

## INTERACTIONAL FEEDBACK ON ENGLISH PROFICIENCY: GRAMMATICAL AWARENESS

Amiruddin<sup>1</sup>, Syahrin Adzim<sup>2</sup>, Anwar Sadat Malik<sup>3</sup>, Nurhidayanti<sup>4</sup>

<sup>1, 2, 3, 4</sup> Institut Agama Islam As'adiyah Sengkang, Indonesia

### Article Info

#### Article history:

Received February 20, 2022

Revised March 17, 2022

Accepted March 20, 2022

#### Keywords:

English Proficiency

Grammatical Awareness

Interactional Feedback

### ABSTRACT

This study examines whether or not interactional feedback has a considerable positive impact on first-year MA Nurul As'adiyah Callacu students' grammatical awareness. The pre-experimental research method was used in the study. 38 grade X A students made up the sample. The research's pre- and post-test grammatical data were collected, and the t-test in SPSS was used to assess it. The study's findings showed a substantial difference between the students' levels of grammatical awareness on the pretest and posttest. The fact that the mean posttest score was greater than the mean pretest score ( $91.32 > 59.08$ ) served as evidence. These mean scores were different in a statistically significant way. The probability value is lower than the significant level ( $0.00 < 0.05$ ), which was based on the t-test value at the significant level of 0.05. Based on the result analysis, it can be said that interactional feedback significantly improved grammatical awareness in the first year of MA Nurul As'adiyah Callacu because it promoted learners' intellectual operations and thought processes, which led them to reflect on ideas, particularly in grammar learning.

Copyright © 2022 ETDCI.  
All rights reserved.

### Corresponding Author:

Amiruddin,  
Institut Agama Islam As'adiyah Sengkang, Indonesia  
Email: [amiruddinn1@gmail.com](mailto:amiruddinn1@gmail.com)

## 1. INTRODUCTION

In general, grammar is a set of verbal conventions. As it can help students use English appropriately, it has been recognized as a key component of the language acquisition process (Shumin, 2002; Leech et al., 2009). A grammar is a linguist's description of a language, typically stated in terms of rules (Larsen-Freeman & DeCarrico, 2019; Nurullayevna, 2021). The majority of the grammar is explanations of linguistic use and structure, or how words are used to form phrases and sentences in a given language. The study of word forms (morphology), word order, and sentence structure are referred to as grammar (syntax). As part of a definition of English, grammar is now defined more broadly to encompass descriptions of English sounds, vocabulary, text kinds, and text structures (Larsen-Freeman & DeCarrico, 2019).

In conjunction with the above definition, grammar is the arrangement of words to create a proper sentence. In particular, structure refers to a particular instance of grammar. The past tense, plural nouns, adjective comparison, etc are some examples of structure (Rankin & Whong, 2020; Biber et al., 2020). The grammar of a language is

also determined. The guidelines that direct a group of speakers' linguistic conduct can also be described using this phrase. Grammar is a set of structural rules that determine how words, clauses, phrases, and sentences are put together in any particular natural language (Biber et al., 2020). Additionally, the term denotes the study of such laws, which encompasses phonology, morphology, syntax, semantics, and pragmatics (Mahmood, 2019; Wolde, 2021).

Grammar is a crucial component of language because it helps speakers and readers understand what is being said (Kaharuddin, 2018; Seidenberg & MacDonald, 2018). Speakers can express diverse meanings if they utilize poor grammar. In other words, grammatical mistakes can cause someone to misunderstand a communication (Seidenberg & MacDonald, 2018). Additionally, it is crucial that kids understand grammar because it greatly affects how sentences are understood. The kids are thought to be able to accurately form acceptable sentences in English by understanding the rules of a language.

However, a lot of students find that mastering grammar causes them a lot of worries when it comes to language learning. It was discovered that some of the first-year students lacked awareness of grammatical rules based on an observation that the current researcher made at MA Nurul As'adiyah Callacu. It happened when they were asked to describe their own holiday experience. The majority of them continue to make grammatical mistakes such as utilizing improper tense, making inappropriate sentences, and producing errors in word order.

## **Literature Review**

### **1. Grammatical awareness**

At the very least, awareness entails a raised level of self-awareness of the language patterns we employ. We must understand that although the relationships between a language's forms and meanings can occasionally be random, language is a system and is generally patterned deliberately (Demetriou et al., 2020; Brinkmann et al., 2021; Hudgens Henderson, 2022). This study was influenced by the idea that linguistic awareness improves learning. Awareness is a particular mental state in which a person has had a particular subjective experience of some cognitive content or external stimulation (Taumoepeau & Ruffman, 2016). A behavioral or cognitive shift, as a result, a description of the event, or a metalinguistic explanation of a guiding principle can all serve as indicators of awareness (Demetriou et al., 2020).

In an effort to define the term, Demetriou et al. (2020) came to the conclusion that grammar is a set of rules that specify how words and groupings of words can be combined to construct sentences in a specific language. This definition suggests that grammar is important in the process of joining linguistic components to create sentences. If the sentences adhere to the grammar standards, they are considered to be correct. It is essential for language students to master proper grammar since it reflects the communication function and goal of language (Leacock et al., 2010; Canale, 2014; Saaristo, 2015). It must be acknowledged that having a solid grasp of grammar makes it simple for people to communicate information, sentiments, and

ideas to others. In other terms, it can be claimed that poor language skills lead to communication breakdown because the intended message cannot be conveyed (Sato et al., 2019; Chen & Kent, 2020). That sentence makes it apparent that pupils must learn grammar if they want to be able to communicate their thoughts and feelings effectively and use English.

So, explicit knowledge of grammatical features of language might be referred to as grammatical awareness. It can be thought of as consisting of two skills: morphological awareness and syntactic awareness. Raising learners' awareness of grammatical characteristics and systems, and most significantly, encouraging learners to "notice" grammar regularities, are the main objectives of explicit and focused grammar training (Puchta, 2018; Larsen-Freeman & DeCarrico, 2019; Larsen-Freeman, 2019; Reynolds & Kao, 2021). The term "noticing" refers to awareness at an understanding level. Explicit learning happens when attention is paid to form, as opposed to implicit learning, which is meaning-focused. Reviews comparing the effectiveness of implicit versus explicit instruction and explicit learning show an advantage - at least in the short term - for explicit modes of learning over implicit in both classroom and laboratory studies, supporting the idea that awareness at an understanding level is essential to learning a second language. Direct instruction, in which the teacher explains the rules to the students, is the conventional approach to teaching explicit information. But learners might struggle with grammatical rules because of their technical nature.

## 2. Interactional feedback

Language learners benefit from interaction as a beneficial component of second language classroom activities because it helps them get understandable input, output, and feedback (Majlesi, 2018; Kasper & Wagner, 2018; Nassaji, 2020). Feedback results from interaction and is easily described as answers to learner utterances containing a mistake (Nassaji, 2020). Teachers respond to student mistakes during verbal contact by using interactional feedback (Kasper & Wagner, 2018).

Students who regularly interacted with their teacher and other students were shown to be more motivated and to have better learning experiences (Mackey et al., 2000; Abdollahifam, 2014; Kaivanpanah et al., 2015). Engaging students in conversations can help them think critically and clarify their ideas. Interactions support and assist cognition and are crucial in fostering students' intellectual activities and thought processes. When the students provide L2 output, we can determine the type of feedback they require. Interactional feedback is therefore crucial since it enables students to check their work by speaking with native speakers or more experienced speakers (Kaivanpanah et al., 2015).

## 2. METHOD

The current researcher used a one group pre-test and post-test design in this research design as a pre-experimental procedure. It attempts to determine whether interactional feedback improved the first-year MA Nurul As'adiyah Callacu student's grammatical awareness.

The following was given as the design:

**O<sub>1</sub>----- X ----- O<sub>2</sub>**

Information:

O<sub>1</sub> = Pre-test

X = Treatment

O<sub>2</sub> = Post-test

Pre-test O<sub>1</sub> was administered during the initial consultation prior to treatment. X denotes the care provided from the second to the fifth meeting. O<sub>2</sub> stands for the post-test administered at the sixth meeting.

Twenty different grammatical tests were used in the pre- and post-tests of the research instrument used for this study. The pre-test was administered prior to therapy to gauge the students' prior knowledge of grammatical rules, and the post-test was administered following treatment to assess the students' mastery of grammar. The researcher determined the test's results by adding up all of the students' accurate responses to the grammar test.

## 3. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

The frequency and percentage of the students' pretest and posttest results are shown in Table 1 below as part of this classification.

**Table 1.** The Frequency and Percentage of the Students' Pretest and Posttest

Classification		Pre-Test		Post-Test	
		F	%	F	%
86-100	Very Good	1	2.63	29	76.32
71-85	Good	3	7.89	9	23.68
56-70	Fair	18	47.37	0	0.00
41-55	Poor	12	31.58	0	0.00
≤40	Very Poor	4	10.53	0	0.00
Total		38	100	38	100

According to table 1 above, only one student (2.63 percent) was classified as having very good performance on the pretest. It also establishes that 3 students (7.89 percent) were given a good classification, 18 students (47.37 percent) received a fair classification, 12

students (31.58 percent) received a low rating, and 4 students were given a very poor classification. No student received a very poor, poor, or fair score on the posttest. Only 9 pupils (23.68%) were given a good grade, and 29 students (76.32%) received a very high grade. It is clear that the students benefit from interactional feedback. It was corroborated by the students' improved test scores. The next Table 2 displays the mean score and standard deviation.

**Table 2.** The mean score and standart deviation

Pretest		Posttest	
Mean score	Standard deviation	Mean score	Standard deviation
59.08	12.73	91.32	6.54

The mean score and standard deviation between the pre-test and post-test are displayed in Table 2 above. In the pre-test, the students had a mean score of 59.08 and a standard deviation of 12.73, whereas the post-test had a mean score of 91.32 and a standard deviation of 6.54. The current researcher deduced from the aforementioned mean scores that the usage of interactional feedback improved students' grammatical awareness. While Table 3 displays the gain score.

**Table 3.** Gain Score

Mean Score		Gain
Pretest	Posttest	
59.08	91.32	32.24

The gain score from the pretest and posttest is shown in Table 3. The increased score demonstrates that students' grammatical awareness has improved. In the pre-test, the mean score was 59.08, and in the post-test, it was 91.32. The gain was 32.24, thus that is what can be said. It implies that using interactional feedback provides benefits over the alternative tactic (the conventional way). According to the gain score in the table above, the students' grammatical awareness was improved by using interactional feedback. The following are the results of the paired t-test analysis in Table 4.

**Table 4.** The results of the paired t-test

	Paired Differences					t	df	Sig. (2-tailed)
	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean	95% Confidence Interval of the Difference				
				Lower	Upper			
Pair 1 pretest - posttest	32.237	13.838	2.245	36.785	27.688	14.361	37	.000

The significant value (0.000) in Table 4 above is less than 0.05, as can be seen. The post-test results are significant, thus that means. With this in mind, it is acceptable to accept the alternative hypothesis (H1) of this study, which states that the use of interactional feedback greatly improves first-year MA Nurul As'adiyah Callacu students' grammatical awareness.

These research findings are consistent with a prior related discovery which discovered that the use of interactional feedback had a substantial impact on grammar acquisition (Russell & Spada, 2006; Rassaei & Moinzadeh, 2011; Hashemifardnia et al., 2019; Nassaji, 2020). The probability value (0.00), which was less than the level of significance, supported this (0.05) In other words, students who received interactional feedback from their teachers performed better in terms of reducing language learning anxiety and fostering grammar learning. It implies that the technique can be applied generally to many mother tongues. The current study also discovered that three of the seven different types of interactional feedback increased the students' awareness of grammatical faults. They consist of direct correction, recasts, and metalinguistic feedback.

#### 4. CONCLUSION

Based on the findings and analysis presented above, the current researcher was able to conclude that the use of interactional feedback significantly improved grammatical awareness in the first year of the MA Nurul As'adiyah Callacu. Interactional feedback promoted learners' intellectual operations and thought processes, which led them to reflect on ideas, particularly in grammar learning. The results of the study revealed a significant difference in the students' grammatical awareness levels on the pretest and posttest. Evidence was provided by the fact that the mean posttest score was higher than the mean pretest score ( $91.32 > 59.08$ ). These mean scores were statistically significantly different from one another. The probability value, which was based on the t-test value at the significant level of 0.05, is less than the significant level ( $0.00 < 0.05$ ).

#### REFERENCES

- Abdollahifam, S. (2014). Investigating the effects of interactional feedback on EFL students' writings. *Procedia-Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 98, 16-21.
- Biber, D., Gray, B., Staples, S., & Egbert, J. (2020). Investigating grammatical complexity in L2 English writing research: Linguistic description versus predictive measurement. *Journal of English for Academic Purposes*, 46, 100869. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jeap.2020.100869>
- Brinkmann, J. L., Cash, C., & Price, T. (2021). Crisis leadership and coaching: a tool for building school leaders' self-efficacy through self-awareness and reflection. *International Journal of Mentoring and Coaching in Education*. <https://doi.org/10.1108/IJMCE-01-2021-0009>
- Canale, M. (2014). From communicative competence to communicative language pedagogy. In *Language and communication* (pp. 14-40). Routledge.

- Chen, J. C., & Kent, S. (2020). Task engagement, learner motivation and avatar identities of struggling English language learners in the 3D virtual world. *System*, 88, 102168. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.system.2019.102168>
- Demetriou, A., Kazi, S., Makris, N., & Spanoudis, G. (2020). Cognitive ability, cognitive self-awareness, and school performance: From childhood to adolescence. *Intelligence*, 79, 101432.
- Hashemifardnia, A., Namaziandost, E., & Sepehri, M. (2019). The effectiveness of giving grade, corrective feedback, and corrective feedback-plus-giving grade on grammatical accuracy. *International Journal of Research Studies in Language Learning*, 8(1), 15-27. [https://papers.ssrn.com/sol3/papers.cfm?abstract\\_id=3463040](https://papers.ssrn.com/sol3/papers.cfm?abstract_id=3463040)
- Hudgens Henderson, M. (2022). Critical Language Awareness in the Spanish as a Heritage Language College Classroom. *Languages*, 7(3), 157.
- Kaharuddin, A. (2018). The communicative grammar translation method: a practical method to teach communication skills of English. *ETERNAL (English, Teaching, Learning, and Research Journal)*, 4(2), 232-254.
- Kaivanpanah, S., Alavi, S. M., & Sepehrinia, S. (2015). Preferences for interactional feedback: differences between learners and teachers. *The Language Learning Journal*, 43(1), 74-93.
- Kasper, G., & Wagner, J. (2018). Epistemological reorientations and L2 interactional settings: A postscript to the special issue. *The Modern Language Journal*, 102, 82-90. <https://doi.org/10.1111/modl.12463>
- Larsen-Freeman, D., & DeCarrico, J. (2019). Grammar. In *An introduction to applied linguistics* (pp. 19-34). Routledge. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9780429424465-2>
- Larsen-Freeman, D. (2019). Teaching and researching grammar skills: Theory-and research-based practices. In *Research-driven pedagogy* (pp. 97-124). Routledge.
- Leacock, C., Chodorow, M., Gamon, M., & Tetreault, J. (2010). Automated grammatical error detection for language learners. *Synthesis lectures on human language technologies*, 3(1), 1-134. <https://doi.org/10.2200/S00275ED1V01Y201006HLT009>
- Leech, G., Hundt, M., Mair, C., & Smith, N. (2009). *Change in contemporary English: A grammatical study*. Cambridge University Press.
- Mackey, A., Gass, S., & McDonough, K. (2000). How do learners perceive interactional feedback?. *Studies in second language acquisition*, 22(4), 471-497.
- Mahmood, R. K. (2019). The Dissolution of linguistics and the rise of language with reference to pragmatics: A deconstructive approach. *Journal of University of Human Development*, 5(3), 1-5. <https://doi.org/10.21928/juhd.v5n3y2019.pp1-5>
- Majlesi, A. R. (2018). Instructed vision: Navigating grammatical rules by using landmarks for linguistic structures in corrective feedback sequences. *The Modern Language Journal*, 102, 11-29. <https://doi.org/10.1111/modl.12452>
- Nassaji, H. (2020). Assessing the effectiveness of interactional feedback for L2 acquisition: Issues and challenges. *Language Teaching*, 53(1), 3-28. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0261444819000375>

- Nurullayevna, S. N. (2021). The techniques of explicit grammar instruction. *Middle European Scientific Bulletin*, 12, 281-284. <http://cejsr.academicjournal.io/index.php/journal/article/view/549>
- Puchta, H. (2018). Teaching grammar to young learners. In *The Routledge Handbook of Teaching English to Young Learners* (pp. 203-219). Routledge.
- Rankin, T., & Whong, M. (2020). *Grammar: A Linguists' Guide for Language Teachers*. Cambridge University Press.
- Rassaei, E., & Moinzadeh, A. (2011). Investigating the Effects of Three Types of Corrective Feedback on the Acquisition of English Wh-Question Forms by Iranian EFL Learners. *English Language Teaching*, 4(2), 97-106. <https://doi.org/10.5539/elt.v4n2p97>
- Reynolds, B. L., & Kao, C. W. (2021). The effects of digital game-based instruction, teacher instruction, and direct focused written corrective feedback on the grammatical accuracy of English articles. *Computer Assisted Language Learning*, 34(4), 462-482.
- Russell, J., & Spada, N. (2006). The effectiveness of corrective feedback for the acquisition of L2 grammar. *Synthesizing research on language learning and teaching*, 13, 133-164.
- Saaristo, P. (2015). Grammar is the heart of language: grammar and its role in language learning among Finnish university students. *Voices of pedagogical development—Expanding, enhancing and exploring higher education language learning*, 279-318.
- Sato, T., Yujobo, Y. J., Okada, T., & Ogane, E. (2019). Communication strategies employed by low-proficiency users: Possibilities for ELF-informed pedagogy. *Journal of English as a Lingua Franca*, 8(1), 9-35. <https://doi.org/10.1515/jelf-2019-2003>
- Seidenberg, M. S., & MacDonald, M. C. (2018). The impact of language experience on language and reading. *Topics in Language Disorders*, 38(1), 66-83.
- Shumin, K. (2002). Factors to consider: Developing adult EFL students' speaking abilities. *Methodology in language teaching: An anthology of current practice*, 12, 204-211.
- Taumoepeau, M., & Ruffman, T. (2016). Self-awareness moderates the relation between maternal mental state language about desires and children's mental state vocabulary. *Journal of experimental child psychology*, 144, 114-129. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jecp.2015.11.012>
- Wolde, V. (2021). phonological, morphological or morpho-syntactic form is studied on. In *Narrative Syntax and the Hebrew Bible: Papers of the Tilburg Conference 1996* (p. 21). BRILL.