THE PERCEPTION OF ENGLISH EDUCATION STUDY PROGRAM OF SRIWIJAYA UNIVERSITY STUDENTS TOWARDS THE USE OF DIGITAL WRITING TOOLS IN ACADEMIC WRITING CLASS ATMOSPHERE

A thesis by

SISIMETRIKA KATLEYANA

Student Number: 06011381621048

English Education Study Program

Language and Arts Education Department



FACULTY OF TEACHER, TRAINING AND EDUCATION SRIWIJAYA UNIVERSITY

PALEMBANG

2020

THE PERCEPTION OF ENGLISH EDUCATION STUDY PROGRAM OF SRIWIJAYA UNIVERSITY STUDENTS TOWARDS THE USE OF DIGITAL WRITING TOOLS IN ACADEMIC WRITING CLASS ATMOSPHERE

A thesis by

SISIMETRIKA KATLEYANA

06011381621048

English Education Study Program

Language and Arts Education Department

FACULTY OF TEACHER TRAINING AND EDUCATION SRIWIJAYA UNIVERSITY

PALEMBANG

2020

Approved by,

Advisor 1,

Dr. Mrgrt. Dinar Sitınjak, M.A.

NIP. 195710041988032001

Advisor 2,

Hesti Wahyuni Anggraini, S.Pd., M.Pd.

NIP. 198609282014042001

Certified by,

Coordinator of English Education Study Program,

NIP. 197408022002121003

THE PERCEPTION OF ENGLISH EDUCATION STUDY PROGRAM OF SRIWIJAYA UNIVERSITY STUDENTS TOWARDS THE USE OF DIGITAL WRITING TOOLS IN ACADEMIC WRITING CLASS ATMOSPHERE

SISIMETRIKA KATLEYANA

Student Number: 06011381621048

This thesis was defended by the writer in the final program examination and was approved by the examination committee on:

Day : Saturday

Date : July 18th 2020

Approved by,

Advisor 1,

Dr. Mrgrt. Dinar Sitinjak, M.A.

NIP. 195710041988032001

Advisor 2

Hesti Wahyuni Anggraini, S.Pd., M.Pd.

NIP. 198609282014042001

Certified by,

Coordinator of English Education

Study Program,

Hariswan Putera Jaya, S.Pd., M.Pd

NIP. 197408022002121003

DECLARATION

I, the undersigned

Name : Sisimetrika Katleyana

Student Number : 06011381621048

Study Program : English Education

Certified that data thesis entitled "The Perception of English Education Study Program of Sriwijaya University Students towards the Use of Digital Writing Tools in Academic Writing Class Atmosphere" is my own work and I did not do any plagiarism and inappropriate quotation against crime and rules commended by the Ministry of Education Republic Indonesia number 17,2010 regarding on the plagiarism in higher education. Therefore, I deserve to face the court if I find the plagiarized in this work.

Palembang,

The undersigned

Sisimetrika Katleyana

NIM. 06011381621048

I sincerely dedicated this thesis for:

My beloved parents and siblings.

Motto:

WHEN WINTER PASSES, SPRING COMES AGAIN

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

Bismilahirohmanirohim

Thesis entitled "The Perception of English Education Study Program of Sriwijaya University Students towards the Use of Digital Writing Tools in Academic Writing Class Atmosphere" was written to fulfill one of the requirements for the final assignment for S1 degree at the English Education Study Program, Faculty of Teacher, Training and Education Sriwijaya University. This thesis would never be finished without God's help, the almighty Allah SWT who always settles everything in order as God's wish, listens every prays and sees every efforts of his creations. I would like to express my gratitude to Allah who always be with me in my every condition. Because God's plan and help, I could finish this thesis on time. In completing this thesis, I have received a lot of help from so many people who I cannot thank you enough. I personally say my greatest gratitude to:

- My little family; parents, sister and brother, mama Ir. Hj. Nurhasanah, M.M., papa Ir. H. Supangkat, M.Si, dr. Nurprima Arum Mawarni (Bobi, my sister), and Gatrajeniusa Ariprima, S.Tr.T. (Goadsi, my brother) who are incredibly very supportive by their own ways, thank you for your prays and love.
- 2. My two dedicated and reliable advisors, Dr. Mrgrt. Dinar Sitinjak, M.A., and Hesti Wahyuni Anggraini, S.Pd., M.Pd for their guidance, suggestions, helpful comments, thoughtfulness and support so I can complete this thesis on time.
- 3. The Dean of Faculty of Teacher, Training, and Education of Sriwijaya Universituy, Prof. Sofendi, M.A., Ph.D. all the staff members, the Head of Language and Arts Departement (Dr.

Didi Suhendi, S.Pd., M.Hum) and the Head of English Education Study Program (Hariswan Putera Jaya, S.Pd., M.Pd.) for their assistance in administrative matters.

- 4. The lecturers of English Education Study Program who gave me a lot of knowledge and life's lesson all this time. The administrative staff and teams who organize the institution's administrative matters well.
- 5. All of my friends from BUKITERS who gave me so many pleasing memories in these 4 years. I am so glad to be able to share some memories with you, thank you for your kindness, knowledge and help all this time. To my friend who I knew from the first meeting, you were a good thing. So, I did not need to think twice to consider you as a sibling. Thank you so much for your kindness, knowledge, help, advices, joy and joke. I believe you will be loved by so many people wherever you are. Thank you!

Palembang, July 2020

The Researcher,

Sisimetrika Katleyana

TABLE OF CONTENTS

TITLE PAGE	i
APPROVAL	ii
DECLARATION	iv
DEDICATION	
ACKNOWLEDGEMENT	vi
TABLE OF CONTENTS	
LIST OF TABLES, FIGURES AND CHARTS	X
LIST OF APPENDICES	
ABSTRACT	
CHAPTER I INDRODUCTION	1
1.1 Background of the Study	1
1.2 Problems of the Study	5
1.3 Objectives of the Study	
1.4 Significance of the Study	
CHAPTER II LITERATURE REVIEW	7
2.1 D	7
2.1 Perception	
2.2 Information, Communication and Technology (Digital Writing Technology)	
2.3 Academic Writing Class Atmosphere	
2.4 Review of Previous Studies	18
CHAPTER III METHODOLOGY	20
3.1 Research Design.	20
3.1 Research Design	20
3.1 Research Design.3.2 Research Setting Place and Time.3.3 Variable of the Study.	20 20 21
3.1 Research Design3.2 Research Setting Place and Time3.3 Variable of the Study3.4 Operation Definitions	20 21
3.1 Research Design 3.2 Research Setting Place and Time 3.3 Variable of the Study 3.4 Operation Definitions 3.5 Population and Sample	20 21 21
3.1 Research Design. 3.2 Research Setting Place and Time. 3.3 Variable of the Study. 3.4 Operation Definitions. 3.5 Population and Sample. 3.5.1 Population.	20 21 21 22
3.1 Research Design. 3.2 Research Setting Place and Time. 3.3 Variable of the Study. 3.4 Operation Definitions. 3.5 Population and Sample. 3.5.1 Population. 3.5.2 Sample.	20 21 21 22 22
3.1 Research Design. 3.2 Research Setting Place and Time. 3.3 Variable of the Study. 3.4 Operation Definitions. 3.5 Population and Sample. 3.5.1 Population. 3.5.2 Sample. 3.6 Technique for Collecting Data.	20 21 21 22 22 22
3.1 Research Design. 3.2 Research Setting Place and Time. 3.3 Variable of the Study. 3.4 Operation Definitions. 3.5 Population and Sample. 3.5.1 Population. 3.5.2 Sample. 3.6 Technique for Collecting Data. 3.6.1 Instrument (Questionnaire)	20 21 21 22 22 23
3.1 Research Design. 3.2 Research Setting Place and Time. 3.3 Variable of the Study. 3.4 Operation Definitions. 3.5 Population and Sample. 3.5.1 Population. 3.5.2 Sample. 3.6 Technique for Collecting Data. 3.6.1 Instrument (Questionnaire) 3.6.1.1 Validity of the Instrument.	20 21 21 22 22 23 23
3.1 Research Design. 3.2 Research Setting Place and Time. 3.3 Variable of the Study. 3.4 Operation Definitions. 3.5 Population and Sample. 3.5.1 Population. 3.5.2 Sample. 3.6 Technique for Collecting Data. 3.6.1 Instrument (Questionnaire) 3.6.1.1 Validity of the Instrument. 3.6.1.2 Reliability of the Instrument.	2021212222232324
3.1 Research Design. 3.2 Research Setting Place and Time. 3.3 Variable of the Study. 3.4 Operation Definitions. 3.5 Population and Sample. 3.5.1 Population. 3.5.2 Sample. 3.6 Technique for Collecting Data. 3.6.1 Instrument (Questionnaire) 3.6.1.1 Validity of the Instrument. 3.6.1.2 Reliability of the Instrument. 3.7 Technique for Analyzing Data.	202121222223232424
3.1 Research Design. 3.2 Research Setting Place and Time. 3.3 Variable of the Study. 3.4 Operation Definitions. 3.5 Population and Sample. 3.5.1 Population. 3.5.2 Sample. 3.6 Technique for Collecting Data. 3.6.1 Instrument (Questionnaire) 3.6.1.1 Validity of the Instrument. 3.6.1.2 Reliability of the Instrument.	202121222223232424
3.1 Research Design. 3.2 Research Setting Place and Time. 3.3 Variable of the Study. 3.4 Operation Definitions. 3.5 Population and Sample. 3.5.1 Population. 3.5.2 Sample. 3.6 Technique for Collecting Data. 3.6.1 Instrument (Questionnaire) 3.6.1.1 Validity of the Instrument. 3.6.1.2 Reliability of the Instrument. 3.7 Technique for Analyzing Data.	20212122222323242425
3.1 Research Design. 3.2 Research Setting Place and Time. 3.3 Variable of the Study. 3.4 Operation Definitions. 3.5 Population and Sample. 3.5.1 Population. 3.5.2 Sample. 3.6 Technique for Collecting Data. 3.6.1 Instrument (Questionnaire) 3.6.1.1 Validity of the Instrument. 3.6.1.2 Reliability of the Instrument. 3.7 Technique for Analyzing Data. 3.8 Scope and Limitation of the Study. CHAPTER IV FINDINGS AND INTERPRETATION.	2021212222232324242525
3.1 Research Design. 3.2 Research Setting Place and Time. 3.3 Variable of the Study. 3.4 Operation Definitions. 3.5 Population and Sample. 3.5.1 Population. 3.5.2 Sample. 3.6 Technique for Collecting Data. 3.6.1 Instrument (Questionnaire) 3.6.1.1 Validity of the Instrument. 3.6.1.2 Reliability of the Instrument. 3.7 Technique for Analyzing Data. 3.8 Scope and Limitation of the Study. CHAPTER IV FINDINGS AND INTERPRETATION. 4.1 Findings.	2021212222232324242525
3.1 Research Design. 3.2 Research Setting Place and Time. 3.3 Variable of the Study. 3.4 Operation Definitions. 3.5 Population and Sample. 3.5.1 Population. 3.5.2 Sample. 3.6 Technique for Collecting Data. 3.6.1 Instrument (Questionnaire). 3.6.1.1 Validity of the Instrument. 3.6.1.2 Reliability of the Instrument. 3.7 Technique for Analyzing Data. 3.8 Scope and Limitation of the Study. CHAPTER IV FINDINGS AND INTERPRETATION. 4.1 Findings. 4.1.1 Personal Information of the Participants.	2021212222232324252527
3.1 Research Design. 3.2 Research Setting Place and Time. 3.3 Variable of the Study. 3.4 Operation Definitions. 3.5 Population and Sample. 3.5.1 Population. 3.5.2 Sample. 3.6 Technique for Collecting Data. 3.6.1 Instrument (Questionnaire) 3.6.1.1 Validity of the Instrument. 3.6.1.2 Reliability of the Instrument. 3.7 Technique for Analyzing Data. 3.8 Scope and Limitation of the Study. CHAPTER IV FINDINGS AND INTERPRETATION. 4.1 Findings.	202121222223232425252727

CHAPTER V CONCLUSION AND SUGGESTIONS	47
5.1 Conclusion.	47
5.2 Suggestions	48
References	49

LIST OF TABLES, FIGURES, AND CHARTS

Figure 2.1	Grammarly11
Figure 2.2	Pro writing Aid
Figure 2.3	Ginger12
Figure 2.4	Paper Rater12
Figure 2.5	Language Tool
Figure 2.6	Small Seo Tools (Grammar checker)
Figure 2.7	White Smoke
Figure 2.8	Google Docs14
Figure 2.9	Small Seo Tools (Plagiarism Checker)15
Figure 2.10	Grammarly (Plagiarism Checker)
Figure 2.11	The Penster
Figure 2.12	Quetext
Figure 2.13	Turnitin
Figure 2.14	Plagiarism Detector
Table 3.1	The Result of Reliability24
Chart 4.1	The Result Gender of the Participants27
Chart 4.2	The Result Age of the Participants27
Chart 4.3	The Frequency Digital Writing Tools Usage27
Table 4.1	Participants responses about the perception towards Online
	Plagiarism Detector
Table 4.2	Result of descriptive statistics from perception of Online Plagiarism
	Detector items29
Table 4.3	Participants' responses about the content of Online Plagiarism
	Detector
Table 4.4	Result of descriptive statistics from the content of Online Plagiarism
	Detector items31
Table 4.5	Participants' responses about the feedback of Online Plagiarism
	Detector32

Table 4.6	Result of Descriptive statistics from the feedback of Online
	Plagiarism Detector items
Table 4.7	Participants' responses about the perception of Online Grammar
	Checker
Table 4.8	Result of descriptive statistics from perception of Online Grammar
	Checker items
Table 4.9	Participants' responses about the content of Online Grammar
	Checker
Table 4.10	Descriptive Results Items of the perception of the content of Online
	Grammar Checker
Table4. 11	Participants' responses about the feedback of Online Grammar
	Checker
Table4. 12	Descriptive Result items of the feedback of Online Grammar
	Checker
Chart 4.4	The types of Online Plagiarism Detector Services used by the
	participants
Chart 4.5	The types of Online Grammar Checker Services used by the
	participants40

LIST OF APPENDICES

Appendix Name of Appendices Appendix A The Questionnaire Appendix B The Result of Questionnaire Try Out The Result of Validity Questionnaire (Try Out) Appendix C Appendix D The Result of Questionnaire Letter of Validation Appendix E Appendix F Surat Usul Judul Appendix G Surat Keputusan Pembimbing Appendix H Surat Permohonan Izin Try Out di PBI UIN Raden Fatah Palembang Appendix I Surat Keterangan Telah Melakukan Try Out dari PBI UIN Raden Fatah Palembang Appendix J Surat Izin Penelitian dari FKIP UNSRI Appendix K Surat Keterangan Telah Melakukan Penelitian dari FKIP UNSRI Appendix L Research Design Seminar Approval (pre) Research Design Seminar Approval (post) Appendix M Appendix N Research Design Seminar Suggestion List Appendix O Preliminary Research Report Approval (pre) Appendix P Preliminary Research Report Approval (post) Appendix Q Preliminary Research Report Suggestion List Appendix R Thesis Final Examination Approval (pre)

Thesis Final Examination Approval (post)

Appendix S

Appendix T Thesis Consultant Cards

THE PERCEPTION OF ENGLISH EDUCATION STUDY PROGRAM OF SRIWIJAYA UNIVERSITY STUDENTS TOWARDS THE USE OF DIGITAL WRITING TOOLS IN ACADEMIC WRITING CLASS ATMOSPHERE

ABSTRACT

In education field, students are increasingly exposed and required to implement various digital tools, especially to augment writing instruction of hybrid learning environments. Writing as a productive skill is considered as the most complex and difficult activity especially for EFL/ESL learners. However, the use of digital writing tools appears to provide new opportunities for creating texts and include a great editing while writing which prevent grammatical mistakes and plagiarism issues. In relation to it, students' perceptions become an important thing that should be considered by the teacher. Therefore, this research is aimed to identify the students' perceptions about the use of digital writing tools in academic writing class environment including their types of digital writing tools. A cross sectional survey was conducted to 67 EFL students of 6th Semester in Sriwijaya University, Indonesia. To investigate students' perception, close-ended questions were analyzed by finding statistical descriptive using SPSS. Meanwhile, open-ended were analyzed by categorizing the results into some categories. The result shows that students have positive perception towards the use of digital writings tools in academic writing. The student perceived that the feature and the feedback of digital writing tools can overcome their issues. Only a very few students perceive less positive in some feature or feedback of digital writing tools. Most of the students use various types of digital writing tools; online plagiarism detector and online grammar checker. Further research on the implementation of specific digital writing tools in different situations is recommended to be conducted.

Keywords: digital writing tools; online plagiarism detector; online grammar checker; academic writing; perception

A thesis by an English Education Study Program Student, Faculty of Teacher Training and Education, Sriwijaya University

Name : Sisimetrika Katleyana

Student's Number : 06011381621048

Advisors : 1. Dr. Mrgrt. Dinar Sitinjak, M.A.

2. Hesti Wahyuni Anggraini, S.Pd., M.Pd

THE PERCEPTION OF ENGLISH EDUCATION STUDY PROGRAM OF SRIWIJAYA UNIVERSITY STUDENTS TOWARDS THE USE OF DIGITAL WRITING TOOLS IN ACADEMIC WRITING CLASS ATMOSPHERE

ABSTRACT

In education field, students are increasingly exposed and required to implement various digital tools, especially to augment writing instruction of hybrid learning environments. Writing as a productive skill is considered as the most complex and difficult activity especially for EFL/ESL learners. However, the use of digital writing tools appears to provide new opportunities for creating texts and include a great editing while writing which prevent grammatical mistakes and plagiarism issues. In relation to it, students' perceptions become an important thing that should be considered by the teacher. Therefore, this research is aimed to identify the students' perceptions about the use of digital writing tools in academic writing class environment including their types of digital writing tools. A cross sectional survey was conducted to 67 EFL students of 6th Semester in Sriwijaya University, Indonesia. To investigate students' perception, close-ended questions were analyzed by finding statistical descriptive using SPSS. Meanwhile, open-ended were analyzed by categorizing the results into some categories. The result shows that students have positive perception towards the use of digital writings tools in academic writing. The student perceived that the feature and the feedback of digital writing tools can overcome their issues. Only a very few students perceive less positive in some feature or feedback of digital writing tools. Most of the students use various types of digital writing tools; online plagiarism detector and online grammar checker. Further research on the implementation of specific digital writing tools in different situations is recommended to be conducted.

Keywords: digital writing tools; online plagiarism detector; online grammar checker; academic writing; perception

A thesis by an English Education Study Program Student, Faculty of Teacher Training and Education, Sriwijaya University

Name : Sisimetrika Katleyana

Student's Number : 06011381621048

Approved by,

Dr. Mrgrt. Dinar Sitinjak, M.A.

NIP. 195710041988032001

Advisor 1,

Hesti Wahyuni Anggraini, S.Pd., M.Pd.

Advisor 2.

NIP. 198609282014042001

Certified by,

Head of English Education Study Program

Hariswan Putera Jaya, S.Pd., M.Pd. NIP. 197408022002121003

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

This chapter presents: (1) background of the study, (2) problems of the study, (3) objectives of the study, and (4) significance of the study.

1.1 Background of the Study

The use of Information and Communication Technology (ICT) is integrated in every aspects of life. According to Božnar (2004), both in educational process and teaching profession are intervened significantly by ICT so that students can access information from other sources. For instance, the practices in education area have changed to more online class so that students from kindergarten to graduate school are increasingly exposed and required to implement various digital tools, especially to augment writing instruction of hybrid learning environments (Nobles & Paganucci, 2015). Moreover, online learning nowadays is more stressed in every institution because of this pandemic era. Inderawati (2017) states that the implementation of technology as information tools by the students independently is very expected. More than last 10 years, a method of engaging students in their literacy practices utilized digital writing tool (Dressman, McCarthy, & Prior, 2009). Therefore, logically the role of ICT in the classroom is very crucial (Gerrard, 2012). A study done by Inderawati, Sofendi, Purnomo, Vianty, & Suhendi (2019) stated that students' engagement in utilizing technology is very important in supporting learning.

Writing capability is important to be achieved either in work or educational life. According to Pew Research Center's Internet & American Life Project (2012), there were 91 % out of 2067 teachers of middle and high school on an online survey stated that writing effectively is an essential skill that students should have in the

future. Advanced Placement (AP) & Writing Project (WP) teachers (2012) on that survey expressed the belief that students must master all styles of writing in order to be successful across social domains and to communicate with different audiences.

According to Jahin (2012), writing is a productive skill considered as the most complex and difficult activity especially for EFL/ESL learners. Furthermore, he states that writing is both a challenging discipline and the singly most difficult aspect of English Language Acquisition. It is in line with the result of informal interview of students of English Education Study program of Sriwijaya University. The setting represented that the students have some difficulties in English writing especially in academic writing. The problems of writing are lack of capability in using proper grammar and citing some references properly to avoid plagiarism. It is also supported by Oktarina (2014, p.2), she found that some students find effort and difficulty in academic writing. In spite of the fact that writing is complicated, writing has become important aspect in academic workload at university both in English and non-English departments (Cahyono & Widiati, 2011).

Meanwhile, a good writing can be achieved by considering several writing aspects such as grammar, vocabulary, mechanic, content and organization (Hartfiel, Hughey, Wormuth, & Jacobs, 1985, p.89). In academic writing, plagiarism can be one aspect that should be considered. Some students from English Education Study Program of Sriwijaya University felt that academic writing is very different from non-academic writing. Non- academic writing uses less formal language and does not need some quotations to support the statement or sentence. However, academic writing is considered as a crucial skill that need to be mastered by students. It can be showed that writing thesis becomes the requirement for undergraduate students to obtain S1 degree. It needs some efforts to lead students of English Education of Sriwijaya University capable to produce academic writing, a complicated process should be conducted. (Inderawati, Petrus and Jaya, 2019).

The use of digital writing tools appears to provide new opportunities for creating texts and include a great of editing while writing (Kress 2003; Stapleton 2012; Akerfeldt 2014). Writing using computers obtains its effectiveness by the significant help of computer use. According to Boudjadar (2014), there are nine positive advantages obtained when writing on computers and technology related in writing class, one of them is availability of digital writing tools that can assist to improve writing outcomes such as online dictionary, online grammar checker, etc.

Digital writing tools are the products of technology. Everything becomes digital in this century, for instance is digital writing tools. In the past, people often revise their handwriting manually by looking for a help of teachers face to face or looking up the handprint dictionary. Yet now, it can be done by using digital writing tools which use *artificial intelligence* can assist the process of writing and revise it automatically such as online plagiarism detector (e.g. Small seo tools, Turnitin, etc) and online grammar checker (e.g. Grammarly, Small seo tools, Google docs, etc).

According to The Wall Street Journal, Grammarly (Grammar Checker) uses learning machine and *artificial intelligence* to improve people's writing. In Grammar checker, people can check not only their grammar errors but also spelling and punctuation errors through the use of grammar checker, while plagiarism detector also uses *artificial intelligence* in detecting the plagiarism in one's writing by comparing to the works which have uploaded online. Both of the tools are the product of technology which can overcome students' problem in writing.

In English Education Study program of Sriwijaya University, Online Grammar checker and Online Plagiarism Detector are broadly implemented by the students as tools to clear up their issues, specifically on errors of grammatical aspect and citation errors of academic writing. The action of clearing up the issues can be done independently by the students as online grammar checker helps the students to know and receive feedback of the errors. It is same with plagiarism detector; students can get the information of how many percentages of their improper citation and they can try another way to cite by summarizing or paraphrasing to level up the

writing outcomes. Then these tools can be easily accessed by the students. Hence, the perception of students towards the use of some others online software/platform as a grammar checker and a plagiarism detector is trying to figure out by the researcher.

In relation to the use of online grammar checker and online plagiarism detector (digital writing tools) where these tools are used voluntary by the students as the teachers' instructions in which they are not really mandatory, the teachers should consider the perception of students since it becomes a crucial thing. It is crucial because the perception is hopefully to enhance proper learning for students. Freiberg and Stain (1999) states that the perception of students influences the process of learning to be successful or failed. The perception becomes the cue element and learning standard. Therefore, the perception of the student needs to be examined if the implementation digital writing tools (online grammar checker and plagiarism detectors) bring the benefits as they claim or lead students to encounter some issues.

There are many studies that relate to the use of digital writing tools such in categorized as grammar checkers or plagiarism detectors for instance, Lailika's research about "students' perception on the use of Grammarly in thesis writing" which have some differences and similarities with this current study. Lailika's research focuses on the impact of Grammarly and students' perceptions of it. Meanwhile, this research does not only focus on the students' perception of using Grammarly as a specific grammar checker. This research will generalize the grammar checker and plagiarism detector tool since some students use some various grammar checkers and plagiarism detectors in academic writing class atmosphere which are free and available in online.

This research is also supported by another previous research such as "students' perception in the use of Turnitin (plagiarism detector) on academic writing" from Nova and Utami (2018); "Students' and Instructors' perceptions of Turnitin: A plagiarism deterrent?" By Ayon (2017); "Exploring students'

perception and ICT use in Indonesian High Schools" by Suratno and Aydawati (2017); "ICT in the writing classroom: The pros and cons" by Boudjadar (2015); "Innovation in education: Students' perception of implementing ICT in learning in second-cycle institutions in Ghana" by Buabeng-Andoh (2015). Therefore, this study is aimed to find English education of Sriwijaya University students' perception toward the use of digital writing tools in academic writing class atmosphere.

1.2 Problems of the Study

Based on the background study above, the problems of this study are;

- 1. What is the perception of English Education Study Program of Sriwijaya University students towards the use of digital writing tools in academic writing class atmosphere?
- 2. What are the types of digital writing tools that are used by the students of English Education Study Program of Sriwijaya University?

1.3 Objectives of the Study

The objectives study is to find out the perception of English Education Study Program of Sriwijaya University students towards the use of digital writing tools in academic writing class atmosphere and the chosen types of digital writing tools.

1.4 Significance of the Study

The researcher expects this study to provides advantages to the English learners, the English lecturers, and the prospective researchers. These are the significance of study:

For English Education students, the writer expects the English Students to know their perception toward the use of digital writing tools in academic writing class atmosphere so that they can reflect their attitudes toward technology and writing to prevent to be left behind in the industrial revolution 4.0.

For English lecturers, the writer expects the English lecturers to know their students' perception toward the use of digital writing tools in academic writing class atmosphere so that the lecturers can discover other digital writing tools by organizing a seminar which tells about new technology in assisting writing process which can be shared to the students and give the instruction of this technology so it cannot mislead the students.

Last, the researcher expects to the prospective researchers who are attracted to a similar topic can implement this research as their references. Hopefully, this research can give the beneficial information.

REFERENCES:

- Abuseileek, A. F. (2009). The effect of using an online-based course on the learning of grammar inductively and deductively. *ReCALL*, 21(3), 319-336.
- Åkerfeldt, A. (2014). Re-shaping of writing in the digital age A study of pupils' writing with different resources. *Nordic Journal of Digital Literacy*, 9(3), 172–193.
- Al-Nouh, A Nowreyah, et.al., (2015). EFL college student's perception of difficulties in oral presentation as a form of assessment. *International Journal of Higher Education*, 4 (1).
- Ayon, N., S. (2017). Students' and instructors' perceptions of Turnitin: A plagiarism deterrent? *Creative Education*, 8, 2091-2108. https://doi.org/10.4236/ce.2017.813141
- Azwar, S. (2010). *Reliabilitas dan validitas*. Yogyakarta: Pustaka Pelajar.
- Batane, T. (2010). Turning to Turnitin to fight plagiarism among university students. *Educational Technology & Society, 13*(2), 1-12.
- Bennett, R. (2005). Factors associated with student plagiarism in a post-1992 university. Assessment and Evaluation in Higher Education, 30(2), 137–162.
- Boudjadar, T. (2015). ICT in the writing classroom: The pros and the cons. *International Journal of Applied Linguistics and English Literature*, 4, 8-13. 10.7575/aiac.ijalel.v.4n.1p.8.
- Božnar, J. (2004). Vpliv sodobne informacijske in komunikacijske tehnologije na spremembe v vzgojno izobraževalnem procesu. V V. Rajkoviĉ, T. Urbanĉiĉ in M. Bernik (Ur.), *Vzgoja in izobraževanje v informacijski družbi* [elektronski vir] (str. 1-4). Ljubljana: Ministrstvo za šolstvo in šport, Univerza v Mariboru, Fakulteta za organizacijske vede, Institut Jožef Stefan, Zavod RS za šolstvo.
- Bungin, B. (2011). Metode penitian kuantitatif. Jakarta: Kencana
- Burns, C., E., et.al. (2009.) *Pediatric primary care* (5th ed.). United States of America: Library of Congress Cataloging.
- Cahyono, B. Y., & Widiati, U. (2011). The teaching of English as a foreign

- Cavaleri, M., & Dianati, S. (2016). You want me to check your grammar again? The usefulness of an online grammar checker as perceived by students. *Journal of Academic Language & Learning*, 10(1).
- Chandrasekhar, (2008). *How to write a thesis: A working guide*. The University of Western Australia.
- Chen, Y., & Hoshower L., B. (2003). Student evaluation of teaching effectiveness: An assessment of student perception and motivation. *Carfax Publishing*, 28(1).
- Creswell, J. W. (2012). Educational research: Planning, conducting, and evaluating quantitaive and qualitative research (4th ed.). Pearson: Pearson Education.
- Davis, M. (2009), The role of Turnitin within the formative process of EAP: A tool for global academic culture. BALEAP 2009. *Conference Proceedings*.
- Davis, N.E., & Tearle, P. (1999). A core curriculum for telematics in teacher training. (Eds.). Available: www.ex.ac.uk/telematics.T3/corecurr/tteach98.htm
- Dörnyei, Z. (2001). *Motivational strategies in the language classroom*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Dressman, M., & Mccarthey, S., & Prior, P. (2009). Editors' introduction: Adolescents' literacy and the promises of digital technology. *Research in the Teaching of English*, 43, 345-347.
- Fajri, H, M., Inderawati, R. & Mirizon, S. (2015). The implementation of peer editing technique to improve writing achievement. *The Journal of English Literacy Education: The Teaching and Learning of English as a Foreign Language*. 2(2), 48-57.
- Freiberg, J. H., & Stein, T. A. (1999). School climate: Measuring, improving and sustaining healthy learning environments. *Measuring, Improving and Sustaining Healthy Learning Environments*. London: Falmer Press.
- Gerrard, L. (2012). Writing in multiple media. In I. L. Clark (Ed.), *Concepts in composition. Theory and Practice in the Teaching of Writing* (2nd ed.). New York: Routledge.
- Hair, J. J., Black, W. C., Babin, B. J., & Anderson, R. E. (2010). *Multivariate analysis* (7th ed.). Upper Saddle River, NJ: Pearson Prentice Hall.

- Hartfiel, V. F., Hughey, J. B., Wormuth, D. R. & Jacobs, H. L. (1985). *Learning ESL composition*. Rowley, Mass.: Newbury House, p. 89.
- Inderawati, R. (2017). In from Classroom to Peer Comment in Facebook: Bridging to Establish Learners' Literacy.
- Inderawati, R. (2017). The dynamics of EFL teaching in Indonesia: Be innovative teachers through social media. *English Language Teaching and Research*, *1*(1), 29-37.
- Inderawati, R., Agusta, O. & Sitinjak, M. (2018). The potential effect of developed reader response strategy-based mobile reading for students' establishing character and comprehension achievement. *Indonesian Journal of Informatics Education*, 2(2), 117-126. Universitas Sebelas Maret. Retrieved January 31, 2020 from https://www.learntechlib.org/p/208856/.
- Inderawati, R., Petrus, I. & Jaya, H.P. (2019). Exploring and identifying technology-based dynamic learning through social media in academic writing. *English Community Journal*, *3*(1): 317–324.
- Ireland, C., & English, J. (2011) Let them plagiarise: Developing academic writing in a safe environment. *Journal of Academic Writing*, *I*(1):165–172
 - ITILT mini-guide. http://bit.ly/2h6ENUi
- Jahin, J. H. (2012). The effect of peer reviewing on writing apprehension and essay writing ability of prosfective EFL teachers. *Australian Journal of Teacher Education*, 37(11), 60-84.
- Jayavalan, K., & Razali, A. B. (2018). Effectiveness of online grammar checker to improve secondary students' English narrative essay writing. *International Research Journal of Education and Sciences (IRJES)*, 2(1), 2018.
- Karyuwatry, L., Rizqan, M. D. A., & Darayani, N. A. (2018). Grammarly as a tool to improve students' writing quality: Free online-proofreader across the boundaries. *Edulitics Journal*, 3(1).
- Kiss, T., & Mizusawa, K. (2018). Revisiting the pedagogy of multiliteracies: writing instruction in a multicultural context. *Changing English*, 25. 59-68. 10.1080/1358684X.2017.1403283.
- Kokkinaki, A. I., Demoliou, C. & Iakovidou, M. (2015). Students' perceptions of plagiarism and relevant policies in Cyprus. *Int J Educ Integr*, 11(3). https://doi.org/10.1007/s40979-015-0001-7
- Kress, G. (2003). Literacy in the new media age. London: Routledge.
- Lailika, H. I. (2019). Students' Perceptions of the use of Grammarly as an online grammar checker in thesis writing.

- http://digilib.uinsby.ac.id/34607/1/Hafni%20Iqbalil%20Lailika_D752140 57.pdf
- Lemke, C., & Coughlin, E. C. (1998). Technology in American schools. Available: www.mff.org/pnbs/ME158.pdf.
- May, M. (2007). Sensation and Perception. United States of America: Chelsea House.
- Montague, M. (1997). Student perception, mathematical problem solving, and learning disabilities. *Pennsylvania State Univ*, 8(1).
- Murray, W (2006) The plagiarism phenomenon. *E.learning Age*, 22–24. Available from: ABI/INFORM Global [Accessed 30 May 2020]
- Nasution, Aisyah, & Fatimah, S. (2018). The use of ProWritingAid web in editing students writing. *Journal of English Language Teaching*, 7(2).
- Neuman, W. L. (2014). *Social research methods: Qualitative and quantitative approaches.* Pearson: Pearson Education, 317.
- Nobles, S., & Paganucci, L. (2015). Do digital writing tools deliver? student perceptions of writing quality using digital tools and online writing environments. *Computers and Composition*, 38, 16–31. http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.compcom.2015.09.0018755-4615/
- Nova, M., & Utami, W. H. (2018). EFL students' perception of Turnitin for detecting plagiarism on academic writing. *International Journal of Education*, 10.
- Oktarina, S. (2014). The use of creative and productive Facebook-based model to increase the quality of writing course. *Journal of Teaching and Education*, *3*(1), 137-149.
- Pallant, J. (2007). SPSS survival manual: A step by step guide to data analysis using SPSS or Windows third edition. Australia: Open University Press.
- Petegem, K. V., et al., (2006). Student perception as moderator for student wellbeing.
- Pew Research Center's Internet & American Life Project. (2012).
- Potter, R,. & Fuller, D. (2008). My new teaching partner? Using the grammar checker in writing instruction. *English Journal*, 98(1).

- Raimes, A. & Miller-Cochran, S. K. (2014). *Keys for writers*. Boston: Wadsworth Cengage Learning.
- Ranawella, T. C., & Alagaratnam, V. (2017). Research ethics and anti-plagiarism software: A study on Turnitin users of General Sir John Kotelawala Defence University (KDU). *Proceedings of Information Use and User Studies*, 347-350.
- Schacter, L. D., Gilbert, D. T., & Wegner, D. M. (2009). *Psychology*. United States of America: Worth Publishers,
- Seow, A. (2002). The writing process and process writing. In J. C. Richards & W. A. Renandya (eds.), Methodology in language teaching. *An Anthology of Current Practice*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 315–320. doi:10.1017/CBO9780511667190.044
- Stapleton, P. (2012). Shifting cognitive processes while composing in an electronic environment: A study of L2 graduate writing. *Applied Linguistics Review.*, 3(1), 151–171. https://doi.org/10.1515/applirev-2012-0007.
- Stone, R. (1992). University breaks in plagiarism machine, *Science*, 285, 1075.
- Sugiyono. (2017). *Metode penelitian kombinasi (mixed methods)*. Bandung: Alfabeta. pp. 63-68.
- Whyte, S. (2017). Digital tools for interactive teaching in languages with technology.
- Wilson, N. and McLean S. (1994). *Questionnaire design: A practical introduction*, co. Antrim: University of Ulster Press, Newtown Abbey.
- Yang, H. (2018), Efficiency of online grammar checker in English writing performance and students' perceptions. *Korean Journal of English Language and Linguistics*, 18(3).
- Yulianti, Erni, & Reni. (2018). Utilizing Grammarly in teaching recount text through genre-based approach. *International Journal of Science, Technology and Society*, 6(1).
- Yusuf, M.O. (2005). Information and communication education: Analyzing the Nigerian national policy for information technology. *International Education Journal*, 6(3), 316-321.