

# Online Corrective Feedback to explore EFL Learners: A Case Study of Higher Education Students from North Sumatera Indonesia

<sup>1</sup>Damanhuri Nursyam and <sup>2</sup>Dodyk Pranowo

<sup>1</sup> Faculty of Administrative Science, University of Brawijaya, Utara Jawa Timur 65145, Indonesia.  
<sup>1</sup>nursyamee@ub.ac.id

## ArticleInfo

International Journal of Advanced Information and Communication Technology

([https://www.ijaict.com/journals/ijaict/ijaict\\_home.html](https://www.ijaict.com/journals/ijaict/ijaict_home.html))

<https://doi.org/10.46532/ijaict-202108007>

Received 03 December 2020; Revised form 6 January 2021; Accepted 07 February 2021;

Available online 05 March 2021.

©2021 The Authors. Published by IJAICT India Publications.

This is an open access article under the CC BY-NC-ND license. (<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/4.0/>)

**Abstract** - Providing feedback on student writing remains an important research topic. Due to the numerous numbers of student assignments papers, technology is a solution for teachers overwhelmed by providing feedback and correction by handwriting. Few studies have been conducted to investigate the students' linguistic problems through the online application platform to provide feedback especially in Indonesia. This research, therefore, aimed to explore the Indonesian EFL students' linguistic problems using "Grammarly" as the online application. This study adopted the ex-post facto design to investigate the assignment written by 54 fourth-semester students of the English department in the Scientific Writing course. Participants' linguistic problems were classified, identified, and categorized by submitting the soft copy to the application. The Statistical Package for Social Sciences was used to obtain the average, standard deviation, and significant differences in accordance to the linguistic problems between male and female students. The result stated that grammar is the major problem possessed by students. Furthermore, it is expected to provide feedback for students and lecturers in the learning process of Scientific Writing.

**Keywords** - Grammarly; Writing Problems; Task Writing; Grammar; EFL

## 1. Introduction

Technological advances provide opportunities for providing feedback in writing. Writing is a language skill that people use to communicate indirectly. These writing skills include the use of word skills, the use of prepositions, the use of capital letters, and the use of spelling, writing words using abbreviations, grammar (sentence structure), clarity, and consistency of each sentence. Linguistic problems are often found in the students' assignments. Therefore, these language problems must be minimized because this will have an impact on the student's final writing the thesis.

[1] states that writing is a mental process that requires three steps: generating ideas, arranging them into sentences, and revising them. According to him, good writing is achieved through knowledge of adequate grammar rules, lexical items, and logical connections. Writing practical scientific work in

English, for example, is an essential skill for EFL students to advance to higher levels where more writing demands are expected until they complete a Bachelor's degree. They must learn to write and write to study. It deals with working with vocabulary and spelling and in more extended text compositions, including the idea of writing [2].

Writing is a very complex activity that requires a lot of cognitive and linguistic abilities, especially for EFL students making many mistakes when completing particular essays. Studies conducted by [3], [4], [5], [6], [7], [8], and [9] shows the seriousness of the number of problems found in students' written results in their paragraphs, letters, and essays. These studies use writing experts to identify the issues. As indicated, most studies consider the reason for making a written mistake against the barriers between the target language and source language because of a lack of training and feedback from the early years of learning, in addition to lack of motivation and carelessness of students in following teacher's instructions. No doubt, the role of the teacher, curriculum, and exposure to foreign languages are also essential to improve students' writing.

For researchers, commenting on the students' problems is an excellent way to help them recognize mistakes and overcome them. Furthermore, this study consistently shows that students experience some significant weaknesses in writing. This deficiency has a severe effect on the quality of their writing. Sometimes, students think that they are excellent; they cannot understand that their writing changes the true meaning of information because making a lot of mistakes, and as a result, they get a low score.

So far, the researchers have noticed that despite adopting different strategies of learning and teaching over long years of education, the students still conduct the frequency of simple problems. Even though the students start from elementary school, going through high school and preparatory schools, and ending with the university level, most university lecturers were surprised by the simple problems done by students. Such issues are considered as the basis of writing, not expected to be carried out by

undergraduate students of the English Department. Thus, the researchers in this study attempted to examine the type and frequency of problems made by second-year students when writing their assignments. However, this research is different because it used an electronic enhancement writing platform available on the web known as Grammarly. Thus, using this platform, this study investigated the types of problems and significant differences by fourth-semester students in writing scientific papers.

Corrective feedback is the teacher's comment on linguistics problems in sentences made by students [10]. The teacher's intended comment is to provide information to students about problematic sentences and to provide corrections to the problems made by students in their writing. Feedback is also an information gap between the level of knowledge performance written by students and the performance that should be in line with expectations [11]. This condition shows that feedback from the teacher is useful to improve student writing performance.

In addition to providing written feedback, teachers can use computers as an alternative. Some researchers have conducted studies about providing feedback using computers [12],[13] and [14]. However, with the progress of the era at present, namely the digital age, the use of technology in providing feedback is felt to be more productive. Several studies have been conducted on the effectiveness of the use of technology in providing feedback on student writing [15],[16].

Providing feedback on writing using technology is beneficial for teachers and students, and it is essential to facilitate collaborative learning between teachers and students in the 21st century [17]. Feedback is a time-consuming process because teachers must pay attention to student writing in detail and then provide feedback. Especially in one class, there are many students. By using technology, in this case, the ECF, teachers, and students can shorten the time. Besides that, the teacher can also clearly see the problem of students' language in writing [18].

The present study intends to investigate the students' linguistics problems, including spelling correction, grammar, and punctuation, suggestions for enhancement, sentence structure, and style checks by using online applications as teacher feedback on student scientific papers.

## 2. Methodology

### 2.1 Participants and Samples

This study was conducted to extract the most common linguistic problem pattern within 162 students' essay assignment, which were submitted as part of National Qualification Framework. Fifty-four students had written three (3) assignments, namely Critical Article Review, Critical Book Review, and Mini Research.

The students were predominantly female students in the age range of 20 to 21 years at the undergraduate level in the course of Scientific Writing, Semester 4. To guarantee anonymity the name of students was not disclosed.

### 2.2 Data Collection

The data needed to answer the research question in this study were gathered by collecting the students' assignment at English Literature Department in one of the state university in northern part of Sumatera, Indonesia. For ethical reasons, the identity of the students will remain anonymous. The linguistic problems within each assignment were extracted and at the end, after categorizing them the linguistic problem pattern were discerned [19].

### 2.3 Data Analysis

The common linguistic problem pattern was extracted from the sample assignments as following: First, collecting the three assignments. Second, uploading the assignment to the Grammarly application. Third, linguistic problems identification. Fourth, describing the linguistic problems. In this study, the linguistic problems pattern frequency and percentage are presented in a table and figure. In addition, chi square was run and reported to examine the distribution of the linguistic problem's categories. All these procedures were done with SPSS software version 21.

## 3. Research Design

This study was carried out based on the ex-post facto design [20]. The reason for choosing this design is because there is no control over the manipulation of independent variables; no treatment (treatment) will be carried out given to the subject, and researchers in this study were required to find several levels of relationships between variables rather than causal relationships. Its purpose usually determined by data collection in any investigation. Data collection in this study was used in terms of objectives: a) to find out the type of problems in the target language (i.e., English); b) to compare the types of issues in writing of male and female students; c) to suggest corrective actions to deal with problems that occur. Data were analyzed using a computer programmed from SPSS in this study.

### 3.1 Participants

The subjects for this study were 54 students in the age range of 20 to 21 years at the undergraduate level in the course of Scientific Writing Semester 4. The students consisted of 19 male students and 35 female students. This study alternately used the terms 'problem' and 'error' because it quantifies all errors in the task of students using an electronic enhancement platform called Grammarly. The six weeks meeting is delegated to teach and study Scientific Writing. In the seventh week was the collection of CBR assignments, where students reviewed two books, one main book, and one comparison book. The CBR tasks were uploaded to an electronic enhancement writing platform known as Grammarly.

### 3.2 The Application Program

The program used to gauge the students' corrective feedback was Grammarly. It is one of the well-known programs to assist learners in writing.

Grammarly is an online grammar checker and spell checker in language structure English and correct errors in writing. Grammarly gives the word a recommendation, which is proper if there is a wrong word in the construction of the English language. Grammarly got it integrated into the Microsoft Word application. Making it easier for users to check for errors in the English structure with computer records must be connected to the Internet. To install and use



**Fig 1:** Sentence Structure

Grammarly, you must have a Grammarly account and download the Grammarly plugin for Microsoft Word. When word usage errors occur, there will be a notification by Grammarly. Grammarly also provides explanations or examples of words or sentence structures correct as shown in figure 1. Grammarly requires an internet connection. So, it needs to be prepared stable internet connection so that Grammarly can function.

#### 4. Results

In this section, the analysis of frequency and percentage

The researchers [21] analysed the Critical Book Review report assignments, which averaged 1300 words. Students typed the report following the format specified. Then the researchers uploaded the softcopy assignment to the Grammarly application. Then the researcher identified the students' linguistic problems in the text.

The researchers found that the students had problems in grammar, punctuation, contextual spelling, sentence structure, style, and vocabulary enhancement. The table 1 below shows the linguistic problems found.

**Table 1:** Mean reported Linguistics Problems per Specific Issues in Writing CAR

Linguistic Problems	Means
<b>1 Spelling Correction</b>	
Misspelled Words	9.67
Confused Words	3.76
Mixed Dialects of English	0.22
<b>Total</b>	<b>4.55</b>
<b>2 Grammar</b>	
Missing Prepositions	3.30
Determiner Use	11.41
Faulty Subject Verb Agreement	5.33
Incorrect Verb Forms	3.85
Incorrect Phrasing	0.19
Modal Verbs	0.11
Misplaced words	0.72
Misuse of Quantifiers	0.30
Misuse of Modifiers	1.17
Incorrect noun number	0.50
Faulty Tense Sequence	0.09
Conjunction	0.46
<b>Total</b>	<b>27.43</b>

<b>3 Punctuation</b>	
Comma Misuse within Clauses	3.17
Closing Punctuations	0.07
Punctuations in Compound	3.39
Misuse of Semicolons	0.61
<b>Total</b>	<b>7.24</b>
<b>4 Enhancement Suggestion</b>	
Word Choice	18.22
<b>5 Sentence Structure</b>	
Misplaced Words and Phrases	0.37
Incomplete Sentence	1.04
Faulty Parallelism	0.06
<b>Total</b>	<b>1.47</b>
<b>6 Style Check</b>	
Passive Voice Misuse	3.87
Improper Formatting	6.76
Unclear Reference	0.41
Wordy Sentences	2.65
<b>Total</b>	<b>13.69</b>

## 5. Linguistic Problems in Writing CAR

### *Spelling Correction*

Based on the results of the Critical Article Review data description, it is found that the average value of (1) Misspelled Words is 9.67; (2) Confused Words of 3.76; and (3) Mixed Dialects of English of 0.22. Thus, in the Critical Article Review assignment, it is found that the problem of writing Spelling Corrections done by students from the largest to the smallest are: (1) Misspelled Words of 9.67; (2) Confused Words of 3.76; and (3) Mixed Dialects of English of 0.22.

### *Grammar*

Based on the results of the Critical Article Review data description, it is found that the average values are: (1) Missing Prepositions of 3.30; (2) Determiner Use of 11.41; (3) Faulty Subject Verb Agreement of 5.33; (4) Incorrect Verb Forms of 3.85; (5) Incorrect Phrasing of 0.19; (6) Verbs Capital of 0.11; (7) Misplaced words of 0.72; (8) Misuse of Quantifiers of 0.30; (9) Misuse of Modifiers of 1.17; (10) Incorrect noun number of 0.50; (11) Faulty Tense Sequence of 0.09; and (12) Conjunction of 0.46.

Thus, in the Critical Article Review assignment, the problem of grammar writing by students from the largest to the smallest is obtained: (1) Determiner Use of 11.41; (2) Faulty Subject Verb Agreement of 5.33; (3) Incorrect Verb Forms of 3.85; (4) Missing Prepositions of 3.30; (5) Misuse of Modifiers of 1.17; (6) Misplaced words of 0.72; (7) Incorrect noun number of 0.50; Conjunction of 0.46; (9) Misuse of Quantifiers of 0.30; (10) Incorrect Phrasing of 0.19; (11) Verbs Capital of 0.11; and (12) Faulty Tense Sequence of 0.09.

From the above table 1, the researchers found that students experienced language problems related to spelling correction in writing CAR, CBR, and MR. And the dominant issue in spelling correction is misspelled words (CAR=9.67; CBR=10.15; MR=14.02) Concerning grammar, the dominant language problem in writing CAR, CBR, and MR that students face is determiner use.

### *Punctuation*

Based on the results of the Critical Article Review data description obtained that the average value: (1) Comma Misuse within Clauses of 3.17; (2) Closing Punctuations 0.07; (3) Punctuations in Compound of 3.39; and (4) Misuse of Semicolons of 0.61.

Thus, the Critical Article Review task obtained the problem of writing punctuation made by students from the largest to the smallest are: (1) Punctuations in Compound of 3.39; (2) Comma Misuse within Clauses of 3.17; (3) Misuse of Semicolons of 0.61; and (4) Closing Punctuations 0.07.

### *Enhancement Suggestion*

Based on the results of the Critical Article Review data description, the average value of 18.22 was obtained. Thus, the Critical Article Review task obtained the problem of writing Enhancement Suggestions on the Word Choice of 18.22.

### *Sentence Structure*

Based on the results of the Critical Article Review data description, it is found that the average value: (1) Misplaced Words and Phrases of 0.37; (2) Incomplete Sentence of 1.04; and (3) Faulty Parallelism of 0.06. Thus, in the Critical Article Review assignment, it is found that the problem of writing sentence structure conducted by students from the largest to the smallest is: (1) Incomplete Sentence of 1.04; (2) Misplaced Words and Phrases of 0.37; and (3) Faulty Parallelism of 0.06.

*Style Check*

Based on the results of the Critical Article Review data description, it is found that the average value: (1) Passive Voice Misuse is 3.87; (2) Improper Formatting of 6.76; (3) Unclear Reference of 0.41; and (4) Word Sentences 2.65.

Thus, the Critical Article Review task obtained problems writing Style Checks (style checks) conducted by students from the largest to the smallest are: (1) Improper Formatting of 6.76; (2) Passive Voice Misuse of 3.87; (3) Word Sentences 2.65; and (4) Unclear Reference of 0.41.

**6. Linguistic Problems in Writing CBR**

**Table 2:** Mean reported linguistics problems per Specific Issues in Writing CBR

<b>Linguistic Problems</b>	<b>Mean</b>
<b>1 Spelling Correction</b>	
a. Misspelled Words	10.15
b. Confused Words	4.02
c. Mixed Dialects of English	0.70
<b>Total</b>	<b>14.85</b>
<b>2 Grammar</b>	
	3.76
a. Missing Preposition	
b. Determiner Use	11.70
c. Faulty Subject Verb Agreement	5.56
d. Incorrect Verb Forms	4.46
e. Incorrect Phrasing	0.15
f. Modal Verbs	0.48
g. Misplaced words	0.96
h. Misuse of Quantifiers	0.31
i. Misuse of Modifiers	0.28
j. Incorrect noun number	1.17
k. Faulty Tense Sequence	0.15
l. Conjunction	0.39
<b>Total</b>	<b>29.37</b>

<b>3 Punctuation</b>	
a. Comma Misuse within Clauses	3.98
b. Closing Punctuations	0.24
c. Punctuations in Compound	3.85
d. Misuse of Semicolons	0.78
<b>Total</b>	<b>8.85</b>
<b>4 Enhancement Suggestion</b>	
Word Choice	<b>25.50</b>
<b>5 Sentence Structure</b>	
a. Misplaced Words and Phrases	0.43
b. Incomplete Sentence	1.70
c. Faulty Parallelism	0.00
<b>Total</b>	<b>2.13</b>
<b>6 Style Check</b>	
a. Passive Voice Misuse	4.22
b. Improper Formatting	12.72
c. Unclear Reference	1.02
d. Wordy Sentences	4.22
<b>Total</b>	<b>22.18</b>

### Spelling Correction

Based on the results of the Critical Book Report, data description obtained that the average value: (1) Misspelled Words of 10, 15; (2) Confused Words of 4.02; and (3) Mixed Dialects of English of 0.70. Thus, the Critical Book Report assignment obtained problems writing Spelling Correction (spelling correction) made by students from the largest to the smallest are: (1) Misspelled Words of 10.15; (2) Confused Words of 4.02; and (3) Mixed Dialects of English of 0.70.

### Grammar

From the above table 2, based on the results of the Critical Book Report data description, it is obtained that the average values are: (1) Missing Prepositions of 3.76; (2) Determiner Use of 11.70; (3) Faulty Subject Verb Agreement amounting to 5.56; (4) Incorrect Verb Forms of 4.46; (5) Incorrect Phrasing of 0.15; (6) Verbs Capital of 0.48; (7) Misplaced words of 0.96; (8) Misuse of Quantifiers of 0.31; Misuse of Modifiers of 0.28; (10) Incorrect noun number of 1.17; (11) Faulty Tense Sequence of 0.15; and (12) conjugation of 0.39. Thus in the Critical Book Report assignment, the problem of grammar writing by students from the largest to the smallest is obtained: (1) Determiner Use of 11.70; (2) Faulty Subject Verb Agreement amounting to 5.56; (3) Incorrect Verb Forms of 4.46; (4) Missing Prepositions of 3.76; (5) Incorrect noun number of 1.17; (6) Misplaced words of 0.96; (7) Verbs Capital of 0.48; (8) Conjunction of 0.39; (9) Misuse of Quantifiers of 0.31; (10) Misuse of Modifiers of 0.28; (11) Incorrect Phrasing of 0.15; and (12) Faulty Tense Sequence of 0.15.

### Punctuation

Based on the results of the Critical Book Report, data description obtained that the average value: (1) Comma Misuse within Clauses of 3.98; (2) Closing Punctuations 0.24; (3) Punctuations in Compound of 3.85; and (4) Misuse of Semicolons of 0.78.

Thus, the Critical Book Report task obtained the problem of writing punctuation (punctuation) made by students from the largest to the smallest are: (1) Comma Misuse within Clauses of 3.98; (2) Punctuations in Compound of 3.85; (3) Misuse of Semicolons of 0.78; and (4) Closing Punctuations 0.24.

### Enhancement Suggestion

Based on the results of the Critical Book Report, the data description obtained an average value of 25.50. Thus, the Critical Book Report task got the problem of writing Enhancement Suggestions on the Word Choice of 25.50.

### Sentence Structure

Based on the results of the Critical Book Report, data description obtained that the average value: (1) Misplaced Words and Phrases of 0.43; (2) Incomplete Sentence of 1.70; and (3) Faulty Parallelism of 0.00.

Thus, the Critical Book Report assignment obtained the problem of writing sentence structure by students from the largest to the smallest are: (1) Incomplete Sentence of 1.70;

(2) Misplaced Words and Phrases of 0.43; and (3) Faulty Parallelism of 0.00.

### Style check

Based on the results of the Critical Book Report data description, it is obtained that the average value: (1) Passive Voice Misuse is 4.22; (2) Improper Formatting of 12.72; (3) Unclear Reference of 1.02; and (4) Word Sentences of 4.22. Thus, in the Critical Book Report assignment, it is found that writing style check done by students from the largest to the smallest are: (1) Improper Formatting of 12.72; (2) Passive Voice Misuse of 4.22; (3) Word Sentences 4.22; and (4) Unclear Reference of 1.02.

## 7. Linguistics Problems in Writing MR

**Table 3:** Mean reported Linguistics Problems per Specific Issues in Writing MR

Linguistics Problems	Means
<b>1 Spelling Correction</b>	
a. Misspelled Words	14.02
b. Confused Words	4.60
c. Mixed Dialects of English	1.76
<b>Total</b>	<b>6.79</b>
<b>2 Grammar</b>	
a. Missing Prepositions	4.74
b. Determiner Use	18.52
c. Faulty Subject Verb Agreement	6.72
d. Incorrect Verb Forms	4.69
e. Incorrect Phrasing	0.60
f. Modal Verbs	0.66
g. Misplaced words	0.34
h. Misuse of Quantifiers	0.52
i. Misuse of Modifiers	1.50

j. Incorrect noun number	1.29	Confused Words of 4.60; and (3) Mixed Dialects of English 1.76.
k. Faulty Tense Sequence	0.16	<i>Grammar</i>
l. Conjunction	0.43	From the above table 3, based on the results of the Mini Research data description, it is found that the average values are: (1) Missing Prepositions of 4.74; (2) Determiner Use of 18.52; (3) Faulty Subject Verb Agreement of 6.72; (4) Incorrect Verb Forms of 4.69; (5) Incorrect Phrasing of 0.60; (6) Verbs Capital of 0.66; (7) Misplaced words of 0.34; (8) Misuse of Quantifiers of 0.52; (9) Misuse of Modifiers of 1.50 (10) Incorrect noun number of 1.29; (11) Faulty Tense Sequence of 0.16; and (12) conjugation of 0.43.
<b>Total</b>	<b>40.17</b>	
<hr/>		
<b>3 Punctuation</b>		
a. Comma Misuse within Clauses	5.95	
b. Closing Punctuations	0.64	
c. Punctuations in Compound	11.64	Thus, the Mini Research assignment obtained the problem of writing Grammar conducted by students from the largest to the smallest are: (1) Determiner Use of 18.52; (2) Faulty Subject Verb Agreement of 6.72; (3) Missing Prepositions of 4.74; (4) Incorrect Verb Forms of 4.69; (5) Misuse of Modifiers of 1.50; (6) Incorrect noun number of 1.29; (7) Verbs Capital of 0.66; (8) Incorrect Phrasing of 0.60; (9) Misuse of Quantifiers of 0.52; (10) Conjunction of 0.43; (11) Misplaced words of 0.34; and (12) Faulty Tense Sequence of 0.16.
d. Misuse of Semicolons	1.62	
<b>Total</b>	<b>19.85</b>	
<hr/>		
<b>4 Enhancement Suggestion</b>		
Word Choice	<b>25.67</b>	
<hr/>		
<b>5 Sentence Structure</b>		
a. Misplaced Words and Phrases	1.50	<i>Punctuation</i>
b. Incomplete Sentence	1.55	Based on the results of the Mini Research data description obtained that the average values: (1) Comma Misuse within Clauses of 5.95; (2) Closing Punctuations 0.64; (3) Punctuations in Compound of 11.64; and (4) Misuse of Semicolons of 1.62.
c. Faulty Parallelism	0.59	Thus, the Mini Research assignment obtained problems students from the most substantial do punctuation writing to the smallest are (1) Punctuations in Compound of 11.64; (2) Comma Misuse within Clauses of 5.95; (3) Misuse of Semicolons of 1.62; and (4) Closing Punctuations 0.64.
<b>Total</b>	<b>3.64</b>	
<hr/>		
<b>6 Style Check</b>		
a. Passive Voice Misuse	9.50	<i>Enhancement Suggestion</i>
b. Improper Formatting	11.34	Based on the Mini Research data description, results obtained an average value of 25.67. Thus, the Mini Research assignment got the problem of writing Enhancement Suggestions on Word Choice of 25.67.
c. Unclear Reference	0.83	<i>Sentence Structure</i>
d. Wordy Sentences	9.60	Based on the results of the Mini Research data description, it is found that the average values are: (1) Misplaced Words and Phrases of 1.50; (2) Incomplete Sentence of 1.55; and (3) Faulty Parallelism of 0.59. Thus, the Mini Research task obtained problems writing sentence structure (sentence structure) conducted by students from the largest to the smallest are: (1) Incomplete Sentence of 1.55; (2) Misplaced Words and Phrases of 1.50; and (3) Faulty Parallelism of 0.59.
<b>Total</b>	<b>31.27</b>	

### Spelling Correction

Based on the results of the Mini Research data description, it is obtained that the average values are: (1) Missing Words of 14.02; (2) Confused Words of 4.60; and (3) Mixed Dialects of English 1.76. Thus, the Mini Research assignment obtained the problem of writing a Spelling Correction (spelling correction) conducted by students from the largest to the smallest are: (1) Misspelled Words of 14.02; (2)

### Style Check

Based on the results of the Mini Research data description, it is found that the average values are: (1) Passive Voice Misuse of 9.50; (2) Improper Formatting of 11.34; (3) Unclear Reference of 0.83; and (4) Word Sentences at 9.60.

Thus, the Mini Research assignment obtained the problem of writing style checks carried out by students from the largest to the smallest: (1) Improper Formatting of 11.34; (2) Word Sentences 9.60; (3) Passive Voice Misuse of 9.50; and (4) Unclear Reference of 0.83.

### 8. Discussions

From the findings above, the researchers found that the students faced linguistic problems in writing. The results also discovered that grammar is the highest portion of the linguistic issues in writing CAR, CBR, and MR. The data finding in this study is surprising. In Grammar category, Determiner Use is the dominant language problem faced by students in writing CAR, CBR, and MR while in the previous study, the dominant Grammar problem is Subject Verb Agreement or [22],[23] describe 'determiner' as a special class of words that limits (or determines) the nouns that follow them. These words could be in the form of articles (the, a(n)), demonstratives (this, that, these, those), possessive determiners (my, your, his, her, its, our, their) and quantifiers (one, two, ten million). Structurally, a determiner precedes an adjective if there are adjectives in the noun phrase. In cases where no adjectives are present, they are positioned directly in front of a noun. Where the sentence "I put my books on the huge table." is concerned, two determiners can be detected. The first is 'my', a possessive determiner that precedes the noun 'books' while the second is 'the', a definite article that precedes the adjective 'huge'. In both cases, both 'my books' and 'the huge table' are noun phrases. Determiners of the English language are often restricted with respect to the number and or countability of the head nouns with which they can co-occur. These agreement features are important information about determiners and nouns that are unique to a language like the English language [24]. The result of this study, it was found that students face linguistic problems such Determiner Use in writing CAR (Means = 11.41), CBR (Means = 11.70), and MR (Means = 18.52). This is corresponding with the previous study by [25].[26] found that first-year and fourth-year students face a serious problem in Article/Determiner, particularly zero article. A related study by [27] also demonstrate that students who have been long studied English often face difficulties in using proper article in Grammar category [28][29].

### 9. Conclusions

the finding in this study corroborates with the previous study, who stated that fifteen students who took English course had frequent problems with the grammar dealing with the use of plural forms, articles, verbs, clauses, passive voice, and prepositions. In the Grammarly application, grammar is categorized into twelve categories. They are wrong or missing prepositions, determiner use (a/an/the/this, etc.,) faulty Subject -Verb Agreement, incorrect verb forms, incorrect phrasing, modal verbs, misplaced words or phrases, misuse of quantifiers, misuse of modifiers, wrong noun number, faulty tense sequence, and conjunction/pronoun use. In addition, using online corrective feedback such as Grammarly is helpful for the teachers to investigate the EFL

Learners' Linguistic Problems including Spelling Correction, Grammar, Punctuation, Enhancement Suggestion, Sentence Structure, and Style Check. The feedback from Grammarly gives positive contribution that makes the teachers easily recognizes the students' mistakes. Corrective feedback from Grammarly can be used to monitor the content of the EFL Learners' Writing.

### References

- [1]. AbuSeileek, A. F. Using Track Changes and Word Processor to Provide Corrective Feedback to Learners in Writing. *Journal of Computer Assisted Learning*, Vol. 29 No. 4, 319-333, 2013.
- [2]. AbuSeileek, A. F., & Abualshar, A. Using Computer-Mediated Corrective Feedback to Support EFL Learners' Writing. *Language Learning & Technology*, Vol. 18 No. 1, 76-95, 2014.
- [3]. Al-Ghabra, I. M. Analyzing errors committed in paragraph committed by Undergraduates. *Journal of Language Teaching and Research*, vol. 10, No. 2, 264-270, 2019.
- [4]. Al-Khasawneh, M. F. Error analysis of written English paragraphs y Jordanian undergraduate students: A case study. *International Journal of English Language, Literature and Humanities*. Vol. 2. No. 8, 85-100, 2014.
- [5]. Amiri, F., & Puteh, M. Error Analysis in Academic Writing: A Case of International Postgraduate Students in Malaysia. *Advances in Language and Literary Studies*. Vol. 8, No. 4, 141-145, 2017.
- [6]. Ananda, R., Gani, S., & Sahardin, R. A Study Error Analysis from Students' Sentence in Writing. *Studies in English and Education*, Vol. 1, No. 2, 81-95, 2014.
- [7]. Brown, H. D. *Principles of language learning and teaching*. New York: Pearson Education, 2007.
- [8]. Budiarta, L., Suputra, P., & Widiasmara, I. An Analysis of Grammatical Errors on Narrative Text Writing Committed by the Ninth Grade Students of Junior High School. *International Journal of Language & Literature*, Vol. 2, No. 3, 98-107, 2018.
- [9]. Corder, S. P. *Techniques in Applied Linguistics (The Edinburgh Course in Applied Linguistics)*. London: Oxford University Press, 1981.
- [10]. Eghlidi, M. Contrastive Analysis of English and Persian Intonation Patterns: An Error Analysis Study on Iranian Undergraduate EFL Students. *Journal of Applied Linguistics and Language Research*, Vol. 3, No. 4, 88-102, 2016.
- [11]. Ellis, R., & Barkhuizen, G. B. *Analyzing Learner Language*. UK: Oxford University Press, 2005.
- [12]. Forutan, A., & Mehranpour, F. On the Iranian EFL learners' sources of errors in the production of propositions. *Journal of Language, Linguistics and Literature*. Vol. 1, No. 4, 120-126, 2015.
- [13]. Hasan, J., & Marzuki, M. An Analysis of Student's Ability in Writing at Riau University Pekanbaru - Indonesia. *Theory and Practice in Language Studies*, Vol. 7, No. 5, 380-388, 2017.
- [14]. Hasan, J., & Marzuki, M. An Analysis of Students' Ability in Writing at Riau University Pekanbaru-Indonesia. *Theory and Practice in Language Studies*, Vol. 7 No. 5, 380-388, 2017.
- [15]. Heydari, P., & Bagheri, M. S. Error Analysis Sources of L2 Learners' Error. *Theory and Practice in Language Studies*, Vol. 2, No. 8, 2012.
- [16]. Jannah, M. Analyzing the Students' Grammatical Error on Writing Narrative Text. *SMART Journal*, Vol.1 No. 2, 57-64, 2015.
- [17]. Kamlasi, I., & Nokas, D. N. Grammatical errors in writing of the second-class students of SMA Kristen 1 Soe. *Journal of English Language, Literature, and Teaching*. Vol. 1. No. 1, 130-140



<https://media.neliti.com/media/publications/207633-grammatical-errors-in-writing-of-the-sec.pdf>,2018.

- [18]. Katiya, M., Mtonjeni, T., & Sefalane-Nkohla, P. Making Sense of Errors Made by Analytical Chemistry Students in their Writing. *Journal of Language Teaching and Research*, Vol. 6, No. 3, 490-503,2015.
- [19]. Kepes, B. Checking Grammar, on the Fly and the Cloud. Retrieved May 24, 2019, from Forbes: <https://www.forbes.com/sites/benkepes/2015/04/02/checking-grammar-on-the-fly-and-on-the-cloud/#5768d3467c63>,May2015.
- [20]. Khansir, A. A. Error Analysis and Second Language Writing. *Theory and Practice in Language Studies*, Vol. 3, No. 2, 363-370,2013.
- [21]. Koroglu, Z. An analysis on grammatical errors of Turkish EFL students' written texts. *International Periodical for the Languages, Literature and History of Turkish or Turkic*, Vol. 9, No. 12,2014.
- [22]. Kusuma, C. Ragam Kesalahan pada Karangan Berbahasa Inggris Mahasiswa Semester 1, Prodi Ilmu Keperawatan Tahun Akademik 2012/2013. *Literasi*, Vol. 3, No. 2, 99-110,2017.
- [23]. Nassaji, H. Qualitative and Descriptive Research: Data type versus data analysis. *Language Teaching Research*, Vol. 19, No. 2, 129-132,2015.
- [24]. Ngangbam, H. An Analysis of Syntactic Errors Committed by Students of English Language Class in the Written Composition of Mutah University: A Case Study. *European Journal of English Language, Linguistics and Literature*, Vol. 3, No. 1, 1-13,2016.
- [25]. Samhon, E. A., & Abdall, A. Y. Common punctuations errors made by secondary schools, Nyala Locality. *Journal of Humanities*. Vol. 17. No. 4, 73-87 [http://www.sustech.edu/staff\\_publications/20161215114241110.pdf](http://www.sustech.edu/staff_publications/20161215114241110.pdf),2016 .
- [26]. Sermsook, K., Liamnimitr, J., & Pochkorn, R. An Analysis of Errors in Written English Sentences: A Case Study of Thai EFL Students. *English Language Teaching*, Vol. 10. No., 101-110,2017.
- [27]. Shintani, N., & Aubrey, S. The Effectiveness of Synchronous and Asynchronous Written Corrective Feedback on Grammatical Accuracy in A Computer-Mediated Environment. *The Modern Language Journal*, No. 100 Vol. 1, 296-319,2016.
- [28]. Sia, D., & Cheung, Y. L. Written Corrective Feedback in Writing Instruction: A Qualitative Synthesis of Recent Research. *Issues in Language Studies*, Vol. 6 No. 1, 61- 80,2017.
- [29]. Simon, M. K., & Gaes, J. *Dissertation and Scholarly Research: Recipes for Success*. Seattle, WA: Dissertation Success LLC,2013.