectiveness of CRH and explanation model for teaching grammar depends on the degree of the students' CTS.

The results of TUKEY test for interaction effect

After knowing the result of the ANOVA test, the data was analyzed by using TUKEY test. Gall et al., (2003) explain that because there are two levels measured in a 2x2 factorial design, TUKEY test was done to determine which of the mean scores are significantly different from each other. The results of TUKEY test for the interaction effect is presented in the table below.

Table 3. *Tukey test results for the interaction effect*

Between Group	N	q _o	q _t	Status	Meaning
High CTS	11	4.597	3.11	significant	q _o > q _t
Low CTS	11	0.219	3.11	Not Significant	q _o < q _t

The descriptions of the table 3 are as follows:

1. The result of q_o between group of high CTS is higher than q_t at the significance level of $\alpha = 0.05$ (3.11). It has meaning that CRH differs significantly for teaching grammar for students having high CTS. Meanwhile, based on the calculation of the average scores, it is known that the mean score of the students having high CTS and taught grammar by using CRH (83.18) was higher than the average score of the students having high CTS and taught grammar by using explanation model (75.63). Thus, it can be said that the effectiveness of CRH was more than explanation model for teaching grammar for students with high CTS.
2. The result of q_o between groups of low CTS (0.219) is lower than q_t at the significance level of $\alpha = 0.05$ (3.11). It means that the difference between CRH and the explanation model for teaching

grammar for students with low CTS is not significant. Both of the teaching models had similar effect toward students' grammar competence for students with low CTS. Then, it is known that the mean score of the students with low CTS and taught by using CRH was 61.54 and the average score of the students having low CTS and taught by using explanation model was 61.909.

Discussion

The results of ANOVA test and TUKEY test showed that the models of teaching (CRH and the explanation model) and the students' CTS level had an interaction effect on the students' competence on grammar. It can be said that the students' CTS level determined the effect of the teaching model used by the lecturer on the students' grammar competence. This study result completed the former studies finding that there was a positive relationship between CTS and the students' English writing ability (Murtadho, 2021; Puspitaloka, 2019; Subroto and Rosalinah, 2017). Besides, this present study result also completed the study by Aditiara et al. (2019) indicated that CTS and the students' reading ability had a positive correlation. This present study could strengthen the study result by Zarei & Haghgoo (2012) about the relationship between the students' CTS and their grammar competence.

Based on these study results, the interaction effect among CRH, the explanation model, and the students' CTS resulted in the differences of the students' grammar competence after the treatment finished. The highest grammar competence was owned by the students having high CTS and taught grammar by using CRH. It strengthened the study results finding that CRH could improve the students' grammar competence (Fauziyyah, 2018; Musdalipa, 2020). Then, the grammar competence by the students with high CTS and taught grammar by using the explanation model was in the second place. This supports the study result by Nazari (2012) finding that explicit grammar learning as used in the explanation model could improve the students' competence on grammar. Meanwhile, the students having CTS and taught grammar by using CRH and explanation model had the similar grammar competence which was still low. This result is in line with the study result by Zarei & Haghgoo (2012) finding that the lower the students' CTS is, the lower their grammar competence is.

The highest grammar competence of the high CTS students in CRH class

The students who had high CTS and learned grammar by using CRH had the highest grammar competence. This occurred, because the students with high CTS were less emotional. According to Karakoc (2016), critical thinking will allow the people to be less emotional (not easy to be panic and angry). Being less emotional made the students more careful in deciding everything. Additionally, the students whose critical thinking skills were high had free and independent thinking. Furthermore, Birgili (2015) states that critical thinkers will think about something freely and independently. Besides those characteristics existing in the students with high CTS, the students' highest grammar competence was also gained because CRH could give the joyful teaching and learning situation. The characteristics owned by the students having high CTS and the interesting learning atmosphere in the grammar class caused the students' competence on grammar to be the highest among others.

Having the characteristics of not being easy to be panic and angry helped the students' success in learning grammar very much. They could control their feelings better. They could stand

their anger so that they could analyze carefully every problem that appeared in their grammar materials. They thought several times before making decisions. They were never in a hurry in deciding everything including deciding the solutions of the problems related to their grammar materials. It is in line with Ozdayi (2019) who explains that the first thing which should be done by the people when they want to get the solution of their problem is by analyzing the problem and deciding it. That was why the students with high CTS in the CRH class often did the right solution for the questions having been delivered in their grammar class. They brought this habit into their grammar test so that they could make their best for that test.

In addition, the ability to think freely and independently possessed by these students also contributed to their success in mastering grammar. They were used to not depending on other friends' help in getting the solutions when they got difficulty in learning grammar. They always tried to think of the solutions freely without being afraid of making mistakes. They thought that the mistakes having been got would become their directions to find the ways in making the right answers. This is supported by Tulis et al. (2016) who mention that errors or mistakes have the potential to increase the students' acquisition of knowledge if the students can face those errors or mistakes adaptively. When they got mistakes, actually they got many things to be learnt more. By learning more and more because of the mistakes that they had ever got, they could master the materials more. This caused them to be able to do the grammar test better.

Moreover, the joyful learning grammar atmosphere which was provided by CRH made the students successful in their learning. CRH brought the students to the class situation which was relaxed. The students felt not to be forced in this grammar learning. It seemed that they learned grammar while they did a little game. When the students could answer the questions related to the grammar materials, the other friends clapped their hands to congratulate them. This encouraged them to try to deliver their answers. Before trying to answer, of course, they tried to understand the materials at first. They enjoyed this kind of situation. According Mustafina et al. (2020), enjoyment has close relationship to the joy and excitement that direct to the concentration. Finally, their concentration caused the students to learn grammar with high motivation so that their knowledge of grammar became better.

The good grammar competence of the high CTS students in the explanation class

The students with high CTS in the class of explanation model still possessed good grammar competence even though it was lower than that of the students with high CTS in CRH class. Although they were taught grammar by using explanation model which was a teacher-centered teaching model, these students still could have good competence on grammar. It is because their high CTS worked well. Adeyemi (2012) states that CTS worked in the two stages of learning, namely: an internalization which happens when the students get the first information and ideas about the materials being studied, they directly try to build the principles of those materials in their minds and an application which occurs when the students apply the relevant theories that they got. Those two learning phases did well on the students in the class of explanation model so that they could obtain good competence on grammar.

The good grammar competence got by the students with high CTS in the explanation model class was also caused by their habit of thinking. Birgili (2015), states that the people who have CTS will not act without thinking. When getting the explanation about grammar materials from their lecturer, the students did not only receive the information as the raw materials. They processed the

information by their thinking because the students had already been accustomed to using their thinking. They tried to use their analysis in answering the grammar questions given by the lecturer so that their answers could not be categorized as the trial answers. They really thought before answering although they had known that their lecturer already prepared the answers in the last slide which was usually displayed after some students tried answering. Thus, this thinking habit caused their good competence on grammar.

The low grammar competence of the low CTS in the CRH and explanation classes

The students with low CTS had low grammar competence. The grammar competence of the students in the experimental class and the control class was almost the same even though they were taught grammar by the different teaching models which were CRH and explanation models. The students of these low CTS did not use their thinking maximally to solve the problems and make decisions. Although they had already learned grammar for six meetings in their classes, their grammar knowledge was still low. It is because their ability to collect and evaluate the information related to the grammar materials was low so that their grammar scores when getting test of grammar was low. Related to this condition, Hapsari (2016) argues that the mind of the human is able to determine the decision based on the information which has been got. Briefly, it can be concluded that the students with low CTS only could get little information about the materials of grammar that they were learning so that their ability to make the right decision about the right answers of the grammar test that they were doing was low. As a result of this, their grammar competence was low.

Conclusion and Recommendations

The results of the present study revealed that the level of the students' CTS determined the effectiveness of the implementation of CRH and explanation models for teaching grammar. The combination of the use of high CTS and CRH in the teaching and learning process of grammar was the most effective among others. Therefore, the English teachers and lecturers are recommended to implement CRH to teach all four English skills, such as speaking, listening, writing and reading for the students with high critical thinking skills. It is also essential for the English teachers and lecturers to always invite and stimulate the students' CTS in their teaching and learning. Furthermore, the other areas of this research such as the students' online discussion in their room groups when getting grammar questions and the use of the other online platforms in teaching online grammar having not been explored in this study can be explored deeply by the future researchers.

References

- Adeyemi, S. B. (2012). Developing critical thinking skills in students: a mandate for higher education in Nigeria. *European Journal of Educational Research*, 1(2), 155–161. Retrieved from <https://www.eu-jer.com/developing-critical-thinking-skills-in-students-a-mandate-for-higher-education-in-nigeria323>
- Adinda, A., & Hamka. (2019). Critical thinking skills of students from the aspect of strategy and tactics in solving mathematics problems. *International Journal of Insights for Mathematics Teaching*, 2(1), 47–56. Retrieved from <http://journal2.um.ac.id/index.php/ijoint/article/view/7122>

- Aditiara, A., Ngadiso, & Drajadi, N. A. (2019). A correlation study between critical thinking skill, grammatical mastery, and critical reading skill. *English Education Journal*, 7(2), 282–291. <https://doi.org/10.20961/eed.v7i2.35808>
- Ahmadi, S. M. (2016). The importance of listening comprehension in language learning. *International Journal of Research in English Education*, 1(1), 7–10. Retrieved from <https://ijreeonline.com/article-1-22-en.pdf>
- Alhaysony, M., & Alhaisoni, E. (2017). EFL teachers' and learners' perceptions of grammatical difficulties. *Advances in Language and Literary Studies*, 8(1), 188–199. <https://doi.org/10.7575/aial.v8n1p.188>
- Amin, F. M., & Sundari, H. (2020). EFL students' preferences on digital platforms during emergency remote teaching: Video Conference, LMS, or Messenger Application? *Studies in English Language and Education*, 7(2), 362–378. <https://doi.org/10.24815/siele.v7i2.16929>
- Azevedo, A. F. de, & Matias, J. (2019). Teaching English through youtube: grammar video analysis of three Brazilian youtube channels dedicated to EFL teaching. *English Review: Journal of English Education*, 8(1), 1–10. <https://doi.org/10.25134/erjee.v8i1.2351>
- Bagheri, F. (2015). The relationship between critical thinking and language learning strategies of EFL learners. *Journal of Language Teaching and Research*, 6(5), 969–975. <https://doi.org/10.17507/jltr.0605.08>
- Birgili, B. (2015). Creative and critical thinking skills in problem-based learning environments. *Journal of Gifted Education and Creativity*, 2(2), 71–80. <https://doi.org/10.18200/JGEDC.2015214253>
- Cam, L., & Tran, T. M. T. (2017). An evaluation of using games in teaching English grammar for first year English-major students at Dong Nai technology university. *International Journal of Learning, Teaching and Educational Research*, 16(7), 55–71. Retrieved from <https://www.ijlter.org/index.php/ijlter/article/view/962>
- Creswell, J. W. (2012). *Educational research: planning, conducting, and evaluating quantitative and qualitative research* (Fourth). Pearson Education, Inc.
- Dehghani, A. P., Bagheri, M. S., Sadighi, F., & Tayyebi, G. (2016). Investigating difficulty order of certain English grammar features in an Iranian EFL setting. *International Journal of English Linguistics*, 6(6), 209–220. <https://doi.org/10.5539/ijel.v6n6p209>
- Demir, S., & Erdogan, A. (2017). The role of teaching grammar in first language education. *European Journal of Educational Research*, 7(14), 87–101. <https://doi.org/10.12973/eu-jer.7.1.87>
- Eliyah, S., Isnaini, & Utami, W. B. (2018). Keefektifa model pembelajaran course review horay berbantuan power point terhadap kepercayaan diri dan prestasi belajar. *Jurnal Edukasi Dan Sains Matematika (JES-MAT)*, 4(2), 131–140. <https://doi.org/10.25134/jes-mat.v4i2.1455>
- Erdogan, V. (2019). Integrating 4C skills of 21st century into 4 language skills in EFL classes. *International Journal of Education and Research*, 7(1). Retrieved from <https://www.ijern.com/journal/2019/November-2019/09>
- Fauziyyah, I. I. (2018). *The use of course review horay to increase students' writing ability in simple present tense* (State Institute for Islamic Studies (IAIN) Salatiga). Retrieved from [http://e-repository.perpus.iainsalatiga.ac.id/4601/1/Irma Innayati Fauziyyah 11314021.pdf](http://e-repository.perpus.iainsalatiga.ac.id/4601/1/Irma%20Innayati%20Fauziyyah%2011314021.pdf)
- Fitriani, H., Asy'ari, M., Zubaidah, S., & Mahanal, S. (2018). Critical thinking disposition of prospective science teachers at IKIP Mataram, Indonesia. *Journal of Physics: Conf. Series*, 1108. <https://doi.org/10.1088/1742-6596/1108/1/012091>
- Gall, M. D., Gall, J. P., & Borg, W. R. (2003). *Educational research: an introduction* (Seventh). New York: Pearson Education, Inc.

- Halimi. (2018). Penerapan Metode Pembelajaran Course Review Horay Untuk Meningkatkan Hasil Belajar Bahasa Inggris Siswa Materi Time Kelas VII . 1 SMPN 18 Pekanbaru Tahun 2017. *Diklat Review: Jurnal Manajemen Pendidikan Dan Pelatihan*, 2(1), 33–38.
- Hapsari, S. (2016). A descriptive study of the critical thinking skills of social science at junior high school. *Journal of Education and Learning*, 10(3), 228–234. Retrieved from dulearn.intelektual.org/index.php/EduLearn/article/view/3791/2548
- Harun, H., Abdullah, N., Wahab, N. A., Harun, H., Abdullah, N., & Wahab, N. A. (2018). *Enhancing Grammar Competence using Glow @ Cbi (Grammar Online Learning @ Cbi) Enhancing Grammar Competence using Glow @ Cbi (Grammar Online Learning @ Cbi)*. 8(7), 607–614. <https://doi.org/10.6007/IJARBS/v8-i7/4403>
- Hendrawaty, N., Angkarini, T., & Retnomurti, A. B. (2021). EFL undergraduate students' perceptions of online learning applications during the COVID-19 outbreak. *Jurnal Pendidikan Dan Pengajaran*, 54(1), 110–119. <https://doi.org/10.23887/jpp.v54i1>
- Kamarudin, Tawali, & Muhlisin, M. (2018). The use of course review horray (CRH) strategy to promote students' self confidence in learning vocabulary. *Edulangue: Journal of English Language Education*, 1(2), 210–224. <https://doi.org/10.20414/edulangue.v1i2.262>
- Karakoc, M. (2016). The significance of critical thinking ability in terms of education. *International Journal of Humanities and Social Science*, 6(7), 81–84. Retrieved from http://www.ijhssnet.com/journals/Vol_6_No_7_July_2016/10.pdf
- Kaur, S., & Niwas, R. (2016). Effectiveness of deductive and inductive methods in teaching English grammar at elementary level. *International Journal of Advanced Research*, 4(7), 1241–1247. <https://doi.org/10.21474/IJAR01/1027>
- Masruddin. (2019). Course review horay method in teaching speaking. *IDEAS: Journal of Language Teaching and Learning, Linguistics and Literature*, 7(1), 147–155. Retrieved from <https://ejournal.iainpalopo.ac.id/index.php/ideas/article/view/732>
- Murtadho, F. (2021). Metacognitive and critical thinking practices in developing EFL students' argumentative writing skills. *Indonesian Journal of Applied Linguistics*, 10(3), 656–666. <https://doi.org/10.17509/ijal.v10i3.31752>
- Musdalipa. (2020). *Enhancing teenagers' tenses mastery by using course review booray in Desa Kawata* (IAIN Palopo). Retrieved from <http://repository.iainpalopo.ac.id/id/eprint/3230/>
- Mustafina, R. ., Ilina, M. ., & Shcerbakova, I. . (2020). Emotions and their effect on learning. *Utopía y Praxis Latinoamericana*, 25(7), 318–324. <https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.4009763>
- Nawir, E. (2021). 4rd English Language and Literature International Conference (ELLiC). *The Role of Pedagogical Grammar in English Language Teaching as Second and or Foreign Language through E-Learning Platform: Zoom Meeting in Pandemic Era*, 220–228. Retrieved from <https://jurnal.unimus.ac.id/index.php/ELLIC/article/view/7481>
- Nazari, N. (2012). The effect of implicit and explicit grammar instruction on learners achievements in receptive and productive modes. *Akdeniz Language Studies Conference 2012*, 156 – 162. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.sbspro>
- Nugroho, A., Haghegh, M., & Triana, Y. (2021). Emergency remote teaching amidst global pandemic: voices of Indonesian EFL teachers. *VOLES: Voices of English Language Education Society*, 5(1), 66–80. <https://doi.org/10.29408/veles.v5i1.3258>
- Nur, A. K. A. (2018). *Using course review boray technique to improve students' reading comprehension at the eight grade of MTs Muhammadiyah Bantaeng* (University of Muhammadiyah Makassar). Retrieved from https://digilibadmin.unismuh.ac.id/upload/796-Full_Text.pdf

- Odora, R. J. (2014). Using explanation as a teaching method: how prepared are high school technology teachers in free state province, South Africa? *Journal of Social Sciences*, 38(1), 71–81. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09718923.2014.11893238>
- Ozdayi, N. (2019). An analysis on problem solving skills of students studying in Balikesir university school of physical education and sports. *Asian Journal of Education and Training*, 5(1), 287–291. <https://doi.org/10.20448/journal.522.2019.51.287.291>
- Pakpahan, A. L. (2020). *The effect of applying course review horay method assisted by animation video on the students' reading achievement* (University of Muhammadiyah Sumatera Utara). Retrieved from <http://repository.umsu.ac.id/handle/123456789/4545>
- Permatasari, A. N., & Oktiwati, U. Y. (2021). Preferred online learning method during COVID-19 pandemic: a students' perspective. *Parole: Journal of Linguistics and Education*, 11(1), 1–9. Retrieved from <https://ejournal.undip.ac.id/index.php/parole/article/view/35421>
- Pratama, H., Azman, M. N. A., Kassymova, G. K., & Duisenbayeva, S. S. (2020). The trend in using online meeting applications for learning during the period of pandemic COVID-19: a literature review. *Journal of Innovation in Educational and Cultural Research*, 1(2), 58–68. <https://doi.org/10.46843/jiecr.v1i2.15>
- Purgina, M., Mozgovoy, M., & Blake, J. (2020). WordBricks: mobile technology and visual grammar formalism for gamification of natural language grammar acquisition. *Journal of Educational Computing Research*, 58(1), 126–159. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0735633119833010>
- Puspitaloka, N. (2019). The effects of grammar mastery and critical thinking on student's descriptive writing skill. *ELT in Focus*, 2(1), 19–28. Retrieved from <https://journal.unsika.ac.id/index.php/ELTINFOCUS/article/view/2024>
- Puspitaningrum, N. P. D., & Arlianty, W. N. (2019). Learning chemistry using course review horay (CRH) model toward students learning activity X grade at SMA negeri 1 Muntilan in nomenclature name of chemical compounds Materials. *International Journal of Chemistry Education Research*, 3(1), 43–48. <https://doi.org/10.20885/ijcer.vol3.iss1.art7>
- Putri, N. D. A., Salim, A., & Sunardi. (2017). The effectiveness of the use of course review horay (CRH) methods to improve numeracy division skill of children with mild mental retardation in SLB Negeri Surakarta, Indonesia year 2016/2017. *European Journal of Special Education Research*, 2(3), 32–42. <https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.252956>
- Rahmawati, F. F., & Prasetyo, Z. K. (2018). Why should course review horay? *6th International Conference on Educational Research and Innovation (ICERI 2018)*, 255–258. <https://doi.org/10.2991/iceri-18.2019.53>
- Setiyawan, H., & Abdillah. (2019). Course review horay (CRH) learning model to improve mathematical learning outcomes of integers materials. *Matematika Dan Pembelajaran*, 7(2), 31 – 41. <https://doi.org/10.33477/mp.v6i2>
- Solikhah, I. (2017). Corrections on grammar, sentence variety and developing detail to qualify academic essay of Indonesian learners. *Dinamika Ilmu*, 17(1), 115–128. <https://doi.org/10.21093/di.v17i1.783>
- Steinlen, A. K. (2017). The development of English grammar and reading comprehension by majority and minority language children in a bilingual primary school. *Studies in Second Language Learning and Teaching*, 7(2), 419–442. <https://doi.org/10.14746/ssllt.2017.7.2.4>
- Subaidi, & Haryanto. (2015). Teaching English grammar with CLT and explanation method. *Wahana Akademika*, 2(2), 3–10. Retrieved from <https://journal.walisongo.ac.id/index.php/wahana/article/view/373/339>

-
- Subroto, I., & Rosalinah, Y. (2017). Grammar and critical thinking effects towards student's writing skill at SMK Ksatria in central Jakarta. *PROGRESSIVE: Journal of Linguistics, Literature, and Teaching*, 12(2), 65–72. Retrieved from <https://ejournal.nusamandiri.ac.id/index.php/progressive/article/view/573>
- Tosuncuoglu, I. (2018). Place of critical thinking in EFL. *International Journal of Higher Education*, 7(4), 26–32. <https://doi.org/10.5430/ijhe.v7n4p26>
- Tulis, M., Steuer, G., & Dresel, M. (2016). Learning from errors: a model of individual processes. *Frontline Learning Research*, 4(2), 12– 26. <https://doi.org/10.14786/flr.v4i2.168>
- Yulianto, D., & Mujtahid, N. M. (2021). Online assessment during Covid-19 pandemic: EFL teachers' perspectives and their practices. *Journal of English Teaching*, 7(2), 229–242. <https://doi.org/10.33541/jet.v7i2.277>
- Zarei, A. A., & Haghgoo, E. (2012). The relationship between critical thinking and L2 grammatical and lexical knowledge. *English Linguistics Research*, 1(1), 104–110. <https://doi.org/10.5430/elr.v1n1p104>