Students' Perceptions of Grammarly Application Feedback on Writing Skill at SMAN 4 Palangka Raya

Mimo Lalito Erisyerico[1], Indra Perdana[2], Elanneri Karani[3]

University of Palangka Raya, Indonesia
[1] mimo.lalito@gmail.com, [2] indraperdana86@gmail.com, [3] elannerikarani@gmail.com

Abstract

Grammarly is an online tool that helps users improve their writing by correcting errors in grammar, vocabulary, and mechanics. With its growing use among students, it is important to understand their perceptions of the tool. This research investigates the perceptions of SMAN 4 Palangka Raya students regarding Grammarly's feedback on their writing skill during the 2024–2025 academic year. Using a descriptive quantitative design, a survey was distributed to 91 students who regularly used Grammarly. The questionnaire gathered data on students' perceptions of Grammarly's feedback features, quality and impact, and overall usage. Analysis was conducted using frequency distributions, percentages, and mean scores in Microsoft Excel. The results show that students have a positive perception of Grammarly, with a mean score of 4.19, highlighting its effectiveness in improving grammar, vocabulary, and mechanics. Students value its ability to identify errors, suggest vocabulary, and correct spelling, punctuation, and capitalization. Grammarly's feedback not only enhances writing quality but also boosts confidence and motivation. The tool's accessibility and user-friendly interface, even in the free version, further reinforce its positive perception. However, individual factors such as prior writing ability, learning preferences, and technical issues influenced how students perceived its effectiveness.

Keywords: Grammarly Feedback; Student Perceptions; Writing Skill Development

INTRODUCTION

Writing is a crucial skill that significantly contributes to language learning success by enabling students to express their ideas and imagination in written form (Kafrawi, 2022). However, mastering writing is a complex process. It involves organizing words into sentences and sentences into paragraphs (Thomas, 2023), making it one of the most challenging skills for both foreign language teachers to teach and learners to acquire.

One of the primary challenges is providing effective feedback on students' writing. The significance of feedback in language education has been widely acknowledged as an essential component of the learning process, providing students with valuable insights into their strengths, weaknesses, and areas for improvement (Hattie & Timperley, 2007; Godwin-Jones, 2022; Han, 2019; Huang et al., 2023). Effective feedback not only helps students recognize learning gaps but also provides targeted suggestions for improvement, fosters responsiveness, delivers constructive information, and serves as a motivational force, encouraging students to engage more deeply in their educational processes (Obilor, 2019).

Based on pre-observations conducted by the researcher, it has been found that writing instruction at SMAN 4 Palangka Raya faces several significant challenges related to feedback. One major issue is the high frequency of grammar, vocabulary, and spelling errors made by students in their writing. However, teachers have limited time to provide thorough feedback. English classes are restricted to just 135 minutes per week with an average of 35 students per class, making it difficult for teachers to give adequate individual attention to each student's writing. This division of class time among explaining learning objectives, delivering lessons,

assigning tasks, and providing feedback further reduces the time available for corrections. Resource limitations also pose a serious challenge in English writing instruction at SMAN 4 Palangka Raya, as the lack of additional teaching materials and resources limits teachers' ability to offer intensive feedback on writing skill. This issue is compounded by students' lack of attention to writing details and their inadequate self-editing skills, leading them to overlook small errors and repeat the same mistakes without significant improvement. Additionally, there is noticeable low motivation to learn, especially when students do not receive adequate or quality feedback. Fortunately, with technological advancements, students at SMAN 4 Palangka Raya have been using various applications to address their writing challenges. One such tool is the Grammarly application (hereafter called Grammarly), known for its effective feedback, especially in correcting errors in grammar, vocabulary, and mechanics.

Grammarly, established in 2009 by Max Lytvyn and Alex Shevchenko, is a highly effective tool for identifying mistakes and other language errors in writing. According to Ghufron & Rosyida (2018), Grammarly helps teachers and students correct EFL writing. It is available for free to individual users and goes beyond basic spell-checking by identifying and correcting various errors, including grammar, punctuation, word choice, and writing style. Additionally, Grammarly uses advanced algorithms to detect plagiarism, ensuring the integrity of written content (Dewi, 2019). Its robust features have made it popular among writers and students, providing essential assistance for achieving clear, accurate, and original written communication.

Previous studies on Grammarly's usage among EFL students reveal both positive impacts and challenges. Students generally appreciate Grammarly for enhancing spelling, grammar, and overall writing clarity, particularly in thesis and academic contexts (Fitria et al., 2022; ONeill & Russell, 2019; Samosir & Daulay, 2023; Dewi, 2022; Billa, 2024; Armanda et al., 2022). It efficiently streamlines proofreading and offers clear feedback, integrating seamlessly into students' writing processes to save time and boost productivity (Aidil, 2023). However, several negative perceptions among students in educational settings necessitate further exploration. These include concerns about the accuracy of Grammarly's feedback, especially in detecting nuanced grammatical errors (Ummah & Bisriyah, 2022; Yurika & Farahdiba, 2023; Dewi, 2022), and frustrations over the need for a stable internet connection to utilize Grammarly effectively (Yurika & Farahdiba, 2023; Samosir & Daulay, 2023). Additionally, the cost-effectiveness of Grammarly Premium has been questioned, particularly for students facing budget constraints (Fitriana & Nurazni, 2022; Hakiki, 2021; Khan et al., 2022; Tarsan et al., 2021).

These negative perceptions highlight the need for further research into how these issues impact students' overall experience and the effectiveness of Grammarly in educational contexts. Additionally, most previous studies have been conducted on tertiary-level students and have focused on academic writing (Fitria et al., 2022; O'Neill & Russell, 2019; Samosir & Daulay, 2023; Billa, 2024; Armanda et al., 2022; Aidil, 2023; Ummah & Bisriyah, 2022; Yurika & Farahdiba, 2023; Fitriana & Nurazni, 2022; Hakiki, 2021; Khan et al., 2022; Tarsan et al., 2021; Faisal & Carabella, 2023; Putri et al., 2024; Nurhidayah & Irawati, 2024), while research at the senior high school level is rare, especially at SMAN 4 Palangka Raya. To fill this gap in the literature, this research focuses on the context of senior high school students and does not refer to specific conditions or types of writing but rather explores the overall experiences felt by the students. Analyzing students' perceptions of Grammarly's feedback provides valuable insights into refining technology integration in writing education, thereby improving the overall learning experience (Rakya, 2023). This understanding is crucial for educators, policymakers, and technology developers to enhance educational technologies. Moreover, exploring students'

attitudes toward technology-generated feedback helps educators tailor their approaches to better meet diverse learning needs and preferences (Le Phan, 2023).

METHOD

This research applied a descriptive quantitative approach using a survey method to present data in both numerical and descriptive formats. In descriptive quantitative research, numerical data are systematically collected and analyzed to describe specific characteristics or phenomena with precision (Creswell, 2014). Survey research, as Creswell highlights, provides a numerical representation of trends, behaviors, or opinions within a population by examining a sample. This method often involves distributing questionnaires to collect data, with the intent of generalizing the results to the wider population (Fowler, 2014). A one-shot survey design was implemented, where data were gathered at a single point in time (Jansen, 2010). The research involved 91 students from SMAN 4 Palangka Raya during the 2024–2025 academic year who regularly utilized Grammarly in their writing. The entire population was included in the sample. Data collection was conducted via a questionnaire distributed through Google Forms, focusing on students' perceptions of Grammarly's feedback features, its quality and impact on writing skill (grammar, vocabulary, and mechanics), and its overall use. The data were analyzed using Microsoft Excel to calculate frequency distributions, percentages, and mean scores, providing a detailed understanding of how students perceive Grammarly's contribution to their writing development.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Results

The data were collected through a questionnaire consisting of 25 items, each rated on a five-point Likert scale: Strongly Disagree (SD=1), Disagree (D=2), Neutral (N=3), Agree (A=4), and Strongly Agree (SA=5). The analysis includes an examination of individual responses, along with the mean scores and mean levels for each item. It also presents the overall mean perception level across all students. The findings are organized into three sections: Grammarly's feedback features, its quality and impact on writing skill, and its usage, as outlined below.

Grammarly's Feedback Features

Students at SMAN 4 Palangka Raya generally perceive Grammarly's features very positively across different aspects of writing. The mean scores for all evaluated aspects range from 4.22 to 4.42, with an overall mean score of 4.34. This indicates that all responses are categorized as "Very Positive." Specifically, items related to sentence structure guidance, capitalization correction, and grammar checking received the highest mean scores of 4.42, 4.41, and 4.40, respectively. Following closely is spelling correction (4.38), vocabulary choice (4.34), punctuation checking (4.31), word choice suggestions (4.24), and grammar rules understanding (4.22). These results highlight strong agreement that these features significantly enhance the writing process.

A closer look at the percentage distribution of responses further clarifies the trend in students' perceptions of Grammarly. For item 1, "Grammarly helps me check grammar errors in my writing," the data shows that a majority of students have a very positive perception of Grammarly's grammar-checking capability. The highest percentage of students strongly agreed (50%) or agreed (41%) with this statement, confirming that students view Grammarly as an effective tool for identifying and correcting grammar errors. This strong agreement reflects Grammarly's real-time error detection, which enables students to spot and correct mistakes quickly. The small neutral group (8%) consists of students who have a strong understanding of grammar rules and, as a result, do not rely as much on the tool. The minimal disagreement (1%)

indicates that almost all students are satisfied with this feature, with only one student expressing concerns due to a preference for manual proofreading and skepticism about the tool's accuracy. For item 2, "Grammarly helps me choose the right vocabulary to develop my writing," the majority of students strongly agreed (44%) or agreed (47%) with this statement, confirming that Grammarly's vocabulary suggestions are highly valued by students. These suggestions help students refine their writing by offering synonyms and contextually suitable word choices. The tool is particularly useful for students who struggle with selecting the right vocabulary, as it offers alternatives that align with their intended meaning. The small percentage of neutral responses (8%) comes from students who feel confident in their vocabulary choices and prefer not to rely on the tool's suggestions. The minor disagreement (1%) indicates that one student prefers making their own word choices, finding Grammarly's suggestions less relevant or intrusive in the student's writing process.

For item 3, "Grammarly helps me check correct spelling in my writing," the majority of students strongly agreed (49%) or agreed (42%), reflecting the tool's effectiveness in detecting and correcting spelling mistakes. This high level of agreement is attributed to Grammarly's real-time spell-check feature, which is particularly beneficial for students who frequently make spelling errors, especially when writing in a foreign language. A small group of neutral responses (8%) consists of students who do not encounter spelling errors often and are already proficient in spelling. The single disagreement (1%) shows that one student prefers to rely on manual proofreading and has concerns about the tool's accuracy.

For item 4, "Grammarly helps me check proper punctuation in my writing," most students strongly agreed (43%) or agreed (48%), demonstrating the tool's effectiveness in assisting with punctuation. Grammarly's real-time feedback on punctuation errors—such as missing commas or incorrect use of periods—helps improve writing clarity and readability. The small number of neutral responses (7%) comes from students who are already confident in their punctuation skill and do not depend on the tool for this purpose. The minimal disagreement (2%) shows that only one student did not find this feature useful, due to their preference for manual proofreading.

For item 5, "Grammarly helps me ensure correct capitalization," the analysis shows that most students strongly agreed (52%) or agreed (38%), confirming Grammarly's effectiveness in detecting capitalization errors. This tool is particularly effective in spotting mistakes with proper nouns and at the beginning of sentences. The neutral responses (9%) come from students who rarely make capitalization errors and prefer to check this aspect manually. The lack of significant disagreement (1%) further supports Grammarly's overall effectiveness in this area, with the minimal disagreement stemming from a small number of students who prefer manual proofreading and feel confident in their capitalization skill.

For item 6, "Grammarly provides guidance on proper sentence structure," the majority of students strongly agreed (48%) or agreed (45%), demonstrating that Grammarly is highly valued for improving sentence structure. The tool helps students avoid common mistakes, such as sentence fragments or run-on sentences, by offering real-time guidance. The small neutral group (7%) consists of students who feel confident in their sentence construction skill and do not rely heavily on this feature. The absence of disagreement further confirms the tool's helpfulness in this aspect of writing.

For item 7, "Grammarly provides appropriate word choices in my writing," 44% of students strongly agreed and 39% agreed, indicating that Grammarly's word choice suggestions are highly valued. These suggestions help students select words that are more accurate or contextually appropriate, enhancing the quality of their writing. The neutral response rate of 15% reflects students who prefer to rely on their own vocabulary choices rather than the tool's

recommendations. The small disagreement rate (2%) shows that some students do not find the suggested words suitable and prefer to make their own word selections.

For item 8, "Grammarly helps me understand English grammar rules," a strong majority of students strongly agreed (43%) or agreed (39%), suggesting that Grammarly is not only useful for correcting grammar errors but also for providing explanations that help students understand grammar rules. The neutral responses (16%) come from students who prefer traditional methods of grammar learning and do not engage fully with Grammarly's explanatory features. The slight disagreement rate (2%) indicates that a small number of students do not find the tool effective for learning grammar rules, due to a preference for other learning methods and a lack of interest in the explanations provided by Grammarly.

In summary, the overall trend shows that students have a highly positive perception of Grammarly's features across all evaluated aspects. Most students agree that Grammarly effectively enhances their grammar, vocabulary, spelling, punctuation, capitalization, sentence structure, and comprehension of grammar rules. Although there is a small percentage of neutral or disagreeing responses, the feedback overall highlights Grammarly as a valuable tool for improving writing skill. The few neutral or disagreeing responses primarily stem from students' confidence in their own writing abilities, especially in areas like grammar, vocabulary, and mechanics. These students tend to feel less dependent on Grammarly's suggestions, often preferring manual proofreading or questioning the tool's accuracy due to their strong understanding of these writing aspects.

Quality and Impact of Grammarly's Feedback on Writing Skill

Students at SMAN 4 Palangka Raya generally have a positive to very positive perception of the quality and impact of Grammarly's feedback on their writing skill. The mean scores for the evaluated items range from 3.99 to 4.23, with an overall mean score of 4.12, placing the responses in the "Positive" category. This suggests that students view Grammarly as an effective tool for enhancing their writing skill, particularly in areas such as grammar correction, vocabulary enhancement, and writing mechanics.

For item 9, the mean score is 4.14, categorized as "Positive." A majority of students either agreed (56%) or strongly agreed (31%) that Grammarly gives explanations and suggestions to improve their writing. This high level of agreement indicates that students find Grammarly's feedback useful for producing clearer and more accurate sentences. The small percentage of neutral responses (10%) reflects students who are confident in their writing abilities and do not rely on external assistance as frequently. The 3% disagreement reflects students who do not fully recognize the utility of Grammarly's feedback and prefer other methods for improving their writing, such as manual revision or seeking feedback from teachers or peers.

In item 10, with a mean score of 4.21 in the "Very Positive" category, 44% of students agreed and 41% strongly agreed that Grammarly provides clear explanations of errors in their writing. The high agreement level suggests that students appreciate the detailed feedback from Grammarly, which helps them understand the nature of their mistakes. The 11% neutral responses reflect students who feel that Grammarly's explanations are not always necessary for them, as they are confident in identifying and understanding errors on their own. The minimal disagreement (4%) indicates that some students prefer their own methods of error identification and explanation.

Item 11 received a mean score of 4.04, categorized as "Positive." The majority of students agreed (52%) or strongly agreed (29%) that Grammarly feedback enhances their writing skill. This reflects the perceived value of Grammarly in improving various aspects of their writing, including grammar, vocabulary, and mechanics. The 16% neutral responses suggest that some students feel sufficiently skilled in their writing and believe Grammarly's feedback does not significantly alter their approach. The small percentage of disagreement (3%) shows that some

students prefer traditional feedback methods, such as peer or teacher reviews, for writing improvement.

The mean score for item 12 is 4.14, also falling into the "Positive" category. Many students agreed (48%) or strongly agreed (33%) that Grammarly feedback boosts their confidence in writing. This positive perception stems from Grammarly's ability to detect and correct errors, helping students feel more assured in their writing. The 19% neutral response rate reflects students who do not rely heavily on Grammarly for confidence, possibly because they are already proficient in writing. The absence of disagreement suggests that Grammarly's feedback generally helps in boosting students' writing confidence.

For item 13, the mean score of 4.12 is classified as "Positive." Most students agreed (53%) or strongly agreed (32%) that Grammarly provides detailed feedback. This indicates that students find Grammarly's comprehensive analysis of writing issues helpful for improving their work. The 13% neutral responses reflect students who feel the level of detail provided by Grammarly is either sufficient and unnecessary for their needs. The minimal disagreement (2%) shows that some students prefer less detailed feedback and believe simpler suggestions would be more helpful.

The mean score of item 14 is 4.13, showing a "Positive" perception. A significant number of students agreed (46%) or strongly agreed (38%) that Grammarly feedback is always helpful. This high level of agreement demonstrates that students perceive Grammarly's feedback as consistent and valuable for improving their writing. The 12% neutral responses reflect students who occasionally find certain feedback less relevant and helpful depending on the task. The small disagreement rate (4%) suggests that a few students prefer manual review over automated feedback.

Item 15 has a mean score of 4.01, indicating a "Positive" perception. A substantial portion of students agreed (42%) or strongly agreed (34%) that they always agree with Grammarly's suggestions. This suggests that students trust Grammarly's feedback and rely on it to improve their writing. The 18% neutral responses show that some students do not always accept the suggestions, preferring to use their own judgment in their writing. The minimal disagreement (6%) reflects a preference for personalized feedback from teachers or peers.

The mean score of item 16 is 4.23, indicating a "Very Positive" perception. A majority of students strongly agreed (46%) or agreed (38%) that Grammarly saves their time in correcting errors. This suggests that students appreciate Grammarly's efficiency in identifying and correcting mistakes quickly, making it a valuable time-saving tool. The 12% neutral responses show that some students prefer traditional proofreading methods and feel that automated tools are not always faster than manual revision. The minimal disagreement (4%) reflects students who feel that manual checking provides more thorough corrections.

For item 17, the mean score of 3.99 falls into the "Positive" category. Most students agreed (51%) or strongly agreed (29%) that they do not find misleading feedback from Grammarly. The positive perception reflects the students' trust in Grammarly's accuracy and the reliability of its suggestions. The 14% neutral responses show students who find some feedback less relevant or applicable to their specific writing context. The slight disagreement (6%) is from students who have experienced instances where Grammarly's suggestions were not in line with their intended meaning or writing style.

In item 18, the mean score of 4.00, categorized as "Positive," shows that many students (49%) agreed, and 28% strongly agreed that Grammarly enhances their motivation to learn. This perception highlights Grammarly's role in encouraging students to engage more with their writing, knowing that immediate feedback is available. The tool's effectiveness in providing constructive feedback and suggestions increase students' motivation to practice and improve their writing skill. The 19% neutral responses reflect students who do not feel that the tool

significantly affects their motivation, because they are already highly motivated or confident in their writing abilities. The 4% disagreement suggests that a small group of students prefer other motivational tools or strategies.

Overall, the analysis indicates that students at SMAN 4 Palangka Raya generally have a positive view of the quality and impact of Grammarly's feedback on their writing skill. Most items scored in the "Positive" or "Very Positive" categories, highlighting Grammarly's effectiveness in providing clear, detailed feedback, boosting confidence, saving time, and enhancing motivation. However, some neutral and disagreeing responses point to alternative preferences for writing improvement. Neutral students felt Grammarly's feedback had little impact, often due to confidence in their own abilities or a preference for peer or teacher feedback. Those who disagreed questioned the accuracy or relevance of Grammarly's suggestions, favoring manual or personalized feedback. Despite these differences, the findings emphasize Grammarly's value in improving writing skill while acknowledging that some students prefer other approaches.

Use of Grammarly

Students at SMAN 4 Palangka Raya generally have a positive to very positive perception of the use of Grammarly. The mean scores for the evaluated items range from 3.98 to 4.34, with an overall mean score of 4.11, indicating that the responses fall within the "Positive" category. This suggests that students view Grammarly as an efficient and accessible tool with an easy-to-use interface for improving their writing skill, which can be accessed anytime and anywhere. Even with the free version, it provides quick and effective writing assistance without requiring a strong internet connection, although it lacks Indonesian language support.

For item 18, the mean score is 4.21, categorized as "Very Positive." A majority of students (47%) strongly agreed, and 37% agreed that Grammarly can be accessed anytime and anywhere. This positive perception reflects the convenience of Grammarly as an accessible tool for students, especially in an era where mobile learning and flexible study schedules are increasingly valued. The widespread agreement can be attributed to the fact that Grammarly's web-based platform and mobile app offer students the flexibility to check their writing at any time and from any location, thus enhancing the tool's effectiveness. The small percentage of neutral responses (7%) reflects students who feel they do not need to access the tool frequently and prefer working in a more structured environment with set hours. The 9% disagreement stem from students who experience issues with internet connectivity and prefer a more structured learning environment with scheduled access to the tool, limiting their use of Grammarly's anytime, anywhere accessibility.

Item 19 received a mean score of 4.20, classified as "Positive." A majority of students (44%) strongly agreed, and 38% agreed that Grammarly has easy-to-use procedures. This suggests that students find Grammarly's interface simple to navigate, making the feedback and correction process straightforward. The high level of agreement indicates that Grammarly's user-friendly design plays a significant role in its popularity and usability among students. The small percentage of neutral responses (15%) reflects those who have experienced some initial difficulties with the interface, but overall, the tool's ease of use is well-recognized by most students. The 3% disagreement represents students who find the tool's features too limited or complex for their needs, especially in the free version.

For item 20, with a mean score of 4.34, categorized as "Very Positive," 46% of students strongly agreed, and 45% agreed that Grammarly is efficient even when using the free version. This high agreement reflects the perception that even without the premium features, Grammarly remains effective in improving writing skill, especially in areas such as grammar, vocabulary, and mechanics. The accessibility of a free version that still provides valuable feedback is a key factor in this perception. The 7% neutral responses reflect students who believe the free version

has limited functionality, and the minimal disagreement (2%) comes from those who feel the premium version offers significantly more benefits.

In item 21, the mean score of 3.98 places it in the "Positive" category. A majority of students (53%) agreed, and 28% strongly agreed that they do not find it difficult to use Grammarly, even though there is no Indonesian language option. This indicates a general willingness among students to work with Grammarly's English-language interface, driven by their desire to enhance their English writing skill. However, there is a 13% neutral perception, influenced by factors such as students' varying levels of English proficiency and familiarity with English-only tools. Some students do not face significant challenges but also do not fully benefit from the tool due to occasional language difficulties. Meanwhile, the 9% disagreement reflects a small number of students who struggle with navigating Grammarly because of language barriers and prefer tools that support their native language.

For item 22, the mean score of 4.13 indicates a "Positive" perception. A majority of students (48%) agreed, and 33% strongly agreed that they do not need good internet access to use Grammarly effectively. This suggests that Grammarly's efficiency in offering feedback and corrections does not heavily depend on a stable or high-speed internet connection. The ability to access the tool with lower bandwidth makes it more accessible for students in areas with limited internet quality. The 18% neutral responses reflect students who experience occasional connectivity issues, and the 1% disagreement is from those who encounter problems when using Grammarly with weak or intermittent internet access.

For item 24, the mean score of 3.98 places it in the "Positive" category. A majority of students (42%) agreed, and 34% strongly agreed that they do not experience difficulties using Grammarly. This positive perception reflects the ease with which most students can integrate Grammarly into their writing workflow. The 17% neutral responses suggest that some students have not encountered significant challenges but still feel there is room for improvement in terms of usability. The 7% disagreement comes from students who experience technical issues and prefer more personalized, in-depth feedback rather than the automated suggestions provided by Grammarly, which do not always address their specific writing needs.

Item 25 received a mean score of 4.14, also categorized as "Positive." A significant portion of students (43%) agreed, and 39% strongly agreed that Grammarly can be accessed quickly. This suggests that students appreciate Grammarly's responsiveness, which contributes to a smooth and efficient writing correction process. The 14% neutral responses indicate that some students experience occasional delays or issues with the tool, though these instances are minimal. The 4% disagreement comes from students who experience technical issues, such as slow internet speeds or platform-related glitches, which can delay access and disrupt their writing correction process. These students are hindered by these technical difficulties, affecting their overall experience with the tool.

Overall, students at SMAN 4 Palangka Raya hold a positive view of Grammarly's accessibility, usability, and efficiency. Those with a positive perception appreciate its easy-to-use interface, availability anytime and anywhere, and effectiveness in improving writing skill, even with the free version. They also value its low internet requirements, making it accessible in areas with unstable connections. Neutral perceptions arise from occasional interface difficulties, language barriers, or moderate connectivity issues, with some students preferring more structured access. Negative perceptions are mainly due to technical issues, struggles with the English-only interface, and a preference for personalized feedback over automated suggestions. Despite these challenges, Grammarly is generally regarded as a valuable tool for improving writing skill, with few areas for improvement noted by students.

Variations in Students' Perceptions of Grammarly's Feedback on Writing Skill

The analysis of the questionnaire also includes the mean score for each student. The overall mean score of 4.19 indicates that students have a positive perception of using Grammarly to enhance their writing skill. Among the 91 respondents, 44 students rated Grammarly as "Very Positive," frequently selecting agree or strongly agree, with some even achieving perfect mean scores of 5.00. Meanwhile, 38 students rated it as "Positive," typically offering a mix of neutral and agree responses, with occasional strongly agree ratings. Additionally, 8 students were neutral in their assessment, often scoring items as neutral with slight variations. Only 1 student expressed a negative view, consistently providing lower ratings across most items. The highest individual score recorded was 5.00, reflecting the strongest positive perception, while the lowest score was 2.52, indicating a negative perception.

Students' perceptions of Grammarly's feedback on their writing skill were also analyzed using percentage calculations. The data on students' perceptions of Grammarly shows that 48% of students rated their experience as "Very Positive," indicating strong overall approval. The highest ratings were given to Grammarly's features, particularly its sentence structure, capitalization, and grammar checks. Students found the feedback clear, saving time in correcting writing errors. Furthermore, the accessibility and efficiency of the free version contributed to a satisfying experience for many.

In addition, 42% of students rated their experience as "Positive," indicating general satisfaction. They appreciated Grammarly's basic features, such as grammar checks, vocabulary suggestions, and mechanics. However, there was some variation in ratings for more advanced features. While the feedback was helpful, it was not always fully utilized. Overall, students found Grammarly useful, though some mentioned occasional technical issues and the limitations of the free version.

A smaller group, 9%, had a neutral perception, neither particularly positive nor negative. Their concerns were primarily related to the trustworthiness of advanced features and the quality of feedback, which they found less accurate and less effective in improving their writing skill. Some students also struggled with the English-language interface, which hindered their user experience.

Only 1% of students expressed a "Negative" view, citing dissatisfaction with the accuracy of Grammarly's features and confusing feedback. Issues with accessibility and technical difficulties were the main complaints in this category. Notably, no students reported a "Very Negative" perception, and even the most critical students acknowledged some value in the tool.

Based on the data analysis, several key trends were identified to explain variations in students' perceptions. Students who provided a very positive perception of Grammarly were typically those who highly valued the practical benefits offered by the application. They found the features and assistance provided by Grammarly to be highly reliable and trusted its effectiveness. These students reported significant improvements in their writing abilities and appreciated the ease of access and usability of Grammarly. They experienced real, tangible benefits from using the tool, particularly in grammar correction, vocabulary suggestions, and writing mechanics checks. The positive feedback from this group indicates that they felt these aspects were crucial for enhancing their writing skill.

Students in the positive group acknowledged Grammarly's benefits but expressed some doubts or limitations they had encountered. They were more critical of specific features and saw room for further development of the application. While these students recognized the positive potential of Grammarly, they were not fully convinced of its effectiveness in all writing situations. Some of them found the free version of Grammarly somewhat limiting, which may have influenced their satisfaction, as they did not have access to some of the advanced features available in the premium version.

Students with a neutral perception of Grammarly were not fully convinced of its benefits. They felt that they needed more evidence and experience before completely accepting it as an

effective solution to improve their writing skill. Some of these students faced barriers, such as challenges with the English-only interface or technical issues like connectivity problems. As a result, they were unable to maximize the benefits of the tool, and their perceptions were more cautious.

A student who provided negative feedback encountered significant challenges in using Grammarly. They felt that the application did not fully meet their needs and found limitations in the features offered. Their trust in the tool's features was low, and they did not see practical benefits from using it. This student preferred traditional, more personalized feedback over Grammarly's automated suggestions, contributing to their negative perception. Interestingly, no students reported a very negative experience, which suggests that even for those who faced challenges with the tool, it still offered some value. The absence of very negative feedback indicates that, despite some limitations, Grammarly was still seen as a helpful tool by the majority of users.

Overall, the variations in student perceptions of Grammarly can be attributed to several key factors, including trust in the tool, practical experience, and the perceived benefits it offers. Students with a very positive view particularly valued its practical benefits, such as grammar correction, vocabulary suggestions, and writing mechanics, and reported significant improvements in their writing. Those with a positive perception recognized Grammarly's benefits but also pointed out limitations, especially with the free version. A smaller group remained neutral, citing technical issues or limited experience, while a few students had negative perceptions, often due to challenges with the tool's features or a preference for traditional, personalized feedback. Despite these differences, the overall feedback was positive, suggesting that Grammarly is seen as an effective writing aid by most students, with none reporting very negative experiences.

Discussion

This research comprehensively analyzed students' perceptions of Grammarly's feedback on their writing skill, focusing on grammar, vocabulary, and mechanics. The findings from this research indicate a generally positive perception of Grammarly, with an overall mean score of 4.19. This suggests that students found the tool useful and effective in improving their writing abilities, particularly in grammar, vocabulary, and writing mechanics. These perceptions are shaped by various factors, both internal and external, that influence how individuals process information. According to Walgito (2004), individuals perceive things differently due to a combination of internal psychological factors (such as thoughts, emotions, desires, needs, gender, motivations, and level of attention) and external influences (such as stimuli, cultural context, and belief systems). These factors play a crucial role in shaping students' responses to the feedback provided by Grammarly.

The findings also revealed important factors influencing the students' responses, which can be explained through various theoretical frameworks, providing a deeper understanding of Grammarly's role in enhancing students' writing skill. The key findings regarding students' perceptions of Grammarly's features, feedback quality and impact, and usage are framed within the contexts of Sociocultural Theory, Constructivist Learning Theory, and Feedback Intervention Theory.

The analysis of students' perceptions revealed that Grammarly's features, such as sentence structure guidance, capitalization correction, spelling correction, vocabulary assistance, punctuation checking, word choice suggestions, and grammar rule explanations received high satisfaction ratings. These features were perceived as particularly helpful in addressing basic writing aspects. The high ratings for these features indicate their effectiveness in providing targeted feedback on fundamental writing skill, which are critical for developing writing

proficiency. This aligns with Sociocultural Theory, which emphasizes the importance of scaffolding in learning (Vygotsky, 1978). By offering immediate and clear feedback, Grammarly serves as an external support system, enabling students to enhance their writing abilities through continuous interaction with the tool. According to Walgito (2004), this interaction is an example of how external factors, such as tools and support systems, can influence individuals' learning processes.

Grammarly's overall quality was positively perceived, with students recognizing its role in enhancing their writing skill. The feedback provided by the tool was seen as clear and actionable, contributing to improvements in students' grammar, vocabulary, and writing mechanics. The positive impact of Grammarly aligns with Feedback Intervention Theory, which suggests that feedback is most effective when it helps learners identify their mistakes and offers solutions for improvement (Kluger & DeNisi, 1996). Students reported that Grammarly's immediate and corrective feedback on grammar, vocabulary, and mechanics helped them avoid recurring mistakes and refined their writing skill over time. This feedback process reflects Walgito's assertion that individuals' perceptions and actions are often guided by feedback loops, where external feedback leads to changes in internal beliefs and behaviors (Walgito, 2004).

The research also revealed that high-achieving students who fully embraced Grammarly saw significant improvements in their writing. These students benefited more from the tool's comprehensive feedback, as it reinforced their understanding of grammatical rules and writing conventions. In contrast, moderate users found Grammarly helpful but not essential, indicating that their existing writing skill was sufficient to perform well without relying heavily on the tool. These findings suggest that Grammarly's impact on writing skill varies based on students' initial proficiency levels and their engagement with the tool. Walgito (2004) highlights how individuals' personal psychological characteristics, such as their level of self-efficacy and motivation, contribute to how they perceive and utilize external tools like Grammarly.

In terms of usage, ease of accessibility emerged as a significant factor influencing students' perceptions. Most students found Grammarly easy to access at any time, which contributed to a positive experience. This factor aligns with Sociocultural Theory, where accessibility and consistent use of learning tools facilitate the learning process by providing students with the opportunity to engage with feedback whenever necessary (Vygotsky, 1978). Moreover, most students reported no major technical difficulties, further supporting the idea that the tool's ease of use enhances its effectiveness. Walgito (2004) would argue that these external factors, such as the tool's accessibility and user-friendly design, influence students' attitudes and their overall learning experience.

However, the research also highlighted a small group of students who reported neutral or negative perceptions. These students cited technical issues, such as internet connectivity problems, as barriers to effective usage. Some students also encountered difficulties with the English-only interface, which suggests that language barriers may have affected their experience. This aligns with previous research by Yurika & Farahdiba (2023), who found that a stable internet connection is essential for optimal use, and Ummah & Bisriyah (2022), who highlighted the limitations of using Grammarly Premium without a reliable connection. Additionally, some students preferred traditional feedback methods over digital tools, reflecting personal learning preferences, and suggesting that not all students are equally comfortable with digital feedback systems. As Walgito (2004) notes, internal factors such as individual preferences and external factors like technological limitations can significantly impact how a person perceives and utilizes a learning tool.

The findings of this research align with previous studies on the use of Grammarly. Similar to Dewi (2022), students in this research found that Grammarly's suggestions for word choices helped them expand their vocabulary and improve their writing. Additionally, Grammarly's

feedback on punctuation, which was seen as crucial for clarity and coherence, echoes the work of Hakiki (2021). In contrast to studies by Ummah & Bisriyah (2022) and Yurika & Farahdiba (2023), students in this research felt that Grammarly effectively identified nuanced grammatical errors, underscoring its role as a supplementary tool in writing instruction.

The quality and impact of Grammarly's feedback were significant. Students reported a better understanding of grammatical structures and writing conventions, which contributed to improved writing skill. This is consistent with Ghufron & Rosyida's (2018) findings that Grammarly enhances English learners' writing. By providing immediate, clear feedback, Grammarly enabled students to make real-time corrections, improving their writing quality and reinforcing their learning process.

Regarding accessibility, most students found Grammarly easy to use and accessible at any time. However, some challenges were noted, including issues with internet connectivity, as reported by Yurika & Farahdiba (2023). Despite concerns about the cost of Grammarly Premium, this research found that the free version was sufficient for high school students, in contrast to the findings of Fitriana & Nurazni (2022), who emphasized the importance of the premium version for more complex academic writing.

In conclusion, this research reveals that Grammarly is perceived positively by students, particularly for its ability to provide clear, immediate feedback on essential writing aspects such as grammar, vocabulary, spelling, punctuation, and capitalization. The tool's effectiveness is heightened by its user-friendly interface and accessibility, allowing students to engage with feedback at any time, thus fostering writing development. While most students reported positive outcomes, individual factors such as prior writing proficiency, personal learning preferences, and technical issues influenced their perceptions and usage. High-achieving students, in particular, benefited significantly from Grammarly's comprehensive feedback, while moderate users found it helpful but not essential. Despite some challenges, including internet connectivity issues and language barriers, the overall impact of Grammarly was positive. The findings suggest that, although Grammarly is a valuable tool for improving basic writing skill, further enhancements in advanced features and language accessibility could further support diverse student needs.

CONCLUSION

Students at SMAN 4 Palangka Raya have a positive perception of Grammarly as an effective tool for enhancing their writing skill, as demonstrated by a mean score of 4.19. This favorable perception highlights the effectiveness of Grammarly's feedback in supporting students with essential writing components, including grammar, vocabulary, and mechanics. Students value the tool's capability to identify grammatical errors, suggest appropriate vocabulary, and ensure correct spelling, punctuation, and capitalization. Furthermore, the explanations and suggestions provided by Grammarly not only enhance the quality of their writing but also boost their confidence and motivation. The accessibility and user-friendly interface of Grammarly, even in its free version, along with its functionality without the need for a strong internet connection and the absence of an Indonesian language option, further strengthen the positive perception. Consequently, Grammarly has proven to be a valuable asset for students, making substantial contributions to their writing skill development. While most students reported positive experiences, individual factors such as prior writing proficiency, personal learning preferences, and technical issues influenced how they perceived and used the tool. These factors suggest that, despite Grammarly being a valuable asset for students' writing skill development, its impact may vary depending on each student's specific needs and circumstances.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

REFERENCES

Aidil, T. M. (2021). *Exploring Students' Perception On The Effectiveness Of "Grammarly Software" In Academic Writing* (Doctoral dissertation, UIN Ar-Raniry).

Armanda, M. L., Nugraheni, A. F., Wulansari, A., & Imron, A. (2022). Grammarly" as English writing assistant from EFL students' perspective. *English Education: Journal of English Teaching and Research*, 7(2), 128-137.

Billa, S. (2024). *English Students' Perception toward the Use of Grammarly in Writing an Undergraduate Thesis at Jambi University* (Doctoral dissertation, Universitas Jambi).

Bimo Walgito, B. W. (2004). Pengantar Psikologi Umum.

Creswell, J. W., & Creswell, J. D. (2017). *Research design: Qualitative, quantitative, and mixed methods approaches*. Sage publications.

Dewi, U. (2022). Grammarly as automated writing evaluation: Its effectiveness from EFL students' perceptions. *Lingua Cultura*, 16(2), 155-161.

Faisal, F., & Carabella, P. A. (2023). Utilizing Grammarly in an academic writing process: Higher-education students' perceived views. *Journal of English Language Teaching and Linguistics*, 8(1), 23-42.

Fitria, R. A., Sabarun, S., & Miftah, M. Z. (2022). Students' perception of the use of grammarly in undergraduate thesis writing. *PROJECT (Professional Journal of English Education)*, 5(2), 366-371.

Fitriana, K., & Nurazni, L. (2022). Exploring English Department Students' Perceptions on Using Grammarly to Check the Grammar in Their Writing. *Journal of English Teaching*, 8(1), 15-25.

Fowler Jr, F. J. (2013). *Survey research methods*. Sage publications.

Ghufron, M. A., & Rosyida, F. (2018). The role of Grammarly in assessing English as a Foreign Language (EFL) writing. *Lingua Cultura*, 12(4), 395-403.

Godwin-Jones, R. (2022). Partnering with AI: Intelligent writing assistance and instructed language learning.

Hattie, J., & Timperley, H. (2007). The power of feedback. *Review of educational research*, 77(1), 81-112.

Han, B. (2019). Application of Artificial Intelligence in Autonomous English Learning Among College Students. *International Journal of Emerging Technologies in Learning*, 14(6).

Hakiki, G. N. R. (2021). Perception of EFL students on the use Grammarly application in writing class. *Eduvelop: Journal of English Education and Development*, 4(2), 99-106.

Huang, X., Zou, D., Cheng, G., Chen, X., & Xie, H. (2023). Trends, research issues and applications of artificial intelligence in language education. *Educational Technology & Society*, 26(1), 112-131.

Jansen, H. (2010). The logic of qualitative survey research and its position in the field of social research methods. In *Forum Qualitative Sozialforschung/Forum: Qualitative Social Research* (Vol. 11, No. 2).

Kafrawi, M. (2022). Meningkatkan Kemampuan Menulis Kreatif Untuk Siswa SMK Labor Pekanbaru. *BIDIK: Jurnal Pengabdian kepada Masyarakat*, *3*(1), 43-46.

Khan, M. O., Nazim, M., & Alzubi, A. A. F. (2024). Exploring Arab EFL Learners' Attitudes: Is Grammarly a Game-Changer in Academic Writing Classes?. *Educational Administration: Theory And Practice*, *30*(4), 1365-3171.

Kluger, A. N., & DeNisi, A. (1996). The effects of feedback interventions on performance: a historical review, a meta-analysis, and a preliminary feedback intervention theory. *Psychological bulletin*, *119*(2), 254.

Le Phan, T. N. (2023, November). Students' perceptions of the AI technology application in English writing classes. In *Proceedings of the AsiaCALL International Conference* (Vol. 4, pp. 45-62).

Nurhidayah, A., & Irawati, T. (2024). Grammarly Through the Lens of Student Perception. *Jurnal Bahasa, Sastra, dan Studi Amerika, 30*(1), 11-18. doi:http://dx.doi.org/10.20961/jbssa.v30i1.87858

NURO'AZAH, D. E. W. I. (2019). The Effectiveness of Grammarly Checker Toward Student'a Writing Quality of The Fourth Semester of English Departement at IAIN Tulungagung.

Obilor, E. I. (2019). Feedback and students' learning. *International Journal of Innovative Research in Education*, *7*(2), 40-47.

ONeill, R., & Russell, A. (2019). Stop! Grammar time: University students' perceptions of the automated feedback program Grammarly. *Australasian Journal of Educational Technology*, *35*(1).

Putri, S., Erni, E., & Masyhur, M. (2024). English Study Program Students' Perception on Using Grammarly as an Online Grammar Checker in Academic Writing. *AURELIA: Jurnal Penelitian dan Pengabdian Masyarakat Indonesia*, *3*(2), 819-830.

Rakya, Z. H. (2023). Exploring the impact of artificial intelligence (AI) on learner-instructor interaction in online learning (Literature Review). *International Journal of Emerging Multidisciplinary: Computer Science & Artificial Intelligence*, *2*(1), 1-14.

Samosir, S. A., & Daulay, S. H. (2023, July). EFL students' perception of the use "Grammarly application" as Automated Writing Evaluation (AWE). In *Conference on English Language Teaching* (pp. 928-940).

Tarsan, V., Kandang, A., & Helmon, A. (2021). Students perception towards the application of grammarly: the automatic grammar checker in writing narrative text in the third semester at stkip ypup makassar. *JIPD (Jurnal Inovasi Pendidikan Dasar)*, *5*(2), 123-133.

Thomas, L. E. (2023). Paragraph Structures. *AMWA Journal*, *38*(1).

Ummah, L. K., & Bisriyah, M. (2022). EFL students' perception on Grammarly premium's feedback and dealing with inaccuracies. *JEES (Journal of English Educators Society)*, *7*(2), 163-172.

Vygotsky, L. S. (1978). *Mind in society: The development of higher psychological processes* (Vol. 86). Harvard university press.

Yurika, F., & Farahdiba, S. (2023). Students' Perceptions Toward The Use of Grammarly as A Grammar Checker In The Process Of Writing. In *Journal of Technology in Language Pedagogy (JTechLP)* (Vol. 2, Issue 2).