

## STUDENTS'S PERCEPTIONS IN USING GRAMMARLY AND QUILLBOT FOR IMPROVE WRITING SKIIL AT MA ANNUR TELUK PALINGET GRADUATE STUDENTS OF PALANGKARAYA UNIVERSITY

By

Bahing<sup>1</sup>, Mayang Meilantina<sup>2</sup>, Wahipal Akhmad<sup>3</sup>

<sup>1,2,3</sup> Universitas Palangka Raya

Email: <sup>1</sup>[bahing@edu.upr.ac.id](mailto:bahing@edu.upr.ac.id), <sup>2</sup>[meilantina@gmail.com](mailto:meilantina@gmail.com),

<sup>3</sup>[wahipalakhmad19@gail.com](mailto:wahipalakhmad19@gail.com)

### Article History:

Received: 25-07-2025

Revised: 27-07-2025

Accepted: 28-08-2025

### Keywords:

Students' Perceptions,  
QuillBot, Grammar  
Assistance

**Abstract:** By using a descriptive quantitative design, data were collected through a cross-sectional survey. The population included 95 students from grades 10 to 12 who regularly used both tools for English writing. After a pilot test with 30 students, 65 students were selected as the final sample. Data were gathered using a validated questionnaire via Google Forms, covering four dimensions: tool features, Grammarly and QuillBot are al-power tool that help users identity and correct grammar, vocabulary, and sentence structure errors. All these tools become more common in Education, understanding students' perception of their effectiveness is essential for optimizing their use in EFL writing instruction. This research explores students' perceptions of Grammarly and quillBot for writing development at Ma Annur Teluk Palinget in the year of 2025 by focusing on Grammar improvement and the factors shaping those perception.feedback quality, knowledge and ability development, and learning experience. Analysis used frequency, percentage, and mean scores in Microsoft Excel. Validity (Pearson > 0.349) and reliability (Cronbach's Alpha = 0.967) were confirmed through pilot testing. The results indicate that students at MA Annur Teluk Palinget held very positive perceptions of both Grammarly and QuillBot, with identical overall mean scores of 3.85. All dimensions—features, feedback quality, knowledge development, and learning experience—were rated very positively, with over 80% strongly agreeing that the tools provided helpful grammar feedback, clear suggestions, and useful explanations. Students particularly noted improvements in understanding subject-verb agreement (89%), sentence structure (85%), and tense consistency (80%), along with increased confidence and motivation. These perceptions were primarily shaped by three factors: accessibility (mean: 3.91), educational effectiveness (3.84), and user experience (3.83), which explained 77% of the total variance. While a small number of students raised concerns—such as

---

*language barriers, internet dependence, and feedback accuracy for complex grammar—both tools significantly supported grammar improvement and were seen as suitable for integration into high school EFL instruction*

---

## INTRODUCTION

Writing is a fundamental skill that students must develop to achieve proficiency in English as a Foreign Language (EFL) (Olga, 2019). Effective writing not only enhances communication but also plays a crucial role in academic achievement and future professional opportunities (Bondarchuk, 2024). However, EFL learners frequently encounter difficulties in mastering writing, particularly in grammar, vocabulary, and mechanics. These challenges often result in unclear expression of ideas, leading to frustration and diminished motivation (Puri, 2023; Dewi, 2023; Tambunan et al., 2022). Given these difficulties, it is essential to provide students with tools that can support their grammatical accuracy and overall writing proficiency.

In response to these challenges, the use of grammar-checking tools has gained attention as a practical solution to improve writing quality among EFL learners. Recent advancements in artificial intelligence (AI) have led to the development of sophisticated grammar-checking applications that offer instant feedback. These tools assist students in detecting and correcting grammatical errors, refining sentence structure, and improving vocabulary use (Fernando & Suryaman, 2022; Fitria, 2021; Fahmi & Rachmijati, 2021). The growing implementation of AI-powered tools such as Grammarly and QuillBot in educational settings highlights their potential to address the very issues that hinder students' writing development. Specifically, these tools offer targeted support for the common writing problems EFL learners face, aligning directly with the focus of this research, which investigates their role in enhancing writing accuracy and performance.

Preliminary observations at MA Annur Teluk Palinget revealed persistent issues in students' writing, particularly in grammatical areas such as subject-verb agreement, tense consistency, and sentence structure. Students often make similar errors across assignments, suggesting limited understanding or reinforcement of grammar rules. Teachers at MA Annur Teluk Palinget reported difficulties in providing individualized feedback due to large class sizes and limited instructional time. Consequently, many students began independently using tools such as Grammarly and QuillBot to support their writing outside of class.

Since early 2023, Grammarly and QuillBot have been used informally by students across grades ten to twelve at MA Annur Teluk Palinget, particularly during writing assignments and independent study. These tools are commonly accessed through their free versions, as students use them on personal devices to receive instant feedback. Teachers have also encouraged their use as supplementary aids, though no formal integration into the curriculum has occurred. The informal yet consistent usage of these tools has created a unique learning environment where students receive feedback beyond teacher comments.

Grammarly, one of the most widely used grammar-checking tools, offers a variety of features designed to enhance writing quality. It provides real-time feedback on grammar, spelling, punctuation, and writing style, making it particularly beneficial for EFL students (Fitriana & Nurazni, 2022; Thi & Nikolov, 2021). Research has shown that Grammarly's

intuitive interface and comprehensive feedback contribute significantly to students' writing improvement (Shahriar, 2023; Khalil, 2018). Similarly, QuillBot is an AI-based tool that specializes in paraphrasing and grammar correction, allowing students to refine their writing and improve sentence fluency (Qassemzadeh & Soleimani, 2016; Armanda et al., 2022). Comparative research has examined the usability, accuracy, and feedback mechanisms of both tools, suggesting that they complement each other in different writing contexts (Fitria et al., 2022; Hakiki, 2021).

## METHODOLOGY

This research adopted a descriptive quantitative design with qualitative enhancement, utilizing the survey method and semi-structured interviews. The data were presented in both numerical and descriptive forms. Descriptive quantitative research involves systematically collecting and analyzing numerical data to accurately describe characteristics or phenomena (Creswell, 2014). As Creswell (2014) explains, survey research provides a numeric description of trends, attitudes, or opinions within a population by studying a sample. The qualitative component through interviews was added to provide deeper insights and validation of the quantitative findings, following a convergent parallel mixed-methods approach where both data types inform and validate each other.

Questionnaires and interviews were used as the main instruments for data collection, with the intent of generalizing the findings from the sample to a broader population (Fowler, 2014). This research employed a cross-sectional or one-shot survey design, in which data were collected from a group of students at a single point in time (Jansen, 2010; Rezigalla, 2020). This approach is considered efficient and practical for capturing diverse perspectives without the need for long-term follow-up. In this context, the design was used to explore students' perceptions of Grammarly and QuillBot as grammar-checking tools for developing their writing skill, particularly in grammar aspects.

### Population and Sample

#### 1. Population

A population refers to all members of a specific group of people, events, or objects (Ary et al., 2010). The population in this research consisted of all students at MA Annur Teluk Palinget during the 2024–2025 academic year who regularly used Grammarly and QuillBot to assist with their writing. This population included 95 students from the tenth, eleventh, and twelfth grades.

#### 2. Sample

A sample is a subset of a larger population that accurately reflects its characteristics (Ary et al., 2010). In this research, the initial population consisted of 95 students from the tenth, eleventh, and twelfth grades at MA Annur Teluk Palinget. A pilot test was conducted with 30 students, and the remaining 65 students formed the sample for the main research.

For the qualitative component, nine students were purposively selected for interviews based on their diverse response patterns in the questionnaire, with three students representing each grade level (X, XI, and XII). The selection criteria included variation in questionnaire responses and willingness to participate in follow-up interviews.

A pilot test with 30 students was considered appropriate because it allowed the researcher to assess the clarity, reliability, and validity of the questionnaire before applying

it to the larger sample. According to Sugiyono (2019), for small populations, especially those under 100, conducting a pilot test with approximately 30 participants is sufficient to ensure that the instrument works effectively and that any issues with the questionnaire can be identified and addressed.

## Data

### Kinds of Data

The research data consisted of both quantitative and qualitative components. The quantitative data included measurements of students' perceptions of Grammarly and QuillBot feedback on their writing skill, gathered through a questionnaire. The qualitative data comprised in-depth explanations and personal experiences obtained through semi-structured interviews. This mixed-methods approach was used to analyze students' experiences with these tools, specifically focusing on aspects of grammar development.

### Data Collection and Analysis

#### 1. Data collection Procedure

The data collection procedure began by selecting 65 students from MA Annur Teluk Palinget as the sample. A questionnaire was designed to collect the students' perceptions regarding the use of Grammarly and QuillBot to develop their writing skill. The questionnaire was divided into two sections: the first section focused on the use of Grammarly, while the second section focused on the use of QuillBot. Each section assessed students' views on the effectiveness and ease of using each tool, specifically in relation to grammar development, such as subject-verb agreement, tense, and sentence structure. The questionnaire was distributed to the students via Google Forms by sending the link through the WhatsApp application. After collecting the responses, the data were organized using Microsoft Excel for further analysis.

To deepen the understanding of students' perceptions and provide richer context to the quantitative findings, semi-structured interviews were conducted with purposively selected students. Five questionnaire items were chosen as the basis for interview questions: (1) accessibility (item 6) due to its highest score (97%) and connection to the dominant accessibility factor, (2) feedback accuracy (item 11) because of its response variation, (3) tense correction (item 15) as it was the only item with disagreement responses and relates to theoretical grammar complexity, (4) trust in applications (item 18) due to its relevance to technological confidence, and (5) motivation (item 22) because of its importance in language learning theory.

#### 2. Data Analysis

The data obtained from the questionnaire were analyzed using Microsoft Excel to derive the descriptive results. This analysis involved several steps. Initially, scores were organized to establish the frequency distribution and percentage for each scale of every item, showing the distribution of students' responses as strongly agree, agree, disagree, and strongly disagree for each questionnaire item. Percentages were calculated using the formula:

$$P = \frac{F}{N} \times 100\%$$

Where P represents the percentage, F denotes the frequency of answers, and N stands for the

total number of students.

Subsequently, the mean score for each item in the questionnaire was calculated using the following formula:

$$\bar{x} = \frac{\sum X}{N}$$

Where  $\bar{x}$  denotes the mean score for each item in the questionnaire,  $\sum X$  represents the sum of the scores, and  $N$  is the total number of students. The mean score was interpreted based on the criteria adapted from Chaihiranwattana & Nookua (2010), as outlined in the following table:

**Table 1. Interpretation of Mean Score**

Mean Levels	Score Range
Very Positive	3.41 – 4.00
Positive	2.81 – 3.40
Neutral	2.21 – 2.80
Negative	1.61 – 2.20
Very Negative	1.00 – 1.60

Next, the mean score for each dimension in the questionnaire was determined using the following formula:

$$\bar{\bar{x}} = \frac{\sum \bar{x}}{N}$$

Where  $\bar{\bar{x}}$  is the average of the mean scores,  $\sum \bar{x}$  is the sum of all mean scores, and  $N$  is the total number of items. The average of the mean scores was interpreted based on the criteria in Table 1.

Interview data were analyzed using thematic analysis to identify patterns and themes related to students' experiences and perceptions. The interviews were transcribed and analyzed to provide narrative descriptions that explain the reasoning behind quantitative responses. The qualitative findings were integrated with quantitative results to offer a more comprehensive understanding of students' perceptions, following the convergent parallel mixed-methods approach where both data types inform and validate each other. Then, the descriptive results were analyzed by examining patterns in the students' responses and identifying the factors that influenced their perceptions of Grammarly's and QuillBot's feedback on writing skill. Finally, the findings were discussed, and conclusions were drawn to answer the research questions.

#### **Admissibility of the Data**

To ensure accurate data collection, the questionnaire used in this research had to meet two essential criteria: validity and reliability. Validity refers to how well the instrument measures what it is intended to measure, as highlighted by Wiersma and Jurs (1990).



Reliability, on the other hand, refers to the consistency of the measurement, as defined by Ary et al. (2010), which indicates how consistently an instrument measures the intended construct. In this research, to ensure both validity and reliability, a pilot test was conducted with 30 students from the same population, excluding those selected for the final research sample. This pilot test was carried out before the questionnaire was used in the actual research, following Sugiyono's (2019) suggestion to include at least 30 participants for pilot testing.

To assess validity, Pearson's correlation method was employed. This involved comparing the Pearson correlation value with the R table value at a significance level of 0.05. According to Sugiyono (2019), an item is considered valid if its Pearson correlation value exceeds the R table value. The validity test was performed using IBM SPSS Statistics 24, and the results showed that each item in the questionnaire had a Pearson correlation value greater than the R table value of 0.349 (with N=30), confirming that all items were valid. The subsequent table summarizes the validity test results for each questionnaire item.

To evaluate the reliability of the instrument, Cronbach's Alpha coefficient was utilized. According to Ghazali (2018), an instrument is deemed reliable when its Cronbach's Alpha value surpasses 0.60. The reliability analysis was carried out using IBM SPSS Statistics 24, yielding a Cronbach's Alpha score of 0.967. This value exceeds the established reliability threshold, indicating that the questionnaire demonstrates a high level of internal consistency. The comprehensive results are displayed in the table below.

**Table 3. Results of the Questionnaire Reliability Test**

Number of Item	Cronbach's Alpha Value	Threshold	Interpretation
22	0.967	0.60	Reliable

Since the questionnaire has been confirmed to be both valid and reliable through pilot testing, it has effectively measured the intended constructs and demonstrated consistent results. The validity testing ensured that the instrument accurately captured what it was designed to measure, while the reliability analysis confirmed the consistency of responses. As no items were found to be invalid or unreliable during the pilot test, no revisions to the questionnaire were necessary. Thus, the finalized questionnaire was deemed appropriate for use in the main research, as it provided trustworthy data that accurately reflected the research objectives. This confirmed the instrument's adequacy in capturing students' perceptions regarding the use of Grammarly and QuillBot in developing their writing skill.

## CONCLUSION

This research involved 65 students from grades ten to twelve at MA Annur Teluk Palinget who regularly use Grammarly and QuillBot for their English writing tasks. The data were collected through a questionnaire distributed via Google Forms, consisting of 22 statements for each tool (Grammarly and QuillBot) measured using a 4-point Likert scale.

The questionnaire was designed to assess four dimensions of students' perceptions: (1) features of the tools, (2) feedback quality, (3) knowledge and ability development, and (4) learning experience. The data collection was conducted during the 2024–2025 academic year, specifically focusing on students' experiences with the free versions of both grammar-checking tools. It began on Monday, May 19, 2025, with the questionnaire link distributed to

participants via the WhatsApp application.

The results of a questionnaire assessing students' perceptions of QuillBot as a grammar correction and learning tool. The highest response percentages are as follows. For item 1, "QuillBot provides feedback on the grammar mistakes I make," 91% of students strongly agreed. In item 2, "QuillBot provides explanations on how to correct the grammar mistakes I make," 89% strongly agreed. For item 3, "QuillBot gives suggestions to correct the grammar mistakes I make," 92% strongly agreed. In item 4, "QuillBot is more efficient even though I use the free version," 92% strongly agreed. For item 5, "QuillBot can be accessed more quickly," 91% strongly agreed. Item 6, "QuillBot can be accessed anytime and anywhere," achieved the highest agreement at 97%. In item 7, "QuillBot has procedures that are easier to use," 85% strongly agreed. For item 8, "I do not feel difficulty using QuillBot even though there is no Indonesian language option," 83% strongly agreed. Item 9, "I do not need a good internet connection to use QuillBot effectively," had 88% strongly agreeing. In item 10, "The grammar feedback given by QuillBot is clearer and easier to understand compared to other tools," 85% strongly agreed.

For item 11, "Feedback from QuillBot is more accurate in correcting my grammar mistakes," 82% strongly agreed. Item 12, "Feedback from QuillBot helps me better recognize and understand the grammar mistakes I often make," saw 86% strongly agreeing. In item 13, "QuillBot is more effective in developing my English grammar skill," 86% strongly agreed. For item 14, "QuillBot helps me better understand the use of subject-verb agreement in sentences," 89% strongly agreed. In item 15, "QuillBot's tense corrections are more accurate and help me avoid mistakes in tense usage," 80% strongly agreed. Item 16, "QuillBot gives more effective suggestions to improve my sentence structure," had 86% strongly agreeing. For item 17, "I use QuillBot more often compared to other tools," 80% strongly agreed. In item 18, "I trust the grammar suggestions and corrections given by QuillBot more," 86% strongly agreed. Item 19, "I am more confident that QuillBot has improved my ability to write grammatically correct sentences," saw 88% strongly agreeing. For item 20, "I am more satisfied with QuillBot as a tool for correcting grammar," 94% strongly agreed. In item 21, "I am more satisfied with QuillBot as a tool for learning grammar," 88% strongly agreed. Finally, for item 22, "QuillBot increases my motivation to learn grammar," 82% strongly agreed. The findings of this research reveal important insights regarding students' perceptions of Grammarly and QuillBot as grammar-checking tools at MA Annur Teluk Palinget. The most striking result is the identical and highly positive perception scores for both applications, with an overall mean of 3.85, categorized as "very positive." This finding theoretically supports the concept of perception proposed by Iersel et al. (2018) and Giritwati (2020).

## SUGGESTION

ncept of perception proposed by Iersel et al. (2018) and Giritwati (2020), which states that perception is the process by which individuals interpret sensory information from their environment. In the context of this research, students' consistently positive perceptions of both applications demonstrate that they successfully integrated sensory experience, cognitive processing, and personal experience to form positive understanding about the effectiveness of both tools.

## REFERENCES

- [1] Carvalho, J., Pereira, L., & Laranjeira, R. (2018). Writing a master's dissertation – students' perspectives. *Journal of Academic Writing*, 8(2), 78-88. <https://doi.org/10.18552/joaw.v8i2.481>
- [2] Cohen, L., Manion, L., & Morrison, K. (2011). *Research methods in education* (7th ed.). London: Routledge.
- [3] Cornelius, T., Willey, J., Edmondson, D., Elkind, M., & Kronish, I. (2020). Are patients afraid to go home? Disposition preferences after transient ischaemic attack and minor stroke. *Emergency Medicine Journal*, 37(8), 486-488. <https://doi.org/10.1136/emered-2019-209154>
- [4] Creswell, J. W. (2014). *Research design: Qualitative, quantitative and mixed methods approaches* (4th ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- [5] 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>
- [6] Dizon, G. (2023). Exploring the effects of Grammarly on EFL students' foreign language anxiety and learner autonomy. *The JALT Call Journal*, 19(3), 299-316. <https://doi.org/10.29140/jaltcall.v19n3.1049>
- [7] Dizon, G., & Gayed, J. (2021). Examining the impact of Grammarly on the quality of mobile L2 writing. *The JALT Call Journal*, 17(2), 74-92. <https://doi.org/10.29140/jaltcall.v17n2.336>
- [8] Dörnyei, Z., & Taguchi, T. (2010). *Questionnaires in second language research: Construction, administration, and processing* (2nd ed.). Routledge.
- [9] Dwifadjrin, G., & Pamungkas, M. (2020). The use of video as media in teaching writing descriptive text. *Project (Professional Journal of English Education)*, 3(5), 624. <https://doi.org/10.22460/project.v3i5.p624-632>
- [10] Embogama, S. (2023). Exploring the efficacy of utilizing song texts as an instructional tool for teaching the present perfect tenses. *SLJO-J-JRM*, 1(2), 26-34. <https://doi.org/10.4038/jrm.v1i2.9>
- [11] Fahmi, M., & Cahyono, B. (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>
- [12] Fahmi, S., & Rachmijati, C. (2021). Improving students' writing skill using Grammarly application for second grade in senior high school. *Project (Professional Journal of English Education)*, 4(1), 69. <https://doi.org/10.22460/project.v4i1.p69-74>
- [13] Fernando, E., & Suryaman, M. (2022). Appropriating grammar as a tool in writing activities: Student's perception. *Journal of English Language and Education*, 7(2), 1-8. <https://doi.org/10.31004/jele.v7i2.232>
- [14] Fish, L. (2017). A study of changes in online graduate business student perceptions over a course. *The BRC Academy Journal of Education*, 6(1), 15-39. <https://doi.org/10.15239/j.brcacadie.2017.06.01.ja01>
- [15] Fitria, R., Sabarun, S., & Miftah, M. (2022). Students' perception of the use of Grammarly in undergraduate thesis writing. *Project (Professional Journal of English Education)*,



- 5(2), 366. <https://doi.org/10.22460/project.v5i2.p366-371>
- [16] Fowler, F. J. (2014). *Survey research methods* (5th ed.). Centre for Survey Research, University of Massachusetts.
- [17] Graham, S. (2019). Changing how writing is taught. *Review of Research in Education*, 43(1), 277–303. <https://doi.org/10.3102/0091732x18821125>
- [18] Gürleyik, S., & Akdemir, E. (2018). Guiding curriculum development: student perceptions for the second language learning in technology-enhanced learning environments. *Journal of Education and Training Studies*, 6(4), 131. <https://doi.org/10.11114/jets.v6i4.2994>
- [19] Hadiat, A. W. F. (2022). The use of Grammarly to enhance students' accuracy in writing descriptive text. *Journal of English Education Program (JEEP)*, 9(2), 133-138. [http://dx.doi.org/10.25157/\(jeep\).v9i2.8552](http://dx.doi.org/10.25157/(jeep).v9i2.8552)
- [20] Haerazi, H., Utama, I., & Hidayatullah, H. (2020). Mobile applications to improve English writing skills viewed from critical thinking ability for pre-service teachers. *International Journal of Interactive Mobile Technologies (IJIM)*, 14(07), 58. <https://doi.org/10.3991/ijim.v14i07.11900>
- [21] Hakiki, G. (2021). Perception of EFL students on the use of Grammarly application in writing class. *Eduvelop (Journal of English Education and Development)*, 4(2), 99-106. <https://doi.org/10.31605/eduvelop.v4i2.891>
- [22] Humphrey, S., & Macnaught, L. (2015). Functional language instruction and the writing growth of English language learners in the middle years. *TESOL Quarterly*, 50(4), 792–816. <https://doi.org/10.1002/tesq.247>
- [23] Iersel, M., Latour, C., Vos, R., Kirschner, P., & Reimer, W. (2018). Perceptions of community care and placement preferences in first-year nursing students: A multicenter, cross-sectional study. *Nurse Education Today*, 60, 92-97. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.nedt.2017.09.016>
- [24] Jansen, H. (2010). The Logic of Qualitative Survey Research and Its Position in the Field of Social Research Methods. *Forum Qualitative Sozialforschung*, 11. <http://www.qualitative-research.net/index.php/fqs/article/view/1450/2946>
- [25] Jones, C., & Fortescue, S. (1987). *Using computers in the language classroom*.
- [26] Kassem, M. (2017). Developing business writing skills and reducing writing anxiety of EFL learners through wikis. *English Language Teaching*, 10(3), 151–164. <https://doi.org/10.5539/elt.v10n3p151>
- [27] Khalil, Z. (2018). EFL students' perceptions towards using Google Docs and Google Classroom as online collaborative tools in learning grammar. *Applied Linguistics Research Journal*. <https://doi.org/10.14744/alrj.2018.47955>
- [28] Kiersma, M., Plake, K., Newton, G., & Mason, H. (2010). Factors affecting prepharmacy students' perceptions of the professional role of pharmacists. *American Journal of Pharmaceutical Education*, 74(9), 161. <https://doi.org/10.5688/aj7409161>
- [29] Kurniati, E., & Fithriani, R. (2022). Post-graduate students' perceptions of QuillBot utilization in English academic writing class. *Journal of English Language Teaching and Linguistics*, 7(3), 437. <https://doi.org/10.21462/jeltl.v7i3.852>
- [30] Latifah, S. (2024). The use of QuillBot in academic writing. *Journey (Journal of English Language and Pedagogy)*, 7(1), 110-121. <https://doi.org/10.33503/journey.v7i1.4047>

- [31] Lee, Y. (2024). University students' perceptions of artificial intelligence-based tools for English writing courses. *Online Journal of Communication and Media Technologies*, 14(1), e202412. <https://doi.org/10.30935/ojcmt/14195>
- [32] Luwoye, A. (2023). Science teachers' perceptions of factors influencing senior school students' performance in steam. *Jurnal Pendidikan Multimedia (Edsence)*, 5(2), 15-26. <https://doi.org/10.17509/edsence.v5i2.60767>
- [33] Maharani, M., & Sholikhatun, E. (2022). Punctuation and capitalization in writing: How do students produce them? *Journal of Advanced Multidisciplinary Research*, 3(1), 53. <https://doi.org/10.30659/jamr.3.1.53-61>
- [34] Maijo, S. N. (2021). Learners' perception and preference of open and distance learning mode at the Institute of Adult Education, Tanzania. *East African Journal of Education and Social Sciences*, 2(Issue 3), 79-86. <https://doi.org/10.46606/eajess2021v02i03.0106>
- [35] Mdogana-Zide, L. (2023). An interventive collaborative scaffolded approach with a writing center on ESL students' academic writing. *Journal of Culture and Values in Education*, 6(2), 34-50. <https://doi.org/10.46303/jcve.2023.7>
- [36] Mumtaz, S. (2021). Academic writing challenges of foreign language learners in Pakistan. *Journal of Arts & Social Sciences*, 8(2), 97-103. <https://doi.org/10.46662/jass.v8i2.181>
- [37] Murtiningsih, S., Kurniawati, S., & Putri, A. (2022). University EFL students' grammar mastery and their writing ability: A quantitative study. *Advances in Social Science, Education and Humanities Research*, 656, 226-236. [https://doi.org/10.2991/978-2-494069-65-7\\_21](https://doi.org/10.2991/978-2-494069-65-7_21)
- [38] Narvika, I., Supriyadi, D., & Deviyanti, R. (2021). The correlation between students' grammar mastery and writing ability in descriptive text of the first grade students in MAN 1 Bandar Lampung. *U-Jet Unila Journal of English Language Teaching*, 10(3). <https://doi.org/10.23960/ujet.v10.i3.202112>
- [39] Nova, M. (2018). Utilizing Grammarly in evaluating academic writing: A narrative research on EFL students' experience. *Premise Journal of English Education*, 7(1), 80. <https://doi.org/10.24127/pj.v7i1.1300>
- [40] Nurhasanah, N., & Huriyah, S. (2019). Enhancing students' writing achievement through e-mail exchanges on personal letters. *Eternal (English Teaching Journal)*, 10(2), 78-89. <https://doi.org/10.26877/eternal.v10i2.5123>
- [41] Nurhidayah, A. (2024). Grammarly through the lens of student perception. *Jurnal Bahasa Sastra Dan Studi Amerika*, 30(1), 11. <https://doi.org/10.20961/jbssa.v30i1.87858>
- [42] Olga, S. (2019). Teaching business English with TED Talks: Putting ideas into practice. *Journal of Language and Education*, 5(2), 95-111. <https://doi.org/10.17323/jle.2019.7995>
- [43] Oluwatayo, A., Aderonmu, P., & Aduwo, E. (2015). Architecture students' perceptions of their learning environment and their academic performance. *Learning Environments Research*, 18(1), 129-142. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10984-015-9172-7>
- [44] Opoku-Darko, J. (2023). Ghanaian students' perceptions of Chinese language learning. *American Journal of Education and Practice*, 7(1), 26-34.

- <https://doi.org/10.47672/ajep.1329>
- [45] Park, M., & Chitiyo, M. (2010). An examination of teacher attitudes towards children with autism. *Journal of Research in Special Educational Needs*, 11(1), 70-78. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1471-3802.2010.01181.x>
- [46] Parra G, L., & Calero S, X. (2019). Automated writing evaluation tools in the improvement of the writing skill. *International Journal of Instruction*, 12(2), 209-226. <https://doi.org/10.29333/iji.2019.12214a>
- [47] Paudel, J. (2022). Demystifying writing: Strategies for developing better writing. *Journal of NELTA*, 27(1-2), 181-200. <https://doi.org/10.3126/nelta.v27i1-2.53202>
- [48] Pawlak, M. (2018). Grammar learning strategy inventory (GLSI): Another look. *Studies in Second Language Learning and Teaching*, 8(2), 351-379. <https://doi.org/10.14746/ssllt.2018.8.2.8>
- [49] Pitenoe, M., Modaberi, A., & Ardestani, E. (2017). The effect of cognitive and metacognitive writing strategies on content of the Iranian intermediate EFL learners' writing. *Journal of Language Teaching and Research*, 8(3), 594. <https://doi.org/10.17507/jltr.0803.19>
- [50] Polat, E. (2023). Are existing mobile writing applications for writing difficulties sufficient?. *Participatory Educational Research*, 10(5), 19-40. <https://doi.org/10.17275/per.23.73.10.5>
- [51] Pramasta, R. G., & Wibowo, Y. W. A. (2023). Virtual reality and language learning in hospitality: an investigation of students' perceptions. *International Journal of Current Science Research and Review*, 06(08). <https://doi.org/10.47191/ijcsrr/v6-i8-32>
- [52] Puri, G. (2023). The use of Grammarly by tertiary English language learners in their online writing classes. *English Education Journal of English Teaching and Research*, 8(2), 163-179. <https://doi.org/10.29407/jetar.v8i2.20981>

HALAMAN INI SENGAJA DIKOSONGKAN