

STUDENTS' PERCEPTIONS TOWARD THE USE OF GRAMMARLY FEEDBACK IN ACADEMIC WRITING AT A PESANTREN-BASED UNIVERSITY

Oleh :

Muhammad Dzakir Aslam Hanani¹⁾, Mukminatus Zuhriyah²⁾

^{1,2} Fakultas Ilmu Pendidikan, Universitas Hasyim Asy'ari

¹email: dzakirhanani@mhs.unhasy.ac.id

²email: mukminatuszuhriyah@unhasy.ac.id

Informasi Artikel

Riwayat Artikel :

Submit, 20 Juli 2026

Revisi, 15 September 2026

Diterima, 17 September 2026

Publish, 18 September 2026

Kata Kunci :

AI-Assisted Language Learning,
Educational Technology,
Grammarly Feedback,
Pesantren Higher Education,
Student Perceptions.

ABSTRACT

Writing proficiency remains a persistent obstacle for English as a Foreign Language (EFL) learners, particularly regarding grammatical accuracy and textual coherence. Although the rise of artificial intelligence tools such as Grammarly provides viable alternative assistance, specific investigations into their adoption within religious-based higher education settings remain scarce. This research adopted an explanatory sequential mixed-methods design. Quantitative data were gathered via questionnaires administered to fifth-semester students and evaluated through descriptive statistics to examine student perceptions regarding the integration of Grammarly feedback in academic writing at a pesantren-based university. Meanwhile, qualitative data were gathered through semi-structured interviews and examined via thematic analysis to explore participant experiences and obstacles. The results reveal that students generally hold favorable views of Grammarly, with most evaluations clustering at moderate to high levels. Grammarly is considered beneficial for advancing grammatical precision, clarity, self-assurance, and learner independence. Nevertheless, several obstacles emerged, encompassing erratic internet connectivity, institutional rules concerning device usage, contextual inaccuracies, and the danger of over-reliance on automated suggestions. Overall, Grammarly functions as a supportive and culturally flexible instrument when utilized prudently alongside instructor mentorship. This study enriches the discourse surrounding AI-enhanced language acquisition within pesantren-affiliated higher education environments.

This is an open access article under the [CC BY-SA](#) license



Corresponding Author:

Nama: Mukminatus Zuhriyah

Afiliasi: Universitas Hasyim Asy'ari

Email: mukminatuszuhriyah@unhasy.ac.id

1. INTRODUCTION

Writing is one of the most challenging skills for EFL learners, as it requires not only grammatical accuracy but also coherence, critical thinking, and adherence to academic conventions (Rahman et al., 2023). In higher education, particularly in English language departments, students are expected to produce various types of academic texts such as essays, reports, and research papers. However, many students still encounter difficulties related to

grammar, vocabulary, and organization, which often lower their confidence and hinder their academic success (Mulyanah et al., 2024).

The emergence of Artificial Intelligence (AI)-based writing tools has provided alternative solutions to support students' writing development. Among these tools, Grammarly has become one of the most widely adopted applications, offering real-time feedback on grammar, spelling, punctuation, clarity, and even plagiarism detection (Wu, 2024). Previous

studies indicate that Grammarly not only corrects errors but also facilitates autonomous learning, as students can reflect on the feedback to improve their writing quality (Dizon & Gayed, 2021; Prasetya & Raharjo, 2023). Nevertheless, some limitations remain, including inaccuracies in contextual suggestions and the potential risk of over-reliance on the tool (Susiana et al., 2024).

Nonetheless, the success of any technological instrument relies not exclusively on its functional capabilities, but equally on user perception and acceptance. To investigate student adoption of Grammarly, this study builds upon the Technology Acceptance Model (TAM) initially established by Davis (1989). TAM posits that an individual's decision to embrace technology is driven mainly by two core constructs: Perceived Usefulness (PU) and Perceived Ease of Use (PEOU). Perceived Usefulness measures the extent to which a user considers that a system boosts their productivity, whereas Perceived Ease of Use defines the level to which they think utilizing the system demands minimal exertion (Wicaksono & Maharani, 2020).

Within academic settings, learners tend to embrace digital applications more readily if they view them as advantageous and user-friendly. Furthermore, Perceived Ease of Use frequently shapes Perceived Usefulness, implying that systems requiring less operational complexity are more frequently deemed beneficial (Scherer et al., 2019). TAM further recognizes that external determinants—including technical infrastructure, institutional backing, cultural background, and digital literacy—can alter these viewpoints. Consequently, investigating students' attitudes toward Grammarly utilizing the TAM structure offers a systematic approach to grasping how utility, usability, and contextual elements govern technology integration in academic composition.

Most existing research has explored Grammarly in conventional higher education settings, particularly focusing on its effectiveness in improving students' writing accuracy and overall writing performance. For example, Dizon and Gayed (2021) found that Grammarly's automated feedback helped improve the quality of students' L2 writing by allowing them to identify and revise grammatical errors more effectively. Similarly, Prasetya and Raharjo (2023) reported that the use of Grammarly contributed to improvements in grammatical accuracy and vocabulary usage in students' academic writing.

In addition, several studies have examined students' perceptions and usability of Grammarly in general EFL contexts. Nurhidayah and Irawati (2024) found that students generally viewed Grammarly as a helpful tool that assists them in correcting writing errors and improving their writing quality. Likewise, Melinia (2024) reported that Grammarly functions as a supportive writing assistant that helps students

revise their work more efficiently through automated feedback.

However, little attention has been given to pesantren-based universities, where the integration of Islamic values with modern education creates a unique learning context. Students in such environments may have different attitudes toward technology adoption, shaped by cultural, religious, and pedagogical considerations. This raises important questions about how they perceive Grammarly—whether as a helpful assistant, a threat to independent learning, or a tool that must be carefully balanced with traditional values.

Given this gap, the present study investigates students' perceptions of using Grammarly in the Academic Writing course at a pesantren-based university. Specifically, it explores (1) how students perceive Grammarly's usefulness and ease of use in supporting their academic writing, and (2) what challenges or limitations they encounter when using the tool. By focusing on this unique context, the study aims to provide deeper insights into technology acceptance in pesantren-based higher education and contribute to discussions on the integration of AI-powered tools in EFL writing instruction.

2. RESEARCH METHOD

This research utilized an explanatory sequential mixed-methods framework, merging quantitative and qualitative strategies across two sequential stages (Creswell & Creswell, 2018). The quantitative stage sought to pinpoint broad trends regarding student views on Grammarly, whereas the qualitative stage was carried out to interpret and expand upon those numerical discoveries thoroughly. Such a design was chosen because it allows investigators to capture both comprehensive breadth and contextual depth through the synthesis of statistical trends and participant narratives.

Research Setting

The study was conducted at the English Language Education Department of Universitas KH. Mukhtar Syafaat (UIMSYA), a pesantren-based university in East Java, Indonesia. The institution integrates Islamic educational values with modern academic instruction, creating a distinctive academic environment. This context was considered relevant because students' perceptions of technology may be influenced not only by usability factors but also by cultural, institutional, and moral considerations.

Participants and Sampling

The participants consisted of fifth-semester students who had completed the Academic Writing course and had prior experience using Grammarly. They were selected through purposive sampling based on specific criteria to ensure that participants possessed sufficient familiarity with academic writing conventions and the tool being studied. This sampling technique was considered appropriate because it allowed the researcher to focus on

information-rich participants whose experiences were directly relevant to the research objectives.

Instruments

Data collection relied on two distinct instruments: a questionnaire alongside semi-structured interviews. Borrowed from Alghamdi and Abusa'aleek (2025), the questionnaire centered around Technology Acceptance Model dimensions, specifically focusing on Perceived Ease of Use and Perceived Usefulness. Past studies confirmed the tool's high reliability, showing a Cronbach's alpha metric exceeding 0.80, which points to robust internal consistency. Meanwhile, the qualitative instrument featured an interview protocol created to probe students' encounters, viewpoints, and hurdles regarding Grammarly utilization.

Data Collection Procedures

An online questionnaire administered through Google Forms served as the instrument for gathering quantitative data. Once responses were compiled, descriptive statistics via SPSS version 27 were applied to compute standard deviations, means, percentages, and frequencies. Subsequent to this stage, a group of volunteers reflecting diverse response trends was chosen for interviews. To gain richer perspectives and background into student viewpoints and encounters, semi-structured interviews were carried out. These sessions received participant approval, were audio-recorded, and were transcribed for evaluation purposes.

Data Analysis

Descriptive analysis of the quantitative information was performed to detect overall trends regarding student viewpoints. The evaluative process involved computing percentages, frequencies, standard deviations, and means to aggregate the feedback. Outcomes were displayed through descriptive statistical metrics to guarantee systematic interpretation and clarity of the results. For the purpose of interpreting questionnaire values, mean scores were split into three tiers: high (3.67–5.00), moderate (2.34–3.66), and low (1.00–2.33). These grouping thresholds were borrowed from established benchmarks utilized in prior literature (AbuSa'aleek & Alotaibi, 2022; AbuSa'aleek & Yaghi, 2024; Ishtaiwa & Aburezeq, 2015; Jamrus & Razali, 2021). The categorization was applied to determine the level of each questionnaire item and to identify the overall tendency of students' perceptions toward the use of Grammarly feedback. This categorization allows clearer interpretation of perception levels and facilitates comparison with previous studies.

These descriptive statistics enabled the researcher to identify patterns, tendencies, and variations in students' responses before the data were further interpreted in the discussion section. Although the calculations were generated automatically using SPSS, the formulas were presented to clarify the statistical procedures applied in this study. To support the descriptive statistical

analysis, several statistical formulas were employed to calculate the mean, percentage, and standard deviation. These formulas were used to summarize the questionnaire data and to interpret students' perceptions quantitatively.

Qualitative data were analyzed using thematic analysis with an inductive approach, involving coding, categorizing, and developing themes directly from the data. This method allowed patterns and meanings to emerge naturally without being constrained by predetermined categories or theoretical assumptions.

Integration of Data

The results from both phases were integrated during the interpretation stage. Quantitative findings provided general patterns, while qualitative findings explained the reasons behind those patterns. This integration ensured a comprehensive interpretation of students' perceptions of Grammarly within the pesantren-based university context.

3. RESULT AND DISCUSSION

Result

a. Students' Perceptions toward Grammarly Feedback

The quantitative findings indicate that students generally hold positive perceptions toward Grammarly as a feedback tool in academic writing. Descriptive statistical analysis revealed that most questionnaire items fall within moderate to high perception levels. Out of twelve items, nine were categorized as moderate, three as high, and none as low. These results suggest that Grammarly is perceived as beneficial and supportive in improving students' writing performance.

The results of the descriptive statistical analysis are presented in Table 1, which summarizes the mean scores, standard deviations, and perception levels for each questionnaire item.

Table 1. Descriptive Statistics of Students' Perceptions toward Grammarly Feedback

No	Code	Item	Mean	Std. Deviation	Level
1	x1	I am satisfied with the feedback Grammarly provides.	3.36	1.02	Moderate
2	x2	I feel that Grammarly's feedback is good for developing writing skills.	3.68	1.09	High
3	x3	"I prefer Grammarly feedback to other kinds of feedback, even if Grammarly seems to be complicated due to its in-depth feedback."	3.64	0.78	Moderate
4	x4	I want my supervisor to keep providing feedback on my research	3.75	1.00	High

		proposal through Grammarly.			
5	x5	I think Grammarly helps students to become autonomous.	3.25	0.75	Moderate
6	x6	In my opinion, Grammarly boosts students' self-confidence in writing.	3.36	1.25	Moderate
7	x7	I like the way Grammarly provides in-depth feedback.	3.61	0.79	Moderate
8	x8	I will follow Grammarly's feedback to enhance my writing skills.	3.57	0.69	Moderate
9	x9	I prefer automated written corrective feedback (Grammarly) to direct or indirect feedback.	3.46	1.17	Moderate
10	x10	From my point of view, Grammarly is adequate for students with different levels.	3.71	1.15	High
11	x11	Grammarly is a good assistant for a writer.	3.43	0.96	Moderate
12	x12	Considering all aspects of Grammarly, I am very happy with Grammarly's utilization in writing research proposals	3.57	0.99	Moderate

Overall, the descriptive statistics indicate that students demonstrate a generally positive perception toward the use of Grammarly in the Academic Writing course. Based on the mean categorization, most questionnaire items fall within the moderate to high levels, and none of the items are categorized as low. This suggests that students tend to accept Grammarly as a supportive tool in their writing process, although the level of agreement varies across different aspects.

As shown in Table 1, the highest mean score was observed in item x4 ($M = 3.75$), followed by x10 ($M = 3.71$) and x2 ($M = 3.68$), indicating strong agreement regarding Grammarly's usefulness. Conversely, the lowest mean score was found in item x5 ($M = 3.25$), suggesting comparatively weaker agreement. Overall, these results demonstrate that students tend to perceive Grammarly positively as a writing assistant.

To provide a more detailed understanding of students' responses, the distribution of responses for each questionnaire item was also analyzed in terms of percentages across the Likert scale categories. This analysis illustrates how respondents distributed their opinions from strongly disagree to strongly agree.

The percentage distribution of students' responses is presented in Table 2.

Table 2. Percentage Distribution of Students' Responses.

No	Code	Item	SD	D	N	A	SA
1	x1	I am satisfied with the feedback Grammarly provides.	7.1	7.1	21.4	46.4	21.4
2	x2	I feel that Grammarly's feedback is good for developing writing skills.	3.6	14.3	50.0	32.1	3.6
3	x3	"I prefer Grammarly feedback to other kinds of feedback, even if Grammarly seems to be complicated due to its in-depth feedback."	0	3.6	32.1	32.1	17.9
4	x4	I want my supervisor to keep providing feedback on my research proposal through Grammarly.	3.6	7.1	35.7	46.4	10.7
5	x5	I think Grammarly helps students to become autonomous.	0	7.1	32.1	57.1	3.6
6	x6	In my opinion, Grammarly boosts students' self-confidence in writing.	14.3	10.7	32.1	28.6	21.4
7	x7	I like the way Grammarly provides in-depth feedback.	0	7.1	17.9	42.9	25.0
8	x8	I will follow Grammarly's feedback to enhance my writing skills.	0	10.7	35.7	39.3	10.7
9	x9	I prefer automated written corrective feedback (Grammarly) to direct or indirect feedback.	7.1	10.7	25.0	46.4	14.3
10	x10	From my point of view, Grammarly is adequate for students with different levels.	7.1	7.1	21.4	46.4	21.4
11	x11	Grammarly is a good assistant for a writer.	3.6	14.3	50.0	32.1	3.6

12	x12	Considering all aspects of Grammarly, I am very happy with Grammarly's utilization in writing research proposals	3.6	3.6	32.1	32.1	17.9
----	-----	--	-----	-----	------	------	------

The percentage distribution shows that most responses were concentrated in the agree and neutral categories. For example, item x4 recorded 46.4% agreement and 21.4% strong agreement, while item x10 showed 42.9% agreement and 25.0% strong agreement. These results indicate strong acceptance of Grammarly among students. However, relatively high neutral responses across several items suggest that some students still hold mixed perceptions regarding certain aspects of Grammarly.

Standard deviation values ranged from 0.69 to 1.25. Lower values indicate stronger agreement among respondents, while higher values reflect greater variation in perceptions. For instance, item x8 showed the lowest variability, whereas item x6 demonstrated the highest variation, suggesting differing experiences among students.

Overall, these quantitative findings indicate that students generally perceive Grammarly as a useful and supportive learning tool in academic writing.

b. Students' Challenges in Using Grammarly

This segment outlines qualitative outcomes derived from semi-structured interview sessions held with chosen participants. The evaluation concentrated particularly on the difficulties learners faced while operating Grammarly for academic composition.

Technical and Institutional Limitations

The most frequently reported challenge concerns technical limitations, particularly unstable internet access. Several participants emphasized that Grammarly's online dependency restricts consistent usage. As Respondent 1 stated:

"The challenges I face are unstable internet access and sometimes difficulty understanding certain technical terms."

Similarly, Respondent 2 noted:

"The main challenges are limited internet access and difficulty with certain technical aspects."

Respondent 3 also reported:

"The challenges are limited internet access and sometimes misunderstanding the context of suggestions."

In addition to connectivity issues, institutional regulations within the pesantren environment were identified as barriers. Respondent 4 explained:

"Pesantren students aren't allowed to bring laptops or phones. They can't use Grammarly easily."

Respondent 5 added that pesantren regulations regarding gadget use and internet time significantly influence accessibility:

"Pesantren regulations about gadget use and internet time sometimes limit when and how long I can use Grammarly."

These findings indicate that external and environmental factors significantly influence students' ability to utilize Grammarly effectively.

Advertisement and Platform Limitations

A unique challenge was mentioned by Respondent 4, who expressed frustration with advertisements in the free version:

"Advertisements. Ads everywhere. ChatGPT doesn't have ads. That's why I prefer ChatGPT."

This indicates that user experience and platform limitations can influence students' preference and satisfaction levels.

Risk of Over-Reliance and Critical Evaluation

Some participants highlighted the potential risk of over-reliance on automated corrections. Respondent 6 observed:

"Another challenge is the tendency for students to accept all suggestions without questioning their validity."

However, most students demonstrated critical engagement with Grammarly's feedback. For example, Respondent 1 explained:

"When a suggestion conflicts with my understanding, I usually re-check the grammar rule before deciding whether to accept or reject it."

Respondent 5 described his approach as comparative:

"I analyze Grammarly's suggestion and compare it with rules I learned from lecturers or classical texts."

Similarly, Respondent 7 stated:

"If I believe my version is more appropriate for the context, I keep my original wording."

These responses indicate that while challenges exist, students generally maintain analytical judgment rather than passively relying on the tool.

Discussion

a. Students' Perceptions toward Grammarly Feedback

Quantitative outcomes demonstrate that learners largely maintain favorable views of Grammarly as a writing support application. The majority of survey items fell into moderate to high ranges, pointing toward positive attitudes regarding the tool's adequacy and utility across varied proficiency tiers. Such discoveries correspond with the Technology Acceptance Model (TAM), indicating that individuals show a greater tendency to embrace technology when deeming it user-friendly and beneficial (Wicaksono & Maharani, 2020). Within this research, student consensus that Grammarly fosters writing advancement demonstrates a robust sense of perceived utility, viewed as a primary driver of technology uptake (Scherer et al., 2019). This outcome validates that perceived usefulness acts as a core mechanism in steering student acceptance of artificial intelligence writing systems.

Furthermore, students' satisfaction with Grammarly's feedback suggests that automated writing evaluation tools can provide meaningful support in academic contexts. The ability to receive immediate corrections and suggestions appears to help students identify errors more efficiently than traditional delayed feedback. This finding is consistent with Dizon and Gayed (2021), who reported that Grammarly improved the quality of mobile L2 writing through real-time feedback. Similarly, Prasetya and Raharjo (2023) found that students using Grammarly demonstrated significant improvement in grammatical accuracy and vocabulary use. However, while previous studies primarily emphasized measurable writing improvement, the present study highlights students' perceptual acceptance within a pesantren-based context, thereby extending the discussion beyond performance outcomes to technology acceptance.

Despite these positive perceptions, students did not express unconditional preference for automated feedback over human feedback. The data reveal that while Grammarly is valued for speed and practicality, lecturer feedback remains essential for contextual understanding and deeper academic guidance. This finding supports Susiana et al. (2024), who noted that students appreciated Grammarly's assistance but still relied on lecturers for more accurate contextual evaluation. Similarly, Alghamdi and Abusa'aleek (2025) emphasized that AI-based writing tools are most effective when combined with pedagogical guidance. Thus, the current study does not position Grammarly as a replacement for teachers but rather as a complementary instructional support.

Additionally, students' perceptions indicate that Grammarly contributes to confidence and learner autonomy. Many respondents agreed that the tool helps them revise independently and feel more secure about their writing before submission. This supports Dewi (2023), who found that Grammarly encourages self-directed learning and reflective revision among EFL students. In line with self-regulated learning theory, the availability of immediate corrective feedback enables learners to monitor and adjust their writing strategies independently. In the present study, this autonomous engagement appears to coexist with critical awareness, as students reported not blindly accepting every suggestion.

Overall, the findings demonstrate that students perceive Grammarly as a supportive and practical academic writing assistant. However, its perceived effectiveness is closely connected to complementary human feedback and responsible usage within the educational environment. Compared to previous research conducted in conventional universities (Melinia, 2024; Nurhidayah & Irawati, 2024), this study contributes a contextual dimension by showing that students in a pesantren-based university also demonstrate positive acceptance, though their perceptions are shaped by cultural and institutional

considerations. Therefore, this research complements existing studies by situating technology acceptance within a religious-based higher education context.

b. Students' Challenges in Using Grammarly

While students generally perceive Grammarly positively, the qualitative findings reveal several challenges that influence its effectiveness. The most prominent issue concerns technical limitations, particularly unstable internet access. Since Grammarly operates primarily as an online platform, connectivity problems significantly affect accessibility. Similar challenges were also reported by Fitria et al. (2022), who noted that internet dependency limits consistent use of the application. In a pesantren-based university setting, where internet access may be regulated or limited, such technical constraints become even more significant. This finding supports Scherer et al. (2019), who argue that external variables such as technological infrastructure strongly influence technology acceptance beyond perceived usefulness.

Institutional policies likewise assume a critical part in shaping learner experiences. Limitations on screen time and gadget utilization inherent to the pesantren setting restrict students' capacity to apply Grammarly on a continuous basis. This discovery emphasizes that technology adoption is governed not merely by perceived ease of use and usefulness, but equally by environmental and structural conditions, as outlined within TAM theory (Wicaksono & Maharani, 2020). Contrasting with earlier investigations carried out in traditional universities where digital access remains largely unconstrained (Melinia, 2024; Nurhidayah & Irawati, 2024), current findings demonstrate that institutional rules and cultural guidelines heavily dictate student engagement with artificial intelligence applications. Consequently, this research builds upon past work by highlighting situational boundaries present in faith-based higher education.

Another challenge relates to contextual and linguistic accuracy. Although Grammarly performs effectively in detecting surface-level errors such as grammar and punctuation, students reported limitations when dealing with academic nuances, discipline-specific terminology, or culturally embedded expressions. This finding is consistent with Susiana et al. (2024), who observed that Grammarly sometimes fails to accurately interpret tense consistency and contextual meaning. Similarly, Alghamdi and Abusa'aleek (2025) highlighted that automated writing evaluation tools may struggle with deeper semantic interpretation. Therefore, the present study confirms previous concerns while reinforcing the argument that AI tools cannot fully replace human feedback in complex academic writing contexts.

In addition, some participants noted the risk of over-reliance on automated feedback. Although most students reported critically evaluating suggestions

before accepting them, there remains a concern that unreflective dependence on AI tools could weaken grammatical awareness. This concern echoes Dewi (2023), who warned that excessive reliance on automated feedback might reduce students' independent problem-solving skills. However, unlike studies that emphasize passive dependence, the present research found that students in a pesantren-based environment tend to apply critical judgment before accepting revisions. This suggests that cultural and moral values emphasizing discipline and responsibility may moderate the risk of over-reliance.

Overall, the challenges identified in this study indicate that Grammarly's effectiveness is mediated by infrastructural, institutional, and contextual factors. These findings complement previous research by demonstrating that technology acceptance is not only a matter of perceived usefulness but also deeply influenced by environmental conditions and educational culture (Scherer et al., 2019). In the pesantren-based university context, technology integration requires balance—leveraging the advantages of AI tools while maintaining critical thinking, traditional pedagogical values, and human instructional support. Therefore, this study contributes a contextual dimension to the broader discussion of AI-assisted language learning in higher education.

4. CONCLUSION AND SUGGESTION

Conclusion

This research sought to explore student perspectives concerning the implementation of Grammarly feedback within academic composition at a pesantren-affiliated university, alongside identifying obstacles they face while operating the application. Based on quantitative discoveries, learners mostly exhibit favorable views toward Grammarly. The majority of answers clustered at moderate up to high tiers, signifying that students regard Grammarly as advantageous and helpful in enhancing their academic composition outcomes. Such insights imply that Grammarly enjoys a favorable reception within higher education English language learning environments.

From the perspective of the Technology Acceptance Model (TAM), the results indicate that students' acceptance of Grammarly is strongly influenced by perceived usefulness and perceived ease of use. Students believe that Grammarly helps enhance grammatical accuracy, clarity, and revision efficiency. At the same time, the tool's accessibility and real-time feedback contribute to its perceived practicality. These factors collectively encourage students to integrate Grammarly into their academic writing process.

However, the study also reveals several challenges that affect the tool's effectiveness. Technical limitations, particularly unstable internet access, and institutional regulations regarding gadget

use within the pesantren environment restrict consistent utilization. In addition, contextual inaccuracies and the risk of over-reliance on automated feedback highlight the limitations of AI-based writing tools. These findings demonstrate that technology acceptance is not determined solely by functional benefits but is also shaped by infrastructural, institutional, and cultural factors.

Importantly, the findings show that students do not perceive Grammarly as a replacement for lecturer feedback. Instead, they consider it a complementary tool that supports technical correction while human instructors remain essential for contextual guidance and deeper academic development. This balanced perception reflects a critical and responsible approach to technology use within a religious-based educational setting.

Overall, this study contributes to the growing body of research on AI-assisted language learning by providing contextual insights from a pesantren-based university. It highlights the importance of integrating technological tools in a way that respects institutional values, promotes learner autonomy, and maintains pedagogical balance. Future research may explore larger samples, comparative institutional contexts, or longitudinal effects of AI-based feedback on academic writing development.

Suggestion

Based on the findings of this study, several recommendations can be proposed. First, lecturers are encouraged to integrate Grammarly as a complementary tool in academic writing instruction rather than as a replacement for lecturer feedback. Students should be guided to critically evaluate Grammarly's suggestions, particularly when dealing with contextual meaning, academic conventions, and discipline-specific language. This guidance is important to promote responsible use of AI-assisted writing tools while preventing excessive dependence on automated feedback.

Second, educational institutions, particularly pesantren-based universities, are encouraged to provide adequate support for the implementation of technology-assisted learning. Improving internet accessibility and developing appropriate policies regarding the use of digital devices for academic purposes may help students benefit more consistently from tools such as Grammarly while maintaining institutional values and regulations.

Finally, future researchers are recommended to investigate the use of Grammarly and other AI-assisted writing tools across broader educational contexts and with larger and more diverse samples. Future studies may also employ longitudinal or experimental designs to examine changes in students' academic writing performance over time and to determine the extent to which AI-assisted feedback contributes to actual improvement in writing ability. In addition, researchers may explore students' critical engagement with AI-generated feedback, including

how they accept, reject, or modify automated suggestions. Such investigations could provide a more comprehensive understanding of the pedagogical benefits and limitations of AI-assisted writing tools, particularly within educational settings that have specific technological, institutional, and cultural considerations.

5. REFERENCES

- Alghamdi, A., & AbuSa'aleek, A. (2025). Students' perceptions of automated written corrective feedback using Grammarly in EFL writing. *Journal of Language Teaching and Research*, 16(1), 45–56.
- AbuSa'aleek, A., & Alotaibi, S. (2022). The effectiveness of automated written corrective feedback in improving EFL students' writing performance. *International Journal of Language Education*, 6(2), 214–228.
- AbuSa'aleek, A., & Yaghi, W. (2024). Exploring students' perceptions of AI-based writing tools in EFL academic writing. *Journal of Educational Technology Systems*, 52(1), 78–92.
- Creswell, J. W., & Creswell, J. D. (2018). Research Design: Qualitative, Quantitative and Mixed Methods Approaches. In *Journal of Chemical Information and Modeling* (Vol. 53, Issue 9)
- Dizon, G., & Gayed, J. (2021). Grammarly: An automated writing evaluation tool for the L2 writing classroom. *Computers and Composition*, 61, 102633. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.compcom.2021.102633>
- Dewi, N. P. (2023). The use of Grammarly to promote self-regulated learning in EFL writing. *Journal of English Language Teaching*, 12(2), 150–160.
- Fitria, T. N., et al. (2022). Students' perceptions of Grammarly in improving academic writing skills. *Indonesian Journal of Applied Linguistics*, 12(1), 89–99.
- Ishtaiwa, F., & Aburezeq, I. (2015). The impact of automated written corrective feedback on EFL learners' writing performance. *International Journal of Educational Technology in Higher Education*, 12(3), 45–56.
- Jamrus, M., & Razali, A. B. (2021). Students' perception of automated writing feedback in ESL writing classrooms. *Asian Journal of University Education*, 17(3), 145–156.
- Melinia, R. (2024). Students' perception of Grammarly as a writing assistant in EFL academic writing. *Journal of English Language Teaching and Linguistics*, 9(1), 77–90.
- Mulyanah, S., et al. (2024). Challenges in EFL academic writing among university students. *Journal of Language and Education*, 10(1), 33–45.
- Nurhidayah, N., & Irawati, L. (2024). EFL students' perception of Grammarly in improving writing accuracy. *Journal of English Education and Teaching*, 8(1), 112–124.
- Prasetya, A., & Raharjo, S. (2023). The effectiveness of Grammarly in improving students' grammatical accuracy in academic writing. *Journal of Applied Linguistics and Language Research*, 10(2), 210–223.
- Rahman, A., et al. (2023). Developing academic writing competence among EFL learners in higher education. *Journal of English for Academic Purposes*, 62, 101212.
- Scherer, R., Siddiq, F., & Tondeur, J. (2019). The technology acceptance model (TAM): A meta-analytic structural equation modeling approach. *Computers & Education*, 128, 13–35.
- Susiana, R., et al. (2024). Limitations of automated writing evaluation tools in academic writing. *Journal of Language and Linguistic Studies*, 20(1), 345–358.
- Wicaksono, A., & Maharani, S. (2020). Technology acceptance model in educational technology adoption. *Journal of Educational Technology Development and Exchange*, 13(2), 1–12.
- Wu, Y. (2024). AI-powered writing assistants in higher education: Opportunities and challenges. *Educational Technology Research and Development*, 72(1), 145–162.