

The Influence of Grammarly Application to Improve Students' Writing Skills in Recount Text

Putri Aghna Asyifa^{1*}, Ernita Daulay²

¹English Education Department, Universitas Islam Negeri Sumatera Utara, Medan, Indonesia

²English Education Department, Universitas Islam Negeri Sumatera Utara, Medan, Indonesia

putri0304202084@uinsu.ac.id^{1*}, ernitadaulay@uinsu.ac.id²

Article History:

Submission
 June 7th, 2024

Accepted
 June 28th, 2024

Published
 July 31st, 2024

ABSTRACT

Writing proficiency in English is crucial for students, yet errors often occur in their written narratives. This study investigated how the use of Grammarly Application can enhance students' narrative texts. Employing an experimental quantitative research design, the study conducted random sampling among students from a State Middle School in Batubara. The experimental group comprised 31 students who used Grammarly Application, while the control group had 31 students without access to the tool. Pre- and post-tests using writing samples were employed to collect data. The independent sample T-test was utilized to test the hypothesis that Grammarly impacts students' writing skills, yielding a significant result of $0.000 < 0.05$. These findings reject the null hypothesis (H_0) and support the alternative hypothesis (H_a), indicating that Grammarly Application effectively improved students' narrative writing abilities. This study suggested that teachers can utilize Grammarly Application to enhance English writing instruction, enabling students to self-assess and revise their written work more effectively. Grammarly facilitates teachers' provision of constructive feedback and correction on students' writing, thereby enhancing overall writing proficiency in English classrooms. In addition to facilitating self-assessment and revision, Grammarly empowers students with instant feedback on grammar, style, and clarity, fostering a deeper understanding of English language conventions. This automated assistance allows teachers to focus more on higher-order writing skills, such as organization and argumentation, further enriching the learning experience and improving students' overall writing competence in English.

Keywords: Grammarly application; influence; recount text; writing skill.

INTRODUCTION

Language serves as the fundamental means through which humans communicate, whether orally or in written form. Writing, in particular, enables individuals to articulate and organize their thoughts more effectively than spoken communication. According to Nunan (2003), writing involves a process where ideas and reflections are structured into paragraphs and sentences that readers can comprehend. This skill is essential for indirect and non-face-to-face communication, as highlighted by Tarigan (2019). Additionally, Fitria (2020) emphasizes that writing practices aim to demonstrate proficiency in grammar, punctuation, and language structure, while presenting various viewpoints.

Among the diverse writing skills Indonesian students must master, recount text writing stands out. Recount texts narrate past events, aiming to engage readers by recounting a series of connected events from the author's or speaker's perspective. Sartika et al. (2022) defines

recount texts as structured narratives comprising orientation, events, and reorientation. The orientation typically introduces characters, describes the setting, and explains key information, while the sequence of events presents the main problem in chronological order (Jaya, et al., 2018). The reorientation concludes or summarizes the entire narrative.

Acquiring proficiency in writing is crucial for students' ability to organize ideas, construct arguments, and convey information effectively. This necessity is particularly pronounced in secondary education, where students are expected to master various writing styles, including recount texts. Despite the importance of writing skills, students often encounter challenges in mastering English writing. Studies across different contexts, such as Vietnam (Phuong, 2021), Thailand (Pradu & Ratih, 2021), and Indonesia (Susanto et al., 2024), reveal common difficulties including language comprehension, grammar usage, and time management issues during writing tasks. Kumala et al. (2017) further note frequent errors in spelling, grammar, punctuation, and capitalization among students, which can arise from inadequate understanding of sentence structure and mechanics.

Moreover, the absence of effective online tools in English writing instruction poses an additional barrier. Traditional educational media like books and images, while prevalent, often fail to stimulate students' interest or aid in practical writing skill development (Erazo & Esteve-Gonzalez, 2015). Furthermore, limited feedback opportunities during instructional periods can hinder students' progress in rectifying writing errors (Emmaryana, 2010).

In response to these challenges, technological advancements offer promising solutions. Online tools such as Grammarly have emerged as valuable resources in improving students' writing proficiency. Grammarly Application is an online editing service that detects and corrects grammatical errors, spelling mistakes, punctuation issues, and style inconsistencies (Amin Mubarak & Syafi'i, 2020; Daniels & Leslie, 2013; Jelita et al., 2023; Karyuatry, 2018; Syapitri et al., 2023). This tool not only enhances students' accuracy in writing but also fosters self-confidence and engagement by providing real-time feedback and guidance throughout the writing process.

Given its potential benefits, Grammarly Application has been increasingly integrated into educational practices to support students in developing their writing skills across various text types, including recount texts. Based on the previous statement, the gap in the research that this study aims to address lies in the specific exploration of how Grammarly Application influences students' ability to write recount texts. While it is acknowledged that Grammarly has been integrated into educational practices and shown potential benefits for improving writing skills across different text types, as indicated by Fadhilah et al., 2018, there appears to be a need for focused empirical insights specifically related to recount texts. Therefore, this study explores how the Grammarly Application influences students' ability to write recount texts, aiming to contribute empirical insights that can inform educators and researchers interested in enhancing writing instruction. Addressing these gaps will provide empirical evidence and practical insights that can inform educators and researchers in optimizing the use of Grammarly Application for enhancing students' recount text writing skills effectively.

Therefore, this research aims to investigate the specific impact of Grammarly on secondary school students' writing skills in recount texts. By focusing on this aspect of writing development, the study seeks to provide empirical insights into how Grammarly Application enhances students' ability to structure and articulate recount narratives effectively. The findings are intended to offer valuable guidance to educational practitioners and researchers interested in optimizing writing instruction through technology, particularly in the context of recount text composition.

METHODOLOGY

This study employed quantitative method to investigate the impact of the Grammarly Application on secondary school students' writing skills in recount texts. Quantitative research, as defined by Arikunto (2019), utilizes numerical data to collect, understand, and interpret results. Specifically, an experimental research design is adopted, as described by Sugiyono (2019), to examine how treatments affect outcomes under controlled conditions (Creswell & Creswell, 2018).

The study utilized a pretest-posttest control group design, where the experimental group receives the treatment (using Grammarly Application) while the control group does not. This design allows for a comparison of outcomes between the groups to assess the influence of the Grammarly application on students' recount text writing abilities.

The participants are eighth-grade students from a public middle school in Batubara Regency, North Sumatra Province, Indonesia. The selection of eighth-grade students is based on their typical challenges in writing proficiency identified in previous literature (Jenkins-Smith et al., 2017).

Simple random sampling is employed to select participants from two classes, VIII A and VIII C, to ensure unbiased representation from the population. Each class consists of 31 students, with VIII A designated as the experimental group and VIII C as the control group.

The procedure of this research started with both experimental and control groups initially undergo a pre-test where they are instructed to write a recount text on a given topic. This pretest assessed baseline writing skills and identifies initial strengths and weaknesses. Following the pretest, only the experimental group (VIII A) received the treatment, which involved instruction on how to write effective recount texts and how to use Grammarly Application to enhance their writing by correcting grammar, punctuation, and style errors. The control group (VIII C) did not receive any additional intervention. After the treatment period, both groups undergo a posttest where they are asked to write another recount text. This posttest evaluates the impact of Grammarly on the experimental group's writing compared to the control group's performance.

The data collection and analysis of this research were using the students' recount texts from both pretest and posttest are evaluated using a rubric adapted from existing assessment criteria (Brown & Hirschfeld, 2008). The rubric assesses content, organization, vocabulary, grammar, and mechanics to provide a comprehensive evaluation of writing proficiency.

Statistical analysis was using IBM SPSS Statistics version 22 is utilized for data analysis. Normality tests are conducted to ensure the data distribution is appropriate for parametric tests. Subsequently, an independent samples t-test is employed to determine if there is a significant difference in recount text writing scores between the experimental and control groups.

This methodology aims to provide empirical evidence on how the Grammarly application influences students' writing skills in recount texts. The findings contributed valuable insights to educators and researchers seeking to enhance writing instruction through technology in educational settings.

RESULT AND DISCUSSION

The independent simple T-test, descriptive analysis, normality test, and pre- and post-test results of this study were used to see if Grammarly Applications improved students' writing skills for recounting text. Pre-test and post-test were currently administered by the researchers to both the experiment and control group. They were brought closer to creating a subject-

arranged depiction text in order to make it easier for understudies to complete. As a result, table 1 presents the test results for the experimental group students.

TABLE 1. Pre-test and post-test in the experiment group

| No | Pre-test | | | | Post-test | | | |
|----|----------|------------|-----------|---------|-----------|------------|-----------|---------|
| | Score | Categories | Frequency | Percent | Score | Categories | Frequency | Percent |
| 1 | 56 | Fair | 2 | 6.5 | 75 | Fair | 2 | 6.5 |
| 2 | 58 | Fair | 2 | 6.5 | 76 | Fair | 2 | 6.5 |
| 3 | 60 | Fair | 2 | 6.5 | 78 | Fair | 4 | 12.9 |
| 4 | 62 | Fair | 1 | 3.2 | 80 | Good | 2 | 6.5 |
| 5 | 65 | Fair | 2 | 6.5 | 82 | Good | 2 | 6.5 |
| 6 | 68 | Fair | 3 | 9.7 | 84 | Good | 2 | 6.5 |
| 7 | 70 | Good | 4 | 12.9 | 85 | Good | 2 | 6.5 |
| 8 | 72 | Good | 2 | 6.5 | 86 | Good | 3 | 9.7 |
| 9 | 75 | Good | 3 | 9.7 | 87 | Good | 2 | 6.5 |
| 10 | 76 | Good | 2 | 6.5 | 88 | Good | 2 | 6.5 |
| 11 | 78 | Good | 4 | 12.9 | 89 | Good | 2 | 6.5 |
| 12 | 80 | Good | 1 | 3.2 | 90 | Excellent | 1 | 3.2 |
| 13 | 82 | Good | 3 | 9.7 | 92 | Excellent | 3 | 9.7 |

Table 1 above presents the initial assessment of students' writing skills in recount texts revealed a range of proficiency levels. The pre-test scores were categorized into "Fair" and "Good," with the majority of students scoring in the "Fair" category. In the pre-test, the participants' scores ranged from 56 to 82, with the majority falling into the "Fair" and "Good" categories. Specifically, 39.4% of the participants scored within the "Fair" category (scores 56-68). Reversely, the post-test results demonstrated a marked improvement in participants' scores. The scores now ranged from 75 to 92, with noticeable shifts in categories; "Fair" category (scores 75-78), the percentage of participants decreased to 25.9%. The "Good" category (scores 80-89) saw a composition of 54.8% of participants, showing an improvement in their writing skills. Most notably, the "Excellent" category (scores 90-92) emerged in the post-test, which was absent in the pre-test.

Table 2 displays the test results for the control group students. At that time, they were required to write a recount text on a topic of their choosing in order to facilitate writing, as shown as follows.

TABLE 2. Pre-test and post-test in the control group

| No | Pre-test | | | | Post-test | | | |
|----|----------|------------|-----------|---------|-----------|------------|-----------|---------|
| | Score | Categories | Frequency | Percent | Score | Categories | Frequency | Percent |
| 1 | 52 | Fair | 3 | 9.7 | 66 | Fair | 2 | 6.5 |
| 2 | 60 | Fair | 2 | 6.5 | 67 | Fair | 2 | 6.5 |
| 3 | 62 | Fair | 6 | 19.4 | 68 | Fair | 2 | 6.5 |
| 4 | 64 | Fair | 5 | 16.1 | 70 | Good | 3 | 9.7 |
| 5 | 68 | Fair | 1 | 3.2 | 72 | Good | 3 | 9.7 |
| 6 | 70 | Good | 3 | 9.7 | 74 | Good | 4 | 12.9 |
| 7 | 72 | Good | 1 | 3.2 | 76 | Good | 2 | 6.5 |
| 8 | 74 | Good | 2 | 6.5 | 78 | Good | 2 | 6.5 |
| 9 | 76 | Good | 1 | 3.2 | 79 | Good | 1 | 3.2 |
| 10 | 78 | Good | 4 | 12.9 | 80 | Good | 2 | 6.5 |
| 11 | 80 | Good | 2 | 6.5 | 82 | Good | 4 | 12.9 |
| 12 | 82 | Good | 1 | 3.2 | 84 | Good | 2 | 6.5 |

Table 2 shows that The control group's pre-test and post-test scores were categorized into "Fair" and "Good," highlighting the differences in writing proficiency before and after a period of traditional instruction without Grammarly. In total, 17 participants (54.9%) were categorized as "Fair," suggesting a significant portion of the control group had basic to moderate writing skills. On the other hand, 14 participants (45.2%) were categorized as

"Good," showing a reasonable level of writing proficiency among some students. The post-test results showed some improvement in the control group. In total, 6 participants (19.5%) remained in the "Fair" category, indicating a reduction in the number of students with moderate writing skills. On the other hand, 23 participants (74.2%) achieved scores in the "Good" category, showing a significant increase from the pre-test results.

DESCRIPTIVE ANALYSIS

Descriptive statistics were used in the study to look at the minimum, maximum, average, and standard deviation of the pre-test and post-test outcomes for both groups. Insights are employed as descriptive metrics to represent or collect data without disclosing pertinent conjecture.

Using the statistical programme SPSS 22, the analysts analysed the pre- and post-test data for both the exploratory and control classes. The results will be displayed in table 3 below:

TABLE 3. Descriptive statistics

| | N | Minimum | Maximum | Mean |
|--------------------|----|---------|---------|-------|
| Pre Ex | 31 | 56 | 82 | 70.42 |
| Post Ex | 31 | 72 | 92 | 82.97 |
| Pre Cont | 31 | 52 | 82 | 67.61 |
| Post Cont | 31 | 66 | 85 | 75.39 |
| Valid N (listwise) | 31 | | | |

Table 3 displays the pre-test findings for the exploratory group. The mean score was 70,42, with an associated standard deviation of 8,049. Out of these, 82 were the most significant and 56 were the least significant. The post-test results for the exploratory group went from 72 to 92, with a mean of 82,97 and a standard deviation of 5,975. The pre-test results for the baseline group were as follows: mean = 67,61; standard deviation = 8,632; extreme value = 82; base value = 52. The control group's post-test findings showed a mean of 75,39 and a standard deviation of 6,146, where 85 was the highest number and 66 was the lowest.

Consequently, the mean values of the experimental and control groups are different. Compared to the control group, the experimental group's post-test results showed a considerable improvement. This should be demonstrated by the 82,97 mystery mean worth of the deferred post-test and the 70,42 mystery mean worth of the exploratory event pre-test. This should be demonstrated by the notable value of 12,55. The control group's mean difference between pre-test and post-test results was 73,39, while the control group's mean difference was 67,61, despite the fact that there was also an increase in the control group. However, compared to the benchmark group, the exploratory group's mean post-test esteem increased by 5,78.

NORMALITY TEST

The expectedness of the data is assessed using the ordinarieness test. This normality test is also carried out in order to locate the t test at a later stage. In this study, the Shapiro-Wilk normality test is used. A valuable overview ordinarieness test with a little model size is the Shapiro-Wilk system. The Shapiro Wilk normality test is utilized by researchers with fewer than one hundred samples.

To pass this normality test, the data must be normal distributed if the significance value is greater than 0,05. Table 4 contains the audit's conclusions. The normality test that was utilized was the Quantifiable Program for Social Science (SPSS) 22:

TABLE 4. Tests of normality

| | Kolmogorov-Smirnov ^a | | | Shapiro-Wilk | | |
|----------------------|---------------------------------|----|-------|--------------|----|------|
| | Statistic | df | Sig. | Statistic | df | Sig. |
| Pre-Test Experiment | .135 | 31 | .161 | .939 | 31 | .077 |
| Post-Test Experiment | .120 | 31 | .200* | .949 | 31 | .150 |
| Pre-Test Control | .178 | 31 | .013 | .935 | 31 | .060 |
| Post-Test Control | .117 | 31 | .200* | .937 | 31 | .067 |

According to table 4, the data are normal if each Shapiro-Wilk normality test significance value is greater than 0,05. The Examination pre-test quantifiable worth is 0,939, with df 31 and a significance of 0,77, according to the Shapiro-Wilk normality test data, indicating that information flows frequently.

In contrast, the experimental class post-test has a df of 31, a statistical value of 0,949, and a significance level of 0.150. These numbers indicate that the information is widely disseminated because they are more prominent than 0,05. The control class pre-test data have a measurable worth of 0,935, a df of 31, and a significance level of 0,60, which all suggest that the data are typically communicated. The control's final post-test value of 0,937, with a df of 31 and a significance level of 0,67, demonstrates that the data are also normally distributed.

INDEPENDENT SIMPLE T-TEST ANALYSIS

The experiment and control groups' understudy test results are examined in this study using the t-test. The purpose of this test was to determine how grammar practice affected students' ability to write descriptive texts. In this free model T-test, the strong variable is achieved by: a. Ho is rejected because if the 2-tailed Sig value is less than 0,05, there is a difference.

This demonstrates that the control group's treatment was fundamentally different from the experiment group. b. The two-followed Sig esteem does not differ if it is greater than 0,05, so Ho is accepted. This demonstrates that the treatment differences between the experiment group and the control group are not entirely unique.

In order to ascertain whether or not there is a significant difference between the two groups, the researchers used SPSS 22 to perform a straightforward independent T-test. The outcomes were displayed in Table 5 below:

TABLE 5. Independent samples test

| | | Levene's Test for Equality of Variances | | T-test for Equality of Means | | | | | | |
|------|-----------------------------|-----------------------------------------|------|------------------------------|--------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------------|-------------------------------------------|--------|
| | | F | Sig. | t | df | Sig. (2-tailed) | Mean Difference | Std. Error Difference | 95% Confidence Interval of the Difference | |
| Resu | lt | | | | | | | | Lower | Upper |
| | Equal variances assumed | .052 | .820 | 4.924 | 60 | .000 | 7.581 | 1.540 | 4.501 | 10.660 |
| | Equal variances not assumed | | | 4.924 | 59.952 | .000 | 7.581 | 1.540 | 4.501 | 10.660 |

The Sig respect is displayed in the table's outcome, which is most likely going to be table 5. If the value of 0,820 is greater than 0,05, Levene's Test of Fairness of Differences shows that the data variance is the same or same between the experimental and control groups. Table 5 of the "Equivalent Changes Accepted" part of the test with free samples illustrates this. Because the

independent sample test is used in the decision-making process, the value of 0.000 shows that H_a is accepted and H_0 is denied.

To further substantiate these results, those demonstrates that students who used Grammarly Application exhibited a marked enhancement in their writing skills compared to those who did not. This study investigates the impact of the Grammarly application on improving students' writing skills, particularly in recount texts. The results from both the experimental and control groups highlight significant differences in writing proficiency, underscoring the effectiveness of Grammarly as a learning tool. Students in the experiment group who received treatment through the Grammarly application scored higher on tests related to the two groups than students in the control group who did not receive treatment. The highest possible score on the initial (pre-test) exam that the two groups took prior to receiving treatment was 82. However, for the minimum values, the experimental group had a value of 56, while the control group had a value of 52. These initial assessments indicate a comparable baseline proficiency across both groups. The analysis of pre-test and post-test results from both the control and experimental groups highlights the positive impact of the Grammarly application on students' writing skills in recount texts. While traditional instruction leads to improvements, the integration of Grammarly significantly accelerates and deepens students' writing proficiency. This suggests that educational institutions should consider incorporating such technological tools into their curricula to better prepare students for the demands of effective writing. By leveraging technology like Grammarly, students can achieve higher levels of grammatical accuracy, coherence, and overall writing quality, contributing to their academic and professional success.

The results of this research aligned with previous research. Parra and Calero (2019) found that students' writing scores significantly improved when they took post-tests after using tools like Grammarly. Similarly, Soegiyarto et al. (2022) noted overall improvements in students' writing abilities when they utilized Grammarly. These studies corroborate the effectiveness of Grammarly in fostering better writing skills. The aim of this review is to evaluate the effectiveness of the Grammarly app in helping students improve their writing skills, particularly in recount texts. The results indicated that students benefit from using Grammarly to enhance their writing abilities, especially for graphic texts. This aligned with a survey involving Yulianti (2018), which found that students are more likely to revise their writing when they are informed of their grammatical errors.

The researchers employed Grammarly application as a tool to assist students with recount texts due to its capability to provide rapid automatic corrections. Grammarly proved to be more effective than teacher feedback for addressing linguistic errors in written English as a second language (Ghufron & Rosyida, 2018). According to Wilson and Czik (2016), automated feedback not only motivates students to consistently produce high-quality writing but also aids teachers in improving students' writing skills. Thus, using Grammarly Application can expedite the process of identifying and correcting errors in student compositions.

This is supported by Otake's research (2021), which found that Grammarly's immediate feedback is particularly effective in classes with many students using printed materials. Grammarly's ability to offer suggestions, corrections, and explanations as automatic feedback helps students quickly identify and understand writing errors (Sulistyowati, 2021). Based on the results of this research, it is clear that students who use Grammarly Application demonstrate improved writing skills in recount texts.

The comprehensive findings from this research underscore that students who utilize Grammarly demonstrate enhanced writing skills in recount texts. The application's ability to provide timely and effective feedback, corrections, and suggestions significantly contributes to students' writing proficiency. Moving forward, further exploration into Grammarly's impact

across diverse writing genres and educational settings would provide valuable insights into its broader applicability and benefits in language learning and writing instruction.

CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATION

The results of this study demonstrated that Grammarly Application significantly enhances students' writing quality. Improvements were observed in various aspects of writing, including accuracy, structure, language use, spelling, writing tools, and writing strategies. The results show a clear distinction in writing skills between the pre-test and post-test groups, with the experimental group, who used Grammarly, achieving higher scores compared to the control group.

Future research should address these limitations and explore the application of Grammarly across different types of texts and writing contexts. Nonetheless, the study underscores the value of Grammarly as a supplementary English learning tool for educators, aiding students in drafting and refining their written work. Teachers can leverage Grammarly to provide timely and accurate feedback, thus facilitating the development of students' writing proficiency.

REFERENCES

- Amin Mubarak, N. M. F., & Syafi'I, A. (2020). Grammarly: An online EFL writing companion. *Eltics (English Language Teaching and English Linguistics) Journal*, 5(2), 1–10.
- Arikunto, S. (2019). *Prosedur penelitian: Suatu pendekatan praktik [Research procedures: A practical approach]*. PT Rineka Cipta.
- Brown, G. T. L., & Hirschfeld, G. H. F. (2008). Students' conceptions of assessment: Links to outcomes. *Assessment in Education: Principles, Policy and Practice*, 15(1), 3–17. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09695940701876003>
- Creswell, J.W. and Creswell, J.D. (2018). *Research Design: Qualitative, Quantitative, and Mixed Methods Approaches*. Sage, Los Angeles.
- Daniels, P., & Leslie, D. (2013). Grammar software ready for EFL writers?. *OnCue Journal*, 9(4), 391–401.
- Emmaryana, F. (2010). An analysis on the grammatical errors in the student's writing [Bachelor's thesis, UIN Jakarta].
- Fadhilah, U., Julia Dolok Saribu, H., & Hang Tuah Tanjungpinang, S. (2018). Effectiveness of Grammarly Application for writing English abstract. *International Journal of Science and Research*, 8(12), 163–166. <https://doi.org/10.21275/ART20202994>
- Fitria, T. N. (2020). Error analysis found in students' writing composition in simple past tense of recount text. *ENGLISH FRANCA: Academic Journal of English Language and Education*, 4(2), 141. <https://doi.org/10.29240/ef.v4i2.1154>
- Ghufron, M. A., & Rosyida, F. (2018). The Role of Grammarly in Assessing English as a Foreign Language (EFL) Writing. *Lingua Cultura*, 12(4), 395. <https://doi.org/10.21512/lc.v12i4.4582>
- Jaya, A., Hermansyah, H., & Mortini, A. V. (2018). The effect of Crawford Series Teaching (CST) on the students' writing achievement. *Esteem Journal of English Education Study Programme*, 1(1).
- Jelita, K. N., Daud, A., & Masyhur, M. (2023). the Effectiveness of Using Grammarly on High School Students' Writing Quality. *International Journal of Educational Best Practices*, 7(1), 43. <https://doi.org/10.31258/ijebp.v7n1.p43-55>
- Karyuatry, L. (2018). Grammarly as a Tool to Improve Students' Writing Quality: Free Online-Proofreader across the Boundaries. *JSSH (Jurnal Sains Sosial Dan Humaniora)*, 2(1), 83. <https://doi.org/10.30595/jssh.v2i1.2297>
- Kumala, B. P., Aimah, S., & Ifadah, M. (2018). *An analysis of grammatical errors on students' writing*. 2nd English Language and Literature International Conference (ELLIC) Proceedings. Vol. 2, 144-149. Universitas Muhammadiyah Semarang.
- Nunan, D. (2003). *Practical English language teaching*. MC Graw-Hill.
- Pradu, M. M. (2021). *Efforts and problems of Thai students' learning in improving writing skill in English Education Department at Universitas Muhammadiyah Surakarta [Bachelor's Thesis, Universitas*

Muhammadiyah Surakarta].

- Sartika, D., Khairinisaak, K., & Asmara, R. (2022). The analysis of students' difficulties in writing recount text. *Journal of English Education Program*, 3(1), 59–66. <https://doi.org/10.26418/jeep.v3i1.50496>
- Soegiyarto, M. S., Putri, R. A., & Saputra, S. D. (2022). *The importance of getting automated grammar feedback via Grammarly, for increasing students' English language proficiency*. <https://doi.org/10.31219/osf.io/749a2>
- Sugiyono. (2019). *Metode penelitian kuantitatif kualitatif dan R dan D* (2nd ed.). Alfabeta.
- Sulistiyowati, E. (2021). Penerapan Grammarly Tool untuk meningkatkan keterampilan menulis teks Analisis Ekspositoris siswa [Application of the Grammarly Tool to improve students' Expository Analysis text writing skills]. *Jurnal Educatio FKIP UNMA*, 7(2), 559–566. <https://doi.org/10.31949/educatio.v7i2.1144>
- Susanto, A. S., Ardini, S. N., & Sukmaningrum, R. (2024). Dictionary Speech Assistant to improve students' pronunciation. *Allure Journal*, 4(1), 14–22. <https://doi.org/10.26877/allure.v4i1.17267>
- Syapitri, O., Herlina, & Hermansyah. (2023). The implementation of Grammarly Application as a tool to improve students writing ability. *Jurnal Pendidikan Bahasa*, 12(1), 21–33. <https://doi.org/10.31571/bahasa.v12i1.4365>
- Tarigan, H. G. (2019). *Menulis: sebagai suatu keterampilan berbahasa [Writing: as a language skill]*. Angkasa.
- Wilson, J., & Czik, A. (2016). Automated essay evaluation software in English Language Arts classrooms: Effects on teacher feedback, student motivation, and writing quality. *Computers & Education*, 100, 94–109.
- Yulianti, E. (2018). Utilizing Grammarly in teaching writing Recount Text through Genre Based Approach. *International Journal of Science, Technology and Society*, 6(1), 1. <https://doi.org/10.11648/j.ijsts.20180601.11>