

THE USE OF ENGLISH SPELLING AND GRAMMAR CHECKER WEBSITE IN IMPROVING JUNIOR HIGH SCHOOL STUDENTS' IN WRITING NARRATIVE TEXT

Riski Amrawati¹, Sulfasyah², Farisha Andi Baso³

^{1,2,3}Universitas Muhammadiyah Makassar, English Department, Faculty of Teacher Training and Education, Bontonompo, Gowa
No.001,92153, Indonesia. riskiamrawati@bg.unismuhmakassar.ac.id

Article Info	Abstract
<p>Received: April 24, 2021 Revised: May 23, 2021 Accepted: June 4, 2021 Published: June 20, 2021</p> <p>Keywords: <i>writing, difficulties Strategies, English Spelling</i></p>	<p>The main objective of this research was to find out the students' difficulties in speaking at SMP PGRI Barembeng and the students' strategies in overcoming their difficulties in writing narrative text. This research used descriptive quantitative method. The participants of this research were the students' at SMP PGRI Barembeng. The sample of this research were 44 students taken by purposive sampling technique. The researcher used the writing test as the instrument of this research. Based on the research findings, there were two students' difficulties those were; lack of vocabulary, lack of confidence and lack of grammar. The researcher also found 23 students' strategies in overcoming writing difficulties at SMP PGRI Barembeng, those were; memory strategy, cognitive strategy, affective strategy and social strategy.</p>
<p>How to cite: Amrawati, R., Sulfasyah, & Andi Baso, F. (2021). THE USE OF ENGLISH SPELLING AND GRAMMAR CHECKER WEBSITE IN IMPROVING JUNIOR HIGH SCHOOL STUDENTS' IN WRITING NARRATIVE TEXT. <i>Journal of Computer Interaction in Education</i>, 4(1). Retrieved from https://jurnal.fkip.unismuh.ac.id/index.php/jcie/article/view/967</p>	

INTRODUCTION

English is an international language that is widely used in many countries around the world. Students need to master English in all skills. The skills are Listening, Speaking, Reading, and Writing. In this case, the researcher is going to focus on writing skill. The first sign of writing is, that writing is the top level of a language. It is the last macro skill that has to be mastered by people who want to be able to communicate perfectly. The second significance is that writing is a productive skill. It involves producing language rather than receiving it. In writing, people will produce written language. The third significance of writing is that writing is the most complex macro skill in language mastery. In writing, people apply everything that they have got in the three stages before. The fourth or the last significance of writing is that writing is the stage of language mastery where people can generate ideas. In writing, people should construct the idea perfectly to make it so understandable that other people can catch the meaning or the purpose of the message (idea) in writing. Students in junior high school should be able to write or produce narrative text.

It is not something attractive and fun for them to write narrative text although the narrative text has a purpose to entertain the reader. They know many stories related to narrative text but when they have to produce their own 2 narrative text, they face many

difficulties. Many students cannot get and generate their own idea. Some students have an idea but cannot express it in their own sentences. They also have difficulties in arranging the idea into good order to form a good narrative text. They also lack of vocabularies related to the idea that they want to write.

The teacher usually asks the students to write a sentence as many as they can but they do need to know how to make their students write as many as they can. This fact encourages the research to focus on helping the students developing their writing ability. Writing narrative text requires more attention in detail. There are complex rules in writing that cannot be ignored. When students write something, they have to pay more attention to word spelling, punctuation marks, dictions, grammar, the purpose of their writing, and the idea of their writing itself. However, researchers find it difficult for students to make good and correct narrative texts, according to the guidelines taught. Often researchers find many errors that occur in writing narrative text due to errors in grammar and lack of vocabulary. The problem may be caused by some aspects: The first is rare opportunity to use English because the status of English as a foreign language, not as main daily communication. The second is the students do not have enough practice in writing text. So the students may make mistake like, determining the main idea, using the suitable word, and arranging the sentences. Therefore, the students need to master the structure of the English language, should have enough vocabulary, and also know the spelling of the words in order to be able to write correct sentences and arrange them into a good paragraph. The last, the technique that used by teacher do not support the students motivation to write the paragraph.

Regardless of the obstructions found by students, writing is a very important competence. It is because nowadays people, who take technology as their means of communication, seem to be impossible to be separated from the activity of writing, from the simplest like sending short messages through mobile phones and to the more complex like making business letters via e-mail. The importance of writing is also seen from the fact that the skill has become a need for people to compete in the global era. Students need to prepare themselves for their future. They need to be able to write an application letter when applying for a job and many other kinds of written texts when doing their job later. Besides, writing is a means of expressing ideas or communicating with others. There are situations in which the ability of writing is crucial or written language is a need, as it is said by Nunan (1993) that writing is needed to communicate with others who are removed in time and space, or is used for those occasions on which a permanent or semi-permanent record is required. Such situations can be easily found in real-life every day, for instance, when someone was visiting a friend but he could not meet and he left a note.

With the development of technological advances, all our daily needs are met starting household needs, transportation, to communication needs. Difficulties in communicating between nations have now been eliminated with the help of online translator technology, as well as in writing. Now our needs in writing good and correct English have been met with the creation of a grammar website. Even so, it has not been systematically tested whether the

helper website has been proven to help the accuracy of the language in writing good and correct narrative texts. Based on the explanation above, the researcher wants to conduct a research entitled “The Use of English Spelling and Grammar Checker Website in Improving Junior High School Students' in Writing Narrative Text”.

RESEARCH METHOD

Type of research using in this research is experiment. This experimental research can be interpreted as a method of research used to find the effect of certain treatment against others in control condition. In this study, the researcher asserts a pre-experimental method with singleclass; the researcher gives pre-test, a treatment and posttest design.

TABLE 1 RESEARCH DESIGN

T1	X	T2
----	---	----

Where :

- T1 : The pre-test
- T2 : The post test
- X : Treatment

(Gay : 2012)

Population and Sample

The population of this research is the whole grade VIII students of SMP PGRI Barembeng in the academic year 2019/2020. The population consisted of three classes. The total of the population of this research is 45 students.

TABLE 2 NUMBER OF POPULATION

Class	Number of Students
VIII.a	22
VIII.b	22
TOTAL	44

Data Analysis Technique

To analysis the data, the researcher employed the formula as follows:

1. Scoring the students' correct answer pre-test and post-test.

$$\text{Students' Score} = \frac{\text{The number of student's correct answer}}{\text{Total Score}} \times 100$$

(Gay, 2012)

2. Scoring the students based on the following criteria, they are :

(West Virginia, 2008)

TABLE 3 STUDENTS' SCORING OF CONTENT CRITERIA

Classification	Criteria	Score
Excellent	Shows the smooth relationship between ideas	90-100
Very good	Shows the transition of relationships between ideas	80-89
Good	The relationship between ideas is unclear	70-79
Fair	The relationship between ideas is chaotic	60-69
Poor	Failed to realize the idea	50-59

(West Virginia, 2008)

TABLE 4 STUDENTS' SCORING OF LANGUAGE USE CRITERIA

Classification	Criteria	Score
Excellent	Effective complex construction, few errors of agreement, tense, number, word/order function, article, pronoun and preposition	90-100
Good	Effective but simple construction. Minor problems in complex construction. Several errors of agreement, tense, number, word/order, function, article, pronoun, preposition but meaning seldom obscured.	70-89
Fair	Major problems in simplex/complex construction, frequent errors of negation, agreement, tense, number, or fragments. Run-on sentence. Meaning confused or obscured.	50-69
poor	Virtually no mastery of sentence construction rule. Dominated by errors of tense, 8 number, articles, pronouns, and preposition. Does not communicate. Or not enough to evaluate.	30-49

(West virginia, 2008)

3. Computing the frequency and the rule percentage of the students' score:

$$P = \frac{f}{n} \times 100$$

Where:

P= Percentage

f= Frequency

n = The total number of students

(Gay, 2012)

4. To find the students' improvement the formula as follows:

$$\% = \frac{x_2 - x_1}{x_1} \times 100$$

Where:

% = the students' improving

X1 = the mean score of pre-test

X2 = the mean score of post-test

(Gay, 2012)

1. Finding out the significant difference between the score of the pre-test and post-test by using the formula:

$$t = \frac{\bar{D}}{\sqrt{\frac{\sum D^2 - \frac{(\sum D)^2}{N}}{N(N-1)}}$$

Where:

t= test of significance

\bar{D} = the mean of the difference score

D = the sum of all score

$(\sum D)^2$ = the square of the sum the different score

N = the total number of score

1 = constant number

(Gay,2012)

2. The criteria for the hypothesis testing is as follows:

TABLE 5 HYPOTHESIS TESTING

Comparison	Hypothesis	
	H0	H1
t-test < t-table	Accepted	Rejected
t-test > t-table	Rejected	Accepted

The table above meant (1) the t-test value is smaller than t-table value, the null hypothesis is accepted, while the alternative hypothesis is rejected, and (2) the t-test value is equal to greater than t-table value, the null hypothesis is rejected while the alternative is accepted.

RESULT AND DISCUSSION

In this posttest classroom learning, researchers as teacher used conventional learning in the classroom. In general, the process and steps in the classroom were the same as the procedures in the learning class at the control 1 class meeting in the pre-test. From the evaluation of the post-test in this control class, the researchers obtained the results' value of student learning scores. Based on the minimum completeness score of school achievement was 71. The students who complete learning outcomes were 12 students. The students do not complete learning outcomes were 10 students. The average student scores were 65, 6 %. The students got the very good score was 4, 5% or 1 student. The students got the good score

was 54, 5 % or 12 students. The students got the very fair score was 18, 2 % or 4 students. The last, the students got the very poor score was 22, 7 % or 5 students.

From the research conducted by researchers at the 1st and 2nd meetings in the control class and control class, it can be described that the average score of students at the first meeting of the control class was 67.5 and at the second meeting the control class was 67, 6. an increase of 2 points of student learning outcomes seen from the results of posttest evaluation. Whereas in the control class the first meeting got an average of 65.6 and at the second meeting it was 67.6. So it can be concluded that at the control class meeting there was an increase of 2 points of student learning outcomes as seen in the post test. the prosentase of score in very good, good, fair, and poor score was unincreased or the same prosentase.

The achievement of these learning outcomes included the results of student activity as well as in developing the material being taught. The learning outcomes increased in the experimental class by 8.2 points while the control class was 2 points. It was seen from the meeting data of the experimental class and the control class, it can be concluded that learning to write narrative text using spelling and grammar checker better be able to improve students' accuracy in class learning.

Normality Test

The normality test was carried out to analyze the data used for the evaluation questions. In the experimental class and the control class, the distribution was normal or not. This normality test used the SPSS version 23.0 program with the Kolmogorov Sminov Test, the results of which were attached. Based on the normality test with the Kolmogorov Sminof Test, the results of the normality test for the experimental class and control class values will be explained in the table and SPSS 23.0 below.

TABLE 6. RESULTS OF NORMALITY TEST OF EVALUATION QUESTIONS
ANOVA

Kelas A					
	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Between Groups	426.568	1	426.568	1.494	0.228
Within Groups	11995.318	42	285.603		
Total	12421.886	43			

Based on the output above, it was known that the significant value (sig.) For all data both in the Kolmogotov-Sminov test and the Shapiro-Wilk test ≥ 0.05 was 0.228, it can be concluded that the research data was normally distributed.

Homogeneity Test

This sample homogeneity test aimed to analyze whether or not the sample variations were taken from the same population. Based on the Test of Homogeneity of Variance, the results of the homogeneity test of the evaluation results obtained from the second meeting in the experimental class and the control class using the SPSS 23.0 computer program. The

results of the experimental class homogeneity trial using literacy strategies and the control class using conventional learning were as follows:

TABLE 7. TEST OF HOMOGENEITY OF VARIANCES

Levene Statistic	df1	df2	Sig.
1.704	1	42	0.199

The results of the homogeneity test above indicate that the significance value was ≥ 0.05 , so the data distribution was homogeneous. Because the data was normally distributed and homogeneous, there was an increase in students' thinking skills.

1. Hypothesis Testing

After checking the normality, and homogeneity of variances of the data, the researcher checked the hypothesis test. According to Sugiyono (2015), if $t\text{-value} > t\text{-table}$, it could be calculated that Alternative Hypothesis (H_a) was accepted and Null Hypothesis (H_0) was rejected or if the Sig. (2-tailed) were under or same with 0,05, then (H_a) was also accepted. Moreover, the table 4.4 below showed the table statistic of the data and the table 9 showed the result of the hypothesis test of the data.

Hypothesis testing in this study aimed to analyze learning by using spelling and grammar checking website to improve students' accuracy in writing narrative texts. This data collection was from the results of the evaluation at the second meeting in the experimental class and the control class. This hypothesis test uses the SPSS version 23 program with the Mann Whitney test as part of non-parametric statistics. The Mann Whitney test was used to determine whether there was a difference in the mean of the two unpaired samples. The improvement of students' thinking skills in the experimental class by using learning to write narrative text by using spelling and grammar checkers on the website and the control class used conventional learning. To find out the results of hypothesis testing, it will be explained in the following table.

TABLE 8. THE RESULT OF HYPOTHESIS DATA STATISTIC IN EXPERIMENTAL CLASS RESIDUALS STATISTICS A

	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Std. Deviation	N
Predicted Value	46.78	89.19	73.95	12.828	22
Residual	-11.986	24.223	.000	7.416	22
Std. Predicted Value	-2.119	1.188	.000	1.000	22
Std. Residual	-1.577	3.188	.000	.976	22

a. Dependent Variable: Kelas A

**TABLE 9. THE RESULT OF HYPOTHESIS DATA STATISTIC IN CONTROL CLASS
RESIDUALS STATISTICS**

	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Std. Deviation	N
Predicted Value	63.38	74.55	67.64	3.308	22
Residual	-36.064	16.615	.000	14.611	22
Std. Predicted Value	-1.285	2.089	.000	1.000	22
Std. Residual	-2.409	1.110	.000	.976	22

a. Dependent Variable: Kelas B

**TABLE 10. THE RECAPITULATION RESULT OF HYPOTHESIS DATA STATISTIC IN
BOTH EXPERIMENTAL CLASS AND CONTROL CLASS**

Teaching Narrative Writing Text		N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error
Gain Scores	The Use of English Spelling and Grammar Checker Website	22	73.95	12.828	16.616
	The used of conventional teaching	22	67.64	3.308	6.205

The table 10 indicated that the output "Test Statistic" above that the value. Sig. (2-tailed) 0.00050, 05, then Howas rejected and Hawas accepted, which means that there was a difference in the average ability of students in writing narrative text using spelling and grammar checker websites between the experimental class and the control class. The data showed the experimental class had mean score 73,95 and control group 67, 64 with the participant of each groups was 22. It means that the mean score in experimental class was higher than control class which was only 6.205. Then, the standard deviation of experimental group was 12,828 and control group 3,308. The conclusion, the data had significant difference between the use of spelling and grammar checker website and the use of conventional teaching as could be seen from the mean scores of two groups in table 11. From the mean scores, the research question can only be answered by using the significant difference that there was the significant difference between the use of spelling and grammar checker website and the use of conventional teaching method that was 9.52.

After analyzing the data, it could be concluded that:

1. Grammar checker tool could improve the students' writing narrative texts mastery at SMP PGRI BAREMBENG in academic year 2019/2020.
2. The students' ability at writing narrative texts before using grammar checker tool was low, the mean score of the pre-test (67,7). The percentage of the students who got point up 75 grew up in pre-test, students who got up 80 were only 6 of 44 students or 15,4%.
3. The observation and interviews conducted by the writer during the action showed that the students were motivated and interest to participate and actively in writing

narrative texts activity.

4. The teacher's response about the implementation of grammar checker tool was positive and it would be an alternative tool in teaching writing. Therefore, grammar checker technique could improve the students' ability in writing of narrative texts.

REFERENCES

- Achmad Munib. 2004. *Pengantar Ilmu Pendidikan*. Semarang: UPT MKK UNNES.
- Arief S. Sadiman, dkk. 2006. *Media Pendidikan: Pengertian, Pengembangan, dan Pemanfaatannya*. Edisi Pertama. Jakarta: PT Raja Grafindo Persada.
- Bhirud, N. S., Pawar, B. V., & Bhavsar, R. P. 2017, August. *Grammar Checkers for Natural Language: A Review*. 6(4).
- Brown, Douglas. 2000. *Teaching By Principles, An Interactive Approach to HilUSA*: New vistas.
- Daryanto. 2013. *Media Pembelajaran*. Yogyakarta: Gava Media.
- Douglas Brown. 2000. *Teaching By Principles, An Interactive Approach to Language Pedagogy*. San Francisco: Longman p. 336.
- Douglas, H. 2003. *Language Pedagogy*. San Francisco: Longman.
- Fatmawati, D. N., Santosa, S., & Ariyanto, J. 2013. *The Implementation of Think Talk Write Learning Strategy to Improve Student's learn Activities*. 2(1).
- Feez S. 2000. *Writing skills: Narrative and non-fiction text types*. Sydney: Phoenix Education Pty Ltd , P. 57
- Harmer, J. 2004. *How to Teach Writing* (Vol. 31). New York.
- Hasan, Chalijah. 1995. *Dimensi-Dimensi Psikologi Pendidikan*. Surabaya: Al-iklas Surabaya soetopo
- Heinich, Robert, Michael Molenda, James D. Russel. 1982. *Instructional Media: and the New Technology of Instruction*. New York: Jonh Wily and Sons.
- Jack Fraenkel and Norman E. Wallen, (2013). *How To Design and Evaluate Research in Education*. Singapore: McGraw Hill, p. 73
- Jacobs., Holly. L., Stephen, A., Zinggraf., Deanne. R., Wormuth, V., Faye, H., Jane, B., Hughey. 1981. *Testing ESL Composition : A Practical Approach*. Rowley : Newbury House Publisher, Inc.
- Jayavalan, K., & Razali, A. B. 2018. *Effectiveness of Online Grammar Checker to Improve Secondary Students' English Narrative Essay Writing*. International Research Journal of Education and Sciences (IRJES), 2(1).
- John W Cresswell. 2013. *Research Design Pendekatan Kualitatif, Kuantitatif, dan Mixed*. Yogyakarta: Pustaka Pelajar.
- Joyce, H & Feez S. 2000. *Writing skills: Narrative and non-fiction text types*.
- Ki Fudyartanta. 2011. *Psikologi Umum*. Yogyakarta: Pustaka Pelajar.
- Miftahul Huda. 2014. *Model-Model Pengajaran dan Pembelajaran*. Cetakan ke 4. Yogyakarta: Pustaka Pelajar.
- Mukarto. 2004. *English on Sky*. Jakarta: Penerbit Erlangga.
- Nugrahani, Alifiyanti and Fernand 2006. *Language to Use English*. Jakarta: Al-Ikhlash.
- Nunan, David. 2003. *Practical English Language Teaching*. New York: Mc Craw Piranti Darma Kalokatama Press. Processing. CRC Press. ISBN 978-0-8247-9000-4. Programme. Jakarta: PT Grasindo.

- Pujianti, N. 2018, March. *Mengintegrasikan Automatic Grammar Checker dalam Pembelajaran Menulis*. Jurnal Pendidikan Unsika.
- Robert Dale, Hermann Moisl, Harold Somers. 2000. *Handbook of Natural Language*
- Robinson. 1967. *Guided in Writing Skill: Serious Errors*. Third Edition. Harvard University
- Siregar & Hartini. 2011. *Teori Belajar dan Pembelajaran*. Bogor: Ghalia Indonesia
- Smaldino, Sharon E, Deborah L Lowther & James D Russell. 2012. *Instructional Technology & Media For Learning*. Edisike 9, terjemahan. Jakarta: Kencana
- Soni, M., & Thakur, J. S. 2018, March. *A Systematic Review of Automated Grammar Checking in English Language*. 23.
- Syahrum and Salim, 2016. *Metodologi Penelitian Kuantitatif*. Bandung: Ciptapustaka Media, p.113
- Utami Dewi. (2013). *How to Write*. Medan: Latansa Press.