

CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

This chapter presented two part of discussion, there are theoretical studies and previous studies. Theoretical studies are comprising some of the related theorists of the study while previous studies are presenting similar studies that have been done before.

2.1 Theoretical Framework

2.1.1 How Grammarly works in L2 Writing

One of the important aspects of writing skill is the ability of Lexico-Grammatical features or grammar (Pujiawati, 2018). However, it is the greatest difficulty faced by students, resulting many grammatical errors found in their writings so which makes the lecturer overwhelmed when giving correction. Therefore, students' writing error should be corrected and reduced through the lecturer's stimulation such as giving written corrective feedback.

Yunus & Salehi (2012) are well recognized during this digitalizing age for coding technology (Automatic Internet application) which can help them learn and study, such as Wike, Twitter, Ms. Word, Grammar software and others. An online learning assistant which is recommended to be used in the EFL writing class is 'Grammarly' (Automatic Internet Programs and Mobile app). It is an electronic database for the proofreading of grammatical texts. It also provides improvements for pronunciation, punctuation, synonyms (use of vocabulary) and the prevention of plagiarism.

The students write their own writing using word processing in computer that computer tells the writers' error in such things; capitalization, punctuation, and spelling. Then, students consulted their own writing produced to Grammarly, an online rater. The use of technology here is to help the teacher and students to revise their own writing in process as Gebhard stated, "As with other language skills, computer technology has opened up new ways for teachers and students to process writing" (Gebhard, 2006).

Grammarly helps teachers and students correct EFL writing, even though teachers has applied several teaching online and offline methods, ways, strategies, or even resources (Daniels & Leslie, 2013). This is since Grammarly not only can distinguish punctuation (such as missed spaces between periods) and errors in orthographer's spelling, including proper nouns, and provide numerous alternative options for the dispeller's terms. That the teachers are responsible to give such a feedback or correction toward students writing to improve and encourage the quality and accuracy in mastering writing skills, several mistakes dealing with grammatical, structure, spelling, or even the word choices should be highlighted (Wichadee, 2013). The teachers seek to analyze the application of grammar in minimizing mistakes that learners have made in terms of syntax, vocabulary, and semantics (spelling and punctuation), to cope with the above-mentioned problems. When errors are detected, the teacher highlights the paper. Such work will help educators and researchers to recognize and understand how computer software like Grammarly can contribute to the learning of English. For this reason, Fast Company has identified Grammarly as one of the most innovative AI companies in the world.

Besides, it might be possible to better understand how EFL learners, especially in terms of writing, could develop their language skills through online software or even through their own smartphone. With this awareness, researchers and practitioners may build unique, relevant and innovative pedagogical concepts or approaches that use Grammarly effectively for EFL training. Despite the fact that there have been several articles conferring this case, the researchers aim to focus primary on proofing how Grammarly is fully beneficial for EFL students as the assistant helping the teachers to guide the students on writing activities, so this articles will deeply justify on defining Grammarly and its features, then how to implement Grammarly in teaching writing in EFL calssroom.

Here is a number of alternative and innovative spelling and grammar tools are appearing. That is Grammarly was able to identify the missing spaces after the periods and the spelling mistakes, including the proper noun and provided several alternative possibilities for the misspelled words. It also provided weaker writers with a “corrected version” of an error rather than lengthy grammar explanations and it corrected the most grammar errors (Daniels & Leslie, 2013)

Typically, grammar checkers work by scanning through a text and providing immediate feedback on grammar, spelling, and punctuation errors (Cavelery & Dianati, 2016). Grammar checkers can highlight issues such as subject-verb disagreement, split infinitives, double negatives, run-on sentences and incorrect use of prepositions. If the checker finds an error, it will explain the grammar rule and may also offer a solution which the user can accept or ignore.

The checkers also highlight spelling errors and words that may have been confused. Some grammar checkers also offer feedback on style and vocabulary

usage. Style is difficult to check because the intricacies of language require extensive artificial intelligence, but some grammar checkers also claim to have this capability. For example, some checkers will flag sentences that are written in the passive voice or indicate that a particular word may have been overused. Hence, many grammar checkers actually claim to do more than just check grammar. An important point to note is that grammar checkers do not claim to teach grammar; they are a tool to bring potential problems to the writers attention.

Despite their growing popularity, research into online grammar checkers is limited. Vernon (2000) conducted a review of the literature of computerised grammar checkers from 1990-2000 and concluded that research on grammar checkers has largely not kept pace with the technology. Since Vernons' paper, several studies on grammar checkers have emerged. Burston (2008) investigated the applications, implications, effectiveness, and accuracy of a French online grammar checking program called BonPatron and found that out of 335 purposefully incorrect errors, the program detected 296 of them (88%). This was consistent with Nadasdi and Sinclair's (2007) findings who commented that the program is just as effective as teacher corrections. Another study also examined BonPatronPro and concluded that the program increased linguistic accuracy by "40 times" and also increased engagement (Gauthier, 2013, p. 24). Similarly, research by Potter and Fuller (2008) found that the use of English grammar checkers for high school students increased students' motivation, engagement and confidence in grammar rules and English language proficiency.

2.1.2 Grammarly Benefits in L2 Writing

Grammarly has been trending topic as a research that exists on its performance within university settings. Some of Universities are increasingly looking towards online technology to assist their students. Grammarly advertises itself as the world's most accurate online grammar checker that responded positively by most of students as grammar adviser that helps them in their writing progress (Cavaleri & Dianati, 2016; Neill & Russell, 2019).

This online feedback also can provide the opportunity for online collaboration and hence can allow students to enhance their writing skill in a better and more exciting way compared with traditional methods (Lund, 2008; Qassemzadeh & Soelaimani, 2016). In line with the research that carried out by Bikowski and Vithanage, (2016); Parra and Calero, (2019) contend that one of the main advantages of social technologies is that they facilitate collaborative writing this is why collaborative writing with technologies has received increasing attention in recent years and achieving the desirable outcomes in the development of writing skill.

Grammarly helps teachers and students correct EFL writing, even though teachers has applied several teaching—online and offline—methods, ways, strategies, or even resources (Daniels & Leslie, 2013). This is since Grammarly not only can distinguish punctuation (such as missed spaces between periods) and errors in orthographer's spelling, including proper nouns, and provide numerous alternative options for the dispeller's terms. That the teachers are responsible to give such a feedback or correction toward students writing to improve and encourage the quality and accuracy in mastering writing skills, several mistakes

dealing with grammatical, structure, spelling, or even the word choices should be highlighted (Wichadee, 2013). The teachers seek to analyze the application of grammar in minimizing mistakes that learners have made in terms of syntax, vocabulary, and semantics (spelling and punctuation), to cope with the above-mentioned problems. When errors are detected, the teacher highlights the paper. Such work will help educators and researchers to recognize and understand how computer software like Grammarly can contribute to the learning of English. For this reason, Fast Company has identified Grammarly as one of the most innovative AI companies in the world.

Besides, it might be possible to better understand how EFL learners, especially in terms of writing, could develop their language skills through online software or even through their own smartphone. With this awareness, researchers and practitioners may build unique, relevant and innovative pedagogical concepts or approaches that use Grammarly effectively for EFL training. Despite the fact that there have been several articles conferring this case, the researchers aim to focus primary on proving how Grammarly is fully beneficial for EFL students as the assistant helping the teachers to guide the students on writing activities, so this articles will deeply justify on defining Grammarly and its features, then how to implement Grammarly in teaching writing in EFL calssroom.

As technology develops and computer facilities become more widely available, the role of the computer in delivering and mediating feedback has become a focus for research. In addition, changes in university sources of funding and student demographic distributions have meant a marked increase in the provision of distance courses and online research supervision. In more local

contexts of instruction, writing workshops have also been extended through the use of computer networks that allow students to exchange writing with each other and with the teacher and receive comments without the need for face-to-face interaction. Some researchers claim that these technological developments can empower students and make writing classes more collaborative (Hyland & Hyland, 2006).

There some additional reasons to choose Grammarly that revealed by Japos (2013) after conducting a study of undergraduate research student and found that Grammarly improved their written accuracy. Qassemzadeh and Soleimani (2016) concluded that Grammarly performed better than traditional teacher intervention with regards to long-term retention of passive voice rules. Students in a study by Reis and Huijser (2016) preferred Grammarly to the alternative feedback system Marking Mate. Results from Cavaleri and Dianati's (2016) investigation of students' perceptions of Grammarly within an Australian higher education setting were also largely positive, with students stating that Grammarly was useful and easy to use. They also maintained that it improved their written work and helped develop their understanding of grammatical rules.

So for the use of such a software in this kind of environment like traditional face to face teaching and learning, there must be some kinds of reactions for the learners to internalize the learning material in the context of learning. Many studies have been done on the effect of feedback on language grammar. The gap here in the EFL literature is, to the researchers' knowledge and literature review, that few studies have been done on CALL-based software especially no studies on Grammarly Software; therefore, we attempted to

investigate whether feedback provision by Grammarly software and teachers dose have any effect on making better the knowledge of the passive structures of the Iranian EFL learners. It goes without saying that each language is consisted a large number of grammatical rules. Therefore, for the sake of the easiness of the study, this study will aim at the instruction of passive structures.

This software does not only help teachers to assess learners' progress but also raises the students' awareness and makes progress in a course. The last thing is somewhat ignored by many people that apparently some of the students are have an anxiety that prefer to learn individually and grammarly can help them through the learning process by themselves so that create a more relaxed atmosphere in learning (Saileek, 2009).

2.1.3 Metalinguistic Development in L2 Learning

Metalinguistic generally has defined by Chomsky, (1975) as the subject knowledge of the characteristics and structures of language. In the context of the present study, L2 metalinguistic knowledge is defined as a learner's explicit knowledge about the syntactic, morphological, lexical, phonological, and pragmatic features of the L2 (Roehr & Gutierrez, 2009). It includes explicit knowledge that can be brought into awareness that is potentially available for verbal report, and is represented declaratively. The use of metalanguage is likely to develop L2 learner's metalinguistic awareness easier such as improving students' self-awareness and sensitivity to the forms and functions of language' (Carter, 2003), which can lead to language development (Berry, 2005). It may play an important role in L2 learners' comprehension (Alipour, 2014).

Metalinguistic awareness is the ability to reflect on and manipulate the structural features of language. Different aspects of metalinguistic awareness can be defined with respect to particular language features. For example, a child's level of syllable awareness might be measured by asking the child to count the number of syllables in a word, or to say what the word would sound like if the initial syllable were removed. Syntactic awareness might be assessed by asking children to correct errors in the order of words in a sentence.

Interest in the concept of metalinguistic awareness has been growing recently in the fields of psychology and language education, with particular focus on reading. The relationship between metalinguistic awareness and language learning promises to be a fruitful area of research for those interested in multilingualism (Thomas, 1992). At the same time, there is increasing interest in language learning strategies, variables affecting a student's choice of such strategies, and strategy training.

In her later work Bialystok (1986) defines metalinguistic ability as an emerging ability that reflects gradual progress with underlying cognitive skills which she refers to as the analysis of knowledge and the control of cognitive operations. As language development takes place so the child structures and organizes an implicit body of language and gradually moves toward "representations of knowledge that include explicit features for the structure of that knowledge". This is what Bialystok means by analysis of language. Control of cognitive operations refers to the degree of intentionality of cognitive processing involved in solving specific problems. In relation to control in

language Bialystok argues that as children develop they are freed from focusing on the meaning of language to treat language as a system.

The issue of metalinguistic terminology in language teaching has been approached from a number of angles. Several writers have discussed the relative merits of its use in the L2 classroom, ranging from the unashamedly positive (Berman, 1979) to the fundamentally opposed (Garrett, 1986), with, in between, a possible majority of the cautiously positive (Carter, 1995; Lewis, 2000; Mohammed, 1994; Woods, 1994). Two Others have taken a more descriptive approach, taking the use of metalinguistic terminology as a given and looking at teachers' beliefs about it (e.g. Borg, 1999) or attitudes towards its use (Berry, 2001) or teachers' knowledge of it (Andrews, 1998), with a view to informing pedagogic practice. However, it is rare to find a focus on learner knowledge of terminology.

Several studies have used terminology as a 'tool' to investigate metalinguistic knowledge/awareness, either in the context of concern about a call for greater metalinguistic knowledge among modern language students in the United Kingdom (Alderson, Clapham, & Steel, 1997; Steel & Alderson, 1994) or in studies investigating the role of formal instruction (Han & Ellis, 1998; Macaro & Masterman, 2006). Steel and Alderson (1994) and Alderson et al. (1997) looked into the relationship between metalinguistic knowledge and language proficiency (as well as language aptitude) in English university students learning French, using a test of metalinguistic knowledge that relied heavily on terminology. They concluded that there was little connection between

metalinguistic knowledge and language proficiency, a finding echoed by Han and Ellis (1998).

Metalinguistic awareness is not typical of normal language use; people usually attend to the message being conveyed rather than to the linguistic elements which convey it. The normal process by which one produces or understands language does not generate answers to metalinguistic questions such as "How many words were in that sentence?" or "How many phonemes were in that word?"

According to Berry (2005) without essential metalinguistic awareness such as present perfect, adjective, and noun, students will have problems in understanding details by educators and textbooks for such test things. Metalanguage needs defining and explaining itself to be assumed by the audience before it can be used to explain another language. In traditional language settings, students are frequently exposed to precise instruction and education where systematic description and explanation of different aspects of second language is permitted. This provides an opportunity for teachers and applied linguistics researchers to create the environment of the connection between foreign language ability and their foreign language metalinguistic awareness, or precise awareness about the second language (Roehr, 2006).

Nowrozi (2011) reveals that explicit awareness is equivalent to metalinguistic awareness and it is typically considered as the students' ability to describe the language and its structures such as phonemes, while implicit awareness is described as using these structures in written or spoken forms of language.

In measuring students' writing performance, it is not only about linguistic but also metalinguistic which is including as a component of writing performance. In some recent study that conducted by Chen (2015) that metalinguistic performance consists of two parts; both are metalinguistic awareness and strategies. Both of them based on two assumptions bellow. First, the open environment of blogs might help students to have a better metalinguistic awareness of English because they could view the whole class' blogs that expose them to more writing and language data (Simsek, 2009). On the other hand, the learners have access to information on learning English and useful learning strategies through the hyperlinks shared by their peers.

Prior to measuring the students' metalinguistic performance, brief reflection training was conducted before students' learning journals were collected. Sample data from the researcher's pilot study in blogging to write were first presented to show what a learning journal might look like. Students then were advised to note down any writing problems that they would encounter and learning strategies they might resort to in solving the problems. Gombert's (1992) classification of metalinguistic abilities in writing, which includes meta-lexical, metamorphological, meta-syntactic, meta-semantic, meta-pragmatic, and meta-textual aware-ness, was used to sort out the data of metalinguistic awareness. The two classes then were compared with each other by running a series of chi-square tests on the number of times they attended to segments that involve metalinguistic awareness. On the other hand, the classification of metacognitive strategies in Oxford's (1990) strategy coding system was adapted to sort out the data of metalinguistic strategies. Under the category of "centering your learning", an

entry related to writing was added, i.e., delaying written production to focus on reading. While under the category of “arranging and planning your learning”, two entries were modified to make them more writing-related instead of general language learning. A series of chi-square tests were also run to show whether the two classes differed significantly from each other in terms of the numbers employing metalinguistic strategies throughout the course.

In learning second language, therefore, learners also need to possess and demonstrate both sentence processing skill and metalinguistic ability to enhance their level of ultimate second language knowledge and skills attainment. It becomes considerable evidence that metalinguistic performance plays an important role in learning how to read (Hu, 2002; Misesani, 2019). Children with deficient or inefficient comprehension and production processes might have to rely on their metalinguistic abilities to learn certain aspects of language.

In a study by Thomas (1988) English-Spanish bilinguals were found to have advantages over monolingual English students when learning French in a formal classroom environment. The college students with prior knowledge of Spanish performed significantly better than the monolingual students on tests of vocabulary (recognition of cognates) and grammar (selecting a grammatically appropriate closure for a sentence stem) where there was time for them to exploit their explicit or analyzed linguistic knowledge. Thomas suggests that students used their metalinguistic awareness to facilitate their performance on the tasks focused on language forms. In addition, the bilingual students learning French as a third language produced compositions that were ranked as more comprehensible to native speakers of French than did their monolingual counterparts. Thomas

concludes that the bilingual subjects' metalinguistic awareness also functioned to monitor linguistic output on a communicative task where their attention was focused on the message.

Metalinguistically aware second-language readers will be in a position to capitalize on overlaps between their first and second languages (Nagy & Anderson, 1995). Appearances can be deceiving, however, so the second language reader who looks for simple one-to-one correspondences between the two languages will often go astray. Further metacognitive and metalinguistic sophistication is required to check interpretations against context and knowledge of the topic, but the same can be said about first-language readers trying to use the known to chart the unknown. Thus, though learning to read in a second language offers increased opportunities for metalinguistic awareness, it also places additional metalinguistic demands on the learner. Children with limited metalinguistic awareness may be especially vulnerable in second-language reading acquisition, and attention to the metalinguistic demands of second-language literacy is therefore all the more important.

Watson and Newman (2017) were talking about metalinguistic understanding, focusing on metasemantic, metasyntactic and metatextual reflections, and probing students' ability to link these to metapragmatic concerns. However, here it is suggested that this may be a particular artifact of the need for a specialized metalanguage for discussing syntax.

2.1.4 Grammatical Awareness in L2 Writing

Grammar has become a central position because it is one of the elements of the language which should be mastered. Mastering grammar of language will affect the mastery of language skills (Effendy, Rokhyati, Rahman, Rakhmawati, & Pertiwi (2017). Several researchers reveal that enhancing learner's grammatical awareness leads to several functions. English students require a good grasp of grammatical awareness to help them develop the target language (Shuib, 2009). It can be concluded that having a grammatical awareness plays an important role in L2 learning because the things that will help the students formulate how to say what they mean are awareness and understanding on how a structure works (Azar, 2007).

The importance of having grammatical awareness among English language teachers has been emphasised by many scholars for various reasons. Denham and Lobeck (2002), for instance, states that many English education textbooks point out that teachers must be aware of certain grammatical fundamentals in order to help students recognise patterns of errors. Azar (2007) states that it is the teacher's job to clarify grammar information for students. Andrews (2005) argues that both "initial and continuing teachers" should have access to grammar knowledge. According to him, "a teacher with a rich knowledge of grammatical constructions will be in a better position to help young writers".

Grammatical awareness is divided into four types, those are metalanguage recognition, metalanguage production, identification and grammatical error correct correction, and grammatical rules explanation, (Shuib, 2009). The first

type is the ability to recognize metalanguage. The second type is the ability to produce appropriate metalanguage terms. The third type 3 is the ability to identify and correct errors. The last type is the ability to explain grammatical rules. Each type focuses on a diverse aspect of explicit knowledge of grammar and grammatical terminology. First type is concerned with the identification of grammatical categories such as pronoun, noun, and verb. Second type focuses on the production of appropriate meta-linguistic terms involving the capability to provide grammatical terms of a given word/ phrase. Third type refers to identification and correction of errors, dwelling on the ability to recognize and correct faulty sentences or parts of sentences. The last type focuses on grammatical rules governing the use of grammar, especially during provision of input.

Despite the high importance of having grammatical awareness various scholars such as Beard (1999), as cited in Cajkler and Hislam (2002), have noted that regardless of years of experience in English teaching, many teachers still lack grammatical awareness or knowledge about language. The situation appears to be similar in Malaysia. Studies such as Mohd. Sofi Ali (2002) have demonstrated that ESL teachers lack sufficient English language proficiency to teach the subject.

While there have been many studies on grammatical awareness of learners of English as a second language, there have been very few studies on grammatical awareness of English language teachers. One related study is Nurazila (2007) which looks at grammatical awareness of prospective English language teachers in a teacher training institution. There have been no studies to date on

grammatical awareness of practising English language teachers in Malaysia at both primary and secondary school level.

Despite the high importance of having grammatical awareness among English learners, in fact, many students still have lack of grammatical awareness in learning English. In the line with this, Han and Kim (2017) claimed that EFL learners have lack of grammatical awareness and they have a low proficiency level. Some students did not know the correct grammatical features due to lack of knowledge and grammatical competency (Refnita, 2014).

It is highly believed that there are many components needed in any instructional programs and learning processes. One important thing, among the others, to build linguistic competence and language awareness on EFL is the grammar instruction. Well-programmed of grammatical instructions and professional execution at classrooms may build better linguistic competence and language awareness on the foreign language. Moreover, the success of EFL learning becomes higher if it is supported by appropriate assessments and school's facilities. It is sure that the ideal outcomes are not always easy to be obtained as they are orally mentioned.

Zhang and Hung (2014) explored the effectiveness of integrating awareness in a grammar course for second-year students at one English as a Foreign Language (EFL) university in China. They concluded that this strategy encouraged participants' positive feelings towards grammar and their motivation to use cognitive strategies such as analyzing the target language, which improved their writing and reading skills. On the other hand, Andrew's (1994) study to characterize English grammar knowledge and awareness among 141 English-as-a-

Second-Language teachers and teacher trainees in Hong Kong revealed that although participants exhibited different levels of confidence, abilities and knowledge toward the grammar system and terminology, which varied according to their previous learning and teaching experiences, all of them agreed on the importance of knowing grammar rules and grammar terminology as part of their training.

Language awareness and grammatical competence normally have significant contribution to all language skills (language performance), and they may give more meaningful supports to writing skill. According to Brown (2001), one category of principles of language learning and teaching is that how learners deal with complex linguistic systems, so called the linguistic principles. Ideally, the linguistic principles include native language effect, inter-language, and communicative competence. In accordance with this, a lot of grammatical features of English should be learned and known by the EFL learners in order to have language awareness and communicative competence. Language awareness (or language consciousness) is the speakers' psychological and personal condition by which they know and are able to use particular forms and grammatical constructions of languages in verbal communication. The grammatical competence and knowledge, in systematic-complex systems, naturally build the language awareness of speakers that lead them to be skillful users, both in oral and written communication (see further Brown, 2001; Yip in Odlin (ed.), 1994; Andrews in Bygate et.al. (eds.), 1994).

Given that grammar benefits language learning, it can help the students to connect their knowledge of grammar to language production particularly in the

forms of production tests, writing and makes learning grammatical structures easier (Alipour, 2014). Students need to use standard grammar and adhere to grammatical conventions to succeed in academic writing at universities (Cavaleri & Dianati, 2016). However, they cannot improve their language skills without input. Lee (1997) explains that students fail to correct errors not because they lack grammatical knowledge but because they cannot detect the errors.

In writing activity, the students need some feedback from the lecturer to hone their writing skill, especially for Grammar because the common errors writing found by the lecturer is grammatical complexity. Grammatical complexity can be seen as a function of salience. In the narrow sense, salience is equated with the frequency with which a feature arises in the input a learner receives (Graus & Copen, 2015). It can also be related to the form, function, and meaning of a grammar feature. There are several factors that make a structure difficult or easy to learn which yielded three broad categories. First, the complexity from the point of view of the grammar structure itself: its form, use, meaning, and salience. Next, the consideration of complexity in terms of the pedagogical rules needed to express the linguistic feature in question. Last, the problematicity, i.e. whether or not learning a grammar point constitutes a problem from a learner's perspective (Ellis, 2008).

In some cases, the lecturer may feel that it is not their responsibility to provide detailed grammatical feedback on students' papers, or they may not feel confident that they have the ability on how to explain complex grammatical rules (Jones, Myhill & Bailey, 2013). To overcome this case, either lecturer or students should find an innovative way concerning corrective feedback, Grammar in

particular. Thus, Grammarly comes in handy because it can help the students to be corrective feedback for their writing and considering as reflection for the students in their writing error.

Although research on grammatical awareness is not new, it is remarkably important in the field of language teaching education. In fact, Svalberg and Askham's (2014) study on how a student in a master's-level teacher education course in England builds her grammar knowledge ratifies that awareness helps to create analytical mindsets which promote better pedagogical practices. Similarly, Shuib's (2009) analysis of the level of grammatical awareness among in-service primary English teachers in Malaysia highlights the role of teachers' understanding and consciousness toward grammar rules and terms in correcting errors made by students in the classroom. Since the study evidenced participants' lack of grammar knowledge, which may affect their teaching practices, it advocates for giving more emphasis to grammar exposure in teacher language training. In addition, the author calls for more studies that consider English language teachers' needs regarding their grammatical awareness. Altogether, by developing grammatical awareness, prospective English teachers would be better positioned to guide their future learners towards an appropriate use of the foreign language grammar system and to efficiently engage in academic writing.

2.1.5 Issues in L2 Writing

Writing has been recognized as a complicated skill that should be mastered by English foreign learner students. Many teachers' perceptions also revealed that writing is one of the productive skills of the language most difficult

to learn and therefore to teach that demands careful attention on accuracy due to its complex process of communication (Hyland & Hyland, 2006). This difficulty is felt by students in general and more so among second language (L2) and multilingual students (Morton, Storch, & Thompson, 2015).

writing skills, as part of future language teachers' training, is fundamental in a context where educators are expected to perform beyond teaching-learning scenarios to be actively involved in scientific production. Actually, pre-service teachers are often demanded by their educators to produce a substantial volume of academic texts in diverse courses. Nonetheless, with the advent of communicative approaches for language teaching and learning, a debate on the suitability of explicit grammar teaching to develop such skills has been raised. Regarding the way prospective teachers are being taught the language, Andrews (1999) states that there is a "switch of attention from teaching the language system to teaching the language as communication" (p. 161). In this attempt, many language teachers tend to disregard grammar, forgetting that it contributes to meaning making (Shen, 2012).

The learning and teaching of writing in a second language is seen as doubly difficult since the linguistic constraints add to the complexity of the task (Widdowson, 1983) and might often mean that writers in a second language attend to linguistic concerns from the very beginning, unlike their first language counterparts who seem to deal with language only after the initial ideas are articulated (Shuy & Robinson, 1990). Added to these linguistic constraints are the numerous contextual constraints imposed by the classroom and the school. In a place like Hong Kong, many findings regarding the effective teaching of writing

from other countries have limited applicability (see for example, Ammon, 1985; Urzua, 1987). Ammon (1985) speaks of two effective writing lessons where the two separate ESL teachers were able to achieve breadth of instruction without sacrificing the depth. This, Ammon feels, was possible by individualizing instruction. In his study, children were involved in activities that addressed their own particular needs. These classes consisted, on average, of nine children (p. 66). However, such practices in Hong Kong classes containing over 40 students would be difficult to imagine.

The students were generally in the 16- to 25-year-old range, possessed excellent speaking skills, were able to perform well on standard, fill-in-the blank, multiple choice, and/or matching style grammar assessments, could use very basic linguistic meta-language, and read English newspapers. The students were not able to perform higher order reading and listening tasks such as making inferences. Their vocabulary sets were limited. And finally, when faced with the prospect of a producing written work, they were absolutely stumped. They did not know where to begin, often sat staring into space awaiting the end of class, and would return to the next class with a completed product that not only didn't adhere to the parameters of the assignment, but also was rife with obvious and pathetic plagiarism (Vanderpyl, 2012). While the issue of plagiarism was a very serious one, a more serious issue had reared its ugly head: the nature of their previous writing instruction, re-writing model texts, had been so engrained in their heads and accepted for so long by their teachers, that they had no knowledge of an alternative way of doing things and therefore, couldn't rightly be held liable for, nor disciplined for, their actions.

Writing instruction is often hampered by a strict interpretation of the curriculum of a program. Teachers are accountable for covering a certain number of units in a textbook, for completing a certain number of writing assignments, for taking a certain number of tests, etc...The name of the game is “business” and boxes must be ticked in order to please stakeholders. Teachers who defy school administrators for the good of the student often find themselves fighting an unwinnable battle.

It has been found that there are a lot of grammatical problems either errors or mistakes made by the learners in writing simple paragraphs. Many grammatical problems can be assigned as their carelessness because those should not have been problems anymore; the grammatical features are academically believed as the basic ones, in fact. The problems frequently appeared in the students’ writings and they are easily found in their spoken language.

Some students told that that they did not know the correct grammatical features due to lack of knowledge and grammatical competency or they had already forgotten (Refnita, 2014). The unexpected reality is not good for academic condition of EFL learning in Indonesia as many students of English Department of the teacher-training and education faculty do not have sufficient language awareness and linguistic competence. The students cannot integrate the knowledge of grammar learnt in Grammar subjects into writing skill as they are learning Writing subjects.

Although the grammatical problems made by the students in oral-direct verbal communication are sometimes permissible, but they are not relatively allowed in written one; grammatical problems should be avoided in written

language, in fact. Thus, it is highly reasonable to state that the students' grammatical problems in writing should be initially corrected and academically improved in appropriate ways.

Compared to students writing in their native language (L1), students' writing in their L2 requires proficiency in the use of language, knowing writing strategies, techniques and skills. According to Hedge (1998), effective writing requires a number of things including "a high degree of development in the organization of ideas, a high degree of accuracy so there is no ambiguity of meaning, the use of complex grammatical devices for emphasis, and careful choice of vocabulary, grammatical patterns, and sentence structures to create a style which is appropriate to the subject matter and the eventual readers" (p. 5). Adequate vocabulary and motivation besides the time allocated to the classroom writing activities are among the other factors contributing to the English writing skill. Nevertheless, writing remains a complex and challenging task and students still find difficulties in writing in English in spite of their teachers' attempt to do their best to help them to achieve good results. It is suggested that writing needs to be taught in L2 like the other skills such as speaking. In the history of language teaching, there have been several approaches to the writing instruction. Traditionally, most writing teachers influenced by structural linguistics and behaviorists usually treated writing as a product and often put strong focus on "linguistic knowledge, vocabulary choices, and syntactic patterns that are essential for the formation of written texts as a product (Hyland, 2003, p. 3). However, instructors following the process approach have this possibility to intervene in the students' writing process at any stage they are involved in.

Students will pay more attention to their topic, maintain more information, and their insights become more when they are asked to spend more time on their writing. Then the effective intervention results in better products.

Hinkel (2011) found in her review of L2 writing that L2 writers had difficulty writing in a variety of contexts for academic, social and also communication purposes. There are two weak points of L2 writers that found in her review, those are Limited vocabulary and grammar, a problem sometimes compounded by the fact that L2 writers incorporate language features from conversational discourse. The unsuccessful mastery of several structural levels in writing, including overall text structure, paragraph structure and sentence structure had been an obstacle for the L2 writers (Collins & Gentner, 1980).

In writing progress, the students need to through the process of organizing idea, writing the idea, and revising it in learning writing (Harmer, 2004). Those all activities in writing progress are under the control and guidance of the teacher. The teacher also should comprehend the kinds of constraints that students must juggle with and the strategies they must orchestrate to produce an effective text. For example, Raimes' research (1985) makes it clear that second language writers need to learn: how to be aware of and make use of the processes involved in their writing, how to develop and organize their ideas and how to deal with language related concerns.

Having a good command of English grammar would help prospective teachers to write effectively by constructing clear, interesting and precise sentences and paragraphs. Andrews (1994) claims that, besides possessing knowledge on the language system, teachers should develop awareness that

involves abilities, sensitivity, understanding, and consciousness regarding how they use this knowledge. Therefore, the extent to which prospective language teachers develop grammatical awareness affects their efficiency in the production of academic texts. Even if future teachers succeed in fully completing their writing tasks, this may not necessarily result in fluent academic performance. For instance, numerous demonstrations of incorrect use of English grammar have been found in academic texts produced by prospective language teachers who are enrolled in advanced courses in an English teaching undergraduate program at a private university in Colombia. Consequently, this phenomenon led the authors of this study to explore pre-service teachers' grammatical awareness development as part of their training in the program.

This special issue is an extension of the colloquium *New Developments in the Study of L2 Complexity* organized by the guest editor during the American Association for Applied Linguistics (AAAL) 2013 conference in Dallas. The colloquium featured oral paper presentations by some of the contributors to this issue, including a summative commentary by Lourdes Ortega. Although the colloquium addressed L2 complexity in general, it happened that all presenters used L2 learner writing as their research data. The colloquium organizer then capitalized on this serendipity and developed a special issue proposal that focused specifically on L2 writing complexity. In the course of bringing this project to fruition, the body of contributors has somewhat changed: not all colloquium presenters contributed an article while additional authors were invited and agreed to participate (Vyatkina, 2015). Furthermore, even the original contributions have changed, primarily due to a substantial refocusing on the specific issues of L2

writing. The resulting special issue presents a balanced compilation of studies written by both seasoned and younger scholars from a variety of theoretical and methodological perspectives, thus providing a broad account of new developments in the field of L2 writing complexity.

Error correction in writing is a subject of lively debate (Lee, 1997). Attitudes towards error correction have evolved from the strict avoidance of errors and hence quick and direct error correction before the 1960s, to the condemnation of error correction as harmful and unnecessary in the late 1960s, and to a more critical view of the need and value of error correction in the 1970s and 1980s. The controversy over the topic of error correction, however, remains unresolved in the 1990s. In a recent article published in *Language Learning*, Truscott (1996) takes up a radical stance and argues for the abandonment of grammar correction in the L2 writing classroom. Truscott's thesis is that grammar correction is both ineffective and harmful and therefore it has no place in the writing classroom. However, until conclusive evidence about the ineffectiveness of error correction is found, Truscott's argument would probably have little impact on classroom teachers. The point is that for a lot of teachers their most immediate concern in the classroom is not so much to correct or not to correct, but rather what to correct and how to correct. Also, there is plenty of research evidence to show that ESL students want correction and believe that it is helpful (Hendrickson, 1978; Young, 1990; Leki, 1991) and so teachers are under pressure to treat errors in the classroom.

There is an overview of issue in L2 writing that attracts so many people's attention, especially for teachers or researchers as well. Lecturer often finds some

students who were not able to aware of their writing, such as how to write well using well components and coherence (Wijayatiningsih, 2015). They only write based on the steps of writing genre using social function, language features, and generic structures and forget about the good mechanism.

To solve the problem above, either teacher or lecturer could be the problem solver towards this issue. Four principles of teaching writing that addressed by Spevolka and Hurst (2013), such as; understand the students' reason for writing, provide many opportunities for students to write, make feedback helpful and meaningful, and clarify to yourself and your students how their writing will be evaluated. In line with the researcher, feedback is very important to students' writing improvement. It can make the students be able to revise their own writing and to assist them to acquire correct English. This is consistent with research from Bitchener, Young and Cameron (2006) which concluded that the direct corrective feedback can improve student learning outcomes by 8%.

The additional factor that second or foreign language (L2) writers have to keep in mind, more closely than native writers, is the selection of appropriate lexical and syntactic structures, which may distract their focus from their general writing goals. L2 writing requires both writing skills and language proficiency (Weigle, 2013). Depending on which of these two are the focuses of attention, we can distinguish between two broad conceptual dimensions of L2 writing: the dimension of learning to write (LW) and that of writing to learn (WL). The latter refers to the practice of using writing to support learning in other areas, such as content classes (Manchón, 2011).

Lexical issues in second language writing have received growing attention over the last three decades. The investigation of this broad topic lies at the crossroads of SLA, language teaching, discourse analysis, corpus linguistics and writing pedagogy. Researchers have looked at various aspects, including, but not limited to, the following four areas: a) the lexical content of texts by learners or academics in small and large corpora, developing and applying text-analysis tools; b) the writing process itself, including writing strategies, lexical choices, drafting and editing; c) the attitudes and beliefs of writers, language teachers, readers and text raters; and d) the lexical content of teaching L2 writing. While the focus of attention is often similar, the proposed research questions, terminology, methods and conclusions are often very different, even contradictory.

2.2 Previous Studies

Regarding Grammarly as some of the similar studies have been done in the last nine years. One of the studies is focusing on Grammarly as a tool to improve students' writing. The researchers believe that university students could be better by self-review by using technology in learning writing (Hui & Yinjuan, 2011; Karyuatry, Rizqan & Darayani, 2018). The result of this study showed that the use of Grammarly was very helpful to minimize giving correction on students' essay and the students' were very actively participated in the teaching-learning process.

Another study investigated on utilizing Grammarly in teaching writing recount text through Genre-Based Approach (Yulianti, 2018). This study employed pre-experimental design one group pretest-post test (Creswell, 2008). Data in this study were obtained from questionnaires and pretest-post test. Data

from questionnaires, to describe the second and the third question, were analyzed by using Likert Scales.

The last study is conducted by Cavaleri and Dianati (2016) that present an overview of Grammarly, a popular online grammar checking web-site. The survey results suggest that there may be longer-term benefits for students as well. Most students felt that the explanations had helped them understand grammar rules. This indicates that Grammarly may be useful for learning about grammar, which may transfer to future pieces of writing.

So for the use of such a software in this kind of environment like traditional face to face teaching and learning, there must be some kinds of reactions for the learners to internalize the learning material in the context of learning. Many studies have been done on the effect of feedback on language grammar. The gap here in the EFL literature is, to the researchers' knowledge and literature review, that few studies have been done on CALL-based software especially no studies on Grammarly Software; therefore, we attempted to investigate whether feedback provision by Grammarly software and teachers dose have any effect on making better the knowledge of the passive structures of the Iranian EFL learners (Qassemzadeh & Soelaimani, 2016). It goes without saying that each language is consisted a large number of grammatical rules. Therefore, for the sake of the easiness of the study, this study will aim at the instruction of passive structures.

Some present studies found concerning metalinguistic awareness in drafting process stated by Myhill and Jones (2016) arguably, writing is always an act of selecting, shaping, reflecting and revising and thus draws on metalinguistic

activity. This statement was also approved by Tolchinsky (2001) and Fortune (2005) that metalinguistic activity is an inevitable element of text production. In other words, it is impossible to write without engaging in metalinguistic activity at some level. In line with Gombert (1992) also argues that metalinguistic activity is an inevitable consequence of the writing demands because most of the components of writing activity are consciously monitored by the subject at some stage during the learning process, from the first acquaintance to the writing activity until the expertise in the production of written text.

In the present study, the role of metalinguistic awareness in reading comprehension was investigated by administering two metalinguistic tasks as well as standardized reading comprehension and vocabulary subtests to 105 sixth and seventh graders. One of the meta-linguistic tasks was a riddle task in which participants were provided with a question and two possible punch lines. In order to choose the appropriate punch line, participants had to recognize the ambiguity inherent in the riddle. All of the riddles turned on units at the word level or higher (i.e., many were dependent on homonyms or the structural arrangement of words within the sentence). It was expected that performance in this task would correlate with participants' reading comprehension and vocabulary. The second test chosen to measure metalinguistic awareness was an ambiguous sentence recognition task. Sentences involving ambiguities at the lexical level, the surface structure level, and the deep structure level were read by the participants whose task was to indicate whether or not each had two different meanings (Zipke, 2007).

Another complication in the relationship between writing systems and particular aspects of metalinguistic awareness is that many widely used writing

systems are mixed--that is, they cannot be seen as purely phoneme-based, or syllable-based, or morpheme-based. Thus, more than one facet of metalinguistic awareness can be expected to make a contribution to learning to read. The English writing system, for example, is not purely alphabetical; it is partly morpheme-based.

A writing system is morpheme-based to the extent that a morpheme maintains the same graphic form despite having different pronunciations. English is full of such instances, that is, pairs of words such as electric and electricity or resign and resignation, which maintain the same spelling for a shared morpheme despite differences in pronunciation. Similarly, the suffix *-ed* is spelled the same despite its different pronunciations in *raised*, *raced*, and *rated*. A writing system also must be considered morphologically-based to the extent that different morphemes with the same pronunciation are given distinct written representations. Again, examples are not hard to think of their and there, here and hear, see and sea, sign and sine, buy, bye and by, sight, cite, and site; and sew, so, and sow. Given the partially morphological basis of the writing system, it is not surprising to find that morphological awareness makes an independent contribution to learning to read English (Carlisle & Nomanbhoy, 1993).

Three studies with kindergarten children have shown that metalinguistic skills may be related to written language development in the preschool years. Backman (1983) investigated syllable and phoneme segmentation, sound deletion ("say nest without the s1 "), sound blending, and sound discrimination with precocious readers. Early readers were more successful than nonreaders in syllable segmentation, sound deletion, and sound blending, but not in phoneme

segmentation, and the sound segmentation and blending scores were closely related in the early readers. In an investigation of the relationships among phonological awareness, alphabet and soundletter knowledge, concepts about print, invented spelling, and word reading, Burns and Richgels (1989) found that mentally gifted children who spelled inventively were more knowledgeable than nonspellers about phoneme segmentation and sound-letter associations, although the groups did not differ in knowledge of the alphabet or concepts about print. About half of the inventive spellers had learned to read words, but no nonspellers had mastered word reading. A third study with kindergartners compared their performance on a variety of oral language and prereading tasks, including phoneme awareness, tests of decontextualized language ability (e.g., describing pictures, giving definitions), knowledge of letters and sound-symbol relationships, and print concepts (Dickinson & Snow, 1987). Phoneme awareness, knowledge of letters and sounds, and print concepts correlated positively and significantly, but had generally low correlations with oral language measures except formal definitions, a highly decontextualized language task.

After reviewing the relevant study above, there are similarities and differences found when compared with this study that previous study and this study were focusing on how to write better but still be a limited study in relevant study concerning metalinguistic awareness research in collaboration with online platforms such as Grammarly and vice versa.