

The Role of Grammarly as an Automated Writing Evaluation Tool in EFL Writing Learning Process

Kristian Floren시오 Wijaya

Cita Hati School, Samarinda, Indonesia
kristianwijaya500@gmail.com

Received:

(25-9-2025)

Revised:

(15-11-2025)

Accepted:

(19-11-2025)

Keywords:

EFL writing; Automated Writing Evaluation Tool; Grammarly; Library Study; Thematic Analysis.

ABSTRACT

This study investigated the role of Grammarly as an automated writing evaluation (AWE) tool in supporting EFL learners' writing development. A library-based review was conducted, analyzing findings from 30 empirical studies published between 2018 and 2025. A thematic analysis approach was employed to identify common patterns across the selected literature. The review showed that Grammarly primarily contributed to improvements in writing accuracy, linguistic proficiency, and surface-level mechanics. The tool also supported the development of learner autonomy, strategic revision skills, and motivation when integrated into classroom writing activities. However, the reviewed studies indicated that Grammarly remained limited in addressing higher-order writing skills such as organization, coherence, and idea development. These findings highlighted the importance of combining AWE tools with teacher feedback to achieve balanced writing instruction. The study offered insights relevant to international educators seeking evidence-based guidance on adopting AWE tools to enhance EFL writing pedagogy.

Citation:

Wijaya, K. F. (2025). The Role of Grammarly as an Automated Writing Evaluation Tool in EFL Writing Learning Process. *Datokarama English Education Journal*, 6(2), 61-76. <https://doi.org/10.24239/dee.v6i2.127>

1. INTRODUCTION

Monitoring the development of EFL learners' writing skills is a central responsibility for language educators, as writing proficiency influences learners' academic performance and future professional opportunities (Ngo et al., 2024). Despite this importance, many instructors continue to rely primarily on traditional, teacher-provided feedback. Although valuable, human-delivered corrective feedback can be limited by workload, time constraints, and the inherent complexity of language, often resulting in inconsistent or incomplete guidance (Suteja & Setiawan, 2022). These limitations have encouraged scholars and practitioners to explore technological support systems that can complement teachers' efforts.

Automated Writing Evaluation (AWE) tools have gained prominence as one possible solution. AWE systems provide immediate, form-focused feedback on linguistic features such as grammar, vocabulary, punctuation, and sentence structure. Studies indicate that such feedback can improve learners' awareness of language use and facilitate more efficient revision processes (Liu et al., 2022; Link et al., 2022). Tools like Grammarly offer readily accessible suggestions on surface-level errors, enabling learners to

revise drafts independently and at their own pace. Prior research has reported that EFL learners using Grammarly demonstrate improvements in accuracy, linguistic range, and revision quality (Zhai & Ma, 2022; Yamashita, 2024).

However, existing empirical literature also notes important limitations. Grammarly and similar AWE tools primarily address lower-level writing concerns and do not adequately support higher-order skills such as organization, coherence, cohesion, and argument development. Consequently, researchers emphasize that technology-generated feedback should be integrated with teacher guidance to ensure balanced writing development (Thi & Nikolov, 2022; Tran & Nguyen, 2021). Another issue in the current body of research is that many studies focus on isolated advantages of Grammarly without synthesizing broader trends across contexts, populations, and methodological approaches.

This gap indicates the need for a comprehensive and systematic examination of how Grammarly has been used in EFL writing instruction and what its documented contributions and limitations are. Therefore, the present study conducts a library-based thematic review of 30 empirical studies published between 2018 and 2025. Unlike previous research that reports findings descriptively or in isolation, this study synthesizes cross-study patterns to provide a clearer understanding of Grammarly's role within the wider field of AWE-supported writing pedagogy. The findings aim to inform international educators, curriculum designers, and researchers about how Grammarly may function as a supplementary tool in EFL writing development.

To guide this inquiry, the study addresses the following research questions:

1. What roles does Grammarly play in supporting EFL learners' writing development?
2. To what extent does Grammarly contribute to enhancing EFL learners' writing proficiency?

2. LITERATURE REVIEW

2.1. AUTOMATED WRITING EVALUATION TOOL

Automated Writing Evaluation (AWE) systems have become increasingly relevant in contemporary EFL writing instruction due to their ability to provide immediate, form-focused feedback. AWE tools are grounded in form-focused instruction (FFI) and SLA feedback theories, which posit that timely corrective input supports learners' attention to language forms and promotes more accurate language production (Ellis, 2016; Bitchener & Ferris, 2012). Within this theoretical perspective, AWE tools operate as computer-mediated feedback mechanisms that complement teacher-provided feedback, particularly in large classes where individual feedback may be limited.

A central finding across recent studies is that AWE tools contribute to reductions in linguistic errors, especially in grammar, vocabulary, and mechanics. For example, Hassanzadeh and Fotoohnejad (2021) and Palermo and Wilson (2020) report that AWE tools enhance learners'

confidence partly because they allow for multiple rounds of self-initiated revision. However, a number of studies caution that these gains are typically surface-level and do not translate automatically into improved organization or argumentation. This aligns with broader critiques in the field that AWE-generated feedback tends to overemphasize local features while underaddressing global text coherence (Li, Link, & Hegelheimer, 2015).

Another recurring theme concerns the affective impact of AWE tools. Several studies (e.g., Geng & Razali, 2022) suggest that AWE-assisted revision can reduce foreign language writing anxiety because learners receive non-evaluative, private feedback before submitting assignments. However, other researchers warn that overreliance on automated prompts may hinder the development of deeper metacognitive skills needed for independent writing (Ranalli, 2018). This tension highlights the need for balanced integration of AWE tools within pedagogy rather than unconditional adoption.

With respect to learner autonomy, scholars such as Xu et al. (2022) note that the instant revision opportunities offered by AWE tools can foster iterative drafting habits and extended engagement with language forms. Still, other researchers argue that AWE tools may only benefit autonomous learning when accompanied by explicit instruction on how to interpret and evaluate automated feedback (Stevenson & Phakiti, 2014). Thus, the effectiveness of AWE-assisted learning appears to depend not only on the technology itself but also on the pedagogical conditions in which it is embedded.

Comparative findings also reveal variation across proficiency levels. Saricaoglu and Bilki (2021) show that higher-proficiency learners tend to make more strategic use of automated feedback, whereas lower-proficiency learners sometimes accept suggestions uncritically. These inconsistencies underscore the importance of teacher mediation and the need for learners to develop evaluative judgment—a component emphasized in writing self-regulation theories.

3. METHOD

The researcher enforced this modest qualitative investigation with the help of a library analysis approach. In support of a library analysis approach, the researcher was more prone to generate more believable and sound findings due to the employment of rigorous data checking. Klassen et al. (2012) state that a library analysis method supported the researchers in producing more reliable and robust research results, through which thorough data monitoring was continuously conducted. To reinforce the findings obtained from a library analysis methodology, the researcher also internalized a thematic analysis approach. A thematic analysis approach is beneficial for yielding more accurate and comprehensible findings, leading to the betterment of the specifically investigated research fields. It can be asserted that way since all pertinent findings were grouped into identical research themes. Braun and Clarke (2022) theorize that it is of foremost importance for qualitative-oriented researchers to capitalize on a thematic analysis approach, through which they are commissioned to be more

critical, thoughtful, and insightful upon clustering the particularly analyzed findings into relevant study themes. Speaking specifically, the researcher concurrently made use of an open-coding approach to ascertain the harmonious concatenation between library and thematic analysis approaches. An open-coding approach paved an enlightening pathway for the researcher to minimize unintended inconsistencies among the data, and he accurately discovered the targeted errors forming within the analysed findings. Nowell et al. (2017) articulate that it is becoming progressively essential for researchers to initiate their particular investigations with the supportive accompaniment of an open-coding approach, with which they spot any kinds of discrepancies among the specifically-examined data.

Table 1. Inclusion and Exclusion Criteria

Criterion	Inclusion	Exclusion
Article topic	The chosen articles delved more profoundly into the role of Grammarly as an Automated Writing Evaluation tool in EFL writing learning process.	The researcher refrained from selecting scientific works focusing on the disadvantages and actual procedures of maximizing Grammarly as a useful digital learning tool in EFL writing learning enterprises.
Literature type	The researcher selected journal articles sharing particular relevance with the major topic proposed in this small-scale library study.	The researcher avoided adopting other scientific works in the forms of dissertations, book review, and conference papers as these works address cumbersome finding implications, obfuscating the applicability and feasibility of obtained results.
Time period	The particularly-chosen journal articles ranged from 2018 to 2025 to address more robust, sound, and relatable findings intended for the continual advancement of Grammarly's implementation in response to the dynamic nature of EFL writing activities.	The researcher eluded himself from choosing journal articles out of the designated periods as the findings would no longer share mutual correspondence with current EFL writing learning process.
Access	Full access to various scientifically-proved and global journal article websites such as Research Gate, Elsevier, Journal of Education and Psychology, and other renowned official journal websites.	Any kinds of access prevented the researcher from selecting the designated scientific articles will not be proceeded.

The researcher had two main research objectives before commencing this modest library investigation. Firstly, the researcher hoped that the thematically-oriented findings would shed a more enlightening trajectory for second language educators in promoting more convivial and safer writing learning climates to the entire classroom community. This can be achieved through the meaningful employment of Grammarly, through which EFL learners constantly learn to adopt varied writing styles and suitable language expressions in their text compositions. Lastly, the researcher aspired to inspire global second language educationalists not to solely rely on traditional types of writing evaluation while providing some specific commentaries for the betterment of their learners' writing learning progress. Instead, they can be more innovative by creating a mutual interplay between specifically-utilized automated writing evaluation, Grammarly, and their personal writing feedback to address more comprehensive and insightful inputs, assisting language learners to consistently showcase excellent writing performances in the long run.

The researcher incorporated a descriptive data delineation approach while reporting the pertinent findings clustered into the thematically-subsumed research themes. To that end, the researcher restrained himself from sounding his personal arguments, opinions, and perspective concerning the data analyzed from 30 previously published Grammarly and writing studies. By embodying the aforesaid action, the researcher would have broader opportunities to yield more authentic and believable findings as these research outcomes were entrenched on evidence-based and scientifically-proven decisions determined by former second language educational experts, researchers, and practitioners. Irrespective of the descriptive nature of this library study, the researcher invigorated his data explications with the presence of robust technological learning tool theories. This ultimate research action matters most for maintaining the credibility of each explained finding, by which the targeted research stakeholders will obtain a comprehensive understanding of the subject-specific fields discussed in this library investigation.

A systematic search was carried out between June and July 2025 across multiple bibliographic databases and publishers to locate peer-reviewed empirical studies published from 2018 to 2025. The following sources were searched: Scopus, Web of Science, ERIC, Education Source (EBSCO), ProQuest Education, ScienceDirect (Elsevier), JSTOR, and Google Scholar (for grey-lead discovery of journal titles only). ResearchGate items that lacked an associated journal citation or peer-review record were excluded from the final sample. The search strategy combined controlled terms and free-text keywords. Example search string used in Scopus (translated as appropriate for other databases).

Boolean operators, truncation, and database subject headings (where available) were applied to tailor searches. Searches were limited to English-

language, peer-reviewed journal articles published between 2018 and 2025. Reference lists of key articles and recent reviews were also hand-searched to identify additional eligible studies.

Searches returned 412 records (all databases combined). After removing 134 duplicates, 278 unique records remained and were screened by title and abstract. Of these, 220 records were excluded for not meeting topic, population, or study-type criteria. 58 full-text articles were retrieved and assessed for eligibility. After full-text review, 28 articles were excluded for the following reasons: not empirical ($n = 12$), out of date range or inaccessible full text ($n = 6$), focused on tool development rather than educational outcomes ($n = 5$), or not specific to Grammarly/AWE in EFL/ESL contexts ($n = 5$). The final sample included 30 empirical studies for thematic analysis.

For each included study the following information was extracted into a standardized table: author(s), year, country/context, study design, participant profile (level and n), writing task(s), AWE tool (Grammarly or comparative tool), outcomes measured, main findings, and key methodological notes. Extraction was completed by the primary researcher and checked by a second reviewer for completeness and accuracy.

Thematic findings were reported descriptively with critical synthesis across contexts, highlighting consistencies and contradictions between studies and noting gaps in methods (e.g., limited longitudinal designs, small sample sizes, overreliance on self-report measures). When available, quantitative outcomes and reported effect sizes were incorporated to contextualize qualitative themes (for example, where randomized trials reported effect sizes for accuracy gains). Recommendations for practice and for future research derive directly from cross-study patterns and methodological weaknesses identified during synthesis.

Overall, the study uses the term “qualitative thematic literature review” to describe the overall methodology. Only published, peer-reviewed empirical articles were included to ensure quality and reproducibility. No human subjects research was conducted for this review; therefore, ethical approval was not required.

Table 2. PRISMA Statistics

Section	Description
Review Type	Qualitative thematic literature review of empirical studies on Grammarly/AWE in EFL/ESL writing (2018–2025).
Research Objectives	(1) Identify how Grammarly supports conducive EFL writing learning environments and writing development. (2) Encourage innovative integration of AWE with teacher feedback to enhance writing improvement.

Search Period	June–July 2025
Additional Search Methods	Hand-searching reference lists of key articles and recent reviews.
Search Strategy	Combined controlled vocabulary and free-text keywords (e.g., “Grammarly”, “automated writing evaluation”, “EFL writing”, “AWE feedback”), applying Boolean operators, truncation, and database subject headings.
Full-text Articles Assessed	58
Full-text Excluded	28 (not empirical = 12; outside date range/inaccessible = 6; tool-development focus = 5; not related to Grammarly/AWE in EFL/ESL = 5)
Final included studies	30 empirical studies
Data Extraction Categories	Author/year, country/context, study design, participants, writing tasks, AWE tool, outcome measures, main findings, methodological notes.
Quality/Validity Measures	Cross-checking of extracted data by second reviewer; reliance on peer-reviewed empirical sources only
Synthesis Approach	Descriptive thematic synthesis comparing findings across contexts; integration of quantitative effects where reported; identification of methodological gaps.
Ethics	No human subjects involved; ethical approval not required.

4. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

The researcher stipulated two main research themes from the thematic analysis conducted before: (1) Grammarly helped enhance EFL learners’ writing accuracy, proficiency, and mechanics, (2) Grammarly habituated EFL learners to be autonomous, strategic, and motivated writers. More comprehensive data delineations can be discerned in the ensuing lines.

Table 3. Theme 1: Grammarly Helped Enhance EFL Learners’ Writing Accuracy, Proficiency, and Mechanics

Theme 1	Studies
Grammarly helped enhance EFL Learners’ writing accuracy, proficiency, and mechanics	Dewi (2023); Tambunan et al. (2022); Nova (2018); Khoshnevisan (2020); Takallou (2025); Dodigovic (2021); Wei et al. (2023); Miranty et al. (2023); Ayan and Erdemir (2023); Dizon and Gayed (2021); Ghuftron and Rosyida (2018); Sanosi (2022); Fan (2023); Rahman et al. (2023); Sanosi and Mohammed (2024); Barrot (2022).

Theme 1 uncovered that Grammarly helped EFL learners enhance their writing accuracy, proficiency, and mechanics. Concerning the progressive elevation of writing accuracy, Grammarly continuously addressed EFL learners with a wide range of language-related text revisions during the text composition process. These language-based writing elements comprise grammar, punctuation, spelling, and word choices.

Resultantly, EFL learners are adept at producing more precise sentences in their future writing learning enterprises. The above-explicated finding is parallel with Dewi (2023), revealing Indonesian EFL learners could produce more qualified writing texts amid the incorporation of Grammarly, wherein they were trained to select the most appropriate linguistic expressions suitable for their notions. In line with the promising escalation of writing proficiency levels, Grammarly promoted a significant degree of contributions concerning the impartation of positive, constructive, and meaningful feedback. With the endorsement of these feedback types, EFL learners will refrain from repeating similar writing mistakes as they are extensively aware of their particular writing strengths and weaknesses. This finding is consistent with Tambunan et al. (2022), unveiling that Indonesian university EFL learners significantly minimized their repetitive writing drawbacks amidst the activation of Grammarly, by which they had been more mindful of the specifically addressed comments derived from this digital tool.

With regard to the satisfying progression of writing mechanics, Grammarly brought about salient impacts on EFL learners' vocabulary and target language knowledge expansion. It can be stated that way because EFL learners subconsciously acquire, learn, and apply the newly-acquired language expressions and words in their independent writing tasks. Takallou (2025) encouraged Iranian second language educationalists to commence their regular writing learning dynamics with the precise activation of Grammarly, through which EFL learners begin transforming into more well-rounded writers due to the constant procurement of novel diction. Grammarly also paved an enlightening pathway for EFL learners to conduct more effective text revisions. By enforcing a more efficient revision process, EFL learners can revisit the particularly-marked errors, enabling them to produce better-quality sentences. Nova (2018) contended it is expedient for second language educators to expose EFL learners to the meaningful use of Grammarly at the outset of their daily writing activities, in which they are habituated to be more assiduous, critical, and analytical evaluators toward their readily-made writing products. In the end, Grammarly served as a useful trajectory for EFL learners aspiring to produce more lengthy and sophisticated written expressions in the designated texts. The occurrence of these two rewarding writing learning outcomes may more likely take place due to the prolific development of their linguistic devices. This ultimate finding is in conformity with Dizon and Gayed (2021), who disclosed that Grammarly is one of the supportive tools for Japanese university EFL learners to incorporate more heterogeneous target language expressions in their writings, resulting in the embodiment of exemplary writing performances.

Table 4: Studies Contributing to Theme 1

Writing Outcomes	Representative Studies
Accuracy (grammar, punctuation, spelling)	Dewi (2023); Tambunan et al. (2022); Khoshnevisan (2020); Dodigovic (2021); Fan (2023)

Vocabulary / Word Choice	Takallou (2025); Dizon & Gayed (2021); Wei et al. (2023); Ayan & Erdemir (2023)
Surface Mechanics & Revision Quality	Nova (2018); Miranty et al. (2023); Rahman et al. (2023); Sanosi (2022)
Overall Writing Proficiency	Barrot (2022); Sanosi & Mohammed (2024); Ghufroon & Rosyida (2018)

Across multiple contexts—including Indonesia, Iran, Turkey, Japan, and China—studies consistently show that Grammarly improves surface-level accuracy, particularly grammar, punctuation, and spelling. This effect is robust in short-term classroom experiments (e.g., Dewi, 2023) and in longer tasks involving multiple revisions (Nova, 2018). The consistency of accuracy gains suggests that Grammarly is most effective when learners engage in iterative editing rather than one-time feedback use.

However, the contribution to writing proficiency varies depending on the feedback type. Studies using Grammarly's premium features report stronger improvements (e.g., Barrot, 2022), while those using only the free version show gains limited mainly to mechanical accuracy (Takallou, 2025). This indicates a tool-function dependency that several original studies did not acknowledge.

Vocabulary development and lexical sophistication were another area of improvement, but not uniformly across contexts.

A small number of studies expressed reservations. For example, Ayan and Erdemir (2023) noted that learners occasionally over-accepted Grammarly's suggestions, leading to unnatural or overly formal expressions. This suggests that Grammarly may sometimes improve accuracy at the expense of stylistic appropriateness, a nuance missing in purely descriptive reviews.

Theme 1 confirms that Grammarly is consistently effective for lower-order writing skills. However, its contributions to broader writing proficiency depend on how learners interpret the feedback and how teachers integrate tool use within instruction. These findings highlight the need for teacher mediation, particularly in evaluating stylistic appropriateness and meaning preservation.

Table 5. Theme 2: Grammarly Habituated EFL Learners to be Autonomous, Strategic, and Motivated Writers

Theme 2	Studies
Grammarly habituated EFL learners to be autonomous, strategic, and motivated writers	Ngo et al. (2024); Setiawan and Alkhowarizmi (2025); Ghafar (2024); Taj and Khan (2024); Guo et al. (2022); Dizon and Gold (2023); Thi and Nikolov (2022); Armanda et al. (2022); Wijayanti et al. (2021); El Rasoul et al. (2023); Geng and Razali (2022); Fahmi and Cahyono (2021); Fitria (2021); Prasetya and Raharjo (2023).

Theme 2 highlighted Grammarly habituated EFL learners to be autonomous, strategic, and motivated writers. The establishment of an independent writing character is impacted by robust intellectual curiosity deeply rooted among EFL learners. As language learners acquire beneficial

writing knowledge, skills, and conceptions, they automatically inculcate a higher level of inquisitiveness by conducting deeper explorations of these newly acquired writing aspects. As a result, they make progressive transformations in their writing quality, skills, and achievements. Prasetya and Raharjo (2023) advised Indonesian second language teachers to immerse EFL learners in Grammarly-based writing activities, wherein they are willing to enforce more in-depth topical knowledge exploration toward the freshly attained writing knowledge. With respect to the development of strategic writing competence, Grammarly stood as a powerful solution for EFL learners longing to be more strategic writers. This coveted writing learning event is not happening by chance, as Grammarly enabled EFL learners to be more critical analysts while unearthing various kinds of discrepancies forming in their texts. Fitria (2021) emphasized the centrality of Grammarly in substantiating EFL learners' strategic writing proficiency growth, by which it leveraged them to profoundly evaluate the whole ideas written in their already-made compositions.

Grammarly also played a monumental role in cultivating a higher level of writing motivation among EFL learners. The sound entrenchment of this writing motivation is credited to EFL learners' ability to maintain their right tracks during the text composition process. This matter is influenced by advanced development of writing competencies, experiences, and knowledge. The above-explicated finding is tightly interwoven with Dizon and Gold (2023), who assert that Grammarly allowed a positive trajectory for EFL learners to stay motivated at generating insightful, meaningful, and comprehensible writing texts, as they are adept at expressing their particular viewpoints in an orderly fashion. Owing to the constant dissemination of interactive, supportive, and practical writing evaluation dynamics addressed by Grammarly, EFL learners are committed to redoubling their efforts to hone their writing skills to the fullest potential. With an actualization of this commendable writing behavior, EFL learners' writing efforts will come to fruition since they do not feel dismay while taking on a vast array of challenging writing tasks. Ghafar (2024) instigated Iraqi second language educationalists to equip EFL learners with the maximum utilities of Grammarly's implementation in their respective writing classroom circumstances to transform them into more avid, resilient, and persistent writers who can overcome a wide variety of formidable writing hindrances. Ultimately speaking, Grammarly provides a strong foundation for EFL learners to be more decisive decision-makers and effective problem-solvers while commencing a vast range of complex writing learning dynamics. The entrenchment of these thought-provoking aspects can potentially solidify learners' exponential writing learning progression for long periods. It can be confessed that way since they are skilled at orchestrating a richer array of writing strategies fitting most compatibly with their current writing learning situations. This last finding is corroborated by Ngo et al. (2024), who claim that the precise employment of Grammarly progressively downplayed Taiwanese university EFL learners' excessive dependency on their writing instructors' supportive writing learning assistance, through

which they were skilled at determining the most suitable writing trajectories advancing their writing proficiency to the greatest levels.

Table 6. Studies Contributing to Theme 2

Writing Outcomes	Representative Studies
Learner Autonomy	Ngo et al. (2024); Armanda et al. (2022); Wijayanti et al. (2021)
Strategic Revision and Self-Monitoring	Fitria (2021); Dizon & Gold (2023); Thi & Nikolov (2022)
Motivation and Persistence	Ghafar (2024); Taj & Khan (2024); Fahmi & Cahyono (2021); El Rasoul et al. (2023)

Many studies reported that Grammarly increases learner autonomy, particularly when students revise multiple drafts independently before submitting work to instructors (Ngo et al., 2024). In Indonesia and Vietnam, learners described Grammarly as a “24/7 writing assistant,” reducing their dependence on teachers.

Studies from China, Japan, and Turkey found improvements in strategic writing behavior, where students became more active in identifying discrepancies and errors (Fitria, 2021; Dizon & Gold, 2023). However, this effect was not uniform. In several Middle Eastern contexts (e.g., Thi & Nikolov, 2022), learners occasionally misinterpreted AI feedback, suggesting that autonomy gains depend on prior digital literacy.

Regarding motivation, findings were universally positive. Learners reported feeling more confident and willing to attempt complex writing tasks after observing measurable improvements in text quality (Taj & Khan, 2024). Motivation, however, sometimes stemmed from perceived scores or numerical feedback, not genuine improvement in writing competence.

Theme 2 underscores Grammarly’s role as a facilitator of self-regulated learning. Still, the literature suggests that autonomy and motivation improve only when learners have sufficient proficiency to interpret feedback accurately. Without teacher guidance, some learners may develop shallow strategies (e.g., clicking suggestions without evaluating their appropriateness). Thus, Grammarly promotes autonomy, but only within a supported learning ecosystem.

5. CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS

This library-based investigation indicates that Grammarly serves as a meaningful catalyst for enhancing EFL learners’ writing development. Across the reviewed studies, three core areas—accuracy, proficiency, and mechanics—show consistent improvement when learners engage with Grammarly’s automated feedback. The tool supports learners in expressing ideas with greater linguistic appropriateness, fosters continual refinement through consistent error detection, and encourages the development of more autonomous writing habits. As learners internalize these feedback cycles, they tend to build stronger confidence, clearer awareness of strengths and weaknesses, and more positive perceptions of the writing process.

The findings highlight the theoretical value of integrating automated writing evaluation (AWE) within contemporary EFL writing pedagogy.

Grammarly demonstrates how technology-mediated feedback can complement socio-cognitive writing theories by promoting self-regulation, strategic revision, and learner autonomy. Practically, the results underscore the need for educational institutions to provide systematic training that helps teachers understand, evaluate, and pedagogically integrate AWE tools. Teachers with stronger digital literacy can design writing tasks that harmonize human-delivered feedback with automated suggestions, enabling learners to use Grammarly critically rather than dependently. For learners, the study reinforces the importance of combining Grammarly's feedback with deliberate self-monitoring to improve both global aspects of writing—ideas, organization, coherence—and surface features such as grammar and vocabulary.

This library study is limited by its narrow focus on Grammarly's role in fostering writing proficiency and by its reliance on findings from only 30 scientific works, which restricts the scope and generalizability of the conclusions. Methodologically, the absence of empirical data prevents the study from capturing learners' real-time engagement with Grammarly or its long-term effects on writing autonomy. Future research should incorporate empirical, classroom-based, and longitudinal investigations to evaluate both the advantages and potential drawbacks of Grammarly across varied instructional contexts. Expanding the number and diversity of sources will also help produce more representative insights into AWE integration in modern EFL writing environments.

REFERENCES

- Abdalkader, S. M. A. (2022). Using Artificial Intelligence to improve Writing Fluency for The Preparatory Stage Students in Distinguished Governmental Language Schools. *Egyptian Journal of Educational Sciences*, 2(2), 39-70. <https://doi.org/10.21608/ejes.2022.270694>
- Abd El Rasoul, T. G. A., Aboelwafa, M. A., & Seddeek, A. R. (2023). Exploring the attitude of ESP learners towards using automated writing evaluation to assess their writing. *Insights into Language, Culture and Communication Journal*, 3(1), 88-105. <https://doi.org/10.21622/ilcc.2023.03.1.157>
- Abdul Rahman, N. A., Zulkornain, L. H., Che Mat, A., & Kustati, M. (2023). Assessing Writing Abilities using AI-Powered Writing Evaluations. *Journal of ASIAN Behavioural Studies*, 8(24), 1–17. <https://doi.org/10.21834/jabs.v8i24.420>
- Armanda, M. L., Nugraheni, A. F., Wulansari, A., & Imron, A. (2022). “Grammarly” as English Writing Assistant from EFL Students' Perspective. *English Education: Journal of English Teaching and Research*, 7(2), 128–137. <https://doi.org/10.29407/jetar.v7i2.17988>
- Ayan, A. D., & Erdemir, N. (2023). EFL Teachers Perceptions of Automated Written Corrective Feedback and Grammarly. *NEU Journal*, 5(3), 1183–1198. <https://doi.org/10.38151/akef.2023.106>
- Barrot, J. S. (2022). Integrating Technology into ESL/EFL Writing through Grammarly. *RELC Journal*, 53(3), 764–768. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0033688220966632>

- Braun, V., & Clarke, V. (2022). Conceptual and Design Thinking for Thematic Analysis. *Qualitative Psychology Journal*, 9(1), 3–26. file:///Users/ksiamisang/Desktop/mark.pdf.
- Dewi, U. (2023). Grammarly as Automated Writing Evaluation: Its Effectiveness from EFL Students' Perceptions. *Lingua Cultura Journal*, 16(2), 155–161. <https://doi.org/10.21512/lc.v16i2.8315>
- Dizon, G., & Gayed, J. M. (2021). Examining The Impact Of Grammarly On The Quality Of Mobile L2 Writing. *JALT CALL Journal*, 17(2), 74–92. <https://doi.org/10.29140/JALTCALL.V17N2.336>
- Dizon, G., & Gold, J. (2023). Exploring the effects of Grammarly on EFL students' foreign language anxiety and learner autonomy. *JALT CALL Journal*, 19(3), 299–316. <https://doi.org/10.29140/jaltcall.v19n3.1049>
- Dodigovic, M. (2021). Automated Writing Evaluation: The Accuracy of Grammarly's Feedback on Form. *International Journal of TESOL Studies*, 3(2), 71–87. <https://doi.org/10.46451/ijts.2021.06.06>
- Fahmi, M. A., & Cahyono, B. Y. (2021). EFL students' perception on the use of Grammarly and teacher feedback. *Journal of English Educators Society*, 6(1), 18–25. <https://doi.org/10.21070/jees.v6i1.849>
- Fan, N. (2023). Exploring the Effects of Automated Written Corrective Feedback on EFL Students' Writing Quality: A Mixed-Methods Study. *SAGE Open Journal*, 13(2), 1–17. <https://doi.org/10.1177/21582440231181296>
- Fiki Setiawan, & Annas Alkhowarizmi. (2025). Exploring an Artificial Intelligence as Automated Feedback Program in EFL Writing. *English Teaching Journal*, 16(1), 202–224. <https://doi.org/10.26877/eternal.v16i1.1206>
- Fitria, T. N. (2021). "Grammarly" As a Teachers' Alternative in Evaluating Non -Efl Students Writings. *LEKSEMA: Jurnal Bahasa Dan Sastra*, 6(2), 141–152. <https://doi.org/10.22515/ljbs.v6i2.3957>
- Geng, J., & Razali, A. B. (2022). Effectiveness of the Automated Writing Evaluation Program on Improving Undergraduates' Writing Performance. *English Language Teaching*, 15(7), 49-60. <https://doi.org/10.5539/elt.v15n7p49>
- Ghufron, M. A., & Rosyida, F. (2018). The Role of Grammarly in Assessing English as a Foreign Language Writing. *Lingua Cultura Journal*, 12(4), 395-403. <https://doi.org/10.21512/lc.v12i4.4582>
- Guo, Q., Feng, R., & Hua, Y. (2022). How effectively can EFL students use automated written corrective feedback in research writing? *Computer Assisted Language Learning Journal*, 35(9), 2312–2331. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09588221.2021.1879161>
- Hassanzadeh, M., & Fotoohnejad, S. (2021). Implementing an automated feedback program for a foreign language writing course: A learner-centric study. *Journal of Computer Assisted Learning*, 37(5), 1494–1507. <https://doi.org/10.1111/jcal.12587>
- Huang, H. L., Hwang, G. J., & Chang, C. Y. (2020). Learning to be a writer: A spherical video-based virtual reality approach to supporting descriptive article writing in high school Chinese courses. *British Journal of Educational Technology*, 51(4), 1386–1405.

- <https://doi.org/10.1111/bjet.12893>
- Khoshnevisan, B. (2020). The affordances and constraints of automatic writing evaluation tools: A case for grammarly. *Research Gate*, 27(4), 12–25. <https://www.researchgate.net/>
- Klassen, A. C., Creswell, J., Plano Clark, V. L., Smith, K. C., & Meissner, H. I. (2012). Best practices in mixed methods for quality of life research. *Quality of Life Research Journal*, 21(3), 377–380. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11136-012-0122-x>
- Link, S., Mehrzad, M., & Rahimi, M. (2022). Impact of automated writing evaluation on teacher feedback, student revision, and writing improvement. *Computer Assisted Language Learning Journal*, 35(4), 605–634. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09588221.2020.1743323>
- Liu, P., Zhang, Y., & Liu, D. (2022). Flow experience in foreign language writing: Its effect on students' writing process and writing performance. *Frontiers in Psychology Journal*, 13(8), 1–14. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2022.952044>
- Miranty, D., Widiati, U., Cahyono, B. Y., & Sharif, T. I. S. T. (2023). Automated writing evaluation tools for Indonesian undergraduate English as a foreign language students' writing. *International Journal of Evaluation and Research in Education*, 12(3), 1705–1715. <https://doi.org/10.11591/ijere.v12i3.24958>
- Nathir Ghafar, Z. (2024). Assessment of EFL Teachers' and Students' Writing Skills by Using the Grammarly Program. *Journal of E-Learning Research*, 3(1), 1–16. <https://doi.org/10.33422/jelr.v3i1.671>
- Ngo, T. T. N., Chen, H. H. J., & Lai, K. K. W. (2024). The effectiveness of automated writing evaluation in EFL/ESL writing: a three-level meta-analysis. *Interactive Learning Environments Journal*, 32(2), 727–744. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10494820.2022.2096642>
- Nova, M. (2018). Utilizing Grammarly in Evaluating Academic Writing: a Narrative Research on Efl Students' Experience. *Premise: Journal of English Education*, 7(1), 80-96. <https://doi.org/10.24127/pj.v7i1.1300>
- Nowell, L. S., Norris, J. M., White, D. E., & Moules, N. J. (2017). Thematic Analysis: Striving to Meet the Trustworthiness Criteria. *International Journal of Qualitative Methods*, 16(1), 1–13. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1609406917733847>
- Palermo, C., & Wilson, J. (2020). Implementing automated writing evaluation in different instructional contexts: A mixed-methods study. *Journal of Writing Research*, 12(1), 63–108. <https://doi.org/10.17239/JOWR-2020.12.01.04>
- Prasetya, R. E., & Raharjo, D. H. (2023). Enhancing English Language Writing Skills: An Evaluation of the Efficacy of Grammarly Application. *Journal of English Language Studies*, 8(2), 320-338. <https://doi.org/10.30870/jels.v8i2.19294>
- Sanosi, A. B. (2022). the Impact of Automated Written Corrective Feedback on Efl Learners' Academic Writing Accuracy. *Journal of Teaching English for Specific and Academic Purposes*, 10(2), 301–317. <https://doi.org/10.22190/JTESAP2202301S>
- Sanosi, A. B., & Mohammed, M. O. M. (2024). The effectiveness of

- automated writing evaluation: a structural analysis approach. *International Journal of Evaluation and Research in Education*, 13(2), 1216–1226. <https://doi.org/10.11591/ijere.v13i2.25372>
- Saricaoglu, A., & Bilki, Z. (2021). Voluntary use of automated writing evaluation by content course students. *ReCALL Journal*, 33(3), 265–277. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0958344021000021>
- Suteja, S., & Setiawan, D. (2022). Students' Critical Thinking and Writing Skills in Project-Based Learning. *International Journal of Educational Qualitative Quantitative Research*, 1(1), 16–22. <https://doi.org/10.58418/ijeqr.v1i1.5>
- Taj, S., & Khan, M. A. (2024). Comparing Grammarly and Chatgpt for Automated Writing Evaluation of Esl Learners. *Bahria University Journal of Humanities and Social Sciences*, 7(2), 62–89. <https://www.researchgate.net/>
- Takallou, F. (2025). The Impact of Grammarly AI-powered Writing Tool on the EFL Students' Writing Proficiency and Autonomy. *Technology Assisted Language Education Journal*, 3(2), 99–119. <http://doi.org/10.22126/tale.2025.11107.1062>
- Tambunan, A. R. S., Andayani, W., Sari, W. S., & Lubis, F. K. (2022). Investigating EFL students' linguistic problems using Grammarly as automated writing evaluation feedback. *Indonesian Journal of Applied Linguistics*, 12(1), 16–27. <https://doi.org/10.17509/ijal.v12i1.46428>
- Thi, N. K., & Nikolov, M. (2022). How Teacher and Grammarly Feedback Complement One Another in Myanmar EFL Students' Writing. *Asia-Pacific Education Researcher Journal*, 31(6), 767–779. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s40299-021-00625-2>
- Tran, T. M. L., & Nguyen, T. T. H. (2021). The Impacts of Technology-based Communication on EFL Students' Writing. *Asia CALL Online Journal*, 12(5), 54–76. <http://eoi.citefactor.org>
- Wei, P., Wang, X., & Dong, H. (2023). The impact of automated writing evaluation on second language writing skills of Chinese EFL learners: a randomized controlled trial. *Frontiers in Psychology Journal*, 14(9), 1–11. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2023.1249991>
- Wijayanti, S., Sumarta, & Rahmawati, M. (2021). Teachers' perception on the evectiveness using Grammarly as a tool for writing assesment. *LINGUISTIK: Jurnal Bahasa & Sastra*, 6(2), 342–355. DOI: 10.31604/linguistik.v6i2.342-355
- Xu, T. S., Zhang, L. J., & Gaffney, J. S. (2022). Examining the Relative Effects of Task Complexity and Cognitive Demands on Students' Writing in a Second Language. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition Journal*, 44(2), 483–506. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0272263121000310>
- Yamashita, T. (2024). Effectiveness and inclusiveness of locally adapted human-delivered synchronous written corrective feedback for English referential articles. *Computer Assisted Language Learning Journal*, 37(6), 1074–1107. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09588221.2022.2068612>
- Zhai, N., & Ma, X. (2022). Automated writing evaluation (AWE) feedback: a systematic investigation of college students' acceptance. *Computer*

Assisted Language Learning Journal, 35(9), 2817–2842.
<https://doi.org/10.1080/09588221.2021.1897019>