



ENGLISH-MAJORED STUDENTS' PERCEPTIONS OF GRAMMARLY'S FEEDBACK IN PARAGRAPH WRITING

Luong Vo Nhat Quangⁱ,

Lam Ky Nhan

Nam Can Tho University,
Vietnam

Abstract:

The growing use of artificial intelligence (AI)-powered writing assistants has transformed English writing instruction by providing learners with immediate and automated feedback. Among these tools, Grammarly has gained widespread popularity in English as a Foreign Language (EFL) contexts; however, limited research has explored English-majored students' perceptions of its feedback in paragraph writing. This mixed-methods study investigated students' perceptions of Grammarly's usability, correction accuracy, impact on confidence and writing development, perceived strengths, and perceived limitations. Quantitative data were collected through a questionnaire administered to 123 English-majored students at Nam Can Tho University, while qualitative data were obtained from semi-structured interviews with ten students. Descriptive statistics and thematic analysis were employed to analyze the data. The findings indicated that participants held highly positive perceptions of Grammarly (overall $M = 4.24$). Students particularly valued its usability, immediate feedback, grammatical accuracy, and support for self-editing and autonomous learning. Interview findings further revealed that Grammarly enhanced learners' confidence, reduced writing anxiety, and encouraged independent revision. Nevertheless, participants acknowledged that Grammarly was less effective in addressing higher-order writing concerns, including idea development, coherence, and organization, and emphasized that it could not replace teacher feedback. The study concludes that Grammarly is a valuable supplementary tool for EFL paragraph writing and is most effective when integrated with teacher guidance to support both linguistic accuracy and overall writing development.

Keywords: Grammarly, automated writing evaluation, AI-assisted writing, paragraph writing, English-majored students

ⁱ Correspondence: email luongvonhatquang0310@gmail.com

1. Introduction

Writing is a key but challenging skill in English as a Foreign Language (EFL) learning, requiring learners to integrate grammar, vocabulary, organization, coherence, and audience awareness simultaneously. As a result, many learners struggle to produce accurate and well-structured paragraphs. In this process, feedback plays an essential role in supporting writing development. Grounded in Schmidt's Noticing Hypothesis (1990) and Vygotsky's Sociocultural Theory (1978), feedback helps learners identify gaps in their language use, revise their writing, and gradually improve writing competence through guided support.

With advances in artificial intelligence, Automated Writing Evaluation (AWE) tools have become increasingly common in EFL writing instruction. Among these tools, Grammarly is widely used due to its accessibility and ability to provide immediate feedback on grammar, spelling, punctuation, vocabulary, and style. Prior research has shown that Grammarly is generally perceived positively by learners, as it supports error correction, increases writing confidence, and promotes self-editing and learner autonomy (Fahmi & Cahyono, 2021; Jelita *et al.*, 2023; Gozali *et al.*, 2024).

However, studies also highlight limitations of Grammarly, particularly its focus on lower-order issues while offering limited support for higher-order writing skills such as coherence, organization, and argument development. In some cases, its feedback may also be inaccurate or contextually inappropriate, requiring critical evaluation by learners. Despite growing interest in Grammarly, few studies have focused specifically on English-major students' perceptions in paragraph writing. Therefore, this study investigates students' perceptions of Grammarly's usability, accuracy, impact on writing confidence and skills, and perceived strengths and limitations in paragraph writing.

2. Literature Review

2.1 Writing in EFL Education

Writing in English as a Foreign Language (EFL) is a fundamental skill that supports learners' academic success, professional development, and communicative competence. It enables learners to express ideas, construct knowledge, and engage in critical thinking, while also integrating linguistic components such as vocabulary, grammar, and discourse into coherent texts (Hyland, 2015). In academic contexts, writing is essential for tasks such as essays, reports, and standardized tests, while in professional settings it enhances employability and intercultural communication (Hyland, 2019).

Despite its importance, EFL writing is widely recognized as one of the most challenging language skills. Learners often struggle with organizing ideas, maintaining coherence, and using accurate grammar and vocabulary (Alharbi, 2019; Al-Khulaidi & Abdulkhalek, 2022). These difficulties are compounded by cognitive overload, as students must simultaneously manage content generation, linguistic accuracy, and audience awareness during writing tasks (Manchón, 2011). Limited writing practice,

insufficient feedback, and lack of genre knowledge further contribute to learners' difficulties (Yang, 2015; Bhowmik, 2021).

In addition, first language (L1) transfer may negatively influence English writing, as learners often apply native rhetorical patterns that do not align with English conventions, leading to issues in coherence and organization (Reichert, 2011). Although various pedagogical approaches have been introduced to address these challenges, their effectiveness depends on instructional context and learner engagement (Thongchalerms & Jarunthawatchai, 2020; Fathi *et al.*, 2022). Overall, EFL writing remains a complex skill requiring continuous pedagogical support and effective instructional strategies to enhance learners' accuracy, confidence, and writing development.

2.2 Common Writing Difficulties Among EFL Learners

EFL learners often face a combination of linguistic, cognitive, and affective challenges that hinder their writing development. Linguistically, students frequently struggle with grammatical accuracy, limited vocabulary, and weak sentence structure, which affect clarity and coherence in writing (Alharbi, 2019; Myles, 2002). Common errors include verb tense misuse, subject-verb agreement issues, and inappropriate word choice. Learners also encounter difficulties in organizing ideas logically and using cohesive devices effectively, resulting in fragmented and poorly structured texts (Hyland, 2003; Lee, 2017). Vocabulary limitations further restrict learners' ability to express complex ideas, often leading to repetitive or simplistic writing.

From a cognitive perspective, writing is a demanding process that requires simultaneous management of language accuracy, idea development, and audience awareness. This cognitive load can overwhelm learners and negatively affect the quality of their written output (Mehta & Al-Mahrooqi, 2014). In addition, insufficient development of critical thinking skills may limit learners' ability to construct and support arguments effectively.

Affective factors also play a significant role, as many EFL learners experience writing anxiety, low confidence, and fear of negative evaluation, which reduce motivation and performance (Sengul *et al.*, 2022). These challenges are often intensified by limited feedback and insufficient writing practice opportunities. Overall, EFL writing difficulties highlight the need for effective instructional support and feedback mechanisms to enhance learners' linguistic competence, cognitive processing, and affective engagement in writing.

2.3 Grammarly as a Writing Support Tool

2.3.1 Features and Popularity

Grammarly is one of the most widely used Automated Writing Evaluation (AWE) tools in EFL writing due to its comprehensive features, including grammar and punctuation correction, vocabulary enhancement, clarity and style suggestions, tone detection, and plagiarism checking (O'Neill & Russell, 2019; Dewi, 2023). Its accessibility across web, desktop, and mobile platforms has contributed to its widespread adoption in academic settings. Studies show that EFL learners particularly value its ability to reduce

grammatical errors and improve writing clarity (Hoang & Van, 2025). In addition, institutions increasingly integrate Grammarly into writing instruction due to its capacity to provide immediate feedback, which supports timely revision and improves writing efficiency (Tambunan *et al.*, 2022).

2.3.2 Pedagogical Potential

Grammarly supports learner autonomy by encouraging self-editing and independent revision before teacher evaluation. It enables a shift toward learner-centered writing practices and functions effectively when combined with teacher feedback. While Grammarly addresses lower-order concerns such as grammar and mechanics, teachers remain essential for higher-order feedback on organization and argumentation (Hoang & Van, 2025). Its real-time feedback also promotes formative learning by making revision a continuous process (Wang & Han, 2022). However, its effectiveness depends on guided classroom integration to prevent overreliance (Amelia, 2020).

2.3.3 Strengths

Grammarly's main strengths include accurate and immediate correction of common grammatical errors, ease of use, and multi-platform accessibility (Hoang & Van, 2025). Its real-time feedback supports iterative revision and enhances writing efficiency. Additionally, features such as clarity and tone suggestions help learners improve stylistic appropriateness in academic writing (Thi & Nikolov, 2021). Grammarly also raises learners' metalinguistic awareness by helping them notice recurring errors over time (Ranalli *et al.*, 2017).

2.3.4 Limitations

Despite its benefits, Grammarly has limitations. It may provide contextually inappropriate suggestions and is primarily focused on surface-level errors rather than higher-order writing skills such as coherence and argument development (Putri & Ardi, 2023; Han & Wang, 2024). Overreliance on Grammarly may also reduce learners' critical engagement with feedback and weaken independent writing skills (Prasetya & Raharjo, 2023). Furthermore, its feedback may not always align with disciplinary writing conventions, requiring teacher mediation (O'Neill & Russell, 2019).

Overall, Grammarly is a valuable writing support tool that enhances accuracy and promotes learner autonomy, but its effectiveness depends on balanced integration with teacher feedback and critical learner engagement.

2.4 Related Studies

Fahmi and Cahyono (2021) investigated EFL students' perceptions of Grammarly through a survey-based study. The findings showed that students held positive attitudes toward Grammarly because it helped them identify grammatical, spelling, and punctuation errors efficiently and supported the revision process. However, participants noted that Grammarly was less effective in addressing higher-order writing aspects such

as coherence, organization, and idea development. The study concluded that Grammarly should be used as a supplementary tool alongside teacher feedback.

Similarly, Koltovskaia (2022) explored students' experiences with Grammarly compared to teacher feedback. The results indicated that Grammarly was particularly useful for correcting lower-order issues and providing immediate feedback that supported independent revision. In contrast, teacher feedback was perceived as more effective for improving content, organization, and argumentation. The study emphasized the importance of integrating both types of feedback to enhance writing quality.

Jelita *et al.* (2023) found that students perceived Grammarly as useful, easy to use, and effective in improving grammatical accuracy and writing confidence. Nevertheless, some participants reported that Grammarly occasionally produced inaccurate suggestions, requiring critical evaluation of feedback.

More recently, Gozali *et al.* (2024) reported that Grammarly promoted learner autonomy, self-editing, and writing confidence by providing immediate feedback. However, students still relied on teachers for higher-order writing guidance, particularly in organization and idea development.

Overall, previous studies consistently show that Grammarly is positively perceived by EFL learners for improving surface-level writing accuracy and confidence, but it remains limited in addressing higher-order writing skills. This highlights the need for further research focusing on English-majored students' perceptions of Grammarly in paragraph writing.

3. Methods

3.1 Research Design

This study adopted a mixed-methods research design to explore English-majored students' perceptions of Grammarly's feedback in paragraph writing. The mixed-methods approach was selected due to its capacity to provide both breadth and depth of understanding by integrating quantitative and qualitative data. Specifically, quantitative data were used to identify general patterns of students' perceptions, while qualitative data were employed to obtain in-depth explanations of students' experiences with Grammarly. The integration of both datasets enhances the validity and comprehensiveness of the findings.

3.2 Participants

The target population comprised undergraduate students majoring in English Language Studies. A total of 123 students participated in the quantitative phase, while 10–12 students were selected for semi-structured interviews in the qualitative phase. Participants were recruited using convenience sampling combined with purposive criteria, specifically requiring prior experience using Grammarly in writing tasks. This ensured that respondents possessed sufficient familiarity with the tool to provide informed and meaningful responses. Variation in academic year was considered to capture differences in writing experience and exposure to Grammarly.

3.3 Research Instruments

Data were collected using a structured questionnaire and semi-structured interviews. The questionnaire consisted of 50 items on a five-point Likert scale (1 = Strongly Disagree to 5 = Strongly Agree), developed based on literature related to automated writing evaluation and AI-assisted feedback tools. It comprised five constructs: (1) Grammarly usability, (2) feedback accuracy, (3) impact on confidence and writing skills, (4) perceived strengths, and (5) perceived limitations. Semi-structured interviews were designed to elicit detailed qualitative insights into students' experiences, focusing on usage patterns, perceived effectiveness, and challenges when using Grammarly in paragraph writing.

3.4 Data Collection Procedures

Data collection was conducted in sequential stages. First, participants completed a guided paragraph-writing task using Grammarly, followed by self-revision based on automated feedback. Subsequently, the questionnaire was administered online via Google Forms. Finally, semi-structured interviews were conducted with selected participants either face-to-face or online. All participants were informed of the study purpose, assured of confidentiality, and participated voluntarily.

3.5 Data Analysis

Quantitative data were analyzed using SPSS 26. Descriptive statistics, including frequencies, percentages, means, and standard deviations, were employed to describe students' perceptions across all constructs. Reliability analysis using Cronbach's Alpha was also conducted. Qualitative data were analyzed thematically following Braun and Clarke's (2006) six-phase framework, including familiarization, coding, theme generation, reviewing, defining, and reporting. The qualitative findings were used to complement and explain quantitative results, ensuring methodological triangulation and enhancing interpretive depth.

4. Results

4.1 Quantitative Results

4.1.1 Students' Perceptions of Grammarly usability in Paragraph Writing

Table 4.1 presents the descriptive statistics regarding students' perceptions of Grammarly usability in paragraph writing. Overall, the findings indicate highly positive perceptions of Grammarly's usability, as all mean scores exceeded 4.00, suggesting a high level of agreement among the participants.

Table 4.1: Descriptive statistics regarding students' perceptions of Grammarly usability in paragraph writing

Items	Min	Max	Mean	SD
1. Grammarly is easy to use across devices (laptop, mobile, browser).	1	5	4.52	.67
2. I find Grammarly's interface user-friendly.	2	5	4.43	.72
3. Grammarly integrates well with my academic writing tasks.	2	5	4.41	.77
4. Grammarly saves me time in editing my writing.	2	5	4.50	.68
5. Grammarly is more convenient compared to waiting for teacher feedback.	2	5	4.19	.79
6. Grammarly encourages me to revise my drafts more frequently.	1	5	4.22	.85
7. I rely on Grammarly for most of my writing tasks.	1	5	4.15	.84
8. Grammarly has become an essential part of my writing process.	1	5	4.04	.95
9. Grammarly is accessible whenever I need writing support.	1	5	4.37	.75
10. Grammarly is a useful tool in my writing practice.	1	5	4.24	.86

Among the ten items, "Grammarly is easy to use across devices (laptop, mobile, browser)" received the highest mean score ($M = 4.52$, $SD = 0.67$), followed by "Grammarly saves time in editing my writing" ($M = 4.50$, $SD = 0.68$). Students also expressed strong agreement regarding Grammarly's user-friendly interface, integration into academic writing, and accessibility, with mean scores ranging from 4.37 to 4.43. In addition, participants perceived Grammarly as a useful writing aid that encouraged more frequent revision and provided a convenient alternative to waiting for teacher feedback ($M = 4.19$ – 4.24). The lowest ratings were given to "I rely on Grammarly for most of my writing tasks" ($M = 4.15$, $SD = 0.84$) and "Grammarly has become an essential part of my writing process" ($M = 4.04$, $SD = 0.95$), suggesting some variation in students' dependence on the tool. Overall, the cluster mean ($M = 4.31$) indicates highly positive perceptions of Grammarly's usability, highlighting its accessibility, convenience, and effectiveness in supporting paragraph writing.

4.1.2 Students' Perceptions of Grammarly's Correction Accuracy

Table 4.2 presents students' perceptions of Grammarly's correction accuracy. Overall, the results demonstrate a high level of confidence in Grammarly's ability to provide accurate feedback, with all mean scores ranging from 4.12 to 4.34.

Table 4.2: Descriptive statistics regarding students' perceptions of Grammarly's correction accuracy

Items	Min	Max	Mean	SD
11. Grammarly accurately detects grammar errors in my writing.	2	5	4.19	.69
12. Grammarly is reliable in correcting punctuation errors.	2	5	4.27	.69
13. Grammarly helps me improve sentence clarity.	2	5	4.29	.75
14. Grammarly provides useful vocabulary enhancement suggestions.	2	5	4.33	.75
15. Grammarly detects subject-verb agreement mistakes effectively.	2	5	4.29	.75
16. Grammarly identifies word form errors accurately.	2	5	4.34	.73
17. Grammarly's tone detection feature is useful for my writing.	1	5	4.15	.86
18. Grammarly plagiarism detection helps me avoid unintentional plagiarism.	1	5	4.22	.854

19. Grammarly provides accurate feedback most of the time.	2	5	4.20	.77
20. Grammarly corrections are trustworthy.	2	5	4.12	.77

The highest-rated item was “Grammarly identifies word form errors accurately” ($M = 4.34$, $SD = 0.73$), followed by “Grammarly provides useful vocabulary enhancement suggestions” ($M = 4.33$, $SD = 0.75$). Students also expressed strong agreement that Grammarly effectively improves sentence clarity, detects subject–verb agreement errors, and corrects punctuation, with mean scores ranging from 4.27 to 4.29. Additionally, participants perceived Grammarly as accurate in identifying grammar errors and providing reliable feedback ($M = 4.19$ – 4.22). The lowest-rated item, “Grammarly corrections are trustworthy” ($M = 4.12$, $SD = 0.77$), still received a high level of agreement, suggesting that although students generally trusted Grammarly’s feedback, some remained cautious about accepting its suggestions uncritically. Overall, the cluster mean ($M = 4.24$) indicates positive perceptions of Grammarly’s correction accuracy, highlighting its effectiveness in supporting grammar, vocabulary, punctuation, and sentence-level revision in paragraph writing.

4.1.3 Students’ Perceptions of Grammarly’s Impact on their Confidence and Writing Skills

Table 4.3 presents students’ perceptions of Grammarly’s impact on their confidence and writing skills. Overall, the results reveal highly positive perceptions, with all mean scores exceeding 4.00. These findings suggest that students believe Grammarly contributes positively to both their writing development and their confidence as English writers.

Table 4.3: Descriptive statistics regarding students’ perceptions of Grammarly’s impact on their confidence and writing skills

Items	Min	Max	Mean	SD
21. Grammarly feedback increases my confidence in writing.	2	5	4.16	.71
22. Grammarly helps me learn from my mistakes.	2	5	4.37	.69
23. Using Grammarly makes me more willing to write in English.	1	5	4.22	.83
24. Grammarly helps me revise my writing independently.	1	5	4.25	.81
25. Grammarly encourages me to pay attention to grammar rules.	1	5	4.34	.78
26. Grammarly motivates me to improve my writing skills.	1	5	4.22	.85
27. Grammarly makes me more confident about grammar accuracy.	1	5	4.33	.82
28. Grammarly helps me write more clearly and concisely.	2	5	4.41	.68
29. Grammarly contributes to my development as an independent writer.	2	5	4.25	.72
30. Grammarly positively influences my writing confidence.	2	5	4.39	.68

The highest-rated item was “Grammarly helps me write more clearly and concisely” ($M = 4.41$, $SD = 0.69$), followed by “Grammarly positively influences my writing confidence” ($M = 4.39$, $SD = 0.69$) and “Grammarly helps me learn from my mistakes” ($M = 4.37$, $SD = 0.69$). Students also agreed that Grammarly increased their awareness of grammar rules, strengthened confidence in grammatical accuracy, and supported independent revision and writing development, with mean scores ranging from 4.25 to 4.34. The lowest-rated items, “Using Grammarly makes me more willing to write in English” and “Grammarly

motivates me to improve my writing skills" (both $M = 4.22$), nevertheless reflected strong agreement. Overall, the cluster mean ($M = 4.29$) indicates that students perceived Grammarly as having a substantial positive impact on their confidence, learner autonomy, and writing development beyond simple error correction.

4.1.4 Students' Perceptions of Grammarly's Strengths in Supporting Paragraph Writing

Table 4.4 presents students' perceptions of Grammarly's strengths in supporting paragraph writing. The findings reveal highly favorable evaluations across all items, with mean scores ranging from 4.27 to 4.50.

Table 4.4: Descriptive statistics regarding students' perceptions of Grammarly's impact on their confidence and writing skills

Items	Min	Max	Mean	SD
31. Grammarly provides feedback immediately.	2	5	4.33	.75
32. Grammarly is available anytime and anywhere.	1	5	4.29	.93
33. Grammarly is effective in detecting common EFL grammar errors.	2	5	4.50	.67
34. Grammarly feedback is easy to understand.	2	5	4.37	.73
35. Grammarly motivates me to recheck my writing drafts.	1	5	4.28	.87
36. Grammarly is helpful for academic writing.	2	5	4.41	.75
37. Grammarly enhances my awareness of language use.	2	5	4.33	.73
38. Grammarly suggestions improve the readability of my writing.	1	5	4.27	.84
39. Grammarly supports my learning outside the classroom.	1	5	4.35	.82
40. Grammarly strengthens my writing performance.	2	5	4.28	.85

The highest-rated strength was "Grammarly is effective in detecting common EFL grammar errors" ($M = 4.50$, $SD = 0.67$). Students also highly valued Grammarly's usefulness for academic writing, the clarity of its feedback, and its support for learning beyond the classroom, with mean scores ranging from 4.35 to 4.41. In addition, participants agreed that Grammarly provides immediate feedback, enhances language awareness, and is accessible anytime and anywhere ($M = 4.29$ – 4.33). They further perceived the tool as encouraging draft revision, improving writing performance, and enhancing readability ($M = 4.27$ – 4.28). With the highest cluster mean among all positive dimensions ($M = 4.34$), the findings indicate that students strongly recognized Grammarly as an effective, accessible, and supportive tool for improving paragraph writing.

4.1.5 Students' Perceptions of Grammarly's Weaknesses and Limitations

Table 4.5 presents students' perceptions of Grammarly's weaknesses and limitations. Interestingly, despite their generally positive perceptions of Grammarly, participants also acknowledged several limitations of the application. The mean scores ranged from 3.80 to 4.19, indicating moderate to high agreement with statements describing Grammarly's shortcomings.

Table 4.5: Descriptive statistics regarding students' perceptions of Grammarly's weaknesses and limitations

Items	Min	Max	Mean	SD
41. Grammarly sometimes gives inaccurate suggestions.	1	5	4.03	.85
42. Grammarly feedback is not always contextually appropriate.	2	5	4.11	.80
43. Grammarly focuses mainly on grammar, not ideas.	1	5	4.03	.97
44. Grammarly does not help with coherence and organization.	1	5	3.80	1.01
45. Grammarly sometimes suggests unnecessary changes.	1	5	4.09	.87
46. Relying on Grammarly reduces my active engagement in revision.	1	5	4.11	.89
47. Grammarly cannot replace teacher feedback.	1	5	4.19	.98
48. Grammarly suggestions can confuse me when they are wrong.	1	5	4.02	.93
49. I sometimes accept Grammarly corrections without critical thinking.	1	5	4.09	.93
50. Grammarly has limitations in improving writing skills.	1	5	3.92	1.05

The highest-rated limitation was "Grammarly cannot replace teacher feedback" ($M = 4.19$, $SD = 0.99$), indicating that students recognized the continued importance of teacher guidance in writing instruction. Participants also agreed that Grammarly's feedback is not always contextually appropriate and that overreliance on the tool may reduce active engagement in the revision process ($M = 4.11$). Additionally, students acknowledged that Grammarly sometimes provides unnecessary or inaccurate suggestions and that they occasionally accept its corrections without critical evaluation ($M = 4.02$ – 4.09). The lowest-rated item, "Grammarly does not help with coherence and organization" ($M = 3.80$, $SD = 1.02$), nevertheless reflected moderate agreement, suggesting that students perceived Grammarly as less effective in addressing higher-order writing concerns. Overall, the cluster mean ($M = 4.04$) indicates that although students viewed Grammarly positively, they also recognized its limitations and regarded it as a supplementary tool rather than a substitute for teacher feedback and comprehensive writing instruction.

4.2 Qualitative results

To complement the quantitative findings, semi-structured interviews were conducted with ten English-majored students. Thematic analysis identified five major themes: (1) Grammarly as an accessible and autonomous writing companion, (2) trust in Grammarly's corrective feedback, (3) Grammarly as a confidence-building and learning tool, (4) perceived strengths in facilitating writing improvement, and (5) perceived limitations of automated feedback.

Theme 1: Grammarly as an accessible and autonomous writing companion

A dominant theme emerging from the interviews was students' perception of Grammarly as an easily accessible writing companion that supports autonomous learning. Participants consistently emphasized that Grammarly was available whenever needed and could be integrated seamlessly into their writing process across multiple devices. Unlike traditional teacher feedback, which is often delayed due to time constraints, Grammarly provided immediate support during drafting and revision stages.

Beyond convenience, students viewed Grammarly as a tool that empowered them to take greater responsibility for their own learning. Rather than depending entirely on

instructors to identify errors, participants reported actively engaging with Grammarly's feedback to revise and improve their writing independently. As Participant 4 explained:

"Whenever I finish writing a paragraph, Grammarly is usually the first thing I use before asking anyone else to check it. It helps me identify problems immediately and gives me a chance to improve the draft by myself."

Similarly, Participant 7 stated:

"I can use Grammarly anytime, whether I am studying in class, at home, or even on my phone. That flexibility makes writing less stressful because support is always available."

These comments suggest that Grammarly functions not merely as a correction tool but as a form of self-regulated learning support. Students perceived the software as promoting independence by encouraging them to identify and address their own errors before seeking external assistance. This finding aligns with the quantitative results, where usability-related items received some of the highest mean scores ($M = 4.31$). It also reflects broader discussions in technology-enhanced language learning, where digital tools are viewed as facilitators of learner autonomy rather than simple instructional aids.

Theme 2: Trust in Grammarly's Corrective Feedback

A second theme concerned students' confidence in Grammarly's ability to provide accurate corrective feedback. Most participants described Grammarly as reliable in identifying grammatical errors, punctuation mistakes, vocabulary issues, and sentence-level problems. Many reported that Grammarly frequently detected errors that they themselves had overlooked during self-editing.

Interestingly, participants tended to trust Grammarly most when dealing with lower-order writing concerns, particularly grammar and mechanics. They perceived the software as highly effective in correcting objective language errors, which increased their confidence in the overall quality of their written work. Participant 2 commented:

"Sometimes I read my paragraph many times and still cannot find mistakes. Grammarly often finds those errors immediately, especially grammar and punctuation problems."

Participant 9 similarly noted:

"The feedback is usually accurate. When Grammarly highlights an error, I often realize that it is something I missed while focusing on my ideas."

However, trust in Grammarly was not unconditional. Several students emphasized the importance of critically evaluating suggestions rather than accepting them automatically. Participant 6 explained:

"Most of the corrections are useful, but sometimes Grammarly changes a sentence that I think is already correct. In those cases, I compare the suggestion with my original meaning before deciding."

This observation reveals a nuanced perception of Grammarly's accuracy. While students generally trusted the system, they also recognized that automated feedback is not infallible. Such critical engagement suggests a level of digital literacy among participants and indicates that trust in AI-assisted feedback is often negotiated rather than absolute.

Theme 3: Grammarly as a Confidence-Building and Learning Tool

Another prominent theme concerned Grammarly's role in enhancing students' confidence and facilitating learning. Participants frequently described Grammarly as reducing anxiety associated with writing in English. Because feedback was available instantly, students felt reassured that many linguistic errors could be identified and corrected before submission.

More importantly, participants perceived Grammarly as contributing to long-term learning rather than merely correcting individual texts. Through repeated exposure to feedback, students reported becoming more aware of common mistakes and developing a better understanding of grammatical rules and language usage. Participant 5 reflected:

"When Grammarly repeatedly points out the same mistake, I start noticing the pattern. After a while, I make that mistake less often because I remember the correction."

Likewise, Participant 1 stated:

"Before using Grammarly, I worried a lot about grammar errors. Now I feel more confident because I know I can review my writing carefully and learn from the feedback."

These comments suggest that Grammarly contributes to both affective and cognitive dimensions of writing development. On the affective level, it reduces uncertainty and increases confidence. On the cognitive level, it promotes noticing and reflection, which are important mechanisms in second-language acquisition. This finding provides qualitative support for the high ratings observed in the confidence and writing-skills cluster ($M = 4.29$).

Theme 4: Perceived Strengths in Facilitating Writing Improvement

Participants identified several strengths that made Grammarly particularly valuable for paragraph writing. The most frequently mentioned advantages included immediate feedback, efficiency, accessibility, and assistance with language accuracy.

Students emphasized that Grammarly accelerated the revision process by allowing them to identify and correct errors in real time. This immediacy enabled them

to focus more attention on developing content and refining ideas rather than spending excessive time searching for language mistakes. Participant 8 explained:

"The biggest advantage is speed. Instead of waiting days for feedback, I can revise my paragraph immediately and continue improving it."

Participant 10 added:

"Grammarly improves my writing because it explains why something is wrong, not just that it is wrong. That helps me understand the correction."

Interestingly, several participants viewed Grammarly as extending learning opportunities beyond the classroom. Because support was continuously available, students felt able to engage in writing practice independently and more frequently. Participant 3 commented:

"I use Grammarly even when there is no assignment. Sometimes I write practice paragraphs and use the feedback to improve on my own."

These findings indicate that students perceive Grammarly not only as a technological tool but also as a learning resource that facilitates continuous writing development.

Theme 5: Recognition of the Limitations of Automated Feedback

Despite overwhelmingly positive perceptions, participants demonstrated a sophisticated awareness of Grammarly's limitations. Most students acknowledged that Grammarly was primarily effective for addressing lower-order concerns and could not adequately support higher-order aspects of writing, such as idea development, argumentation, coherence, organization, and audience awareness. Participant 4 explained:

"Grammarly can improve the language, but it cannot tell me whether my ideas are persuasive or whether the paragraph is logically organized."

Similarly, Participant 7 stated:

"When I receive feedback from my teacher, I learn about content, structure, and communication. Grammarly mainly focuses on grammar and vocabulary."

Another concern involved occasional inaccuracies and contextually inappropriate suggestions. Participant 2 noted:

"There are times when Grammarly changes a sentence in a way that sounds unnatural or does not match what I want to express."

Perhaps most importantly, several participants expressed concerns about overreliance. They recognized that excessive dependence on Grammarly could reduce active engagement with the revision process. Participant 9 reflected:

"If students simply click 'accept' every time, they may stop thinking about why the correction is necessary."

These findings reveal a mature understanding of AI-assisted feedback. Rather than viewing Grammarly as a replacement for human instruction, students perceived it as a supplementary tool that should be used critically and in combination with teacher feedback. This interpretation strongly supports the quantitative finding that the highest-rated limitation was "Grammarly cannot replace teacher feedback" ($M = 4.19$).

Taken together, the interview findings portray Grammarly as a highly valued writing-support tool that enhances accessibility, autonomy, confidence, and language accuracy. Participants perceived Grammarly as an effective aid for self-editing and revision, particularly in relation to grammar and vocabulary. However, students simultaneously recognized the limitations of automated feedback and emphasized the continuing importance of teacher guidance for higher-order writing concerns. The coexistence of positive perceptions and critical awareness suggests that English-majored students do not view Grammarly as a substitute for teachers but rather as a complementary resource that supports their writing development within a broader learning ecosystem.

5. Discussion

The present study examined English-majored students' perceptions of Grammarly's feedback in paragraph writing. Overall, participants reported highly positive perceptions across all five dimensions ($M = 4.24$), indicating that Grammarly was viewed as a useful writing support tool. The qualitative findings complemented the survey results by showing that students regarded Grammarly as an accessible, reliable, and confidence-building writing assistant while recognizing its limitations in addressing higher-order writing concerns.

Students reported highly positive perceptions of Grammarly's usability ($M = 4.31$), highlighting its accessibility, ease of use, and convenience for supporting paragraph writing. Interview participants similarly described Grammarly as an always-available writing companion that encouraged independent revision. This finding can be explained by Vygotsky's Sociocultural Theory (1978), which views learning as being mediated by supportive tools. Grammarly functions as a form of technological scaffolding that assists learners in revising their writing and developing greater autonomy. These findings are consistent with Fahmi and Cahyono (2021) and Jelita *et al.* (2023), who likewise reported that students valued Grammarly for its usability and practical support during writing.

Participants also expressed strong confidence in Grammarly's correction accuracy ($M = 4.24$), particularly for grammar, punctuation, vocabulary, and sentence-level errors.

Interview data indicated that Grammarly helped students notice mistakes they had overlooked, increasing their awareness of language accuracy. This finding supports Schmidt's Noticing Hypothesis (1990), which suggests that language development begins when learners consciously notice errors in their own language production. Consistent with Fahmi and Cahyono (2021) and Jelita *et al.* (2023), the results indicate that Grammarly effectively facilitates error detection, although students emphasized the importance of critically evaluating automated suggestions rather than accepting them unconditionally.

Students perceived Grammarly as having a positive influence on their confidence and writing development ($M = 4.29$). Interview data indicated that Grammarly encouraged self-editing, reduced writing anxiety, and promoted greater independence during the revision process. These findings can be interpreted through Vygotsky's Sociocultural Theory (1978), which views feedback as scaffolding that supports learners' gradual development of self-regulation, and Schmidt's Noticing Hypothesis (1990), which suggests that repeated exposure to corrective feedback enhances metalinguistic awareness. The results are consistent with Gozali *et al.* (2024), who found that Grammarly improved learner confidence, self-editing ability, and writing efficiency. Together, the findings suggest that Grammarly supports both writing performance and learner autonomy.

The strengths dimension received the highest mean score ($M = 4.34$), indicating that students strongly valued Grammarly's immediate feedback, grammatical error detection, and support for academic writing. From the perspective of the Noticing Hypothesis, immediate feedback facilitates learners' recognition of language errors, while Sociocultural Theory explains how continuous technological support promotes independent learning beyond the classroom. These findings align with Fahmi and Cahyono (2021) and Gozali *et al.* (2024), who likewise reported that Grammarly effectively supports grammatical accuracy, self-editing, and writing improvement. Overall, the findings reinforce Grammarly's role as a valuable supplementary tool for EFL writing instruction.

Although students held highly positive perceptions of Grammarly, they also recognized its limitations ($M = 4.04$). Participants agreed that Grammarly is less effective in addressing higher-order writing concerns, such as idea development, coherence, and organization, and emphasized that it cannot replace teacher feedback. Interview data further revealed concerns about overreliance on automated suggestions, highlighting the need for learners to evaluate feedback critically rather than accept it unconditionally.

These findings can be interpreted through Vygotsky's Sociocultural Theory (1978), which emphasizes that learning is mediated through interaction with more knowledgeable others. While Grammarly provides effective support for lower-order language issues, it lacks the contextual understanding and pedagogical guidance necessary to improve higher-order aspects of writing. The findings are consistent with Koltovskaia (2022), Fahmi and Cahyono (2021), and Gozali *et al.* (2024), all of whom concluded that Grammarly is most effective when used alongside teacher feedback rather than as its replacement.

Overall, the findings suggest that Grammarly serves as an effective supplementary tool that enhances writing accuracy, confidence, and learner autonomy. However, its pedagogical value is maximized when integrated with teacher feedback, allowing automated feedback to address lower-order concerns while teachers provide guidance on content, organization, and critical thinking. This complementary approach offers more comprehensive support for EFL writing development.

6. Conclusion

This study explored English-majored students' perceptions of Grammarly's feedback in paragraph writing using a mixed-methods approach. Overall, the findings indicated highly positive perceptions of Grammarly, particularly regarding its usability, immediate feedback, and contribution to writing confidence and learner autonomy. Students regarded Grammarly as an effective tool for identifying grammar, punctuation, vocabulary, and sentence-level errors, while also encouraging self-editing and independent revision.

The qualitative findings complemented the survey results by showing that students valued Grammarly as an accessible writing assistant that enhanced confidence and reduced writing anxiety. However, participants also recognized that Grammarly has limitations in addressing higher-order aspects of writing, such as idea development, coherence, and organization, and emphasized that it cannot replace teacher feedback.

The findings support Schmidt's (1990) Noticing Hypothesis, suggesting that Grammarly promotes language learning by drawing learners' attention to linguistic errors, and Vygotsky's (1978) Sociocultural Theory, which highlights the role of technological tools in scaffolding learning and fostering learner autonomy. Overall, Grammarly should be viewed as a complementary rather than a substitute resource in EFL writing instruction. Integrating automated feedback with teacher guidance may provide more comprehensive support for developing both linguistic accuracy and higher-order writing skills.

Creative Commons License Statement

This research work is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial-NoDerivatives 4.0 International License. To view a copy of this license, visit <https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/4.0>. To view the complete legal code, visit <https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/4.0/legalcode.en>. Under the terms of this license, members of the community may copy, distribute, and transmit the article, provided that proper, prominent, and unambiguous attribution is given to the authors, and the material is not used for commercial purposes or modified in any way. Reuse is only allowed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial-NoDerivatives 4.0 International License.

Conflict of Interest Statement

The authors declare that there are no financial, institutional, personal, or professional conflicts of interest that could have influenced the design, analysis, interpretation, or presentation of this study titled "English-Majored Students' Perceptions of Grammarly's Feedback in Paragraph Writing. The authors further declare that no external funding agency, commercial organisation, or publishing body influenced the outcome, arguments, or conclusions of the study. The analysis of the study is undertaken objectively and critically in the interest of boosting the effectiveness of English language education. The authors affirm adherence to accepted ethical standards in research and academic publishing.

About the Author(s)

Luong Vo Nhat Quang is an English lecturer at Nam Can Tho University, Vietnam. His primary research interests encompass learning media, critical thinking, creativity and innovation, as well as teaching and learning methodologies.

Lam Ky Nhan is a lecturer in the Faculty of Foreign Languages at Nam Can Tho University, Vietnam. He teaches undergraduate courses in English grammar, academic writing, and language assessment. His research interests include English language teaching, online language learning, teacher and learner motivation, language testing and assessment, and the integration of emerging technologies into language education. He has participated in and published research on English language education, teacher development, textbook implementation, and AI in language teaching and learning.

References

- Alharbi, M. (2019). Saudi Arabia EFL university students' voice on challenges and solution in learning academic writing. *Indonesian Journal of Applied Linguistics*, 8(3), 576–586. <https://doi.org/10.17509/ijal.v8i3.15276>
- Al-Khulaidi, M., & Abdulkhalek, M. (2022). Academic writing problems in L2 settings: Realities and need for intervention. *Journal of English Studies in Arabia Felix*, 1(1), 42–51. <https://doi.org/10.56540/jesaf.v1i1.15>
- Amelia, R. (2020). Students' perception on employing self-directed feedback in writing. *Journal of Applied Linguistics and Literature*, 5(1), 60–70. <https://doi.org/10.33369/joall.v5i1.10151>
- Bhowmik, S. (2021). Writing instruction in an EFL context: Learning to write or writing to learn language? *BELTA Journal*, 5(1), 30–42. <https://doi.org/10.36832/beltaj.2021.0501.03>
- Dewi, U. (2023). Grammarly as automated writing evaluation: Its effectiveness from EFL students' perceptions. *Lingua Cultura*, 16(2), 155–161. <https://doi.org/10.21512/lc.v16i2.8315>

- Fahmi, M., & Cahyono, B. Y. (2021). EFL students' perception on the use of Grammarly and teacher feedback. *JEES (Journal of English Educators Society)*, 6(1), 18–25. <https://doi.org/10.21070/jees.v6i1.849>
- Fathi, J., Rahimi, M., & Liu, G. (2022). A preliminary study on flipping an English as a foreign language collaborative writing course with video clips: Its impact on writing skills and writing motivation. *Journal of Computer Assisted Learning*, 39(2), 659–675. <https://doi.org/10.1111/jcal.12772>
- Gozali, I., Wijaya, A. R. T., Lie, A., Cahyono, B. Y., & Suryati, N. (2024). Leveraging the potential of ChatGPT as an automated writing evaluation (AWE) tool: Students' feedback literacy development and AWE tools integration framework. *The Jalt Call Journal*, 20(1), 1–22. <https://doi.org/10.29140/jaltcall.v20n1.1200>
- Hoang, G. T. L., & Van, K. T. G. (2025). Grammarly Feedback on EFL Learners' Writing: Feedback Precision and Student Perceptions. *EIKI Journal of Effective Teaching Methods*, 3(2). <https://journals.eikipub.com/index.php/jetm/article/view/469>
- Hyland, K. (2003). *Second language writing*. Cambridge University Press. <https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9780511667251>
- Jelita, K., Daud, A., & Masyhur, M. (2023). The effectiveness of using Grammarly on high school students' writing quality. *International Journal of Educational Best Practices*, 7(1), 43–55. <https://doi.org/10.31258/ijebp.v7n1.p43-55>
- Koltovskaia, S. (2020). Student engagement with automated written corrective feedback (AWCF) provided by Grammarly: A multiple case study. *Assessing Writing*, 44, 100450. Retrieved from <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.asw.2020.100450>
- Lee, I. (2017). *Classroom writing assessment and feedback in L2 school contexts*. Springer. Retrieved from <https://link.springer.com/book/10.1007/978-981-10-3924-9>
- Manchón, R. M. (2011). Writing to learn the language. *Learning-to-write and writing-to-learn in an additional language*, 61-82. <https://doi.org/10.1075/llt.31.07man?locatt=mode:legacy>
- Mehta, S., & Al-Mahrooqi, R. (2014). Can thinking be taught? Linking critical thinking and writing in an EFL context. *REL C Journal*, 46(1), 23–36. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0033688214555356>
- Myles, J. (2002). Second language writing and research: The writing process and error analysis in student texts. *Tesl-ej*, 6(2), 1-20.
- O'Neill, R., & Russell, A. M. T. (2019). Stop! Grammar time: University students' perceptions of the automated feedback program Grammarly. *Australasian Journal of Educational Technology*, 35(1), 42–56. <https://doi.org/10.14742/ajet.3795>
- 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>
- Ranalli, J., Link, S., & Chukharev-Hudilainen, E. (2017). Automated writing evaluation for formative assessment of second language writing: investigating the accuracy and usefulness of feedback as part of argument-based validation. *Educational Psychology*, 37(1), 8–25. <https://doi.org/10.1080/01443410.2015.1136407>

- Reichelt, M. (2011). Foreign language writing: An overview. *Foreign language writing instruction: Principles and practices*, 3-21. Retrieved from https://books.google.ro/books/about/Foreign_Language_Writing_Instruction.htm?id=wKoWEAAAOBAJ&redir_esc=y
- Sengul, F., Bostancı, H., & Kurt, M. (2022). Online in-class vs. out-of-class flipped learning models in English as a foreign language writing classes. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 13, 1009800. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2022.1009800>
- Tambunan, A., Andayani, W., Sari, W., & Lubis, F. (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., & Nikolov, M. (2021). How teacher and Grammarly feedback complement one another in Myanmar EFL students' writing. *The Asia-Pacific Education Researcher*, 31(6), 767–779. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s40299-021-00625-2>
- Thongchalerms, S., & Jarunthawatchai, W. (2020). The impact of genre-based instruction on EFL learners' writing development. *International Journal of Instruction*, 13(1), 1–16. <https://doi.org/10.29333/iji.2020.1311a>
- Vygotsky, L. S. (1978). *Mind in society: The development of higher psychological processes*. Harvard University Press.
- Wang, Z., & Han, F. (2022). The effects of teacher feedback and automated feedback on cognitive and psychological aspects of foreign language writing: A mixed-methods research. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 13. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2022.909802>
- Yang, Y. I. (2015). An investigation of Chinese junior high school teachers' and students' attitudes towards EFL writing. *International Journal of Research Studies in Education*, 5(2), 59-75. Retrieved from https://consortiacademia.org/wp-content/uploads/IJRSE/IJRSE_v5i2/1209-4335-1-PB.pdf