

CHAPTER V

CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

The last chapter of this thesis presents the conclusions, limitations, and recommendations on the present study. This chapter concludes the results and the discussion discussed in the previous chapter to give a brief summary of the answers to the research questions proposed at the beginning of the study. This chapter also describes the limitations faced during the study to give clearer insights for further studies in similar fields. Lastly, this chapter also offered some recommendations for some aspects related to the results of the study. To give clearer insights, this chapter is divided into two sections, namely conclusions and recommendations

5.1 Conclusions

The present study was conducted to investigate the EFL undergraduate students' writing errors using an automated writing evaluation program, namely Grammarly program. In this study, the investigation of the current phenomenon are divided into five major focuses, including the types of errors detected by the Grammarly program, the types of errors undetected by the Grammarly program, the students' propensity of producing errors in writing, the possible causes of errors occurring in students' writings, and the Grammarly program's strengths and weaknesses as an error analyzer. Therefore, the results of the investigation reveal four main points.

First, the Grammarly program's evaluation in detecting and identifying errors still needs to be re-evaluated. In this study, the Grammarly program has detected 483 errors in students' writings which regarded to 21 error types, but this program has left 151 errors undetected which regarded to 18 error types. Moreover, from the 18 types of errors left undetected, 8 of them have actually been identified by the program previously, whereas, the other 10 types of errors have not been identified by the program. This result indicates that the program still has some limitations in identifying the error which occurs in certain cases and the result of evaluation needs to be re-checked. Therefore, the utilization of this

program needs an expert supervision, i.e. the lecturer, to re-check the evaluation result given by the program to reduce the misidentification cases left by the program.

Second, the students have a propensity for producing six types of errors in their writings. This propensity was derived from the total calculation of both detected and undetected errors and it was identified there are six types of errors mostly produced by the students, including missing a determiner, incorrect word family form, subject-verb agreement, miswritten, incorrect preposition, and missing a comma. It indicates that the majority of the students tend to produce grammatical error rather than misspelling and punctuation errors. Thus, the error treatment for the students can be more focus on grammatical error, especially on missing a determiner, incorrect word family form, subject-verb agreement, and incorrect preposition.

Third, the errors occurring in students' writings are caused by both intralingual and interlingual errors. The intralingual errors have occurred in 24 types of errors and the interlingual errors have occurred in 7 types of errors. As the intralingual error dominates the error production, it indicates that the majority of errors produced by the students in this study are possibly caused by the incomplete learning process. Therefore, the lecturer should re-check the students' understanding on the target language grammatical rules after the teaching and learning activities to avoid any misunderstanding or misinterpretation of the target language grammatical rule application in the sentence structure.

Fifth, the utilization of Grammarly program as an error analyzer still has its strengths and weaknesses. It is found that this program has 3 strengths which can support the process of error identification, including color codification, feedback and explanation box, and punctuation checks. On the other hand, the study also identifies 5 weaknesses of the program which can decrease the accuracy of program's error identification, including misplacement item identification, long phrases identification, complex clauses identification, question structure identification, and context identification. It indicates that this program still needs some improvements to create a comprehensive evaluation. Therefore, the utilization of this program needs lecturer's assistance to reduce the negative

inputs given by the program by providing further explanation on any misidentification cases and also giving the right correction for the misidentification error cases found.

Conducting an error analysis using an automated writing evaluation program can bring new insights into error analysis trends. The potential of automated writing evaluation program as an error analyzer can be a new solution for evaluating students' writings since it can detect various types of errors and provides some supportive features. However, as the program also leaves some errors undetected and provides some weaknesses in error identification, the utilization of this program needs the assistance and guidance from the lecturer to reduce the negative input given by the program.

5.2 Recommendations

After conducting the study, it is revealed that the automated writing evaluation program can give positive contributions to English teaching and learning process. The utilization of this program as an error analyzer has been proved to be able to detect the errors occurring in students' writings, to give feedback and explanation for the errors detected, and to give a correction to the errors found. Reflecting on the results of this study, there are two types of recommendations are offered, namely methodological recommendation and practical recommendation.

For methodological recommendation, the present study recommends other researchers to conduct further studies on similar investigation focus in order to fulfill the limitation found in this study. Even though the results of the study which have been discussed in the previous chapter have answered the research questions proposed, still, the present study has several limitations. These limitations of the study occur due to the limitation of time and fund in conducting the study. These limitations may influence the results of the study and may also contribute to new insights on the phenomenon investigation. Firstly, the type of automated writing evaluation program utilized in this study is a free-service version which can give some limitations to the service provided by the program. Thus, the further study is recommended to take the full-service version to improve the error identification accuracy conducted by the program. Secondly, the focus of

this study is limited to utilize the automated writing evaluation program in identifying and analyzing the students' writing errors only, without seeking the effect of having the program toward students' error production. There is a possibility that new insights on automated writing evaluation program's potential in reducing the error production can be revealed if the further study had investigated the effect of automated writing evaluation program toward error production. Lastly, the scope of the study only involves one department in one university. A wider range of participants is required to give a better contribution to the types and causes of errors occurring in undergraduate students' writings. Having some limitations during the study may bring different results on the current investigation and thus, further data collection is required to fulfill the gap in the present study's limitations to create a more comprehensive result on the current phenomenon.

For practical recommendation, the present study would give some recommendations to three practical aspects; students, lecturer, and program developer. Firstly, for the students, the result of the study can give them a positive input in writing since they can learn from the feedback and explanation given by the program to raise their awareness of their writing errors and help them in revising their errors in writing. Thus, it is recommended that the students use this program in re-checking their writing and learn independently. Secondly, for the lecturer, the use of the automated writing evaluation program can be a solution in addressing the lecturer's problem of having limited time in evaluating a huge number of students' writings, but they need to re-check the result of evaluation given by the program before giving final judgment on the students' writings. Thus, it is suggested that the lecturer utilizes this automated writing evaluation program to evaluate students' writings. Lastly, for the automated writing evaluation program developer, the results of the study can become a product evaluation feedback for further program improvement. The study could reveal several weaknesses of the program in identifying the error which can mislead the user in recognizing their errors. Thus, it is recommended that the program developer adds additional analysis and diagnostic features in analyzing writing errors to give a comprehensive error evaluation and identification.