



Department of Digital Business

Journal of Artificial Intelligence and Digital Business (RIGGS)

Homepage: <https://journal.ilmudata.co.id/index.php/RIGGS>

Vol. 5 No. 1 (2026) pp: 1453-1460

P-ISSN: 2963-9298, e-ISSN: 2963-914X

A Systematic Review of Teachers' Perspectives on the Use of Grammarly in EFL Writing Classrooms

Aurelya Chesia Sefina

English Language Education Program, Faculty of Language and Arts, Universitas Kristen Satya Wacana

aurelvachesia1@gmail.com

Abstract

Grammarly has become increasingly popular among teachers and students as an automated writing evaluation tool for improving writing accuracy in English as a Foreign Language (EFL) contexts. Despite its widespread use, teachers' perspectives on its pedagogical benefits and challenges in writing instruction remain an important area to explore. This study aims to examine EFL teachers' perspectives on the use of Grammarly in writing classrooms, particularly focusing on its perceived benefits and challenges. A systematic literature review method was employed by analyzing 15 peer-reviewed journal articles published in national and international journals between 2020 and 2025. The articles were selected using specific keywords related to Grammarly and teachers' perspectives and were retrieved from Google Scholar and SINTA databases. The selected studies were analyzed thematically to address two research questions concerning the benefits and challenges of using Grammarly in EFL writing classrooms. The findings indicate that Grammarly offers several benefits, including saving teachers' time in providing written feedback, enhancing students' grammatical accuracy, and improving overall writing quality. However, the review also reveals several challenges, such as students' over-reliance on automated feedback, inaccuracies in correcting complex or context-dependent errors, and Grammarly's limited ability to address higher-order writing concerns such as organization, coherence, and content development. These findings suggest that while Grammarly can serve as a supportive tool in EFL writing instruction, it should be used alongside teacher guidance and human feedback to ensure effective and balanced writing development. Directions for future research are also discussed.

Keywords: EFL, Grammarly, Teachers, Writing

1. Introduction

The rapid advancement of technology in the field of education has significantly influenced the teaching and learning of English as a Foreign Language (EFL). Digital tools, online platforms, and artificial intelligence-based applications are increasingly integrated into language classrooms to support teaching effectiveness and enhance students' learning experiences. Despite these developments, writing remains one of the most challenging skills for EFL learners to master. Previous studies indicate that writing classes continue to pose difficulties for both teachers and students, particularly in higher education contexts (Ftik et al., 2024; Manggolo et al., 2024). University students frequently struggle with various aspects of writing, especially vocabulary use and grammatical accuracy, which often results in low-quality written outputs (Njonge, 2023; Rahman et al., 2024). These persistent challenges suggest that conventional writing instruction and feedback practices may not be sufficient to address students' needs in contemporary EFL classrooms.

In response to these challenges, recent technological developments have introduced new possibilities for supporting writing instruction. One notable innovation is the emergence of automated written corrective feedback (AWCF) tools, which aim to assist writers by providing immediate feedback on language use. Among these tools, *Grammarly* has become one of the most widely used applications in EFL contexts. Its popularity can be attributed to its ability to identify grammatical errors, spelling mistakes, punctuation issues, and stylistic problems in written texts. As a result, *Grammarly* is increasingly adopted by both teachers and students as a supplementary tool in writing instruction. The integration of such technology reflects a broader shift toward technology-enhanced language learning, where digital tools are expected to support efficiency and accuracy in the learning process.

From teachers' perspectives, *Grammarly* offers several practical advantages in the writing classroom. One of the most frequently reported benefits is its potential to save time in providing written feedback. Writing teachers often face heavy workloads, particularly in large classrooms where providing detailed and individualized feedback

to each student can be time-consuming. Studies have shown that *Grammarly* helps teachers reduce the time spent correcting lower-order concerns such as grammar, spelling, and punctuation, allowing them to focus more on higher-level aspects of writing instruction (Dewi, 2023; Koltovskaia, 2023; Miranty et al., 2022). This time-saving feature is especially valuable in higher education settings, where teachers are required to manage multiple classes and extensive writing assignments.

In addition to supporting teachers' workload management, *Grammarly* is also perceived to contribute positively to students' writing development. Teachers observe that the tool helps students become more aware of their language errors, including issues related to grammar, vocabulary usage, spelling, and punctuation. This heightened awareness may encourage students to reflect on their mistakes and make revisions independently, which can lead to gradual improvement in writing accuracy and quality (Abu Guba et al., 2024). For EFL learners who often struggle with basic writing mechanics, such immediate and detailed feedback can be particularly beneficial, as it provides continuous exposure to correct language forms during the writing process.

However, despite its perceived benefits, the use of *Grammarly* in EFL writing classrooms is not without challenges. Several studies have raised concerns regarding the potential negative effects of excessive reliance on automated feedback tools. Teachers have reported that frequent use of *Grammarly* may hinder students' ability to critically analyze their own writing, as students may rely heavily on the tool's suggestions rather than engaging in independent problem-solving (Al-Shaboul et al., 2024; Isyabella, 2020). This over-reliance on technology may limit students' opportunities to develop deeper linguistic awareness and critical thinking skills, which are essential components of effective writing.

Another major concern highlighted in previous research relates to the accuracy and contextual appropriateness of *Grammarly*'s feedback. While the tool performs well in identifying surface-level errors, several studies indicate that it may provide inaccurate or misleading suggestions when dealing with complex sentence structures, idiomatic expressions, or context-dependent language use (Dewi, 2023). In such cases, students may accept incorrect suggestions without fully understanding the underlying grammatical rules. This issue underscores the continued importance of teachers' roles in guiding students, clarifying errors, and providing explanations that go beyond what automated tools can offer (N. K. Thi & Nikolov, 2022).

Existing studies on *Grammarly* have largely focused on students' perceptions or the effectiveness of the tool in improving writing accuracy. While these studies provide valuable insights, there is still a need for a more focused examination of teachers' perspectives, particularly regarding how *Grammarly* is used pedagogically in EFL writing classrooms. Teachers play a crucial role in mediating the use of technology, deciding how and when it should be integrated into instruction, and balancing automated feedback with human guidance. However, research that systematically synthesizes teachers' views on both the benefits and challenges of using *Grammarly* remains limited, especially within EFL contexts.

This gap in the literature highlights the need for a comprehensive review that brings together existing empirical evidence on teachers' perspectives. By examining previous studies systematically, it is possible to identify recurring patterns, shared concerns, and areas of agreement or disagreement among EFL teachers regarding the use of *Grammarly*. Such an analysis can also reveal how current research addresses or fails to address issues related to technological advancement, pedagogical effectiveness, and the development of students' writing skills. Furthermore, synthesizing teachers' perspectives can contribute to a clearer understanding of how *Grammarly* can be used more effectively and responsibly in writing instruction.

Therefore, this study aims to explore EFL teachers' perspectives on the use of *Grammarly* in EFL writing classrooms by conducting a systematic literature review of relevant empirical studies. Specifically, this study seeks to examine the benefits perceived by teachers when using *Grammarly* as part of writing instruction, as well as the challenges they encounter in its implementation. By focusing on teachers' perspectives, this study addresses an important aspect of technology integration that is often overlooked in discussions centered primarily on learners.

To achieve this aim, the study is guided by the following research questions: (1) What are the EFL teachers' perspectives on the benefits of using *Grammarly* in EFL writing classrooms? and (2) What challenges do EFL teachers face when using *Grammarly* in EFL writing classrooms? Answering these questions is expected to provide insights that are valuable for both EFL teachers and students. For teachers, the findings may inform strategies for maximizing the pedagogical potential of *Grammarly* while minimizing its limitations. For students, the findings may increase awareness of the appropriate use of automated feedback tools and encourage more critical and informed engagement with technology in the writing process. Ultimately, this study seeks to contribute

to the ongoing discussion on the role of AI-based tools in EFL writing instruction by highlighting the importance of balanced integration between technology and human feedback.

2. Method

Research Design

This study employed a systematic literature review to explore EFL teachers' perspectives on the benefits and challenges of using Grammarly in EFL writing classrooms. This design was selected to allow an in-depth, structured, and transparent synthesis of empirical evidence derived from previous studies focusing on teachers' viewpoints. A systematic literature review was considered appropriate because it enables the identification, evaluation, and synthesis of relevant studies in a rigorous manner, ensuring that conclusions are grounded in existing empirical findings rather than individual observations (Mali, 2025). The focus of the review was limited to empirical studies examining Grammarly use in EFL/ESL writing contexts, particularly from teachers' perspectives, to maintain analytical precision and relevance.

Data Collection Procedures

The data collection process was conducted through a structured search of two academic databases: **Google Scholar** and **SINTA**. These databases were chosen due to their wide coverage of peer-reviewed journals in education and applied linguistics, including both international and Indonesian scholarly publications. The article search was carried out using specific keywords aligned with the research focus, namely: *teachers' perspective using Grammarly*, *lecturers' perspective using Grammarly*, *educator perspective on Grammarly for writing*, and *teachers using Grammarly in class*.

The initial search yielded a broad pool of articles. Each article was then screened sequentially by reading titles and abstracts to determine its relevance to the topic. Articles that appeared relevant were further examined in full-text form to ensure that they explicitly addressed Grammarly use in English writing instruction and involved teachers as participants or as a central analytical focus. Studies that did not meet these criteria were excluded at this stage.

All selected articles were subsequently uploaded and organized using Mendeley as a reference management tool. This step facilitated systematic documentation, citation tracking, and data organization. To ensure consistency and completeness, the researcher extracted key information from each article and summarized it in a structured table (Table 1). The extracted information included the author(s) and year of publication, article title, journal name, research goal, research method, and research context and participants. The reviewed studies included empirical research conducted by Ayan and Erdemir (2023), Damashola et al. (2025), Anis (2023), Ghafar (2024), Julaid (2025), Bnaiche (2023), L. Thi et al. (2025), Suharno et al. (2025), Putra (2023), Sutaryo et al. (2022), Tonic (2020), Utami and Mahardika (2023), Wijayanti et al. (2021), Wulandari et al. (2024), and Garcia et al. (2025), as summarized in Table 1. No article that met the inclusion criteria was omitted from the table, ensuring comprehensive coverage of all reviewed studies.

Table 1 presents a total of fifteen empirical studies published between 2020 and 2025. These studies represent diverse geographical contexts, including Türkiye, Indonesia, Algeria, Vietnam, Iraq, Middle Eastern countries, Scotland, the United States, and the Philippines. The research methods reported in these studies varied and included qualitative approaches such as interviews and case studies, quantitative descriptive and survey designs, mixed or combined qualitative–quantitative approaches, and questionnaire-based investigations. The participants across the studies consisted of EFL teachers, university lecturers, high school teachers, pre-service teachers, and instructors in higher education settings. The inclusion of varied contexts and methodological approaches allowed for a richer and more balanced synthesis of teachers' perspectives on Grammarly use in EFL writing classrooms.

Inclusion and Exclusion Criteria

To ensure methodological rigor and relevance, explicit inclusion and exclusion criteria were applied during the article selection process, as summarized in Table 2. Only articles written in English were included, while non-English publications were excluded. The review was limited to peer-reviewed journal articles, excluding non-journal publications and non-peer-reviewed works. In terms of content, included studies were required to discuss the use of Grammarly in learning contexts, with a particular emphasis on teachers' perspectives. Studies that focused on Grammarly without addressing instructional or pedagogical perspectives were excluded.

Regarding context, the selected studies had to be conducted in EFL settings within higher education, ensuring alignment with the focus of this research. Studies conducted outside EFL contexts or outside higher education settings were excluded. The publication year was also restricted to the period 2020–2025 to ensure the inclusion of recent and relevant research reflecting current developments in AI-assisted writing tools. Finally, only articles published in official academic journals and available as open-access sources were included to ensure quality and accessibility of data.

Study Settings

Figure 1 illustrates the geographical distribution and educational settings of the reviewed studies. The figure shows that the research contexts were predominantly situated in higher education institutions across Asia, the Middle East, Europe, Africa, and North America. This distribution highlights the global interest in Grammarly as an automated written corrective feedback tool and provides a broad contextual foundation for analyzing teachers' perspectives across different EFL environments.

Data Analysis Procedure

The data analysis was conducted using an inductive thematic analysis approach. This approach was chosen to allow themes to emerge directly from the data rather than being imposed a priori. The researcher began by reading each selected article multiple times to gain a comprehensive understanding of its content. During this process, relevant statements, findings, and discussions related to the benefits and challenges of using Grammarly in EFL writing classrooms were highlighted.

The highlighted information was then coded and grouped into preliminary categories based on recurring ideas and patterns. These categories were gradually refined into broader themes that directly addressed the research questions of the study. Throughout the analysis, careful attention was paid to maintaining consistency with the original findings reported in each article, avoiding reinterpretation beyond the scope of the data. The final themes derived from this inductive process were presented in the findings section as synthesized answers to the research questions concerning EFL teachers' perspectives on the benefits and challenges of using Grammarly in writing instruction.

3. Results and Discussion

3.1 Results

Based on the synthesis of fifteen empirical studies summarized in Table 1, the findings reveal consistent patterns regarding EFL teachers' perspectives on the use of Grammarly in writing classrooms. The results are organized according to the research questions and categorized into two major areas: (1) the benefits of using Grammarly in EFL writing instruction, and (2) the challenges encountered by teachers in its implementation.

Benefits of Using Grammarly in EFL Writing Classrooms

Theme 1: Grammarly as a Time-Saving Tool for Written Feedback

One of the most frequently reported benefits across the reviewed studies is Grammarly's ability to reduce the time teachers spend providing written feedback. Ayan and Erdemir (2023) reported that Grammarly is significantly more time-efficient than traditional feedback practices, particularly in correcting surface-level errors such as grammar, spelling, and punctuation. This finding is supported by Julaid (2025), who noted that Grammarly contributed to shortening the reviewing and revising process in English writing instruction.

Tambunan et al. (2022) further found that automated writing evaluation tools, including Grammarly, help improve writing fluency by reducing the time students need to generate ideas, resulting in increased language production. Similarly, Putra (2023) observed that Grammarly assists learners by offering alternative expressions, raising grammatical awareness, identifying recurring errors, and supporting idea development. Other studies also indicated that Grammarly enables teachers to focus more on higher-level writing concerns, such as content and coherence, because basic language errors are addressed automatically (Ghafar, 2024; Wijayanti et al., 2021).

Overall, these findings suggest that teachers perceive Grammarly as an effective support tool for managing feedback-related workload, particularly in large EFL writing classes.

Theme 2: Grammarly's Role in Improving Writing Accuracy

Another prominent benefit identified across the reviewed studies is Grammarly's role in improving students' writing accuracy. Utami and Mahardika (2023) reported that Grammarly assists students in correcting spelling, grammar, and punctuation errors while also promoting learner autonomy through self-revision. Consistent with this finding, several studies indicate that Grammarly supports the development of grammatical accuracy by providing immediate and explicit feedback on language use.

Moon (2021) found that Grammarly helps students enhance grammatical precision and partially compensates for the limitations of traditional teacher feedback, particularly in addressing frequent surface-level errors. Similarly, Yunita (2020) observed that Grammarly facilitates grammar learning in writing activities; however, teacher guidance remains necessary due to occasional inaccuracies in automated feedback. In addition, students themselves were reported to acknowledge Grammarly's contribution to improving the grammatical quality of their academic writing (Yunita, 2020).

Overall, these findings suggest that Grammarly functions as a supportive instructional tool that increases students' awareness of language errors and contributes to improved writing accuracy in EFL contexts, particularly when its use is complemented by teacher guidance.

Challenges of Using Grammarly in EFL Writing Classrooms

Theme 3: Limitations in Addressing Complex and Contextual Language Use

Despite its benefits, several studies highlighted Grammarly's limitations in handling complex grammatical structures and contextual meaning. Thi et al. (2025) reported that Grammarly sometimes fails to capture the intended meaning of sentences, particularly in cases involving idiomatic expressions or complex sentence constructions. Damashola et al. (2025) similarly noted that teachers are aware of these limitations and expressed concerns regarding contextual accuracy and over-reliance on automated corrections.

Students also reported instances of unclear or misleading feedback. Wulandari et al. (2024) identified several limitations, including limited contextual understanding, misleading error suggestions, and weak content evaluation. These findings suggest that Grammarly's effectiveness decreases when addressing higher-level linguistic complexity and meaning-making in writing.

Theme 4: Limited Support for Higher-Order Writing Concerns

Another challenge identified in the reviewed studies relates to Grammarly's limited ability to address higher-order writing concerns. Ayan and Erdemir (2023) found that while Grammarly is effective in correcting grammatical and mechanical errors, it struggles to evaluate organization, coherence, and idea development. This finding aligns with Fitria (2021), who reported that Grammarly's feedback is largely restricted to surface-level corrections.

Teachers across studies acknowledged that Grammarly is useful for saving time and improving accuracy but emphasized that it cannot replace teacher feedback in developing students' overall writing quality. As a result, Grammarly is viewed as a supplementary tool rather than a comprehensive solution for writing instruction.

Theme 5: The Continued Need for Teacher Guidance

Several studies emphasized that teacher guidance remains essential when integrating Grammarly into writing instruction. Garcia et al. (2025), Bnaiche (2023), and Tonic (2020) reported concerns that excessive reliance on Grammarly may reduce students' critical thinking and independent writing skills. Garcia et al. (2025) noted that although Grammarly improves accuracy, students must still develop core writing competencies independently to avoid dependency on AI tools.

Tonic (2020) found that students often struggle to understand Grammarly's feedback without teacher explanation, highlighting the importance of instructional mediation. Anis and Khalid (2023) also observed discrepancies between students' Grammarly-assisted writing and their performance in examination settings, reinforcing the necessity of human assessment. Suharno et al. (2025) further emphasized that AI tools should complement rather than replace teachers due to the need for contextual understanding, creativity, and deeper reasoning in writing.

3.2 Discussion

The findings of this systematic literature review indicate that Grammarly is widely perceived by EFL teachers as a beneficial support tool in writing instruction, particularly for addressing lower-order writing concerns. One of the most significant advantages identified is Grammarly's ability to save time in providing written feedback. This aligns with the growing demands placed on EFL teachers, especially in higher education contexts where large class sizes and frequent writing assignments are common. By automating the correction of surface-level errors, Grammarly allows teachers to allocate more instructional time to higher-level writing issues and individualized guidance.

In addition to efficiency, the reviewed studies suggest that Grammarly contributes positively to students' writing accuracy. Teachers perceive that repeated exposure to automated feedback helps students become more aware of grammatical patterns and common errors. This increased awareness may support learner autonomy, as students are encouraged to revise their work independently. Such findings are consistent with broader research on automated written corrective feedback, which emphasizes its potential role in supporting self-regulated learning.

However, the discussion of benefits must be balanced with the challenges identified in the literature. A recurring concern across studies is Grammarly's limited capacity to handle complex linguistic and contextual issues. While the tool performs well in identifying mechanical errors, it often fails to provide accurate feedback on meaning, pragmatics, and idiomatic language use. This limitation underscores the risk of students accepting automated suggestions uncritically, which may lead to misunderstandings rather than improved language competence.

Another critical issue discussed in the literature is Grammarly's inability to address higher-order writing concerns such as coherence, organization, and argument development. Writing is a complex cognitive process that extends beyond grammatical accuracy, and these higher-level skills require human judgment and pedagogical insight. The findings suggest that teachers recognize Grammarly's value as a supportive tool but do not view it as a replacement for teacher feedback. Instead, effective writing instruction requires a balance between automated assistance and human intervention.

The importance of teacher guidance emerges as a central theme in the discussion. Teachers play a crucial role in mediating Grammarly's use, helping students interpret feedback, and fostering critical engagement with automated suggestions. Without proper guidance, there is a risk that students may become overly dependent on AI tools, potentially hindering the development of independent writing skills and critical thinking. Therefore, the integration of Grammarly should be accompanied by explicit instructional strategies that emphasize reflection, evaluation, and learning from feedback.

Overall, this discussion highlights that Grammarly functions most effectively when used as a complementary tool within a pedagogically guided writing framework. While it offers clear advantages in efficiency and accuracy, its limitations reinforce the continued importance of teacher expertise in EFL writing instruction. Future research may further explore instructional models that integrate Grammarly with teacher feedback to maximize its pedagogical benefits while minimizing potential drawbacks.

4. Conclusion

To conclude, this study aimed to explore EFL teachers' perspectives on the benefits and challenges of using Grammarly in EFL writing classrooms. The research questions focused on (1) identifying the benefits teachers perceive in using Grammarly, and (2) examining the challenges they face when implementing it in writing instruction. Based on the systematic review, the findings reveal that Grammarly provides several significant benefits, such as helping teachers save time when giving feedback and improving students' grammatical accuracy and writing quality. Nevertheless, Grammarly has some issues to consider, such as its inaccuracies in correcting errors in complex sentences, and its inability to provide feedback on higher-order concerns like organization and coherence. In summary, even though Grammarly is a useful tool for teachers and students, it should be used in combination with teacher feedback rather than in place of it to guarantee well-rounded and efficient writing development. This study also has limitations in spite of its contributions. First, this study only reviews several journals from Indonesia and small parts of Asian countries. Therefore, future studies could include more journals from other regions to provide a broader and more global point of view. The other limitation is related to the number of articles to review (i.e., 15 articles). Future research could include more articles in their review to gain more insights on the benefits and challenges of using Grammarly in EFL writing classrooms. Based on this study, there

are several questions that worth exploring by future researchers. What is the effect of using Grammarly over a long period of time? Does using Grammarly too frequently reduce a writer's self-confidence? What are the best ways to minimize the over-reliance on the use of Grammarly? Furthermore, in the future, researchers could also investigate what kinds of errors Grammarly frequently makes when reviewing students' written work. In essence, future researchers should explore the long-term effects of Grammarly and how Grammarly plays a role in increasing the writer's confidence, as well as to what extent Grammarly can support learning.

References

1. Abu Guba, M. N., Awad, A., & Qub'a, A. A. (2024). Grammarly in teaching writing to EFL learners at low levels: how useful is it? *World Journal of English Language*, 14(3), 1–13. <https://doi.org/10.5430/wjel.v14n3p1>
2. Abu Qub'a, A., Abu Guba, M. N., & Fareh, S. (2024). Exploring the use of Grammarly in assessing English academic writing. *Heliyon*, 10(15), e34893. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.heliyon.2024.e34893>
3. Al-Shaboul, I. A., Al Rousan, R. M., Kalsoom, T., & A-Awawdeh, N. (2024). A critical examination of how AI-driven writing tools have impacted the content, style, and organization of foreign language undergraduates' writing: A survey of lecturers. *Research Journal in Advanced Humanities*, 5(4), 156–172. <https://doi.org/10.58256/pjf6en83>
4. Anis, N., & Khalid, B. (2023). Teachers' and students' perception about the effects of using ChatGPT, Grammarly, and Quillbot on students' writing skills. *People's Democratic Republic of Algeria Ministry of Higer Education and Scientific Research*, 1–100. <https://dSPACE.centre-univ-mila.dz/jspui/handle/123456789/3481>
5. Ayan, D., & Erdemir, N. (2023). EFL teachers perceptions of automated written corrective feedback and Grammarly. *Ahmet Keleşoğlu Eğitim Fakültesi Dergisi*, 5, 1183–1198. <https://doi.org/10.38151/akef.2023.106>
6. Boussouf, A. (2023). *PEOPLE'S DEMOCRATIC REPUBLIC OF ALGERIA MINISTRY OF HIGER EDUCATION AND SCIENTIFIC RESEARCH Board of Examiners*. <https://dSPACE.centre-univ-mila.dz/jspui/handle/123456789/3481>
7. Damashola, A., Sulistyanto, I., & Prasongko, A. (2025). Teachers' perception of Grammarly for writing assessment: quantitative study. *Universitas Gunung Jati*, 13(May), 43–59. <https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.33603/perspective.v13i1.10206>
8. 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>
9. Fitriana, T. N. (2021a). "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>
10. Fitriana, T. N. (2021b). Grammarly as AI-powered English writing assistant: students' alternative for writing English. *Metathesis: Journal of English Language, Literature, and Teaching*, 5(1), 65. <https://doi.org/10.31002/metathesis.v5i1.3519>
11. Ftik, I., Abdurrahman, U. I. N. K. H., & Pekalongan, W. (2024). Exploring the challenges of student at writing skills from creative writing courses: a case study. *ICONIE*, 1693–1704. <https://proceeding.uingusdur.ac.id/index.php/iconie/article/view/1940>
12. Garcia, P. D., Dyn, M., Maghanoy, R. G., Ahmad, F. S. H., Manabat, A. D., Psyche, J., & Arnoco, P. (2025). Chatgpt, Grammarly, and Quillbot: Perceptions of students and teachers towards the use of AI tools in writing. *Journal of English Language Teaching and Applied Linguistics*, 7(3), 161–167. <https://doi.org/10.32996/jeltal>
13. Ghafar, Z. N. (2024). Assessment of EFL teachers' and students' writing skills by using the Grammarly program. *JOURNAL OF E-LEARNING RESEARCH*.
14. Ghufron, M. A., & Rosyida, F. (2018). The Role of Grammarly in assessing English as a Foreign Language (EFL) writing. *Lingua Cultura*, 12(4), 395. <https://doi.org/10.21512/lc.v12i4.4582>
15. Isyabella. (2020). Teachers' perspective of Grammarly as an online grammar checker to improve writing skill. *UHAMKA International Conference on ELT and CALL (UICELL)*, December, 17–18.
16. Julaid, A. S. (2025). Teachers and students' perceptions toward the use of Grammarly to improve EFL students' academic writing. *EXCELLENCIA: INTERNATIONAL MULTI-DISCIPLINARY JOURNAL OF EDUCATION*, 3(1), 1–10. <https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.5281/>
17. Koltovskaia, S. (2023). Postsecondary L2 writing teachers' use and perceptions of Grammarly as a complement to their feedback. *ReCALL*, 35(3), 290–304. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0958344022000179>
18. Llausas, S. M., Ruiz, E., Ayucan, S. M., & Jr, O. J. E. (2024). A systematic literature review on the use of grammarly in improving the writing skills of ESL / EFL students. *International Journal of Multidisciplinary: Applied Buisness and Education Research*, 5(9), 3507–3516. <https://doi.org/10.11594/ijmaber.05.09.10>
19. Mali, Y. C. G. (2025). Factors hindering the integration and potential of technology in EFL classrooms. *International Journal of Indonesian Education and Teaching*, 9(1), 171–185. <https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.24071/ijiet.v9i1.9553>
20. Manggolo, N. S. K. H., Arifin, M. F., Indriani, L., & Khusniyati, N. N. (2024). Analysis of EFL Learners' Writing Challenges in the Digital Era. *ETERNAL (English Teaching Journal)*, 15(1), 130–143. <https://doi.org/10.26877/eternal.v15i1.376>
21. Marwa Bnaiche, N. G. (2023). The effectiveness of using Grammarly in the writing process. *People's Democratic Republic of Algeria Ministry of Higher Education and Scientific Research*, 1–112.
22. Miranty, D., Widiati, U., Cahyono, B. Y., & Sharif, T. I. S. T. (2022). The Effectiveness of using Grammarly in teaching writing among Indonesian undergraduate EFL students. *Proceedings of the International Seminar on Language, Education, and Culture (ISOLEC 2021)*, 612(ISOLEC), 41–45. <https://doi.org/10.2991/assehr.k.211212.008>
23. Moon, D. (2021). Evaluating corrective feedback generated by an AI-powered online grammar checker. *International Journal of Internet, Broadcasting and Communication*, 13(4), 22–29. <http://dx.doi.org/10.7236/IJIBC.2021.13.4.22>
24. Moosapour, H., Saeidifard, F., Aalaa, M., Soltani, A., & Larijani, B. (2021). The rationale behind systematic reviews in clinical medicine: a conceptual framework. *Journal of Diabetes and Metabolic Disorders*, 20(1), 919–929. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s40200-021-00773-8>
25. Njonge, T. (2023). Influence of psychological well-being and school factors on delinquency , during the Covid-19 period among secondary school students in selected schools in Nakuru County : Kenya. *International Journal of Research and Innovation in Social Science (IJRISS)*, VII(2454), 1175–1189. <https://doi.org/10.47772/IJRISS>
26. Putra, M. (2023). Ai writing correction tools: teachers and students' perception. *Jurnal Tatsqif*, 21(1), 35–66. <https://doi.org/10.20414/jtq.v21i1.7963>
27. Rahman, M., Hossain, M. A., & Uddin, M. M. (2024). Challenges in academic writing for undergraduate students in Bangladesh. *European Journal of Teaching and Education*, 6, 49–77.

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.31004/riggs.v5i1.6449>

Lisensi: Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International (CC BY 4.0)

28. Siddaway, A. P., Wood, A. M., & Hedges, L. V. (2019). How to do a systematic review: a best practice guide for conducting and reporting narrative reviews, meta-analyses, and meta-syntheses. *Annual Review of Psychology*, 70, 747–770. <https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev-psych-010418-102803>
29. Suharno, S., Musthafa, B., & Purnawarman, P. (2025). Exploring perceptions and experiences: integrating AI in English language teaching from the perspectives of learners and educators. *Jurnal Pendidikan Progresif*, 15(1), 499–515. <https://doi.org/10.23960/jpp.v15i1.pp499-515>
30. Sutaryo, Asrul, & Hasan, N. (2022). The use of Grammarly application as electronic feedback on students writing of English thesis at universities in Ternate city. *Jurnal Bilingual*, 11(1), 1–12. <https://doi.org/10.33387/j.bilingual.v11i1.3377>
31. 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>
32. Thi, L., Vy, M., Vδ, T., Quỳnh, N., Thi, T., Nhung, H., & Hiếu, N. M. (2025). Perspectives of vietnamese students and teachers on the effectiveness of Grammarly in English writing development. *English Education Journal of English Teaching and Research*, 10(01), 72–81. <https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.29407/jetar.v10i1.23743>
33. Thi, N. K., & Nikolov, M. (2022). How teacher and Grammarly feedback complement one another in Myanmar EFL s tudents' writing. *Asia-Pacific Education Researcher*, 31(6), 767–779. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s40299-021-00625-2>
34. Tonic, J. (2020). Teachers, AI grammar checkers, and the newest literacies: emending writing pedagogy and assessment. In *DIGITAL CULTURE & EDUCATION* (Vol. 12, Issue 1). <https://www.digitalcultureandeducation.com/volume-12>
35. Utami, I. G. A. L. P., & Mahardika, I. G. N. A. W. (2023). Grammarly and grammatical errors reduction: a case for non-native English teachers' professional learning. *International Journal of Language Education*, 7(2), 227–240. <https://doi.org/10.26858/ijole.v7i2.46431>
36. 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.
37. Wulandari, S., Laeli, A., & Astutik, I. (2024). Using Grammarly software to check the problems in essay writing: EFL pre-service teachers' perceptions. *Journal Unesa*, 5(1), 12–22. <https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.26740/nld.v5n1.p12-22>
38. Yoong, S. L., Turon, H., Grady, A., Hodder, R., & Wolfenden, L. (2022). The benefits of data sharing and ensuring open sources of systematic review data. *Journal of Public Health (United Kingdom)*, 44(4), E582–E587. <https://doi.org/10.1093/pubmed/fdac031>
39. Yunita, R. (2020). The influence of Grammarly on students' Grammar in academic writing: students' view. *Universitas Kristen Satya Wacana*, 1–27. <https://repository.uksw.edu/handle/123456789/23714>