

UNLOCKING GRAMMARLY'S POTENTIAL TO FACILITATE NOTICING AND UPTAKE IN EFL WRITING

Yuliana Angreini Syafruddin¹, Putri Nurul A'la¹, Muntasir¹

Jurusan Pendidikan Bahasa Inggris Universitas Syiah Kuala¹

E-mail: yuliana.syafruddin@usk.ac.id, putrinurul.ala@usk.ac.id,
muntasir@usk.ac.id

ABSTRAK

Penelitian ini bertujuan untuk menunjukkan bagaimana Grammarly dapat diintegrasikan ke dalam proses pembelajaran guna meningkatkan *noticing* (kesadaran linguistik) dan *learners' uptake* peserta didik terhadap tata bahasa serta keterampilan menulis. Penelitian ini menggunakan metode deskriptif kualitatif untuk memahami proses *noticing* serta menganalisis *learners' uptake* guna memperoleh pemahaman yang lebih mendalam tentang proses pemerolehan dan pembelajaran bahasa. Penelitian ini didasarkan pada kerangka *Noticing Hypothesis* yang dikemukakan oleh Schmidt (1990) serta konsep *Learners' Uptake* dari Lyster dan Ranta (1997). Partisipan penelitian adalah sekelompok peserta dewasa yang mengikuti kelas IELTS di KIES Aceh, salah satu lembaga kursus intensif di Banda Aceh, dengan tingkat kemampuan bahasa Inggris dari pemula hingga tingkat menengah. Untuk memperoleh data yang komprehensif, penelitian ini menggunakan *Noticing Sheet* sebagai instrumen bagi peserta untuk mencatat proses *noticing* yang mereka alami. Selain itu, hasil tulisan peserta sebelum dan sesudah revisi juga dianalisis untuk mengidentifikasi tingkat *penyerapan peserta*. Hasil penelitian menunjukkan bahwa Grammarly dapat memfasilitasi proses *noticing* peserta didik ketika umpan balik otomatis digunakan pada tahap revisi dalam proses pembelajaran. Selain itu, Grammarly juga dapat membantu guru dengan menyediakan umpan balik yang konsisten dan otomatis terhadap banyak hasil tulisan peserta didik dalam waktu yang relatif singkat.

Kata kunci: Grammarly, *learner uptake*, *noticing*, *Noticing Sheet*

ABSTRACT

The research aims to show how Grammarly can be integrated into the learning process to increase the noticing and learners' uptake of grammar and writing skills. The research used the descriptive qualitative method to understand the noticing process and analyze the learners' uptake to understand the acquisition and learning process in depth. The study was based on the framework of Schmidt's (1990) Noticing Hypothesis and the Learner's Uptake Concept from Lyster and Ranta (1997). The participants in the study were a group of adults who took an IELTS class at KIES Aceh, one of the intensive learning courses in Banda Aceh, ranging from beginner to intermediate level. To receive comprehensive data, the study employed the Noticing Sheet for students to record their noticing process; then, the students' writings were also compared to analyze the uptake. The research shows that Grammarly could facilitate the students' noticing process when the automated feedback was used in the revision stage of the learning process. Grammarly could also help the teachers by providing constant and automated feedback for numerous students' writings in a short period of time.

Keywords: Grammarly, *learner's uptake*, *noticing*, *Noticing Sheet*

INTRODUCTION

The number of AI tools released and employed has provided numerous options on how to teach and learn in this digital era. The current precedent on AI tools lies in the focus of empowering learners to be well prepared to learn ethically (Mohammed & Khalid, 2025). In the education sector, both teachers and students need to fully acknowledge how humans and AI intersect in the learning process, where the line crosses between learning enhancement and ethical usage.

AI tools in the education context should not present hindrances and diminish critical thinking in learners, but assist and scaffold the learning process to achieve expected outcomes (Barrot, 2023). Particularly in language learning, many AI tools were created to offer numerous supports for both educators and learners. For language learners, these various assistants provide confidence in producing language output during the language learning process (Alhusaiyan, 2025).

As a result, the AI tools have transformed into language learners' companions, as they are massively used and integrated, especially in the EFL context (Alhalangy & Abdalgane, 2023). Therefore, it is necessary to research how language learners are empowered to use AI tools for language learning.

Grammarly, one of the most common tools used to provide grammar correction, has been

significantly employed by language users to increase writing performance by enhancing coherence and clarity. It is one of the Automated Writing Evaluation (AWE) software programs that native and non-native English speakers have widely utilized (Rababah & Talafha, 2024).

It has become popular in the EFL context, as this tool provides numerous assistance for grammar correction and language evaluation from students' writings (Yawiloeng, 2025). Specifically, it aids learners by offering quick grammar and spelling corrections, appropriate choices of vocabulary, and writing evaluation (Lin & Yu, 2025). As a result, this tool has been extensively used by many and rated as one of the excellent applications for supporting writing for performance. As one of the AWE software, Grammarly is not only able to provide spontaneous feedback, but also presents metalinguistic explanations for grammar corrections (Yawiloeng, 2025).

As a result, it offers users the option to receive direct grammar corrections or to collect grammar information from Grammarly's explanations. While the benefits largely contribute to learners' self-assurance, challenges remain.

The key issue lies in students' cognitive writing development, to determine whether any employed AI tools, such as Grammarly, could empower and facilitate students to experience the noticing and uptake process as part of second language acquisition in grammar and writing

skill development (Ellis, 2009). In the EFL context, Schmidt (1990) proposed the Noticing Hypothesis as a core process in the acquisition and learning of a second language.

The notion is that learners will not be considered to have fully learned a particular language feature unless they consciously 'notice' it as part of the received input (Schmidt, 1990, p. 148). Thus, the noticing hypothesis suggests that it is crucially important for learners to have active exposure that leads to conscious noticing of language forms (ElEbyary et al., 2024).

As a result, any integrated or utilized AI tools in language learning need to guarantee that learners will not have a passive learning process. Thus, they are expected to empower students to have conscious awareness of the input presented in the grammar feedback. After ensuring the tools can facilitate the noticing process, the focus then shifts to students' uptake. Lyster and Ranta (1997) developed the concept of learner uptake, which defines learners' immediate response to feedback.

This involves any modification or repair to fix the errors. To confirm whether the noticing process has been consciously undertaken, learners' writing revision needs to be evaluated to see how the errors have been mediated (Uddin, 2022) in the context of writing development. The noticing process only occurs internally; learners' writing revision could reveal their writing progress. Thus, uptake could

show the stage of learners' writing development after the noticing process, which is characterized by writing revisions, language feature repair, and grammar accuracy (Uddin, 2022).

As Grammarly is expected to encourage the grammar noticing process, the success will be measured by whether learners can develop successful or unsuccessful uptake from their writing revision (ElEbyary et al., 2024). In EFL writing, uptake can be seen from sentence revisions based on the feedback given, the appropriate sentence structure, and the increase in language accuracy (Ellis, 2009).

As a result, the uptake process in students' writing revision will define whether the noticing process has been successfully undertaken through AI tools, and this is the point at which the research on any grammar checker tools needs to be evaluated.

Previous research on Grammarly has yielded many insights into how this tool could be integrated by learners to promote grammar learning and how the impact of utilizing this tool has been perceived in writing development. In the EFL context, Grammarly's extensive utilization as a grammar checker has been recognized in many studies (Syafuruddin, 2025; Thi et al., 2022; Zhang et al., 2020). Earlier research has examined how second language learners perceived Grammarly in assisting their writing skills, particularly in grammar and sentence structure

(Ventayen & Orlanda-Ventayen, 2018).

Other aspects of Grammarly studies have also shown the potential and limitations of embedding this tool in grammar learning (Syafruddin, 2025; Thi et al., 2022). Moreover, evaluating EFL students' writing using Grammarly has been studied to show how this tool can be employed in language assessment (& Rosyida, 2018).

In the context of noticing and uptake, ElEbyari et al. (2024) have investigated the role of several automated writing feedback tools in improving writing skills. However, studies on how Grammarly, in particular, can facilitate the noticing process and enhance learners' uptake remain understudied (ElEbyary et al., 2024), especially in the Indonesian context.

Thus, this study focuses on two aspects of SLA in the students' writing process while using Grammarly for learning:

- a) How could Grammarly encourage the noticing aspect?
- b) How could Grammarly facilitate the students' uptake?

The purpose of the study is to reveal how the students' writing development can be internalized through the noticing and uptake using Grammarly. The research is grounded in theoretical perspectives of the Noticing Hypothesis (Schmidt, 1990) and learners' uptake (Lyster & Ranta, 1997) in second language acquisition. It seeks to investigate

how learners receive, interpret, and respond to automated grammar feedback from Grammarly while composing and revising their writing. The study aims to examine how Grammarly can facilitate learners' cognitive awareness of grammar and sentence structures, and how error recognition can be supported by aligning it with subsequent revisions in their writing.

METHOD

The study was conducted using a descriptive qualitative method to understand the complex nature of specific learners' actions in the grammar acquisition process. The qualitative approach was determined as the most appropriate method to explore, which examines learners' behaviour in language learning in depth (et al., 2003). Moreover, the method could provide nuances to explore the cognitive reasons governing students' behaviour and internalized decisions in the writing development process. Therefore, the approach was utilized to provide a comprehensive explanation of the writing process and final product.

The subjects in this research were the 16 adult learners, aged around 20 to 26 years old, who took an IELTS class from February to March 2026, in KIES Aceh, one of the intensive learning courses in Banda Aceh province. Their proficiency ranged from beginner to intermediate level, with 9 students at the beginner level and 7 at the intermediate

level. The research objects were two aspects. First were the students' Noticing Sheets (see Appendix 1), suggested by Schmidt (1990) and adapted from (ElEbyary et al., 2024) for recording students' reflections and knowledge while learning. The second was their two IELTS Task 2 writings; the first one was about *"Some people believe that technology has made our lives more complicated rather than easier. To what extent do you agree or disagree?"* and the second writing was about *"Governments should take more responsibility for reducing environmental pollution. Do you agree or disagree?"*.

Data collection was performed in several stages. To gather information on the noticing process, the specific steps were:

- (1) Asking the students to write an IELTS Writing Task 2 with the first topic without Grammarly
- (2) Instructing them to check their work in terms of grammar and sentence structure using Grammarly,
- (3) Requesting them to do a revision log in the Noticing Sheet (NS) from the Grammarly automated feedback. The NS was used to express their thoughts and reflections on their revisions.

In terms of collecting data on uptake, the steps conducted were:

- (1) Asking the students to write another IELTS Writing Task 2

on the second topic without Grammarly.

- (2) (Comparing their very first and last writing tasks to examine any progress that occurred.

In analyzing the data, the framework of the Noticing Hypothesis (Schmidt, 1990) and the uptake (Lyster & Ranta, 1997) were incorporated. For the noticing analysis, the students' Noticing Sheets were collected, and the data were coded to identify the noticing process. The students' revision notes were identified, such as comments, questions, and self-corrections.

In terms of uptake analysis, the writing comparisons were conducted to investigate whether previously highlighted errors were corrected, whether similar linguistic forms were used, and whether revisions reflected internalization rather than mere surface-level correction. In other words, Grammarly was not incorporated when the students wrote their writing practices. The tool was only used by the students to receive feedback and review their grammar and sentence structure during the learning process.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Result

This section presents data from samples of the students' Noticing Sheets (NS) and two types of students' writing. The first part describes the occurrences of the noticing aspect based on the Noticing Sheet (NS). The students used the NS when they reviewed their first writing feedback from

Grammarly, and the data are presented in Table 1. The presented error types are the most frequent errors that occurred in the students' writing. Then the second part of the results section demonstrates the data on students' uptake. It contains the

targeted error types chosen from the first and second writings. The data were collected by comparing the two writings from before and after reviewing Grammarly feedback.

a) Noticing Evidence from the Noticing Sheets (NS)

Table 1. Samples of Students' Noticing Sheets (NS) Analysis, adapted from Schmidt (1990) (EIEbyary et al., 2024)

Student Level	Error Type	Sample of Student Revision Log (from Noticing Sheet)	Noticing Explanation (Cognitive Reflection Level)
Beginner	Subject-Verb Agreement	"Grammarly said change 'have' to 'has'. I changed it because 'use of technology' is only one thing, not many things."	Deep Cognitive Processing: The learner clearly demonstrated grammatical awareness by identifying the true singular subject (<i>use</i>) rather than the closer plural noun (<i>technology</i>).
Beginner	Article Use	"The app highlighted 'changed way' and told me to use 'the way'. I accepted it because it sounds better."	Understanding without Internalization: The learner noticed the correction and applied it based on implicit "sounding right" intuition rather than explicit rule recognition.
Beginner	Verb Tense	"It corrected 'become' to 'has become'. I don't really get why because it is happening now, but I clicked change anyway."	Mechanical Uptake / Confusion: The student noticed the feedback but lacked the linguistic framework to understand the present perfect tense in context, leading to a mechanical correction.
Beginner	Preposition	"I wrote 'depend to', Grammarly corrected it to 'depend on'. I didn't know 'depend' must always go with 'on'."	Deep Cognitive Processing: The learner noticed a lexical gap (collocation error) and explicitly stated the acquisition of a new formulaic language rule.
Intermediate	Sentence Structure	"I made a mistake using 'Although' as a separate sentence. Grammarly showed it was a fragment. I combined the two sentences into one."	Deep Cognitive Processing: The learner showed strong metalinguistic awareness, identifying syntactic boundary errors (sentence fragments) and resolving them accurately.
Intermediate	Word Choice	"I wrote 'gives many negative effects'. Grammarly suggested 'has many negative effects'. I think 'gives' is okay, so I ignored the suggestion."	Noticing with Rejection: The learner actively evaluated the automated feedback against their own interlanguage system and consciously decided to reject it, showing autonomous agency.
Intermediate	Cohesion	"I used 'On the other hand' twice in a row. Grammarly flagged it as repetition. I changed the second one to 'However' to make the transition smoother."	Deep Cognitive Processing: The student noticed a macro-level discourse issue (cohesion and coherence) rather than a mere local grammatical error, reflecting on essay flow.

The data from Table 1 shows vital hints of whether the students experienced the noticing

process, and importantly, it reveals how the noticing occurred. The table also presents the data in two categories of student level: beginner and intermediate. When the first writings were transferred into Grammarly to receive the automated feedback, the beginner students received more feedback on grammatical structures. The feedback mostly pertained to basic grammar, such as Subject-Verb Agreement, Article Usage, Verb Tense, and Preposition. When receiving the direct feedback from Grammarly, these students wrote their thoughts and opinions towards the feedback, which can be seen from their revision log in the NS from Table 1. From their revision log, three types of noticing aspects occurred.

First, the students experienced the Deep Cognitive Processing when receiving feedback about Subject-Verb Agreement and Prepositions. From their notes, Deep Cognitive Processing occurred when these students acknowledged the errors and understood the Grammarly feedback. The second noticing type that occurred was Understanding without Internalization, which occurred mostly on the Article Usage error type. This type of noticing occurred when the students agreed with the feedback and noticed that the proposed feedback sounded more correct than the previous forms. The final noticing type that occurred in the beginner students' writing was Mechanical Confusion, which

occurred mostly in the Prepositions error type. This type of noticing occurred when the students noticed the presented feedback, but they did not fully understand the reasons behind their errors, which led to mechanical corrections.

In terms of the noticing aspect from the intermediate students, the error types mostly comprise three types of errors, which are the Sentence Structure, Word Choice, and Cohesion. From their revision log, it was revealed that the students only had two types of noticing: Deep Cognitive Processing and Noticing with Rejection. Deep Cognitive Processing occurred when these students received feedback about the Sentence Structure and Cohesion. In this group, the Deep Cognitive Processing occurred as reflections of their metalinguistic awareness and deep understanding of grammatical structures. The incorrect forms in their writing were considered mistakes, which they realized, but they occurred as slips. The second noticing type that occurred in this group is the Noticing with Rejection. This type of noticing occurred when the Grammarly feedback was considered as a suggestion, and the students considered that their previous forms were adequate or appropriate. Thus, they rejected the advice from Grammarly.

The results from the students' Noticing Sheet concluded that error types occurred more frequently in beginners than intermediate

students. In addition, the noticing aspects evidently could occur in these students when using Grammarly for feedback revision.

However, the depth of the noticing might vary between the two groups of students.

b) Learners' Uptake

Table 2: Comparative Analysis of Learners' Uptake between Task 1 and Task 2

Student Level	Targeted Error Type (from Task 1)	First Essay Sample (Task 1: Technology Topic)	Second Essay Sample (Task 2: Pollution Topic)	Evidence of Uptake / Analysis
Beginner	Subject-Verb Agreement	<i>The increasing use of technology in daily life have created more problems...</i>	<i>The main cause of air pollution has become industrial factories...</i>	Successful Uptake: The student successfully applied the singular verb (<i>has</i>) to match the singular head noun (<i>cause</i>), showing transfer of the rule from Task 1.
Beginner	Article Use	<i>Technology has changed way people communicate in modern society.</i>	<i>Every individual should change way they dump plastic garbage.</i>	Unsuccessful Uptake: The student repeated the identical zero-article error (<i>change way</i>) instead of using <i>the way</i> , indicating the Grammarly correction in Task 1 was purely mechanical and did not stick.
Beginner	Verb Tense	<i>In recent years, technology become more complicated for users.</i>	<i>Since 2010, the government has paid less attention to clean river water.</i>	Successful Uptake: The learner successfully used the present perfect tense (<i>has paid</i>) with a time marker (<i>Since 2010</i>), indicating an internalized grasp of the tense.
Beginner	Preposition	<i>People depend to technology in their daily activities.</i>	<i>Our environment depends on the policy of local governments.</i>	Successful Uptake: The lexical chunk <i>depend on</i> was successfully retained and applied correctly in a new semantic context.
Intermediate	Sentence Structure	<i>Although technology provides convenience. It also causes social isolation...</i>	<i>Although factories bring economic profit, they damage the ecosystem.</i>	Successful Uptake: The student correctly avoided the sentence fragment error found in Task 1 by cleanly embedding the <i>although</i> -clause into a complex sentence.
Intermediate	Word Choice	<i>Technology gives many negative effects to society.</i>	<i>Chemical waste causes severe damage to human health.</i>	Successful Uptake (Alternative): While the student initially rejected Grammarly's suggestion of "has effects," they self-corrected in Task 2 by selecting a more precise, sophisticated collocation (<i>causes damage</i>).
Intermediate	Cohesion	<i>On the other hand, technology makes life easier. On the other hand, it creates dependency.</i>	<i>On one hand, pollution harms wildlife. However, cleaning it requires high budgets.</i>	Successful Uptake: The student successfully abandoned the repetitive cohesive device and varied their transitional markers to create smoother discourse.

Table 2 reveals the occurrence of students' uptake by comparing their first and second writing samples from the targeted error types. In the beginner group, there are both successful and unsuccessful uptakes. The successful uptake occurred in the second writing samples when the students were able to produce the correct sentences involving the Subject-Verb Agreement, Preposition, and Verb Tense aspects. Based on the students' revision log, they experienced noticing when receiving feedback about The Subject-Verb Agreement and Prepositions, which led to successful uptake. However, although the students had Mechanical Confusion when encountering feedback about verb tense, they were able to transform it into successful uptake in the second writing sample.

The unsuccessful uptake occurred in the aspect of Article Usage. The students experienced the Understanding without Internalization for the article usage from Grammarly feedback, which undoubtedly became unsuccessful in the second writing sample because they did not recognize the explicit rule of the form.

For intermediate students, all targeted error types were transformed into successful uptake. Their revision log revealed that noticing aspects mostly occurred when receiving Grammarly feedback, which led to successful uptake in the second writing samples. Although this group also experienced the

Noticing with Rejection besides Deep Cognitive Processing, the data in Table 2 shows that they incorporate the Grammarly suggestion to use appropriate vocabulary in the second writing sample.

The comparison of the first and second writing samples, focusing on the targeted error types, shows that the successful uptake could occur in students' writing once they experience noticing when reviewing Grammarly feedback. However, in order for the students to have a successful uptake, the depth of the noticing should be experienced.

Discussion

From the research results on the noticing and learners' uptake, the data provide an insightful interpretation of how Grammarly could encourage learners' autonomy in the noticing and uptake development, particularly how the AI tools could be integrated to empower students in the learning process. Although the results also show a slight difference in outcome in terms of the students' language level, the results of the noticing and uptake still offer valuable analysis on how Grammarly can be incorporated to aid the student learning process. The result of this research aligns with previous research on AI tools (Mohammed & Khalid, 2025)

In the noticing process, the results show clear patterns between beginner and intermediate students. Besides

producing more errors in sentences and grammatical structures, beginner students also show that Grammarly's immediate feedback can assist them in deep cognitive processing, but understanding without internalization and mechanical confusion can also occur. This is the impact of Grammarly's immediate feedback, which lacks further explanations for students with inadequate grammatical skills. Thus, the integration of AI tools for beginner students should also be anticipated (Barrot, 2023).

For students who at least reach the intermediate level, Grammarly's automated feedback could offer deeper cognitive processing, which promotes noticing. The feedback works mostly to assist the students in correcting the grammar mistakes, which sometimes can be considered as 'slips'. Moreover, noticing with rejection also occurs as Grammarly's comments could function as suggestions for the students to consider the appropriate forms that are needed in situations. Thus, higher-order revision can occur when the students review the feedback from this AI tool. This is the reason why Grammarly can be considered a tool to help English language learners gain their learning autonomy (Syafuruddin, 2025; Yawiloeng, 2025).

From the results of this research, the Noticing Sheet (NS) plays a crucial role. The NS functions not only to provide moments for the students in both levels to rethink, internalize, and

negotiate Grammarly's feedback, but also to provide opportunities to process the feedback and instruction from Grammarly to their reflective capacities. Various noticing processes could occur, such from the tool such as deep cognitive processing, understanding without internalization, mechanical uptake, and noticing with rejection. As a result, the NS should be integrated into the learning process when using any AI tools (ElEbyary et al., 2024). Without the conscious noticing process, the learners would not reach the learning capacity of a particular language aspect (Schmidt, 1990).

The main objective of noticing is the learner's uptake. The concept of uptake provides essential information on how the learners respond to their previous learning, and importantly, it describes the depth of the students' knowledge from what they have learned (Lyster & Ranta, 1997). Thus, the uptake data from this research have revealed how much the students have learned from Grammarly's feedback.

As reflected in the noticing data, the beginner students had both successful and unsuccessful uptake. The uptake result shows meaningful information: although the students in the group admitted confusion about Grammarly's feedback on verb tense, which occurred in the noticing phase, the second writing samples show successful uptake in this aspect. In addition, the students in the

group also demonstrate successful uptake of fixed collocations, such as prepositions, and rigid rules, because they are easy to memorize. The process of memorizing particular aspects of language structures occurs when students write in their NSs, as part of the noticing process (Ellis, 2009; Schmidt, 1990). However, regarding the article usage, the beginner students had an unsuccessful uptake. Although Grammarly had provided feedback on the use of the article, it requires a gradual process to successfully internalize the feature because the Indonesian language (L1) does not utilize the form. It indicates that, although the students in this group need more time to internalize Grammarly's automated feedback, the tool could provide process-oriented instruction for the students' reflective capabilities (EIEbyary et al., 2024).

For the intermediate students, the successful uptake mostly occurred. Reflecting on the noticing data, the students in the group utilized Grammarly's feedback to reflect, review, and negotiate their prior knowledge of the sentences and grammatical structures.

The assistance from Grammarly's automated comments encourages the students to have higher-order revision, which leads to many successful uptakes in the second writing samples. Grammarly, in this case, promote the learners to be empowered in utilizing the

feedback for their learning autonomy (Zhang et al., 2020).

For both beginner and intermediate students, their second writing samples represent the authentic results of their noticing process, which was recorded in their Noticing Sheets. The results demonstrate the students' independent uptake, which shows the role of Grammarly's feedback in their grammar and writing skill development. It validates the pedagogical use of the Noticing Sheet in the previous stage, which encourages noticing for deep cognitive processing. Therefore, Grammarly could be used to promote the noticing process if the tool is integrated into the revision stage for learning purposes.

CONCLUSION

Based on the research conducted in one of the intensive learning courses in Banda Aceh, the utilization of Grammarly's feedback for the students' revision process could encourage the noticing process through the Noticing Sheet, which leads to a more successful uptake. As one of the most popular AI tools, Grammarly has been widely used by EFL students to improve their writing results. However, this is the fundamental issue which many consider might diminish the students' critical thinking and their learning process.

The students would easily accept the revisions from Grammarly's automated feedback without undergoing the noticing process. Thus, many EFL

teachers become sceptical about encouraging students to use the tool. This research has shed light on how specifically Grammarly can assist both teachers and students. Grammarly can provide consistent and automated feedback for numerous writing tasks in short periods of time, which therefore helps the teacher navigate feedback for the students accordingly. For EFL students, both beginner and intermediate levels, Grammarly could encourage the noticing process for learning English language writing and grammar skills if the tool is incorporated for revision purposes, not for writing. Although beginner students need more assistance and time in processing Grammarly's feedback, with constant help from the teachers and commitment to noticing the language through the revision log, for instance, successful uptake could be reached.

REFERENCES

- Alhalangy, A. G. I., & Abdalgane, M. (2023). Exploring the impact of AI on the EFL context: A case study of Saudi universities. *Journal of Intercultural Communication*, 23(2), 41–49.
<https://doi.org/10.36923/jic.c.v23i2.125>
- Alhusaiyan, E. (2025). A systematic review of current trends in artificial intelligence in foreign language learning. *Saudi Journal of Language*
- Studies*, 5(1), 1–16.
<https://doi.org/10.1108/SJLS-07-2024-0039>
- Barrot, J. S. (2023). Using automated written corrective feedback in the writing classrooms: Effects on L2 writing accuracy. *Computer Assisted Language Learning*, 36(4), 584–607.
<https://doi.org/10.1080/09588221.2021.1936071>
- Creswell, J. W., Plano Clark, V. L., Gutmann, M., & Hanson, W. (2003). Advanced mixed methods research designs. In A. Tashakkori & C. Teddlie (Eds.), *Handbook of Mixed Methods in Social and Behavioral Research* (pp. 209–240). Sage.
- ElEbyary, K., Shabara, R., & Boraie, D. (2024). The differential role of AI-operated WCF in L2 students' noticing of errors and its impact on writing scores. *Language Testing in Asia*, 14(1), 1–24.
<https://doi.org/10.1186/s40468-024-00312-1>
- Ellis, R. (2009). Corrective feedback and teacher development. *L2 Journal*, 1(1), 2–18.
<https://doi.org/10.5070/L2.V1I1.9054>
- Gašević, D., Siemens, G., & Sadiq, S. (2023). Empowering learners for the age of artificial

- intelligence. *Computers and Education: Artificial Intelligence*, 4, 100130.
<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.caei.2023.100130>
- Ghufron, M., & Rosyida, F. (2018). The role of Grammarly in assessing English as a foreign language (EFL) writing. *Lingua Cultura*, 12(4), 395–403.
<https://doi.org/10.21512/lc.v12i4.4582>
- Lin, Y., & Yu, Z. (2025). Elucidating university students' intentions to seek automated writing feedback from Grammarly: Toward perceptual and systemic predictors. *Humanities and Social Sciences Communications*, 12(1).
<https://doi.org/10.1057/s41599-024-03861-1>
- Lyster, R., & Ranta, L. (1997). Corrective feedback and learner uptake: Negotiation of form in communicative classrooms. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, 19(1), 37–66.
<https://doi.org/10.1017/S0272263197001034>
- Mohammed, S. J., & Khalid, M. W. (2025). Under the world of AI-generated feedback on writing: Mirroring motivation, foreign language peace of mind, trait emotional intelligence, and writing development. *Language Testing in Asia*, 15(1).
<https://doi.org/10.1186/s40468-025-00343-2>
- Rababah, L. M., & Talafha, D. K. (2024). Unlocking writing potential: Assessing the impact of Grammarly on Jordanian EFL students' writing proficiency. *Theory and Practice in Language Studies*, 14(5), 1486–1492.
<https://doi.org/10.17507/tpls.1405.21>
- Schmidt, R. W. (1990). The role of consciousness in second language learning. *Applied Linguistics*, 11(2), 129–158.
<https://doi.org/10.1093/appin/11.2.129>
- Syafruddin, Y. A. (2025). Integrating AI tools in EFL writing: Enhancing critical thinking and addressing cultural bias. *Pioneer: Journal of Language and Literature*, 17(2), 253–269.
<https://doi.org/10.36841/pioneer.v17i2.7199>
- Thi, N., Nikolov, M., & Simon, K. (2022). Higher-proficiency students' engagement with and uptake of teacher and Grammarly feedback in an EFL writing course. *Innovation in Language Learning and Teaching*, 17(3), 690–705.
<https://doi.org/10.1080/17501229.2022.2122476>

- Uddin, M. N. (2022). L2 teachers' oral corrective feedback practices in relation to their CF beliefs and learner uptake. *Theory and Practice in Language Studies*, 12(4), 617–628. <https://doi.org/10.17507/tpls.1204.01>
- Ventayen, R. J. M., & Orlanda-Ventayen, C. C. (2018). Graduate students' perspective on the usability of Grammarly® in one ASEAN state university. *Asian ESP Journal*, 14(7.2), 1–24.
- Yawiloeng, R. (2025). Investigating EFL students' writing problems through the lens of Grammarly. *Theory and Practice in Language Studies*, 15(7), 2172–2181. <https://doi.org/10.17507/tpls.1507.09>
- Zhang, J., Ozer, Z., & Bayazeed, B. (2020). Grammarly vs. face-to-face tutoring at the Writing Center. *Praxis: A Writing Center Journal*, 17(2), 33–47. <https://doi.org/10.26153/tsw/8523>