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ABSTRACT

Nowadays, English is one of the languages that must be mastered, especially for students. One of the skills that must be mastered by students is writing. However, students have some problems in writing, such as a lack of ideas and creativity in writing, lack of motivation in writing, and there are still many grammatical errors in writing. To overcome this problem, researchers used Grammarly as a treatment to provide feedback on students’ writing. Therefore, this study aims to determine whether Automated Written Corrective Feedback using Grammarly significantly affects Students’ Writing Ability at SMP Negeri 47 Pekanbaru. The type of research used in this research is the pre-test-post-test group quasi-experimental design. This research involved tenth-grade students of SMP Negeri 47 Pekanbaru Kota. The sampling technique used is purposive sampling. The number of samples in this study amounted to 74 people divided into two classes, namely 37 people from class IX 9 as the experimental class and 37 from class IX 10 as the control class. The data collected in this study were analyzed using the t-test. Based on the results of statistical calculations, the t-table value is 1.666, and the t-count value is 2.192, which shows that the t-value is greater than the t-table (2.192 > 1.674). Furthermore, based on independent sample t-test on p-value or sig. (2-tailed) is 0.005. These results reject the null hypothesis (H0), and the alternative hypothesis (Ha) is accepted. It concluded that using Grammarly as Automated Written Corrective Feedback has a significant effect on students writing skills of tenth-grade students at SMP 47 Pekanbaru
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INTRODUCTION

In the 21st century, English is a crucial language everyone must master. The reason is that English is an international language used to communicate and has rapidly grown in pace with the times. Furthermore, many people speak this language, and it helps to connect people in a global world. Another reason is that most information is delivered and written in English. Even most technology uses English to communicate (Lee McKay, 2010). Thus, communication is essential not only orally but also in writing.

To achieve success in mastering the English language can be seen from at least four basic skills, such as listening, speaking, reading, and writing. According to Masrul (2016), the two categories of receptive and productive skills are used to categorize the four basic English language skills. Speaking and writing are regarded as productive skills, whereas reading and listening are referred to as receptive skills. One of four basic skills, writing is an essential skill that must be mastered in academics because it will aid students’ academic activities. Defazio et al. (2010) define writing as producing writing through developing creativity, problem-solving, feedback, and revision. Besides, as Kane (2003) states, writing conveys everything about ourselves, our perspectives, and our thoughts in written form. So, writing, by its definition, is an activity used to communicate information.

According to Warnock (1983), writing is a complex process. Learners often go through a long and complicated process, such as developing ideas and
arguments, to produce good writing suitable for learners. According to Harmer (2006), there are at least four processes in writing: planning, preparation, editing, and final version, so writing is a challenging thing to do and requires perseverance to practice to improve writing skills. Writing activities also require various skills, such as language accuracy and coherence, good vocabulary, and an understanding of grammar. As a result, writing can be difficult for students, particularly Indonesian students who consider English a foreign language.

There are several factors cause students to need help in writing English. It relates to writing components such as vocabulary, spelling, punctuation, and grammar (Yoandita, 2019). As stated by Septiawan (2020) and Ayu & Viora (2019), students' writing difficulty factors are related to vocabulary and grammatical cases, difficulties in writing coherently, intrinsic factors that include motivation, media, teaching methods, a lack of creativity and approach in teaching, parental support, and learning control. As a result, this becomes a challenge for students when writing.

Based on the result of pre-observation at SMP Negeri 47 Pekanbaru by conducting a pre-interview in the middle of March 2023 with one of the tenth-grade English teachers, the researcher found that students often find many errors in students writing. Errors in their writing may include grammar, word choice, spelling, and other factors. So, the results of students’ writing need to reach the desired score in the writing assessment.

According to one of the tenth-grade English teachers, the difficulties occurred because students were confused about grammar, word choice, and lack of vocabulary. In addition, students also needed to help develop ideas related to topic writing, and students needed more motivation in writing. It happens because the learning method still lacks an approach in writing, namely the "process approach" (Hassanzadeh & Fotoohnejad, 2021). Badger & White (2000) state that in the process approach, learners go through four stages of writing: pre-writing, composing/drafting, revising, and editing. However, the teacher needs to apply this approach to writing class. As a result, students' writing contains numerous errors, resulting in less creativity and understanding.

Based on the description above, Given the prevalence of these errors, particularly among language learners, teachers must help students learn from their mistakes so that they do not repeat them. Teachers frequently offer feedback on students' work, especially written corrective feedback (WCF), to make students aware of any errors in their writing. According to Bitchener & Ferris (2012), Writing corrective feedback is also known as error or grammar correction. It is a writing instruction in the classroom. Mirzaii & Aliabadi (2013) stated that written corrective feedback aims to inform authors of their writing's correctness or incorrectness compared to accepted grammatical norms. Bitchener & Ferris (2012) and Lee (2004) revealed that it is evident that students need to respond to or pay attention to the WCF in order for it to help improve language accuracy.

Among the written corrective feedback type and technology development, one type can be used in the target school: "Automated written corrective feedback (AWCF)." Although feedback is traditionally provided by professors and peers, students can increasingly acquire it from other sources, notably software or programs that offer proofreading capabilities. "The information provided by an AWE tool to its users about grammatical lapses in their written work," according to AWCF as stated (Barrot, 2021). According to Nugroho & Benecia (2022), AWE is an abbreviation for automated writing evaluation. One of the main differences between AWCF and traditional WCF is that AWCF can provide more real-time and comprehensive direct corrections on the students' errors quickly, giving students more time to revise their work.

Grammarly is one of the applications that provides AWCF and used by millions worldwide. Several studies investigated Grammarly with various variables as it gradually established itself as an effective writing assistance and grammar checker (Sanosi, 2022). Nova (2018) investigated three Indonesian students' experiences with Grammarly regarding their perceptions of the application. According to the findings, participants found Grammarly helpful because it offers simple, quick, and free editing services. So, it can improve the student's motivation in writing as they learn independently.
METHODE

This research design used quantitative research to calculate the data obtained from the research results systematically and accurately through statistical measurements. The preparation of quantitative methods is carried out in a systematic and well-planned manner from the beginning of the preparation to the research design so that the research results are structured (Siyoto & Sodik, 2015).

In this quantitative study, the researcher used an experimental design to examine the impact of Automated Written Corrective Feedback on students’ writing ability using Grammarly. An experimental design is a general plan for conducting a study with an active independent variable. The study's internal validity, or the ability to draw valid conclusions about the effect of the experimental treatment on the variable, is determined by design. Participants are assigned to groups for the experiment in a quasi-experimental design, but not at random.

The two main types of quasi-experimental design are pre-test and post-test group designs. In this study, the researcher used a pre-test-post-test group quasi-experimental design. According to (Creswell, 2003), the pre-test and post-test strategies can be used in a quasi-experimental design.

This research compared the experimental group (X) and the control group (Y). The control group is a class that does not give writing feedback using Grammarly. The class gave the writing feedback using Grammarly is indicated as an experimental group. This research’s experimental and control groups were drawn from different students or classes. The formula of quasi-experimental design is described as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Pre-Test</th>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Post-test</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Experimental (G1)</td>
<td>T1</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>T2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Control (G2)</td>
<td>T1</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>T2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It required two courses to do the research. As an experimental and control group, two classes were employed in this investigation. The researcher offered therapy and writing exams for the experimental class. The researcher treated the pupils before administering a writing exam. After being taught with Grammarly, students were given tests to determine their level of achievement. They are only given a test in the control group.

The Technique of Collecting Data, This study involves the participation of SMP Negeri 47 Pekanbaru Kota class IX students in learning to write. In collecting data, the researcher uses a writing test consisting of pre-test and post-test. The test will be given to the class who has been selected as sample during the study. After the pretest is given, it is continued by giving treatment and finally the posttest is carried out after the treatment is given.

1) 1. Pre-test
Pre-test will be conducted at the beginning of the study and has not been given treatment. Pre-test will be given at control and experimental class. The pre-test conducted with the aim of knowing the extent to which students' writing skills were in the recount text. The pre-test will contain instructions along with a choice of topics that students will choose and later they are asked to compose a recount text text based on the ideas and arguments they have. The pre-test will be conducted with a duration of 90 minutes.

2) 2. Treatment
Treatment will be done after students do the pre-test. The experimental class selected as the sample will be given treatment by providing Automated Written Corrective Feedback using Grammarly in recount text lessons. Treatment will be given two times with each meeting for 90 minutes. Meanwhile, control class will not give the treatment.

3) 3. Post-test
Post-test will be given after the experimental class receive treatment. Post-test is conducting to determine the improvement of students' writing ability in recount text and to see whether there is a significant effect of Automated written corrective feedback using Grammarly. The post-test
questions contain a choice of topics related to the previously studied material. The post-test will be conducted with a duration of 90 minutes. Furthermore, control class also conducted post-test to determine difference effect of Automated written corrective feedback using Grammarly between experimental class.

RESEARCH FINDING AND DISCUSSION
A. Data Description
This research was conducted in SMP Negeri 47 Pekanbaru Kota at tenth grade from May 2nd to May 30th, 2023. The researcher used two classes as samples: IX 9 as the experimental class and IX 10 as the control class. For the experimental class, the researcher used Grammarly as a treatment of Automated Written Corrective Feedback, whereas for the control class, there is no treatment. The purpose of this study is to determine whether Automated Written Corrective Feedback significantly effects on Students' Writing at SMP Negeri 47 Pekanbaru in writing recount text.

This study consisted of eight meetings. Four meetings in the experimental class and four meetings in the control class. At the first meeting in the experimental class the researcher gave a pre-test to the students, at the second meeting the researcher gave the treatment using Grammarly as Automated Written Corrective Feedback to the students in experimental class. The third meeting the researcher gave the treatment using Grammarly as Automated Written Corrective Feedback to the students in experimental class. And the last, the researcher gave the student a post-test. In control class, the researcher gave pre-test at the first meeting, at the second meeting the researcher taught writing recount text without treatment. The third meeting the researcher taught researcher taught writing recount text without treatment and the last day the researcher gave post-test to the students in control class.

1. Pre-Test
In this research, the researcher used class IX 9 of SMP Negeri 47 Pekanbaru Kota as the experimental class and IX 10 as the control class. In class IX 9, it consists of 37 students and X 10 consist of 37 students. At first, the researcher was doing Pre-test in order to know the skills of students’ writing skill of writing recount text. Hence, here is the result of the tests score of pre-test experimental class and control class presented in Table 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tabel 1</th>
<th>The Analysis Statistics of Pre-test in Experimental and Control Class</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Experiment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Valid</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>50.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Std. Error of Mean</td>
<td>1.551</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Median</td>
<td>50.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mode</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Std. Deviation</td>
<td>9.435</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Variance</td>
<td>89.023</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Range</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minimum</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maximum</td>
<td>83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sum</td>
<td>1878</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Data Analysis on the 25 SPSS

Based on the data in Table 4.1, the pre-test score of students from Class IX 9 as the experimental class and Class IX 10 as the control class was shown. According to the statistics above, the total pre-test score in the experimental class was 1878, with a mean score of 50.76
and a median score of 50.00. In the control group, the total pre-test score was 1817, with a mean score of 49.11 and a median score of 46.00.

The highest score in the experimental class was 83, whereas the highest score in the control class was 66, according to the diagram above. The lowest score in the experimental class was 29, whereas the lowest score in the control class was 34. In this situation, it is possible to conclude that the experimental class's pre-test scores increased. Furthermore, according to the data in figure 4.1, the students’ writing score on the pre-test of the experimental class increased slightly from the pre-test score.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No</th>
<th>Class</th>
<th>The Total of Students</th>
<th>Mean</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Experimental Class</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>50.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Control Class</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>49.11</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Data Analysis on the 25 SPSS

The value between experimental and control class with the total number of students was 74, according to table 4.2 inform the pre-test results. The mean score of the pre-test in the experimental class (50.76) is higher than in the control class (49.11).

#### 2. Post-Test

After doing a pre-test, classes in experimental are given a treatment using Grammarly as Automated written corrective feedback in writing recount text. In control class, they are taught without getting any kind of treatment like an experimental class which is using Grammarly. Then, after doing the teaching and learning process, the experimental class and the control class were given a post-test. The result of the post-test in both classes are shown in Table 3.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Experiment</th>
<th>Control</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>78.46</td>
<td>72.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Std. Error of Mean</td>
<td>1.349</td>
<td>1.606</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Median</td>
<td>79.00</td>
<td>71.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mode</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Std. Deviation</td>
<td>8.208</td>
<td>9.767</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Variance</td>
<td>67.366</td>
<td>95.401</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Range</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minimum</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maximum</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sum</td>
<td>2903</td>
<td>2677</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Data Analysis on the 25 SPSS

According to the statistics in Table 4.3, the total score of the pre-test in the experimental class was 2903, with a mean score of 78.46, a median of 79.00, and a standard deviation of 8.208. The total post-test score in the control group was 2677, with a mean score of 72.35, a median of 71.00, and a standard deviation of 9.767.

The highest score in the experimental class was 95, while the highest score in the control class was 93, according to the diagram above. The lowest score in the experimental class was 59, whereas the lowest score in the control class was 54. In this situation, it is possible to conclude that the experimental class's post-test scores increased. Furthermore, according to the data in figure 4.2, the students’ post-test writing score of the experimental class was greater than the post-test writing score of the control class.
Table 4
The Data Description of Post-test

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No</th>
<th>Class</th>
<th>The Total of Students</th>
<th>Mean</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Experimental Class</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>78.46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Control Class</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>72.35</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Data Analysis on the 25 SPSS

The value between experimental and control class with the total number of students was 74, according to Table 4.4 inform the post-test scores. The mean score of the pre-test in the experimental class (78.46) is higher than in the control class (72.35). Furthermore, the table shows that the post-test results differ significantly between experimental and control groups. The experimental class outperformed the control class in this session.

B. Prerequisite Test Analysis

The researcher conducted a preliminary analysis in this study before analyzing the t-test data value. The primary data analysis consisted of normality and homogeneity test. Both tests have functions to see whether the data were distributed normally and whether the data was homogeneous or not. To find out the data’s normality and homogeneity, the researcher used IBM SPSS Statistics 25. The result of the preliminary analysis can be seen as follows:

1. Test of Normality

The normality of the test is one of the prerequisites for measuring the study's data. In this study, the researcher used Kolmogorov-Smirnov techniques to assess the normality of the data and determine if the data were distributed normally.

Table 5
Test of Normality

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Class</th>
<th>Kolmogorov-Smirnov&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt; Statistic</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
<th>Shapiro-Wilk Statistic</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total_Score</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Experimental Class</td>
<td>.131</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>.108</td>
<td>.971</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>.439</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Control Class</td>
<td>.138</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>.072</td>
<td>.962</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>.232</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<sup>a</sup> Lilliefors Significance Correction

Data Source: Data Analysis on the 25 SPSS

According to Table 4.5, the normality test employed above is Kolmogorov-Smirnov. Furthermore, according to the significance level of 0.05, the significance value (Sig.) of the normality test in the experimental class was 0.108, whereas the normality test in the control class was 0.072. However, if the significance value is more than that, the data can be considered to be regularly distributed (significance level). According to the data in Table 4.5, \( p (0.108 > 0.05) \) and \( (0.072 > 0.05) \) indicate that in this study, the experimental class data was distributed normally and the control class data was distributed normally.

2. Test of Homogeneity

The researcher performed the homogeneity test after doing the normality test to see if the data was normally distributed or not. The goal of the homogeneity test was to determine the similarity of the sample from the experimental and control classes. To calculate the homogeneity of the test, the researcher employed the Levene statistic test in IBM SPSS Statistic 25. The test results for homogeneity are provided below:
Based on the data in Table 4.8, the significant value (Sig.) between the experimental and control groups was 0.27. As a result, the data can be considered to be homogeneous if the significance value is more than the significance threshold (0.05). As a result, it may be determined that the data from the experimental and control groups were homogenous since it was more than significant (0.27>0.05).

3. T-Test

The independent samples t-test compares two unrelated sets of means to see if there is statistical evidence that the associated population means are substantially different. The T-test formula was utilized by the researcher in IBM SPSS statistic version 25.
of the t-table to determine its significance. In psychological and educational research, the significance threshold is commonly set at 5% (0.05). The number of subjects in this study is 74, with a degree of freedom (df) of 72. The formula may be used to calculate the degree of freedom (n2). The crucial value shown on the t-table for 5% significant level and 72 degree of freedom is 1.666. t-value is 2.912, and it demonstrates that t-value is higher than t-table (2.912 > 1.666). As a result, the null hypothesis (Ho) is rejected, whereas the alternative hypothesis (Ha) is accepted.

DISCUSSION

Students at the tenth grade of SMP Negeri 47 Pekanbaru Kota lacked adequate writing skills. They had lack on developing ideas, motivation in writing and also had difficulties in grammatical. After they took the treatment, there was an improvement in their writing skill. The result of T-Test table and the students' score in the aspect of writing skill was increase. It can be seen that the sig (2-tailed) was 0.005 < 0.05.

According to the study, the brief discussion influenced the students' writing scores. Despite its widespread use in EFL classrooms and significant benefits, Grammarly as an automated writing evaluation (AWE) tool, is under-represented in AWCF research (Guo et al., 2022). AWCF was implemented in the EFL classroom to account for teachers' heavy workloads, which prevent them from accurately following their students' writing (Burstein, Chodorow, and Leacock 2004). It was discovered that Grammarly as Automated Written Corrective Feedback checks students' spelling, grammar, word choice, tone, and plagiarism effectively (Sanosi, 2022). Automated Written Corrective Feedback has positif impact on students' writing that they improve students' written, i.e. content, organization, grammar, vocabulary, punctuation, and other writing mechanics, in the long or short term. As a result of automated feedback, student will enhance their own writing. While studying, student will create their writing by themselves, which will help them understand about content, organization, grammar, vocabulary, punctuation, and other writing mechanics by themselves. Especially in the concept of grammar and mechanics, student will understand which correct grammar they use in their writing. In terms of vocabulary, the student will acquire some new words from the feedback that they must write appropriate in their writing, as well as some new words to boost their English vocabulary. In content and organization, student can create more ideas and detail in their writing, so they may improve their quality in writing. Finally, students can comprehend the subject of the writing being discussed using the Grammarly as Automated Written Corrective Feedback.

The researcher found a problem in the class when conducting this investigation. Researchers faced challenges in controlling the class at the first meeting of this study because this research was carried out in a computer laboratory using an internet network. Before learning begins, students use computers to watch YouTube. Then after starting, students follow the instructions that have been given. However, when the teaching and learning process takes place, suddenly, the network error and the computer turn off. However, some of these obstacles can be directly overcome by researchers so that students can follow the learning and teaching process properly.

Based on the pre-test and post-test results, the reference was the highest score in the pre-test and post-test. In contrast, inference had the lowest writing aspect score. Although the lowest score of the writing components remained inference following the treatments, the student's scores improved, as evidenced by their post-test results. The experimental class had significantly more growing points than the control class. This is reinforced by previous research (Nugroho & Benecia, 2022) which compares both groups to determine whether Grammarly is more effective than the lecturer's traditional feedback. The study's findings reveal that the feedback provided by the lecturer and the feedback from Grammarly is more effective in improving the students' writing. In addition, the students from both groups generally have a positive view of the necessity of the feedback and feel that they are more or less able to improve their writing after receiving the feedback, either from the lecturer or from Grammarly. Another research by (Hassanzadeh & Fotoohnejad, 2021) shows that the within-group findings revealed that after receiving automated WCF for several weeks, the experimental group's writing scores improved significantly from the pre-test to the post-test. Except for the first and second rounds of scores, there was significant
progress on all scores obtained from the five essays assigned to this group. When comparing computer- and teacher-administered WCF, it was discovered that the former was more efficient. Overall, the findings provide a deeper understanding of the workings of an automated evaluation tool and how it was used in the L2 classroom to improve assessment consistency and alleviate the burden traditionally placed on teachers. Guo et al., (2022) also shows that using Grammarly as automated written corrective feedback is effective and can improve students' motivation in writing. The latest research by (Tambunan et al., 2022) Grammarly is very good at detecting errors and providing student feedback. So that students can understand and apply good and correct writing. This effectively improve their writing skill.

Based on the results of statistical data in the previous explanation, significant changes occurred not only in the mean score but also in the median score. The data shows the median score in the experimental class is 79.00, while in the control class in the median score is 71.00. In addition, the use of the test in this research was also proven by the result of t-test, for 5% of significance level and 72 degrees of freedom, the critical value that showed on the t-table is 1.666, t-value is 2.912, and it shows that t-value is lower than t-table (2.912> 1.666). This is supported by (Hassanzadeh & Fotoohnejad, 2021) his research presented that the result of data analysis in the experimental group, the repeated-measures ANOVA test run for the comparison group scores also pointed to a significant improvement from pretest to posttest; Wilks' Lambda = 0.58, F(1, 25) =18.35, p <0.001, ηp2 = 0.42.

According to the following explanation, the effect of using Grammarly as Automated Written Corrective Feedback has a significant effect on students' writing skills at tenth grade students of SMP Negeri 47 Pekanbaru Kota. It means that this research enriches the previous research that was conducted by (Hassanzadeh & Fotoohnejad, 2021) which already mentioned above.

CONCLUSION

Based on the data analysis, hypothesis, and discussion in the preceding chapter, the conclusion is that there is a considerable Grammarly as Automated Written Corrective Feedback on students' writing at SMP Negeri 47 Pekanbaru in the academic year 2022/2023. The t-test validates this assertion. The 2-tailed Sig. was 0.005 < 0.05. The result of the students' scores is typically a rise from the pretest to the posttest following treatment. It may be demonstrated by increasing the mean score. The mean score before treatment is 50.76, whereas the mean score after treatment is 78.46. It falls under the category of good. Furthermore, the t-value resulted in 2.912. The researcher then consults the 5% crucial value on the t-table (0.05). In conclusion, this study underscores the potential benefits of automated written corrective feedback in enhancing students' writing proficiency at SMP Negeri 47 Pekanbaru. The positive outcomes highlighted the significance of incorporating technology in language learning. They provided valuable insights for educators seeking to optimize writing instruction strategies, so using Grammarly as Automated Written Corrective Feedback (AWCF) significantly improves students' writing skills.
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