JEFL

Journal on English as a Foreign Language

Contents

Course review horay and critical thinking skills: the effective teaching model for students' grammar competence in remote EFL classrooms

Mukminatus Zuhriyah[1]*, Maskhurin Fajarina[2]

[1,2] English Language Education Department, Faculty of Education, Universitas Hasyim Asy'ari Tebuireng Jombang, Jombang, Jawa Timur, Indonesia

* Email: zoehrea@gmail.com (corresponding author)

Abstract

Since the COVID-19 pandemic, EFL lecturers need to be creative in handling their remote teaching. However, scarce studies investigated the use of course review horay (CRH) and students' critical thinking skills (CTS) in remote EFL classrooms especially in grammar classes. The study aimed to explore whether or not CRH was more effective than explanation model to teach grammar and the students having high CTS had better grammar competence than those of low CTS. This experimental study employed a 2x2 factorial design. The population was the second semester students of non-English departments in a private university in East Java, Indonesia. The sample was four groups comprising of two groups (high and low CTS) in the experimental class and two groups (high and low CTS) in the control class. To categorize them into high and low CTS, an Indonesian argumentative essay writing test was used. After six meetings of treatment, the students did the grammar test. The grammar scores were, then, analyzed using ANOVA and TUKEY tests. The results indicated that CRH was more effective and the students with high CTS possessed better grammar competence. The present study implies that CRH and CTS created a joyful learning atmosphere in remote grammar teaching.

Keywords: course review horay; critical thinking skills; grammar competence; Indonesian EFL students; remote EFL classrooms

Introduction

The existence of grammar makes the English language that the people use more meaningful and understandable. In line with this, Navaz and Sama (2017) state that grammar has connection with those four skills of English. English grammar really has an important role in the success of learning all of the skills of English. Rao (2019) explains that grammar has a major role in the construction of the sentence as well as in the oral and written communication. Additionally, Subasini and Kokilavani (2013) mention that grammar is the structural foundation of our skill for expressing ourselves.

English learners cannot avoid learning grammar. It is supported by Effendi et al. (2017) who state that the language learners must provide enough grammar of the target language in order for them to be able to have good skills on that target language. Indeed, grammar is needed in all English skills. The readers of English texts have to understand grammar if they want to comprehend the content of the text well. In addition, when people are speaking, they need to use grammar so that their messages can be transferred to the others well. Alvarez (2017) argues that to enhance the skill of speaking, the learners need to master grammar. Furthermore, learning listening is easier if the students have already understood the grammar. Finally, to create effective and non-confusing English texts, the writers must express their thoughts with the correct grammar. Grammar which is bad can result in the text which is less qualified (Khamesian, 2016).

Because of the COVID-19 pandemic, all the teaching and learning processes in Indonesia have been done remotely. This remote teaching has been held for more than two semesters. Grammar was one of English courses remotely taught. Unfortunately, from their preliminary study, the researchers got the data that the grammar competence of the second semester students of non-

English departments in a private university located in East Java, Indonesia was low. The class documents stated that almost sixty percent of the students' score was under 70. Most of the English learners of non-English Departments at this university also stated in the questionnaires given to them that it was not important to learn the grammatical structure or the grammar of English. Therefore, they did not care much of their grammar class. This less motivation in learning grammar caused them to have low grammar competence. In line with this, Riswanto and Aryani (2017) state that motivation is one main factor determining students' success in learning. Additionally, they also felt bored because their lecturers often taught grammar by using explanation model in their remote classroom on video conference of Google Meet. Explanation model is a kind of conventional teaching model in which the teacher explains more the materials while the students are given less time to have their own effort to master the material in the teaching and learning process. It is a teacher-centered model. In this model, the teacher serves as the center of knowledge, directing the learning process and controlling leaners' access information (Lak et al., 2017).

In this remote classroom, the lecturers needed to be as creative as possible to create an interesting and not a monotonous class. That is why in the experimental class of this study, via Google Meet video conference, the researchers taught grammar by implementing course review horay model. CRH model is a student-centered teaching model. It belongs to cooperative learning in which the students are working in groups of discussion in the teaching and learning process. According to Saputra et al. (2019), CRH is a model of learning which is able to create a fun and enjoyable learning atmosphere. Meanwhile, Meganingtyas et al. (2019) argue that students' understanding of the materials being studied is examined by asking them to answer the questions provided by the teachers in this CRH model. Furthermore, Rahmawati and Prasetyo (2018) present the procedures of CRH model as follows. It starts with the material explanation by the teacher. Then, the teacher divides the students into heterogeneous groups. After that, some cards having been given numbers are given to each group. Next, the teacher delivers the questions and the groups answer the questions on the cards given. After finishing writing the answers on the cards, the groups submit the cards to the teacher. Afterward, the teacher gives the checklist mark for the correct answer and cross mark for the wrong answer. The group has to shout "horay" when their answer is right. This activity is ended with giving a reward to the winner by the teacher.

Zuhriyah & Fajarina   Course review horay and critical thinking skills: the effective
teaching model for students' grammar competence in remote
EFL classrooms

Because the grammar teaching in this research was done online, the researchers modified the CRH procedures to be implemented in their class. This online teaching used the platform of Google Meet. It is supported by Pratama et al. (2020) who state that Google Meet can facilitate the teacher and the students to meet and discuss directly in their online teaching and learning process. Furthermore, Setyawan et al. (2020) argue that the use of Google Meet influences the students' building knowledge and learning outcomes. Meanwhile, the modification of the procedures in implementing the CRH can be explained as follows. Two lecturers were handling this grammar class. One lecturer was to deliver the materials of grammar and lead the class meeting while the other one was to become a Google Meet host and observe the students' participation in the class from their videos. The lecturer explained the grammar materials. After the materials were explained, the students were asked to choose their own partners. Then, the lecturer had the students complete the list of group numbers. After that, the lecturer displayed the questions with their numbers in the PowerPoint. Next, the students with their partners having been chosen before were instructed to discuss the answers to the questions displayed based on their group number. Next, the group having finished answering their question was asked to unmute their speaker and said "horay." Then, they read their answer. If their answer was right, both the lecturers and the other students applauded them.

By modifying and applying this CRH, the researchers hoped that the students could reach the competence of grammar maximally. Besides that, the researchers also invited the students to use their critical thinking skills as maximally as possible because their critical thinking skills also have an important role for the better grammar competence. Critical thinking skill is an ability of thinking beyond memorization. Ennis (1993) in Hidayati and Sinaga (2019) presents five indicators of CTS namely: elementary clarification, basic support, inference, advanced clarification, and strategies and tactics. Furthermore, Facione (2015) argues that CTS consist of six components, such as interpretation, analysis, evaluation, inference, explanation and self-regulation. All those components which exist in the CTS are really helpful in succeeding the students' learning.

There were still limited studies related to the implementation of course review horay (CRH) in English teaching and learning process. One of them is a study by Kamarudin et al. (2018) who found that CRH could improve students' self confidence in the teaching and learning of vocabulary. Meanwhile, Masruddin (2019) had showed the result of his study that CRH was able to

develop students' speaking skill. Those studies have proven that CRH is able to improve the students' skills in the EFL classroom. Unfortunately, studies in English teaching in Indonesia since the COVID-19 pandemic still focused on what platforms were used (Atmojo & Nugroho, 2020; Fitria, 2020; Suryana et al.,2021). In addition, Atmojo and Nugroho (2020) also state that the teachers do not use games in their online English teaching. Therefore, after knowing the advantages of CRH and the lack of English teaching done during the pandemic of COVID-19, the researchers in the present study used CRH containing a game in its teaching and learning process in their grammar classes.

There were also scarce studies about critical thinking skills (CTS) in English language classrooms. One of them is the research by Malmir and Shoorcheh (2012) explaining that the students who got the instructions of critical thinking had better speaking performance than those who did not. While, Indah (2017) made a conclusion for her study that topic familiarity in writing could trigger CTS, whereas writing performance mediated CTS. Then, Rahmat et al. (2020) also did the study about CTS in writing class with the result that the students' CTS were reflected by their writing process. All those studies state that CTS are very beneficial in improving the students' English skills. That is why the researchers also explored the use of the students' CTS in the grammar class.

However, the studies by Kamarudin et al. (2018) and Masruddin (2019) still focused on the use of CRH in the vocabulary class and the speaking class. Meanwhile, the studies by Malmir and Shoorcheh (2012), Indah (2017) and Rahmat et al. (2020) only investigated the use of CTS in the speaking class and writing classes. There is still scarcity of the studies exploring the use of CRH combined with students' CTS especially related to the teaching and learning of grammar. Therefore, the researchers of this present study investigated the use of CRH model combined with the students' CTS in the remote grammar class. The objectives of this study were to explore whether or not course review horay model was more effective than explanation model for teaching grammar and the students having high critical thinking skills had better grammar competence than those with low critical thinking skills.

Method

Research design

The focus of this study was to investigate the influence of the CRH model and the students' CTS on their grammar competence. Consequently, this study

employed a factorial experimental study, especially a 2x2 factorial design. According to Gall et al. (2003), the formation of four treatment groups is required for this factorial design. The four groups of treatment in the present study consisted of (1) the students with high CTS and taught grammar by using CRH model, (2) the students having low CTS and taught grammar by using CRH model, (3) the students whose CTS were high and taught grammar by using explanation model and (4) the students who had low CTS and taught grammar by using explanation model.

Participants

This research was carried out in the second semester of undergraduate students of non-English departments in a private university in East Java, Indonesia. All these non-English department students had to join an intensive English program for one year or two semesters. Because that private university had twenty active non English departments, the population of this research was twenty classes from those non-English departments. The researchers took sampling technique of cluster random sampling in order not to change the order of the students in those twenty classes. The steps to take the sample in this study were as follows. Firstly, a list of the twenty classes was made. It was continued by writing each class name on twenty pieces of paper. After that, the researchers rolled those twenty pieces of paper, and then, put them into a can. Next, the can was shaken. Finally, two pieces of paper were dropped. Those two rolled pieces of paper which were dropped were class A and class B so that class A and B were the sample of this study. Each class consisted of twenty-two students. In order to decide which class became an experimental class and a control class, the researchers used a lottery. Table 1 presents the demographic information of the participants in this research.

Table 1. The demographic information of the participants

Gender	Experimental class	Control class
Male	10	9
Female	12	13
Total	22	22

Zuhriyah & Fajarina

Course review horay and critical thinking skills: the effective teaching model for students' grammar competence in remote EFL classrooms

Data collection

After having decided the experimental and the control classes, the next step that the researchers had done was administering the test of critical thinking skills. This test was in the form of an Indonesian argumentative essay writing that had to be written by the students of class A and class B. The essay was written in Indonesia because the students of those two classes were from non-English departments. To determine the students' critical thinking skill levels which were high and low, the researchers used median score of their essay test. When they got the score that was lower than the median, they were categorized as having low critical thinking skills and if their score was higher, they had high critical thinking skills.

All the treatments in this study were done via Google Meet. Class A as the experimental class was taught grammar by using course review horay and explanation model was implemented to teach grammar in class B as the control class. Both of the classes were taught grammar during six meetings. They were taught about the use of simple present tense, simple past tense, simple future tense and imperative sentences. Simple present tense was taught for two meetings and simple past tense was the same. The other two meetings were for simple future tense and imperative sentences. Table 2 presents the summary of the teaching procedures in both the experimental class and the control class.

Table 2. Teaching steps in the experimental and control classes

Teaching steps	Experimental class	Control class
1. The lecturer explained the grammar material	Yes	Yes
2. The students were divided into five groups of discussion	Yes	No
3. The lecturer displayed the five grammar questions on PPT	Yes	Yes
4. All the groups were obligated to say "horay" and read their answer	Yes	No
5. The lecturer gave applause to the students having the right answer	Yes	Yes
6. The lecturer showed the correct answers in the end of the PowerPoint slide	No	Yes

The procedures of teaching grammar in Table 2 can be explained as follows. In the experimental class, the students made five groups after the lecturer explained the grammar materials. After that, the lecturer displayed five

Zuhriyah & Fajarina   Course review horay and critical thinking skills: the effective
teaching model for students' grammar competence in remote
EFL classrooms

questions of grammar in the form of sentence completions on PowerPoint. Every group had to answer the question based on their group number. For instance, group one had to answer the question number one. The group had got the answer, directly unmuted their speaker to say horay. Then, they read the answer. When their answer was correct, the lecturer gave applause. This was followed by other students.

Meanwhile, the students in the control class was not grouped. After finishing explaining the grammar materials, the lecturer showed five grammar questions on PowerPoint. The form of the questions were the same as that of experimental class. Then, the students were asked to try answering those questions. After some students tried answering, the lecturer gave applause if the answer was right. But, finally, the lecturer displayed the right answers while explaining them.

Data analysis

The grammar test consisted of ten questions which were in the form of sentence completions. Before the grammar test was administered to the experimental class and the control class, this test was tested its validity and reliability. The first thing to be done was the validity test. Twenty respondents did this test. The validity test results are shown in Table 3.

Table 3. Results of validity test

Questions	Pearson correlation	Sig. (2-tailed)	Number of respondents
1	0.931	0.000	20
2	0.931	0.000	20
3	0.468	0.038	20
4	0.670	0.001	20
5	0.931	0.000	20
6	0.931	0.000	20
7	0.931	0.000	20
8	0.848	0.000	20
9	0.682	0.001	20
10	0.819	0.000	20

Table 3 shows that sig.2-tailed of the ten questions were lower than 0.05. It means that those ten questions were valid. The next step is to calculate the reliability of the test items which were valid. Because all the questions were

valid, all of them were calculated its reliability. Table 4 presents the result of the reliability test.

Table 4. Reliability test result

Cronbach's alpha	Number of questions
0.823	10

Based on Table 4, it can be known that the score of Cronbach's alpha was higher than 0.6. It can be concluded that the questions were reliable. Because all the questions on the grammar test were valid and reliable, they could be used to test the students' grammar competence. The students did the grammar test after the six meetings of treatment.

After all the data were collected, the students' average grammar scores were calculated. Then it was followed by calculating the normality and homogeneity of the data. After fulfillment of the normality and homogeneity of the data were known, they were analyzed by using two way ANOVA test. To answer the research problems, the researchers analyzed the data between columns (the data of the students in course review horay class and explanation model class) and the data between rows (the data of the students with high critical thinking skills and the students having low critical thinking skills) using ANOVA test. After knowing that the results of the ANOVA test showed significant differences, further analysis was done using the TUKEY test. It was to know the significant difference of mean between columns and between cells.

Findings

Course review horay model as a more effective model for teaching grammar

After the students in both classes of course review horay model and explanation model had learned grammar for six meetings, they did their test of grammar. Table 5 presents the mean scores that they got from this grammar test.

Table 5. Summary of students' average scores

No	Groups	Average scores
1	Course review horay	72.36
2	Explanation model	68.7
3	High CTS	79.409
4	Low CTS	61.72

Zuhriyah & Fajarina   Course review horay and critical thinking skills: the effective
teaching model for students' grammar competence in remote
EFL classrooms

Table 5 shows that the average score of grammar got by the students in the CRH class was higher than the mean score of the students in the explanation model class. It has meaning that the students' grammar competence in the CRH class was better. This result was supported by the result of ANOVA test for teaching models (course review horay and explanation model). Table 6 shows this result.

Table 6. Result summary of ANOVA test for teaching models

Source of variance	Sum square	df	Mean square	F_o	F_t (0.05)
Between columns (teaching models)	141.84	1	141.84	4.792	4.08

Table 6 shows that F_o between columns (teaching models) was higher than F_t. The meaning of it was that the difference between columns was significant so it is said that course review horay model was more effective than explanation model for teaching grammar. To strengthen the result of this ANOVA test, TUKEY test was also applied to know which teaching model was more effective. The TUKEY test result for the data calculation of teaching models is presented in Table 7.

Table 7. TUKEY test result for teaching models

Between group	N	q_o	q_t	Status	Meaning
Teaching models	22	3.095	2.95	Significant	$q_o > q_t$

Table 7 tells that q_o between columns (teaching models) was higher than q_t so that applying course review horay model was significantly different from explanation model to teach grammar. This result revealed that CRH model was more effective.

Therefore, based on those three calculation results (average score, ANOVA test and TUKEY test), it could be concluded that course review horay model was more effective than explanation model for teaching grammar.

The better grammar competence owned by the students with high CTS

Meanwhile, based on their critical thinking skills presented in Table 8, it can be known that the grammar mean score of the students with high critical thinking skills was 79.409 and the students having low critical thinking skills got 61.72. This means that the competence on grammar of the students whose critical

Zuhriyah & Fajarina   Course review horay and critical thinking skills: the effective
                                       teaching model for students' grammar competence in remote
                                       EFL classrooms

thinking skills were high was better than those whose critical thinking skills were low. To support this result, ANOVA test for the data of critical thinking skills was also calculated. The result of it can be seen in Table 8.

Table 8. ANOVA test result for critical thinking skills

Source of variance	Sum Square	df	Mean Square	F_o	F_t (0.05)
Between rows (critical thinking skills)	3439.11	1	3439.11	116.204	4.08

From Table 8, we can see that F_o between rows (critical thinking skills) was higher than F_t. It means that the difference between rows was significant so it can be said that the students having high critical thinking skills had better grammar competence than those with low critical thinking skills.

After knowing the result of the ANOVA test, the data was also analyzed by using TUKEY test in order to know which group (groups of high and low critical skills) had better grammar competence. The result for this TUKEY test calculation is in Table 9.

Table 9. TUKEY test result for critical thinking skills

Between group	N	q_o	q_t	Status	Meaning
Critical thinking skills	22	15.243	2.95	Significant	$q_o > q_t$

Table 9 shows that q_o between rows (critical thinking skills) was higher than q_t so that the students with high critical skills and the students whose critical thinking skills are low are significantly different in their grammar competence. This result indicated that students with high critical thinking skills had better grammar competence.

Thus, all three calculation results proved that the students whose critical thinking skills were high had better grammar competence than those of low critical thinking skills.

Discussion

Course review horay model as a more effective model for teaching grammar

Based on this study result, it is known that course review horay (CRH) model is more effective than explanation model to teach grammar. Those two models were applied in the class meeting by using Google Meet. However, the students who were in the class using course review horay had higher scores on their

grammar test than those in the class applying explanation model. CRH class students' grammar competence was known better than the students in the class of explanation model after all of them got the test of grammar in the post-test. The result of this study added the proof that the implementations of course review horay could increase the students' skills in learning English. This study result completed the study results by Kamarudin et al. (2018) increasing the students' self confidence in learning vocabulary and by Masruddin (2019) increasing students' speaking skill. Automatically, the study result becomes more complete because the previous studies were conducted in the classes of vocabulary and speaking while the present study was implemented in grammar class.

The success of the implementation of CRH in this study was assisted by the use of Google Meet. It has been known that the use of Google Meet in the teaching and learning process in this COVID-19 pandemic is very helpful in creating the in-class meeting. There are many lecturers who use this kind of video conference tool to hold an online face-to-face teaching and learning. This situation demands the creativity of the lecturers to select the appropriate teaching model for their class. It is done with the purposes of avoiding students' boredom and feeling sleepy and engaging students' active participation as well as creating students' enthusiasm in joining the class.

The lecturers' hope and expectation came true when they applied course review horay for the grammar class that they handled. This online meeting was handled by two lecturers in order to get the maximum result. The first lecturer acted as a lecturer handling the grammar materials by applying CRH. The other lecturer acted as a host of Google Meet and observed all the students who participated in the class. Then, the students were asked to unmute their videos at the time using Google Meet. It made the lecturers easy to observe their active participation in the class.

From the students' faces which appeared in the videos, the lecturers could see that they were enthusiastic to join the class. They seemed to enjoy every single of their lecturer's instruction in their grammar class. They did not show their laziness in this class because they interchangeably answered the questions which were related to the grammar materials that they were studying. They who would answer the grammar question unmuted their speaker and clapped his or her hand by saying horay. This created the different situation from the usual video conference which only had them listen to the lecturers' or their friends' presentation while they were looking at the slides of PowerPoint being presented.

Zuhriyah & Fajarina

Course review horay and critical thinking skills: the effective teaching model for students' grammar competence in remote EFL classrooms

The voice of their friend when he or she was saying horay could make the other students keep their eyes open moreover they also gave applause when their friend's answer was correct. If their answer was still not correct, the lecturer would thank for their effort of having tried to answer based on their understanding. Next, the lecturer asked whether there was another student wanted to answer the question. In this occasion, the researchers noticed that many times some students said horay at the same time. It indicated that they really enjoyed this kind of teaching and learning way. This feeling enjoys produced the spirit of the students to come to their grammar online class. When their spirit became high in studying grammar, they automatically would become encouraged to know and learn grammar more and more. This internal motivation is needed very much in learning everything. The motivation which comes from the students themselves influences the successful learning very much. It happens to every learning including learning grammar. Filgona, et al. (2020), state that the key to succeed in the teaching and learning process is motivation.

In addition, the movement of the hands for clapping before delivering their answer and giving applause after there was a correct answer from their friend made the body relaxed and not tense in front of their laptops or their mobile phones. It caused them to stay focus on the materials being discussed in the class. They were able to raise their concentration in their learning. When they were concentrated on what was being learned, they would be easy in understanding the materials well. Erwiza et al. (2019), assume that the students who are concentrated only pay attention to the materials that they are learning. Their material understanding would increase because of it. If they had well understood, they would have good knowledge about the materials so that they could do the questions in grammar test easily. Absolutely, they got the better score that meant that their grammar competence became better.

Meanwhile, the students taught grammar by using explanation model acted differently. They were less active in the class because the lecturer had already explained the materials. The lecturer spoke more and more while showing the presentation slides. Only listening to their lecturer's explanation while watching their laptops or hand phones could make their attention not focus on what knowledge was being transferred by their lecturer. Afterward, they missed the information that was being delivered. It is in line with what Daniel and Kamioka (2017) claim that the brains of the students who are not concentrated are not able to cultivate the information that they get well. This

Zuhriyah & Fajarina   Course review horay and critical thinking skills: the effective
teaching model for students' grammar competence in remote
EFL classrooms

led them not able to answer the questions which were given by the lecturer at the end of her explanation.

As what was seen by the host of Google Meet, the students in this class also showed their feeling sleepy. This decreased their concentration on the materials given more and more. It seemed that they just made their videos on in order that they were not judged to be absent from their class. One point that they always thought about that they were present in grammar class without caring more about whether they could understand the materials of grammar or not. It was proven when the lecturer gave the question about the grammar materials having been studied at the end of the meeting, only certain students who showed their willingness to answer. Fortunately, those specific students were the same as those who always answered the questions in the previous meetings. The other students only had little attention to the materials they were studying. Cicekci and Sadik (2019) argue that when there is no attention, the learning cannot happen. This means that the students who did not pay attention in the explanation model class; they actually did not learn anything. It was the reason why most of them did not deliver their answer. They did not know what to answer.

The students got more and more inactive to try answering the questions after knowing that their lecturer would give the correct answers for the questions that she had delivered in the end of her presentation slides. The lecturer always displayed the slide that contained the right answers before she closed the meeting. Actually, what their lecturer did by displaying the answers in the end of the slide was to make them easy to catch what their lecturer explained. Unfortunately, this brought them to the bad habit which was a laziness to have a hard effort in answering the questions given. Finally, most of them always waited the last slide that the lecturer would show to them. This resulted their grammar score lower than the students in CRH class.

To sum up, course review horay model could create the different learning atmosphere from the explanation model. CRH model could make the students become more enthusiastic and more motivated in learning grammar. Besides that, the students also became more focused in their learning. But, the explanation model led the students to be indolent and less active in responding the lecturer's instructions and answering her questions. They preferred waiting for the answers from the lecturer before finishing the class. All those conditions above became the factors that distinguished the grammar scores between the students in CRH class and the class of explanation model. In other words, it can

be said that CRH model was more effective than explanation model for teaching grammar.

The better grammar competence owned by the students with high CTS

The other result of this study showed that the students with high critical thinking skills had better grammar competence than those whose critical thinking skills were low. This study result also completed the success of the study results of previous researchers, such as Malmir and Shoorcheh (2012) implementing critical thinking skills in speaking class and Indah (2017) and Rahmat et al. (2020) conducting critical thinking skills in writing class. This present study proved that critical thinking skills had really worked to be used in grammar class.

By using their high critical thinking skills, the students having high critical thinking skills could answer the grammar test appropriately. They could do the test well so that their competence in grammar was better than those with low critical thinking skills. The cause of it was that high critical thinking skills which were owned by the students helped them to have qualified decision in solving the problems that they were facing. They had found the better reasons and used their reflective thinking for their answers in test of grammar. It is supported by Ennis (2011) who defines critical thinking as the thinking that is reasonable and reflective with the focus on deciding what has to be done.

Thus, the students having high critical thinking skills would not deliver the answers carelessly. They must have answered the grammar test by using their best consideration. They must have stronger reasons when they gave their answers. They had already felt sure with their thinking because they had the evidences. They were carefully in making their decisions. They would not be easy to believe in something without having evidences. According to Vdovina and Gaibisso (2013) as cited in Toshpulatova and Kinjemuratova (2020), critical thinking skills improve the students' abilities to analyze, solve problems and make decision. These brought them to be able to make their best in their test.

People who have high critical thinking skills tend to be able to identify the relevant information quickly. Dealing with this, Facione (2015) states that one of the dispositions of ideal critical thinkers is that they are habitually diligent to find the information which is relevant. They will separate the irrelevant information which is not needed. This habit enables them to make the decision well. Because of it, they will not be confused when they find the same problems.

Zuhriyah & Fajarina   Course review horay and critical thinking skills: the effective
teaching model for students' grammar competence in remote
EFL classrooms

They are already ready to face the problems by using the sufficient information that they have. It is exactly what was experienced by the students with high critical thinking skills when they got the grammar questions. They gathered their understanding and knowledge about grammar based on what they had learned in their class and what they had known from their own information search when they were given grammar test. They used their knowledge and understanding to make good decision in order to avoid making mistakes in answering the test.

The low critical thinking skills (CTS) students were on the contrary with those having high CTS. They seemed to be careless in making decision. They did not care much about the reasons behind the decision that they had taken. It is strengthened by Masduqi (2011) who states that the limited use of critical thinking skills by the students makes them tend to receive opinions, moreover, they do not evaluate these opinions carefully. This reveals that the students with low CTS were less reflective in giving the answers of the test they had. It caused their answer to be inappropriate. They got many mistakes in their test so that it can be said that they did not do their test well. As a result, their grammar score was low.

Besides that, their low score was also caused by their not enough grammar knowledge. They just relied on what their lecturer had informed. They were not so diligent to seek the proper information that they could not solve the problems which were little more complex than those which their lecturer had guided to overcome. They were only able to solve the same problems as the examples from their lecturer. This narrow knowledge restricted them to process the broader problems. It is as what Levine (2002) in Aghajani and Gholamrezapour (2019) says that experience will not do much for the people's learning without thinking of it creatively and repeatedly. It is the reason why the students with low CTS became very confused when they got similar questions but different forms. The result of it was that they could not answer the questions well.

The differences between high and low critical thinking skills above made the competence of grammar which was possessed also different. The students who have high CTS could reach the right answers from their decisions that had been made by using their logical reasons and broader knowledge. Conversely, the students who have low CTS get the poor score for their answers because of their limited knowledge and always being in a hurry or not reflective when making decisions to deliver their answers. That is why the low CTS students had lower grammar competence than those with high CTS.

All in all, we can see from those two studies results above that the students who had the better grammar competence were the students who had been taught by using course review horay model and the students who had high critical thinking skills. Therefore, it can be summarized that both course review horay model and high critical thinking skills have significant influence toward the students' competence in grammar.

Conclusion

Having known the results of this study, the researchers come across the conclusions for this research that CRH model is more effective than explanation model for teaching grammar and the students having high CTS have better grammar competence than those of low CTS. These results prove that the implementation of CRH model and the use of the students' critical thinking skills influence the students' competence on grammar.

The present study has given insights that the use of CRH model when having video conferences with the students in their remote grammar learning can make them become fresh and relaxed with the activities existing in this model. Meanwhile, the use of the students' CTS is working so much in reaching their high grammar competence. It is suggested for English teachers or lecturers to implement the combination of CRH model and students' CTS in their remote teaching and learning of grammar. But, there are still many areas of this remote grammar teaching which have not been explored yet in this research so that the future researchers are able to explore them deeper by conducting the same research as this study. Future researchers are also recommended to investigate the implementation of CRH and students' CTS in the teaching and learning of English skills and other English language components.

Acknowledgements

Funding

This work was supported by Novice Lecturer Research (PDP) fund from KEMENDIKBUD-RISTEK in 2021.

Disclosure statement

No potential conflict of interest was reported by the authors.

ORCID

Mukminatus Zuhriyah http://orcid.org/0000-0002-6854-4317
Maskhurin Fajarina https://orcid.org/0000-0003-2018-2756

References

Aghajani, M., & Gholamrezapour, E. (2019). Critical thinking skills, critical reading and foreign language reading anxiety in Iran context. *International Journal of Instruction*, *12*(3), 219–238. https://doi.org/10.29333/iji.2019.12414a

Alvarez, E. H. (2017). Enhancing grammar competence of the senior secondary students through communicative language teaching (CLT). *International Journal of Research in Humanities and Social Studies*, *4*(11), 9–16. Retrieved from https://www.ijrhss.org/papers/v4-i11/2.pdf

Atmojo, A. E. P., & Nugroho, A. (2020). EFL classes must go online! teaching activities and challenges during COVID-19 pandemic in Indonesia. *Register Journal*, *13*(1), 49–76. https://doi.org/10.18326/rgt.v13i1.49-76

Cicekci, M. A., & Sadik, F. (2019). Teachers' and students' opinions about students' attention problems during the lesson. *Journal of Education and Learning*, *8*(6), 15–30. https://doi.org/10.5539/jel.v8n6p15

Daniel, K. N., & Kamioka, E. (2017). Detection of learner's concentration in distance learning system with multiple biological information. *Journal of Computer and Communications*, *5*, 1–15. https://doi.org/10.4236/jcc.2017.54001

Effendi, M. S., Rokhyati, U., Rachman, U. A., Rachmawati, A. D., & Pertiwi, D. (2017). A study on grammar teaching at an English education department in an EFL context. *International Journal on Studies in English Language and Literature (IJESELL)*, *5*(1), 42–46.

Zuhriyah & Fajarina Course review horay and critical thinking skills: the effective
teaching model for students' grammar competence in remote
EFL classrooms

https://doi.org/http://dx.doi.org/10.20431/2347-3134.0501005

Ennis, R. H. (1993). Critical thinking assessment. *Theory Into Practice*, *32*(3), 179–186. https://doi.org/10.1080/00405849309543594

Ennis, R. H. (2011). The nature of critical thinking: an outline of critical thinking dispositions and abilities. *Sixth International Conference on Thinking at MIT, July 1994*. Cambridge.

Erwiza, Kartiko, S., & Gimin. (2019). Factors affecting the concentration of learning and critical thinking on student learning achievement in economic subject. *Journal of Educational Sciences*, *3*(2), 205–215. https://doi.org/10.31258/jes.3.2.p.205-215

Facione, P. A. (2015). Critical thinking: what it is and why it counts. *Insight Assesment*, 2–30. Retrieved from https://www.insightassessment.com/article/critical-thinking-what-it-is-and-why-it-counts

Filgona, J., Sakiyo, J., Gwany, D. M., & Okoronka, A. U. (2020). Motivation in learning. *Asian Journal of Education and Social Studies*, *10*(4), 16–37. https://doi.org/10.9734/AJESS/2020/v10i430273

Fitria, T. N. (2020). Teaching English through online learning system during Covid-19 pandemic. *Pedagogy: Journal of English Language Teaching*, *8*(2), 138–148. https://doi.org/10.32332/pedagogy.v8i2. 2266

Gall, M. D., Gall, J. P., & Borg, W. R. (2003). *Educational research: an introduction* (7th ed.). New York: Pearson Education, Inc.

Hidayati, Y., & Sinaga, P. (2019). The profile of critical thinking skills students on science learning. *4th Annual Applied Science and Engineering Conference*, 1–5. https://doi.org/10.1088/1742-6596/1402/4/044075

Indah, R. N. (2017). Critical thinking, writing performance and topic familiarity of Indonesian EFL learners. *Journal of Language Teaching and Research*, *8*(2), 229–236. https://doi.org/10.17507/jltr.0802.04

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

Khamesian, M. (2016). Grammatical competence : an indispensable. *Global Journal of Human-Social Science: G Linguistics & Education*, *16*(1), 22–26. Retrieved from https://globaljournals.org/GJHSS_Volume16/4-Grammatical-Competence.pdf

Lak, M., Soleimani, H., & Parvaneh, F. (2017). The effect of teacher-centeredness method vs. learner-centeredness method on reading comprehension among

Zuhriyah & Fajarina

Course review horay and critical thinking skills: the effective teaching model for students' grammar competence in remote EFL classrooms

Iranian EFL learners. *Journal of Advances in English Language Teaching*, *5*(1), 1–10. Retrieved from https://european-science.com/jaelt/article/view/4886/2415

Levine, D. P. (2002). Thinking about doing: on learning from experience and the flight from thinking. *Human Relations*, *55*(10), 1251–1268. https://doi.org/10.1177/0018726702055010083

Malmir, A., & Shoorcheh, S. (2012). An investigation of the impact of teaching critical thinking on the Iranian EFL learners' speaking skill. *Journal of Language Teaching and Research*, *3*(4), 608–617. https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.4304/jltr.3.4.608-617

Masduqi, H. (2011). Critical thinking skills and meaning in English language teaching. *TEFLIN Journal*, *22*(2), 185–200. https://doi.org/10.15639/teflinjournal.v22i2/185-200

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

Meganingtyas, B. R., Winarni, R., & Murwaningsih, T. (2019). The effect of using course review horay and talking stick learning methods towards social science learning result reviewed from learning interest. *International Journal of Educational Research Review*, *4*(2), 190-197. https://doi.org/10.24331/ijere.518053

Navaz, A., & Sama, F. (2017). Teaching grammar in the English language classroom: perceptions and practices of students and teachers in the Ampara district. *Proceedings of 7th International Symposium, SEUSL*, 654–667.

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

Rahmat, N. H., Aripin, N., Lin, N. M., Whanchit, W., & Khairuddin, Z. (2020). Exploring the connection between critical thinking skills and academic writing. *International Journal of Asian Social Science*, *10*(2), 118–128. https://doi.org/10.18488/journal.1.2020.102.118.128

Rahmawati, F. F., & Prasetyo, Z. K. (2018). Why should course review horay? In *6th International Conference on Educational Research and Innovation (ICERI 2018)* (pp. 255–258). https://doi.org/10.2991/iceri-18.2019.53

Rao, P. S. (2019). The role of grammar in English language teaching (ELT)

Zuhriyah & Fajarina   Course review horay and critical thinking skills: the effective
teaching model for students' grammar competence in remote
EFL classrooms

techniques. *Research Journal Of English (RJOE)*, *4*(2), 239–249. Retrieved from https://www.rjoe.org.in/Files/vol4issue2/new/RJOE-Srinu Sir 239-249).pdf

Riswanto, A., & Aryani, S. (2017). Learning motivation and student achievement: description analysis and relationships both. *COUNS-EDU: The International Journal of Counseling and Education*, *2*(1), 42–47. https://doi.org/10.23916/002017026010

Saputra, D. S., Yonanda, D. A., Rachmatullah, R., & Rasmitadila. (2019). The application of cooperative learning model type course review horey to improve mathematical understanding for fourth grade of primary school. *International Journal of Scientific & Technology Research*, *8*(10), 2362–2363. Retrieved from http://www.ijstr.org/final-print/oct2019/The-Application-Of-Cooperative-Learning-Model-Type-Course-Review-Horey-To-Improve-Mathematical-Understanding-For-Fourth-Grade-Of-Primary-School.pdf

Setyawan, A., Aznam, N., Paidi, Citrawati, T., & Kusdianto. (2020). Effects of the google meet assisted method of learning on building student knowledge and learning outcomes. *Universal Journal of Educational Research*, *8*(9), 3924–3936. https://doi.org/10.13189/ujer.2020.080917

Subasini, M., & Kokilavani, B. (2013). Significance of grammar in technical English. *International Journal of English Literature and Culture*, *1*(3), 56–58. https://doi.org/10.14662/IJELC2013.022

Suryana, I., Hidantikarnillah, V., & Murwantono, D. (2021). A narrative inquiry of language teachers' perceptions and experiences in using WhatsApp during new normal post-Covid-19 era. *EduLite: Journal of English Education, Literature, and Culture*, *6*(1), 55–70. https://doi.org/10.30659/e.6.1.55-70

Toshpulatova, D., & Kinjemuratova, A. (2020). Teacher perceptions on developing students' critical thinking skills in academic English module. *International Journal of Psycho-Educational Sciences*, *9*(1), 48–60. Retrieved from https://www.journals.lapub.co.uk/index.php/IJPES

Vdovina, E., & Gaibisso, L. C. (2013). Developing critical thinking in the English language classroom: a lesson plan. *ELTA (English Language Teachers' Association) Journal*, *1*(1), 54–68. Retrieved from http://eltajournal.org.rs/wp-content/uploads/2013/12/VII-Developing-Critical-Thinking-in-the-English-Language-classroom.pdf