

Supplementary Intervention Material in English Grammar

Rogela A. Flores

Languages and Literature, College of Arts and Sciences, Cebu Technological University-Tuburan, 6043, Philippines

Corresponding Author: Rogela A. Flores; E-mail: rogela.flores@ctu.edu.ph

ARTICLE INFO

Received: January 5, 2023

Accepted: March 2, 2023

Volume: 4

Issue: 1

KEYWORDS

English Teaching, grammar, grammatical competence, supplementary intervention material, CTU-Tuburan

ABSTRACT

This study assessed the effectiveness of the *Supplementary Intervention Material in English Grammar* developed by the researcher. The material was tried out to the BA English Language and BA Literature students of CTU-Tuburan Campus to determine its effectiveness. After using the material, a summative test was administered to determine their grammatical competence. Questionnaires were also accomplished by the students to gain an in-depth understanding of their attitude towards the use of the material. The result of the summative test revealed that the students' grammatical competence was fairly competent. They have developed their grammatical competence after using the material, from being low-performing to fairly competent. However, it is highly reasonable to state that their grammar skills need to be further improved to particularly support their writing skill. They also showed a very positive attitude towards the material and found it very useful and effective. Thus, the Supplementary Intervention Material in English Grammar was recommended for use in the grammar intervention program of the BAEL and BAL students.

1. Introduction

One cannot argue the importance of the English language. It is the language that one uses to communicate with other people from other countries. It is the language of international politics, law, science, technology, business, literature, arts, sports, music, and aviation. English language proficiency offers numerous opportunities in the country and the global arena.

The K to 12 Basic Education Curriculum of the Department of Education (2016) presents in their English Curriculum Guide its framework to provide necessary knowledge and skills to its learners to wit: The ultimate goal of the Language Arts and Multi-Literacies Curriculum is to produce graduates who apply the language convention, principles, strategies, and skills in (1) interaction with others, (2) understanding and learning other content areas, and (3) fending for themselves in whatever field of endeavor they may engage in .

Given this framework, quality secondary English education, reflective in the best practices in instruction, also entails using varied, practical approaches and instructional materials in teaching, which would equip each learner with the needed skills and competence.

However, in the K-12 era, where instruction focuses on developing the learners holistically, most of the learning materials in English focus on different kinds of literature and somehow give a lesser emphasis on teaching grammar. It is perhaps acceptable if the students are already proficient in grammar; however, the English language has remained foreign to most Filipino students.

Some Filipino students cannot fully understand a lesson taught in straight English. Thus, teachers have to translate the lesson in the native tongue that is comprehensible to them. Some senior high school students cannot write even a decent English sentence. This is particularly evident in research subjects, where students must produce research papers to pass a course (Brillantes et. al, 2019).

Students enter college lacking the essential communication skills in English. The scenario worsens as English grammar courses no longer exist in the general education courses of the new curricula, thereby affecting the students' academic performance in college. It appears that these students cannot write correctly; they know less about the parts of speech. They write in "text language." Their writing is full of run-on sentences. Cortes (2016) states that the inadequate competencies in English in secondary will affect the students' performance in the subject and will continue to fail when they go to the next higher years and college.

The researcher, a Bachelor of Arts in English Language and Bachelor of Arts in Literature instructor observed that many students have difficulty mastering the rules of grammar as could be seen in their written outputs. As such, they can barely write grammatically structured sentences. Grammatical rules are among the difficulties found in the process of learning the English language. The other instructors agreed upon these observations. The inability to communicate fluently and accurately in English will create problems that could severely affect academic performance. In this regard, the Languages and Literature Department of Cebu Technological University-Tuburan Campus has taken immediate action through an intervention program to develop the students' grammatical competence. Likewise, the researcher's utmost desire is that the instructional materials to be used in the intervention program must be research-based to tailor strategies and lessons that will suit the needs of the students. This summarizes the intent of this research as it is envisioned to help by designing and providing a Supplementary Intervention Material in English Grammar for the BA English Language and BA Literature students of CTU-Tuburan Campus.

2. Literature Review

This section indicates a summary of theories and empirical literature that served as basis of this research.

According to Canale and Swain (1987, as cited in Murcia, 2006), communicative competence as a synthesis of an underlying system of knowledge and skill is required for communication. It is made up of four concepts: grammatical competence, discourse competence, sociolinguistic competence, and strategic competence.

Canale and Swain (1980, as cited in Enisa & DİLİLİTAŞ, 2015) assert that there are rules of language use that would be useless without rules of grammar. They firmly believe that grammatical competence is as significant to communicative competence as is the study of sociolinguistic competence.

Grammatical competence focuses on lexical items, morphology rules, syntax, semantics, and the aspect of phonology (pronunciation). Moreover, it includes the essential elements of communication such as the sentence patterns and types, the constituent structure, the morphological inflections as lexical resources. It deals with the ability of the learners to form sentences or utterances based on appropriate rules. It is mainly related to accuracy.

Grammatical competence has the knowledge which empowers the language learner/user to construct and express meaning by using the principles of linguistic standards of the target language, as restricted to only memorizing and replicating language structure. A learner's ability to recognize and produce grammatically correct sentences is an integral part of learning the English

language. Grammatical competence is a critical concern for any communicative approach whose objectives incorporate giving learners the knowledge of how to decide and express precisely the exact meaning of the utterance. They accept that knowledge of these rules will be vital in interpreting utterances for social meaning when there is a low level of clarity between the strict meaning of utterances and the speaker's intention (Liu, 2019).

Experts fervently expressed English as the language of the global village. It is known to be the international language and is the second tongue here in the Philippines; thus, it is used as the medium of instruction in schools. In fact, Section 7, Article XIV in the 1987 Constitution states that "... for communication and instruction, the official languages are Filipino and, until otherwise provided by law, English." Knowing grammar and understanding its usage is basic in everyday communication with other people. Good knowledge of English grammar allows the students to communicate better his/her ideas to others. Grammatical mistakes confuse the reader from what one is saying to how he is saying it. Grammar is an essential element within communication to form a speech. Grammar is the rule of combining and constructing words into larger units in the aspect of meaning. It is a study of producing possible structures used in a language slot into any link in the chain. So, to be able to communicate with others, it is necessary to have the ability to use grammar correctly (Fikroni, 2018).

Moreover, Praise and Meenakshi (2014) state that within the context of communication, the rule of grammar is not simply deemed as such a device in which it directs the rules in constructing the language, but something more than that. In the discussion of generative grammar, Chomsky proposes Universal Grammar, which is related to the very abstract principle inside the human mind. In this case, grammar is considered to be an internal knowledge related to the process of producing the language. Consequently, it can be said that language is the reflection of the linguistic use itself. Thus, having grammatical competence will assist the learners to have such capacity in producing the language. It is closely related to how to combine lexical resources as well as the rules accurately. Moreover, it is also related to the ability in understanding the message or the idea given while interacting with other people. Therefore, it has such an important role to make such communication happen.

The presence of grammar within communicative language teaching is vital. Pica (2000) asserts that communicative teaching that centers on meaning and gives minor consideration to grammatical rules is inadequate to make the students fluent. As a result, the learners tend to make grammatical mistakes in which at the same time not able to detect them because they do not have enough grammatical knowledge. Ellis et al. (2002) suggest that the teaching of linguistic form, grammatical rules, in particular, is still a significant part of language pedagogy. Thus, it can be claimed that grammar plays a part in L2 communicative ability.

To be able to communicate using the target language, grammatical competence is necessary. In other words, grammar's role is to deliver meaning or messages within the communication. When someone is not accurate in saying something, there is a possibility that people he/she talks to will misunderstand what he/she wants to say.

In relation to grammatical competence, Krashen (1981) proposed the Monitor Model Hypothesis, which states that the learned system will function as a monitor or editor for language production. Learners make use of their acquired system differently, so their monitor also varies. Krashen suggests that there is a mental device inside human beings which works as an editor. This device is called Monitor, which is developed through learning, a conscious process linked with explicit learning of grammatical rules. The learning process that involves learning the grammatical rules will enable the learners to have such a device to help them

correct their mistakes. Therefore, learners' grammatical competence is vital not just in producing the language but also in monitoring the language production itself. It functions as an editor to their language production so that they will be able to correct their utterances whenever they make mistakes.

Krashen (1981) identifies three variations of monitor users: monitor over-users, under-users, and optimal-users. The first variation is monitor over-users. Monitor over-users are the people who try to monitor all the time and constantly verify their output with their conscious knowledge of the language production. Furthermore, he says that these users tend to speak cautiously, often do self-correction in the middle of utterances, and are so worried about correctness that they cannot speak fluently.

There may be two possible different causes for over-user of the monitor, for instance, the use of grammar. Over-user may first do not have sufficient experience in language production, especially in oral production. They might have been victims of the learning process, which only focuses on grammar, so they do not acquire much good experience in language. They do not have any choice except to be dependent on the learning process itself. Another possibility may be related to personality. They have had a chance to acquire and may have acquired sufficient knowledge of the language. They simply do not trust their acquired system and only feel confident when they use their Monitor.

The second variation is monitor under-user. Monitor under-users refer to performers who have not learned, or if they have learned system, they choose not to use their conscious knowledge, even when conditions allow it. These performers are typically uninfluenced by error correction, self-correct only by using their feeling for correctness (e.g., "it sounds right"), and depend completely on the acquired system.

Stafford and Covitt (1978, as cited in Krashen, 1981) note that some under-users pay "lip service" to the value of conscious grammar. Their subject felt that people need conscious rules to speak "correctly" and that "grammar is the key to every language. The subject, however, hardly used conscious rules at all, in speech or writing. The under-user may be living in the country where the target language is spoken or exposed to frequent use of the second language in his own country (Krashen 1981).

The last variation is optimal monitor users. According to Krashen, optimal monitor users use the monitor when it is appropriate and when it does not interfere with communication. Many optimal users do not use grammar in ordinary conversation, where it might interfere. In writing, when there is time, optimal users are typically able to make whatever corrections they can to raise the accuracy of their output (Krashen, 1981).

Optimal Monitor users can therefore utilize their learned system, as a supplement to their acquired system. Krashen (1981) says, "Most of the optimal users who have not completely acquired their second language, who make small and occasional errors in speech, can use their conscious grammar so successfully that they can often produce the illusion of being native in their writing". This does not mean that conscious learning can entirely make up for incomplete acquisition. Some un-acquired rules will be learnable and others not. The optimal user can complete the gap in conscious learning, but not all of it.

Krashen (1981) states that three conditions need to be achieved in order to make conscious grammar entirely operated. Nevertheless, it does not necessarily suggest that the users can fully control their monitor even if these conditions are met. Those conditions are time, focus, and knowing the rule. There must be sufficient time in order to use the grammar correctly. In conversational activities, sometimes there is insufficient time to think or even to utilize the grammar correctly. Having a sufficient amount of time will not be enough to operate the monitor. The speaker needs to think of the form as well. This process may lead

to the process of thinking about correctness- knowing the rule. This is the most challenging requirement because the structures of language are complex. Some other aspects need to be considered. He stresses that this has become the problem because even the best learners do not learn every rule they are supposed to.

Teaching grammar can be a very challenging task since the teacher will teach the rules and teach other aspects of language. In relation to this problem, the teachers may apply some approaches, principles, and techniques in teaching grammar to make the teaching and learning process effective and meaningful

Teaching grammar can be a very challenging task since the teacher will teach the rules and teach other aspects of language. In relation to this problem, the teachers may apply some approaches, principles, and techniques in teaching grammar to make the teaching and learning process effective and meaningful. Successful language learning can be promoted by ensuring that the learner is in an emotionally safe place. Krashen's (1981, as cited in Saaty, 2016) Affective Filter Hypothesis states that the affective filter can either facilitate or hinder language production in a second language. It controls how much comprehensible input gets through the learner. Even though the language learner understands specific input, anxiety, low self-esteem, or a sense that he or she is not a potential member of the group that uses the language- the affective filter – will keep it out. Thus, the primary goal in language teaching and learning is to “lower” the affective filter to maximize comprehensible input. This hypothesis explains why individual students make different amounts of improvement when presented with the same input.

Having confidence in using the English language means being self-assured about one's abilities. Most students frequently self-doubt when they are incapable of understanding a concept or when they perform poorly. What is significant is that students do not stay in this mentality for long and continue to believe in themselves. Giving practical materials can arouse interest while making the students see the importance and relevance of English in real life.

Undeniably, Filipino students face challenges in learning the English language. More than ever, language teaching approaches is now shaped by the changes in learning environment. With this, the importance of instructional materials cannot be belittled in developing students' skills in English since instructional materials can help teachers in transferring and organizing knowledge and attitudes toward learners within an instructional situation. They are essential and significant tools necessary for teaching and learning to support teacher's efficiency and enhance the students' performance.

Teachers use instructional materials to facilitate effective teaching and better quality of learning by students. Instructional materials are designed to suit the different ways students learn (Olawale, 2013). While some students acquire and remember information fed to them through lectures, others learn better by reading. Others, however, understand information with the aid of visual cues in addition to lectures and reading. The utilization of different instructional materials guarantees and gives students the different learning aids maximizing learning and retains information given to them.

According to Richards (n.d.), there are some options in deciding on teaching materials: (1) choosing a suitable published course, (2) adapting a published course to match the needs of the course, and (3) using teacher-made materials and authentic materials as the basis for the course. Using institutionally derived or teacher-derived materials for a course has its advantages. The first advantage is relevance. These materials are directly relevant to students and institutional needs and reflect local content, issues, and concerns. Improvisation of materials can help develop expertise among teachers, giving them a greater understanding of the

characteristics of effective materials. Reputation is another advantage of teacher-derived materials. These materials may enhance the institution's reputation by showing its commitment to providing materials, particularly for its students. Finally, flexibility is another benefit of a teacher-derived material. It is much easier to modify or adapt materials produced within the institution, giving them greater flexibility than a commercial coursebook.

Bautista (2005, as cited in Bautista, 2012) suggests that teachers, being professionals, should respond to the needs of the students to ensure an effective teaching-learning experience both for the students and the teachers. The use of modules and learning packages has become the tailored instructional technique that would cater to students' abilities. The 21st century demands for teachers who are innovators because teaching-learning process is a matter of personal responses.

The use of suitable instructional materials is a special venue to transform and improve Philippine education. Such instructional materials can help teachers attain flexibility in meeting the individual differences among students. Moreover, Orao (2010) states that the adequacy of instructional materials is critical a consideration in upholding students' quality instruction.

Fernandez (2010) asserts that the use of instructional materials in teaching English is one way by which continuous development can be attained by the English teacher. The use of a workbook in English, for example, encourages students to become independent and self-directed and provides for new levels of individualization within the English program. Sufficient instructional materials are a great source of authentic language activities.

Instructional materials in the form of textbooks, supplementary reading materials, intervention materials, and others are the teacher's effective tools in stimulating the desire of every student to learn and a strong drive for language mastery (Cortez (2016). Moreover, for students to learn English more quickly, teachers must provide teaching aids that enhance their activities and experiences. According to Perez's (2015, as cited in Cortez, 2016), when key components of many textbooks were merged based on the needs and interests of the students, generated work texts or teacher-made materials are more effective in the teaching-learning process.

Grammatical competence, the main focus of this research, has a significant role in the learners' English language production. Therefore, it was given emphasis in the production of the *Supplementary Intervention Material in English Grammar* where specific rules of grammar are discussed. These grammar rules include the correct use of pronouns, adjectives, adverbs, placement of modifiers, types of verbs, tense-aspect combinations, subject-verb agreement, active and passive voice, sentence structures, and sentence patterns.

Effective and quality instructional materials can positively impact the learning of the students when both the teachers and students contribute to the development of the material rather than being a mere consumer of ready knowledge. For this reason, this research considered the following vital components in the material development: (1) level of students' grammatical competence; and (2) attitude of the students with regard to the use of the supplementary intervention material.

3. Methodology

This research used a descriptive method in the form of test and questionnaire. The test result was used to assess the students' grammatical competence after using the *Supplementary Intervention Material in English Grammar*. Furthermore, the students' attitude and feedback were used to validate the material

The research was conducted at Cebu Technological University-Tuburan Campus. CTU- Tuburan Campus is one of the satellite campuses of Cebu Technological University. The participants were the 34 BA English Language and BA Literature second-year students of CTU-Tuburan Campus. CTU-Tuburan Campus demonstrates its commitment to providing learning resources and materials specifically for its students. Various print and non-print materials are available in the library. It provides students, and teachers access to sources in text, video, and audio formats. Aside from the learning resources available in the library, instructors and professors are also encouraged to develop their teaching materials and teaching aids tailored to the experiences, realities, and needs of the students.

Since only identified students were the subject of this research, purposive sampling was used. The selection of the participants was based on their post-test performance administered during the previous intervention program last first semester of the academic year 2020-2021. They were the students who underperformed in the post-test.

The *Supplementary Intervention Material in English Grammar* was tried out to the selected students during the implementation of the second intervention program to obtain the necessary data needed for this research. However, the intervention program was conducted online as the school was adopting flexible system. Various online platforms such as Facebook messenger, Zoom, and google forms were utilized to realize the program. In the first session, the researcher gave a brief orientation to the students and teachers about the intervention program and how to use the material. Each of the students and teachers was given a copy of the material.

At the end of the program, a summative test was administered to the students to determine their grammatical competence. Then, the students accomplished the questionnaires to gain an in-depth understanding of their attitude with regard to the use of the supplementary intervention material. Students' responses were sorted out, analyzed and interpreted.

3.2 Scoring Procedure

The students' responses were scored and categorized using the range of scores and verbal description. The level of students' grammatical competence was measured and interpreted using the following numerical values:

Table 1 Scoring Procedure for Students' Grammatical Competence

Numerical Values	Scores	Verbal Description
5	9.00 – 10.00	Very Competent
4	7.00 – 8.99	Competent
3	5.00 – 6.99	Moderately Competent
2	3.00 – 4.99	Fairly Competent
1	1.00 – 2.99	Incompetent

The attitude of the students with regard to the *Supplementary Intervention Material in English Grammar* was measured and interpreted using the following numerical values.

Table 2 Scoring Procedure for Students' Attitude toward the Material

Scale	Point Value Scale	Category	Verbal Description
4	3.26 – 4.20	Strongly Agree	Students have a very positive attitude towards the material and find it very useful and effective with excellent quality.
3	2.51 – 3.25	Agree	Students have a positive attitude towards the material and find it useful and effective with average quality.
2	1.76 – 2.50	Disagree	Students have a negative attitude towards the material and do not find it useful and effective with unacceptable quality.
1	1.00 – 1.75	Strongly Disagree	Students have a very negative attitude towards the material and do not find it useful and effective with very unacceptable quality.

4. Results and Discussion

This section presents, analyzes, and interprets the results of the research conducted. The flow of discussion is based on the following: (1) the level of students' grammatical competence; and (2) the attitude of the students with regard to the use of the supplementary intervention material.

4.1. Level of Students' Grammatical Competence

Table 3 presents the level of students' grammatical competence based on the summative test conducted after using the *Supplementary Intervention Material in English Grammar*.

Table 3 Level of Student's Grammatical Competence

Competencies in English Grammar	Mean	Verbal Description	Rank
Sentence Patterns	4.32	FC	1
Adjectives	4.23	FC	2
Subject-Verb Agreement	4.03	FC	3
Types of Verbs	4.0	FC	4
Sentence Structures	3.97	FC	5

Active and Passive Voice	3.71	FC	6
Placement of Modifiers	3.62	FC	7
Pronouns	3.59	FC	8
Adverbs	3.06	FC	9
Tense-Aspect Combinations	1.89	IC	10
Over-all Mean	3.64	FC	

Legend: VC-Very Competent C-Competent MC-Moderately Competent FC-Fairly Competent
IC-Incompetent

As reflected in Table 3, the students were fairly competent in using sentence patterns with a mean of 4.32. The researcher considered that sentence patterns were thoroughly discussed in the material with various and easy-to-understand examples, which aid the students in grasping the grammar concept more effectively. In addition, the students have acquired enough knowledge of sentence patterns due to the existence of English Syntax in the BA English Language program. Being able to study the course enhanced their ability to understand and use those patterns. The result of this research also revealed that the students were fairly competent in adjectives with a mean of 4.23. Adjective is a major component in students' essays and papers. For the most part, students use adjectives so the reader can visualize a more exact image and make writing come to life. This was evident in the writing activities given to the students during the intervention program. Hence, the more the students use descriptive texts, the easier for them to improve their knowledge about adjectives. The data also show that they were fairly competent in using subject-verb agreement with a mean of 4.03. Subject-verb agreement was one of the most common mistakes of the students. During the intervention program, students expressed that they were still confused when using subject-verb agreement and did not know its rules. Thus, with the aid of the supplementary intervention material, rules were carefully explained and examples were given to help them choose the correct singular or plural verb after the subject. Most of the errors that students frequently made when using verbs were evident in subjects such as fractions, percentages, and correlatives.

Table 3 further shows that the students were fairly competent in the different language structures. They were fairly competent in the types of verbs with a mean of 4.0. Students also expressed that they still have problems in identifying the verbs used in sentences. Their lack of familiarity with verb types hindered their understanding of when to use and not to use a verb type. Moreover, they do not have a clear concept of what an auxiliary verb is and how it functions. They also obtained a fairly competent rating in sentence structures with a mean of 3.97. They know how to identify simple, complex and compound sentences, except when the sentence has an intervening phrase. This gives the implication that the students need to learn more about the concept of subordination. They were fairly competent in active and passive voice, with a mean of 3.71. Although students have a clear understanding of the difference between active voice and passive voice, they have difficulty choosing the correct verb that agrees with the subject and tense of the sentence. The data also show that students were fairly competent in placement of modifiers with a mean of 3.62. Most of the students encountered difficulties in revising sentences with dangling and misplaced modifiers, especially when the noun being modified is far away from the participle phrase.

Table 3 also shows that the students were fairly competent in pronouns with a mean of 3.59 and adverbs with a mean of 3.06. With regards to pronouns, the students lack competence in recognizing the singularity and plurality of the subject. In most cases, they showed difficulty in the use of indefinite pronouns. They used the plural pronoun instead of the singular pronoun. For example, in the summative test, students wrote Each of my sisters has their own room instead of Each of my sisters has her own room. As observed, the students might have considered the noun "sisters" as the main subject of the sentence. This can be the cause of the students' difficulty because the indefinite pronoun "each" was

used together with the plural noun "sisters". In terms of adverb use, the students failed to identify and use the correct adverb modifiers, adjective modifiers and sentence modifiers. This implies that identifying the parts of speech is still a problem for them. The students need to be taught that the same word may have more than one kind of grammatical function.

It was also noted that students were having problems using tense-aspect combinations, as evidenced by their incompetent rating with a mean of 1.89. The result can be explained by the fact that it is quite challenging for students to remember the combinations most, especially when it involves the perfect and progressive tenses. Tense and aspect are two grammatical components students find difficult to learn. Students tend to overuse the simple aspects because they find them easy to use, which he considered an illustration of overuse and avoidance strategies. They often replace complex structures of English with simple ones (Zhiri, 2017).

As a whole, the students were observed to be fairly competent in the areas of language structure, with an overall mean of 3.64. Magpayo et.al. (2015), in their research, assert that many pre-service teachers were not able to obtain the necessary grammar skills, although they were given a lot of opportunities to master the requisite knowledge in teacher preparation (2). According to Krashen (1988), knowing the rule, which is one of the conditions that need to be attained to make conscious grammar fully functional, is the most challenging requirement because language structures are complex. Various aspects are needed to be considered. This has become a problem because even the best learners do not learn every rule they are expected to learn.

Some factors which might have affected the performance of the students were also identified. One factor is that the intervention was conducted online. The intervention program would have been effectively implemented through face-to-face or in-person discussion that offers a better learning experience for students. In addition, the online assessment was also a challenge since this is a fairly new system for the students. Internet connectivity is still a huge problem for most students. The slow internet connection and other technical problems can likely interrupt the students to perform at their best during the examination.

In this study, the students' *fairly competent performance* revealed that the BA English Language and BA Literature students still have insufficient knowledge of English grammar rules. This suggests that a grammar intervention program becomes more necessary and academically needed. As multidirectional courses, these prepare students for various careers (e.g., writer, language teacher, journalist, events host). It is almost impossible for them to have better English language skills if they do not have grammatical competence and language awareness. These courses demand communicative competence and language skills from the students. As stated by Liu (2013), knowledge of the language, especially grammar, needs to be possessed by a good language teacher. Nevertheless, considering the students' performance in the previous intervention program, it can be noted that they were able to develop their grammatical competence after the use of the supplementary intervention material, from being low-performing to fairly competent. The supplementary intervention material was, in some way, able to improve the grammatical competence of the students.

4.2. Attitude of the Students with regard to the Use of the Supplementary Intervention Material

The attitude of the students with regard to the use of the *Supplementary Intervention Material in English Grammar* was also determined in this study. The questionnaire of Reyes and De Guia (2015) was used to assess the students' attitude towards the material focusing on the following areas: (a) content; (b) clarity; (c) appeal to target user; and (d) originality. The summary of the students' attitude towards the material is presented in Table 4.

Table 4 Attitude of the students with regard to the use of the supplementary intervention material

	Mean	Category
A. CONTENT		
The topics are well-arranged to provide clear sequence understanding.	3.37	SA
The different parts aid me in grasping the English grammar concepts in a systematic way.	3.06	A
It provides sufficient reception of learning through examples to easily understand the concept.	3.49	SA
It provides variety of exercises from simple to complex manipulation for mastery of concepts.	3.43	SA
It provides sufficient information on each topic.	3.26	SA
Weighted Mean	3.32	SA
B. CLARITY		
The lessons are organized and clear.	3.57	SA
Directions are understandable and easy to follow.	3.54	SA
Lessons are well explained and become the preparatory stage for exercises.	3.46	SA
The ideas and concepts are well expressed.	3.54	SA
The flow of activities is coherent and non-confusing.	3.31	SA
Weighted Mean	3.49	SA
C. APPEAL TO TARGET USER		
It captivates my interest.	3.31	SA
It stimulates my interest in answering the different activities.	3.31	SA
It enables me to develop critical thinking.	3.51	SA
It strengthens my positive attitude.	3.29	SA
It creates vicarious experience for group and individual learning.	3.37	SA
Weighted Mean	3.36	SA
D. ORIGINALITY		
The design and appearance of the material are exceptionally different from other work text.	3.17	A
The material serves a new approach in teaching English grammar.	3.43	SA
It provides a variety of relevant evaluation measures.	3.29	SA
It enhances skills through authentic learning activities.	3.43	SA
It contains activities that lead to life-long learning.	3.46	SA
Weighted Mean	3.35	SA
OVERALL COMPOSITE MEAN	3.38	SA

Legend: SA-Strongly Agree A-Agree DA-Disagree SDA-Strongly Disagree

Table 4 shows the computed weighted mean of the students' responses and the descriptive analysis of each item and category. In terms of the content of the supplementary intervention material, the students strongly agreed, as evidenced by the weighted mean of **3.32**. In particular, they strongly agreed that the *topics are well-arranged to provide a clear sequence understanding* with a mean of **3.37**. This suggests that the topics in the material organized in units made it easier for them to remember information

and concepts as they continue from one topic to another. The students agreed that *the different parts aid them in systematically grasping the English grammar concepts* with a mean of **3.06**. Furthermore, they strongly agreed that *it provides good reception of learning through examples to easily understand the concept* with a mean of **3.49**. The majority of the students think of grammar as an important skill that they should possess. During the conduct of the intervention program, they expressed that they need a material that they could use as a reference to guide them in the correct grammar usage. They believed that the supplementary intervention material is just the right material for them as it contains the topics, discussions, examples, and tasks that could help them strengthen their grammar skills. They also strongly agreed that *the material provides a variety of exercises from simple to complex manipulation for mastery of concepts* with a mean of **3.43** and *provides sufficient information on each topic* with a mean of **3.26**. The data suggests that the students considered the examples, exercises, and information on each topic substantial and sufficient which helped them understand English grammar.

In terms of **clarity**, the students strongly agreed with a weighted mean of **3.49**. Specifically, the students strongly agreed that *the lessons are organized and clear*, with a mean of **3.57**. This implies that they were able to follow the lessons in the prototype without difficulty. The students also strongly agreed that *directions are understandable and easy to follow*, as evidenced by the mean of **3.54**. Thus, it can be said that it is more helpful and effective when directions are written clearly, explicitly, and unambiguously as shown in the prototype. In addition to the directions, the objectives indicated in the introduction of each lesson already provided the students an idea of what they were expected to do at the end of the lesson. The data also revealed that the students strongly agreed that *the lessons are well explained and become the preparatory stage for exercises* with a mean of **3.46**. The students found the discussions in the material relevant and sufficient for them to capably accomplish the exercises and activities. They also strongly agreed that *the ideas and concepts are well expressed* with a mean of **3.54**, which shows that the presentation of lessons was clear enough to facilitate understanding of the grammar concepts. This was evident during the conduct of the intervention program. It was observed that students did not have a hard time grasping the ideas and concepts. This could also be attributed to the fact that the students were already given a chance to read the material in advance. In reference to the item, *the flow of activities is coherent and non-confusing*, the students strongly agreed with a mean of **3.31**. This indicates that the material provided the students with the opportunity to learn or check their understanding of previously learned lessons or activities and prepare for what was coming next, leading them to a unified understanding of the lesson.

As to the material's **appeal to the target user**, it has a weighted mean of **3.36**. In particular, the students strongly agreed that *it captivates their interest* with a mean of 3.31. They also strongly agreed that *it stimulates their interest in answering the different activities*, obtaining a mean of 3.31. Interest is a very important motivational process that strengthens learning. At the beginning of the second intervention program, students already showed their interest in utilizing the material to help them enhance their grammar skills. During the first intervention program, the facilitators and lecturers were only assigned topics to discuss and made to choose their own references. Activities and references were not organized, unlike the second intervention program. This explains why the supplementary intervention material captured the interest of the students as the discussions and activities in the prototype and intervention program, in general, were designed to address their grammar needs and weaknesses.

The students strongly agreed that the material *enables them to develop critical thinking* with a mean of **3.51**. Although the material is simple and straight to the point, the lessons, exercises and activities prompt critical thinking, engagement and student learning.

The material also exposed the students to authentic texts that allowed them to process the information and analyze the grammatical structures contained in the texts. They also strongly agreed that *it strengthens their positive attitude* with a mean of **3.29**. This can be explained by the fact that the students considered grammar as an area they have struggled with. The supplementary intervention material, through the intervention program, allowed them to spend time learning or reviewing the basic principles of grammar. They have developed independent learning skills and a confident attitude towards learning grammar with the help of the material. Furthermore, the students strongly agreed that *it provides vicarious experience for group and individual learning* with a mean of **3.37**. Various written examples such as articles and essays were provided in the prototype. Differentiated tasks which can be performed individually and in a group were also provided. It also gave the students the chance to share and evaluate each other's outputs.

As reflected on Table 4, **originality** obtained a weighted mean of **3.35** which means that the students strongly agreed. In particular, the students agreed that *the design and appearance of the material are exceptionally different from other work text* with a mean of **3.17**. This means that the students found the features of the material original that make it different from other materials. The data also show that the students strongly agreed that *the material serves a new approach in teaching English grammar* with a mean of **3.43**. Students claimed that they need more guidance and direction regarding grammar usage, which they had failed to experience when they were in high school. Through the intervention program and with the help of the material, students were given the opportunity to focus on grammar rules through situations and sentences. The students strongly agreed that *the material provides a variety of relevant evaluation measures* with a mean of **3.29**. They also strongly agreed that *it enhances skills through authentic learning activities* with a mean of **3.43**. The material provided the students various written tasks and authentic activities that allowed them to apply the grammar concepts in sentence and paragraph forms. The students strongly agreed that *it contains activities that lead to life-long learning* with a mean of **3.46**. This can be explained by the fact that the students view grammar as essential in their field of specialization. Some asserted that the intervention program and the material would greatly help them in their research activities and future careers as teachers and writers. Although there are many excellent resources, both online and in print, tailoring the material to meet the needs of the students always makes a powerful approach to instruction and learning.

The overall composite mean of **3.38** shows that the students have a very positive attitude towards the *Supplementary Intervention Material in English Grammar* and found it very useful and effective with excellent quality. The result of this research suggests that the supplementary intervention material obtained the students' favorable responses because the topics and activities were directly relevant to their needs. They were suitable and tailor-made to address the needs of students. The content of the instructional material is within the experiences of the learners. The result affirmed Perez's (2015, as cited in Cortez, 2016) statement that teachers' developed worktext is considered to be more effective in the teaching-learning process because important elements of different textbooks and references were combined based on the needs and interests of the students.

The attitude of the students indicates the importance of providing improvised learning materials that suit their needs. Since the lessons included in the material were based on their post-test results in the previous intervention program, the result suggests that

recognizing the students' needs and weaknesses is one of the most important parts of designing instructional materials. Tailoring the lessons and instructional materials to the learners' needs can contribute to more engaged and motivated learners.

5. Conclusion

The *Supplementary Intervention Material in English Grammar* is an effective tool in developing the grammatical competence of the BA English Language and BA Literature students. Even though they have not achieved a very competent or competent rating, they have shown progress in their grammar skills, from being low performing to fairly competent. Thus, it can be inferred that the *Supplementary Intervention Material in English Grammar*, in some way, worked for the students and contributed to their progress. The students also expressed a very positive attitude towards the material. This signifies their interest and willingness to use the material in the intervention program. The result of this study can be a basis for revision, specifically targeting the tense-aspect combinations, the least mastered grammar structure. It should be addressed and explained clearly in the material. A comprehensive discussion with sufficient examples and exercises on pronoun-antecedent agreement and adverb is suggested to be included in the revision.

6. References

- Bautista, R. G. (2012). The effects of personalized instruction on the academic achievement of students in physics. *International Journal of Arts & Sciences*, 5(5), 573-583. Retrieved from <https://tinyurl.com/43fkfk7f>
- Brilliantes, K. et. al. (2019). Status of senior high school implementation: A process evaluation. The Philippine Institute for Development Studies. Retrieved from <https://pidswebs.pids.gov.ph/CDN/PUBLICATIONS/pidsdps1913.pdf>.
- Celce-Murcia, M. (2006). *Teaching English as a Second or Foreign Language*. Singapore: Thomson Heinle & Heinle.
- Cortez, R. (2016). Supplementary intervention material in developing grammatical competence of grade 7 students. Retrieved from <https://www.slideshare.net/mobile/RYANCORTEZ3/>
- Enisa, M. E. D. E., & DİLİLİTAŞ, K. (2015). Teaching and learning sociolinguistic competence: Teachers' critical perceptions. *Participatory Educational Research*, 2(3), 14-31. <https://doi.org/10.17275/per.15.29.2.3>
- Ellis, R., Basturkmen, H., & Loewen, S. (2002). Doing focus-on-form. *System*, 30(4), 419-432. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0346-251X\(02\)00047-7](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0346-251X(02)00047-7)
- Fernandez, I. C. (2010). *Intervention material in english grammar for seniors at tagudin national high school*. Unpublished MSE Thesis. Ilocos Sur Polytechnic State College. Tagudin, Ilocos Sur.
- Fikroni, M. R. (2018). Grammatical competence within l2 communication: language production, monitor hypothesis, and focus on forms instruction. *Pancaran Pendidikan*, 7(1). <https://10.25037/pancaran.v7i1.140>
- Krashen, S. (1988). *Second language acquisition and second language learning*. Prentice-Hall International.
- Krashen, S. (1981). Second language acquisition. *Second Language Learning*, 3(7), 19-39. Retrieved from https://www.academia.edu/download/35238869/second_language_acquisition_and_learning.pdf
- K to 12 Curriculum Guide in ENGLISH (2016). <https://www.deped.gov.ph/wp-content/uploads/2019/01/English-CG.pdf>
- Liu, D. (2019). The Role of CLT in Innovating the Intensive Reading Course for Second-year English Majors in China. *Journal of Education and Human Development*, 8(2), 159-167. <https://doi.org/10.15640/jehd.v8n2a16>

- Liu, D. (2013). Describing and explaining grammar and vocabulary in ELT: Key theories and effective practices. Routledge. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9780203085608>
- Magpayo, C., Paras, R., & Sarmiento, P (2015). Grammatical competence of first year English major students of teacher education. Retrieved from <https://tinyurl.com/3x8vm7vr>
- Charles Brent Magpayo, Rea Dolor J. Paras and Nicole, Paula E. Sarmiento
- Olwale, S. K. D. (2013). The use of instructional materials for effective learning of Islamic studies. *Jihat ul Islam*, 6(2), 20-30. <https://doi.org/10.51506/jihat-ul-islam.v6i2.312>
- Orao, R. O. (2010). Analysis of Adequacy and utilisation of instructional resources for learners with mental retardation in special schools in Nyanza province, Kenya. Unpublished Thesis. Kenyatta University. Retrieved from <http://ir-library.ku.ac.ke/bitstream/handle/123456789/899/Orao%20Remi%20Odero.pdf>
- Pica, T. (2000). Tradition and transition in English language teaching methodology. *System*, 28(1), 1-18. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0346-251X\(99\)00057-3](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0346-251X(99)00057-3)
- Praise, S., & Meenakshi, K. (2015). Importance of grammar in communication. *International Journal of Research studies in language learning*, 4(1), 97-101. <https://doi.org/10.5861/ijrsl.2014.789>
- Priyanto, A. (2013). The correlation between English grammar competence and speaking fluency of eleventh grade students in sman 1 sidoarjo. Retrieved from <https://ejournal.unesa.ac.id/index.php/retain/article/view/1847>
- Reyes, Y. D., & De Guia, R. G. (2017). Development of English worktext in English 101. *International Journal of Science and Research (IJSR)*. <https://doi:10.21275/ART20177303>
- Richards, J. (n.d.). Advantages and disadvantages of using instructional materials in teaching ESL. The Official Website of Educator Jack C Richards. Retrieved from <https://www.professorjackrichards.com>
- Saaty, A. A. (2016). Utilizing facebook in language classrooms: Social constructivist and affective filter approaches. *Arab World English Journal (AWEJ)* Vol. 6. <http://dx.doi.org/10.2139/ssrn.2843931>
- Zhiri, Y. (2017). The Present Progressive: A Difficult Aspect to Learn, Evidence from the Moroccan EFL Classroom. *Arab World English Journal (AWEJ)*, 8(4). <http://dx.doi.org/10.2139/ssrn.3094544>