



EFL Instructors' Experiences, Challenges and Perceptions of Pedagogical Drawbacks of Using Grammarly Software in their Academic Writing: Salale University, Fitcha, Ethiopia

Yonas Tamiru Gebre

College of Social Sciences, Department of English Language and Literature, Salale University, Fitcha, Ethiopia

Abstract

This study explores EFL instructors' experiences, challenges, and their perceptions of pedagogical drawbacks of the software in their academic writing: Salale University, Fitcha, Ethiopia. To achieve this objective, the researcher utilized descriptive survey research design. The researcher collected data via questionnaire and interview. Quantitative data gained through close-ended questionnaire were organized and analyzed statistically by the use of Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (SPSS) version 25. Qualitative data collected via interview were analyzed in a qualitative way through thematic analysis, and narrated and interpreted to support the finding. The study concluded that respondents of the study area 'sometimes' use Grammarly software to check grammar, edit common writing errors, generate citation, and enhance vocabulary with the overall mean score of (M=3.19; SD=.756). Grammarly software has several challenges with the mean score of (M=4.66, SD=.697), which falls between "Always" and "Usually". Among these, the software highly depends on internet, there is a frequent upgrade prompt which interrupts the activities, limited access of free version, and other technological barriers hinder instructors' use of the software. The respondents showed 'strong agreement' regarding the drawbacks of Grammarly software in their academic writing with the overall mean score (M=4.70; SD=.575). Grammarly highly offers incorrect or misleading suggestions (M=4.90, SD=.553), Grammarly provides incorrect or contextually inappropriate suggestions (M=4.75, SD=.716), and Grammarly's suggestions sometimes change the intended meaning of sentences (M=4.75, SD=.638). Thus, technical and pedagogical supports are likely to be at hand, and stable internet connection should be set up by the University.

Keywords: - Grammarly software, experiences, challenges, drawbacks

*Corresponding author's email: yonas_tamiru@slu.edu.et / yonasshalom27@gmail.com

Article information:

Received: 12Nov, 2025

Accepted: 19 Feb, 2026

Revised: 3 Feb, 2026

Available online: 31 March, 2026

Doi: <http://doi.org/10.20372/ajids.2026.2819>

1. Introduction

Effective writing skills become essential for academics in the worldwide academic scenarios (Indiah, Alvindi, Dimas & Sadri, 2025). EFL instructors are expected to produce effective write ups in the 21st century's work force. EFL instructors are likely to contributing to academic discourse through articles, proposals, and other intellectual outputs (Indiah, Alvindi, Dimas & Sadri, 2025). The complex requirements of academic writing in English, however, can be difficult for even those who speak the language fluently. Even though many EFL instructors have professional credentials in language teaching, academic writing is nevertheless a difficult task for them (Richards & Rodgers. 2016). With reference to this, technology has been promisingly easing educational workloads in 21st century. The growing tendency of EFL teachers looking to improve their writing skills is reflected in the increased use of digital tools like Grammarly, which are automatic writing aid programs (Ha & Ho, 2025). Grammarly is a well-liked academic application since it offers input on grammar, spelling, style, tone, and even plagiarism (Mat, 2024). Grammarly introduces instructors to proper writing practices in Standard English in their research writing (Alshehri, 2025). Besides, Grammarly has been widely used by EFL instructors to yield effective writing (Dizon&Gayed, 2021; Dewi, 2022).

EFL instructors use Grammarly, an AI-powered writing assistant and grammar checker, to improve their writing by identifying and correcting errors in spelling, grammar, punctuation, and style, as well as suggesting improvements for clarity and tone, and detecting plagiarism (Fitria, 2021; Wu, 2024; Mohd, Noordin & Ahmad, 2025). It functions across various platforms, including web browsers and desktop applications, to provide real-time feedback and explanations for its suggestions, making writing more effective and accessible (Ashrafganjoe, Rezai&Elhambakhsh, 2022; Wu, 2024; Ha & Ho, 2025).

Besides, Grammarly is an online proofreader recognized to be the most innovative company (Su, 2024; Slater & Li, 2025). Grammar Checker 'Grammarly®' is a piece of computer software (automated internet-based software) that may be used in EFL writing (Ha & Ho, 2025). Grammarly® is a grammar-checking tool in a software package or online versions to be installed on the Microsoft Office Word platform to correct grammatical mistakes that enhances writing significantly during typing (El-Ebyary&Windeatt, 2010). This application offers grammar checking, spell checking, passive voice misuse, punctuations in compounds, correcting hard-to-read texts, wordy sentences, and services for detecting plagiarism, as well

as advice on writing clarity, conciseness, vocabulary, delivery style, and tone (Fahmi&Rachmijati, 2021).

Grammarly is a very sophisticated automated writing evaluation (AWE) tool that provides a variety of linguistic feedback (Gavina&Ibay-Pamo, 2024). Apparently, EFL instructors practice Grammarly for the sake of lowering superficial mistakes during writing. As per Grammarly helps non-native speakers, EFL instructors utilize it to increase self-editing, raise understanding of grammatical conventions, and develop confidence of writing (Ghufron&Rosyida, 2018). The EFL instructors further run Grammarly software to see how their vocabulary, sentence structure, and editing skills are evolving, a much-needed confidence-booster for many writers (Sharadgah&Sa'di, 2022). Grammarly also evaluate elements like clarity and engagement, so a writer who may struggle with punctuation can see that they have an engaging writing style, another way to build their confidence (Hakiki, 2021). Thus, EFL instructors practice Grammarly software to navigate the challenges of academic writing (Halim, Sharina&Zur, 2022).

Grammarly supports skills and confidence building. Grammarly is important because it helps users improve their writing by checking for grammar, spelling, and punctuation errors, which enhances clarity and professionalism (Faisal &Carabella, 2023). The EFL instructors practice it to improve vocabulary, sentence structure, and tone, make writing more engaging and effective for various purposes, from academic work to professional communication in the 21st century's workforce. Additionally, the software has a plagiarism checker which ensures the originality of the content by comparing it against billions of web pages. Henceforth, EFL instructors can produce original work (Huang, Li & Taylor, 2020; Fahmi & Cahyono, 2021; Ha & Ho, 2025).

Despite its widespread use, little is known about the pedagogical and professional consequences of Grammarly's application by EFL instructors (Sharadgah&Sa'di, 2022). Besides, Grammarly is doubtful for its dependence on an internet connection, the limited features in the free version, its cost for the premium version, and potential inaccuracies due to its automated nature (Mat, 2024). Grammarly requires an internet connection to function, meaning it cannot be used for offline editing. The free version offers only basic spelling, grammar, and punctuation checks (Gavina &Ibay-Pamo, 2024). Many advanced features are exclusive to the paid Premium version (Su, 2024). Grammarly enhances surface-level correctness and provides instant feedback, but there are questions regarding over-reliance, the extent of linguistic progress, and the possible deterioration of instructors' analytical

writing abilities (Slater & Li, 2025). While powerful, Grammarly can sometimes offer misleading or unnecessary suggestions. It primarily focuses on mechanical errors and may not address higher-level issues like the logical flow of an argument. The effectiveness of suggestions can vary, and users should exercise their own judgment (Daroina, et.al, 2022). It can sometimes provide false positives, flag correct but intentional stylistic choices, and lacks the nuanced understanding of a human editor, especially for complex or academic writing (Alshehri, 2025). Grammarly can sometimes misinterpret context or make incorrect suggestions (Mohd, Noordin& Ahmad, 2025). It may flag correct sentences as wrong or flag legitimate stylistic choices as errors. Besides, depending on Grammarly may reduce writers' critical thinking (Dewi, 2022). Hence, it cannot fully replace the critical eye of a human editor, who can provide more nuanced feedback, especially in complex or academic writing. Thus, the main purpose of the current study is examining EFL instructors' practices, challenges, and perceptions of pedagogical drawbacks of using Grammarly software in their academic writing: Salale University, Fitcha, Ethiopia. The study sought to find out answer for the following research questions:

1. To what extent do EFL instructors use Grammarly software in their academic writing?
2. What challenges hinder EFL instructors' use of Grammarly software in their academic writing?
3. What do the EFL teachers perceive towards the pedagogical drawbacks of using Grammarly software in their academic writing?

2. Materials and Methods

2.1. Research Design

The main objective of this study was to examine EFL instructors' practices, challenges, and drawbacks of Grammarly software in their academic writing: Salale University, Ethiopia. To achieve this objective, the researcher utilized cross-sectional descriptive survey research design with mixed-methods of data collection and analysis. Henceforth, descriptive survey was used to gain the instructors' actual experiences, challenges, and perceptions of pedagogical drawbacks of using the software in the real setting. Using cross-sectional descriptive survey research design helped the researcher to gather objective and sufficient information against the research objectives (Creswell, 2014).

2.2. Study Population

The study was undertaken in Salale University, Fitcha, Ethiopia. Twenty instructors were

selected from English language and literature department. The instructors are regularly working in the university in the year 2026. Almost of the instructors give instruction on various courses. Besides, some of the instructors act in different positions of the university and some undertake research and various academic workshops.

2.3. Sampling size and techniques

The researcher selected twenty EFL instructors who are regularly working at Salale University, Fitcha, Ethiopia. The researcher used comprehensive sampling technique to select the participants. Thus, all of the EFL instructors were selected for the study. Using comprehensive sampling helped the study gain data from every conceivable condition and participant within a population to ensure a thorough and in-depth understanding. Besides, comprehensive sampling is used to achieve maximum information richness which allows researchers to describe complex phenomena that might be missed by less intensive sampling methods (Creswell, 2014).

2.4. Instruments

2.4.1. Questionnaire

The researcher prepared 27 close-ended items (10 items for practice, 8 items for challenges, and 9 items for drawbacks, respectively) based on the research questions and administered to the respondents. The questionnaire was made by the researcher. The whole respondents (20) participated in the questionnaire. The respondents were requested to rate their response in a five-point Likert scale in the close-ended items. The questionnaire items for practice and challenges of Grammarly software were rated based on the following items: (5) for “Always”, (4) for “Usually” (3) for “Sometimes”, (2) for “Rarely”, and (1) for “Never”., whereas, the questionnaire items for perceptions of pedagogical drawbacks were rated based on the following items: (5) for “Strongly Agree”, (4) for “Agree”, (3) for “Undecided”, (2) for “Disagree”, and (1) for “Strongly Disagree”. The questionnaire was collected back and analyzed to meet the research objective. By using close-ended questions, one can gather multiple data from multiple respondents in a short time.

2.4.2. Interview

The researcher used interview to gain pertinent data from the respondents after the questionnaires were collected. Five items were prepared and used to collect data to the research problem. Five participants were selected for their convenience and requested to respond on the semi-structured interview items. They were required to reflect on their

practices, challenges, and perceptions of pedagogical drawbacks of using Grammarly in their academic writing. The respondents' identification was coded as 'I1', 'I2, etc. where 'I' stands for instructor. Then, their response was narrated and interpreted. The interview items were constructed in clear and concise manner that made ease and clarity of understanding.

2.5. Data collection procedures

The required data were collected based on the following procedures. First of all, relevant literatures were reviewed to obtain sufficient information to develop the items of the questionnaire and interview. Then, the researcher came-up with the items to administer and then to collect the relevant data. Following this, the data analyses were carefully carried out. To secure this, the researcher got a legal consent from the university. Then, the researcher defined the objective of the study to the study participants. Centrally, the participant's consent to participate in the study was raised; fortunately, they were willing to be part of the study. Thus, the researcher started providing items of questionnaire, first. Then, the researcher made an interview to get the real portrayal of the existing experiences, challenges and drawbacks of using Grammarly in the real setting. Afterwards, the researcher undertook the process of data analysis; here, quantitative data which collected throughout close-ended questionnaire were analyzed quantitatively; whereas, the qualitative data collected by the interview sessions were analyzed qualitatively to strengthen the findings of the data. Finally, conclusions that bases on the findings of the study was given, and followed by the possible recommendations.

2.6. Data Analysis

The researcher used both quantitative and qualitative ways of analysis in the current study. The quantitative data gained through close-ended questionnaire was organized and analyzed statistically by the use of Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (SPSS) version 25. In the quantitative session, descriptive statistics was used to compute the mean score and standard deviation. The qualitative data collected through interview was analyzed in a qualitative way through content analysis, and narrated and interpreted to support the finding. The qualitatively analyzed data supported the data which were analyzed quantitatively by providing more examples and detailed descriptions for data clarifications. Finally, conclusions were provided on the basis of the data and recommendations were suggested on the ground of research questions and conclusions.

2.7. Validity and Reliability

The researcher of the current study took various measurements to secure validity and reliability in the study. Initially, the researchers developed data collection tools, and provided it for two TEFL instructors who are working at Salale University. Then, the instructors came up with comments on the content and face validity of the questionnaire. Lastly, the researcher edited the items based on comments given. Besides, validity measure utilized in this study was secured via collection of data from questionnaire, and interview. Reliability of items was checked via Cronbach’s Alpha as it is indicated in Table 1 as follows:

Table 1: Reliability analysis

Variables	Cronbach’s Alpha	Number of Items	Remark
1. Practices	.948	10	Excellent
2. Challenges	.894	8	Very good
3. Drawbacks	.969	9	Excellent

In Table 1, Cronbach’s Alpha was utilized to audit internal consistency among items. Regarding the items used to check instructors’ practice of Grammarly software, Cronbach’s Alpha of $r=.948$ was found excellent, and for the items used to check drawbacks of Grammarly software, Cronbach’s Alpha of $r=.969$ was exhibited, which is still excellent. Thus, the item analysis is found excellent and the items used in practices and drawbacks have a very high degree of internal consistency and are measuring the same underlying concept or construct. For items employed under challenges of Grammarly software, a Cronbach’s Alpha of $r=.894$ with 8 items indicates a high and very good level of internal consistency reliability. This means the 8 items in the scale are very closely related and are reliably measuring the same underlying concept.

3. Results and Discussions

3.1. Results

This study incorporated twenty EFL instructors from Salale University. The whole participants answered on the questionnaire. The first research question was aimed to answer instructors’ experiences of Grammarly software in their academic writing. The collected data were analyzed as follows:

3.1.1. Descriptive statistics

Table 2: Descriptive statistics on the instructors’ practices

Items	Mean	SD
1. I use Grammarly to check grammar	3.20	.615
2. I use Grammarly to assure clarity and conciseness	3.15	.812
3. I use Grammarly to enhance vocabulary	3.25	.638
4. I use Grammarly to detect Plagiarism	3.25	.638
5. I use Grammarly to edit common writing errors	3.55	.686
6. I use Grammarly to detect tone	3.35	.745
7. I use Grammarly to assure genre conventions	3.15	.745
8. I use Grammarly to develop confidence in writing	3.05	.887
9. I use Grammarly to generate citation	2.95	.944
10. I use Grammarly to check style	3.00	.858
Overall Mean	3.19	.756

Keys: - 5=Always, 4=Usually, 3=Sometimes, 2=Rarely, 1=Never

In Table 2, the respondents 'sometimes' use Grammarly software as it is clearly shown by the overall mean score (M=3.19, SD=.756). Besides, the item entitled "editing common writing errors" has the highest mean (M=3.55, SD=.686), while "citation generator" has the lowest mean (M=2.95, SD=.944). This reveals that participants reported using the "citation generator" less frequently (Rarely) and "editing common writing errors" frequently ("Sometimes"). The overall standard deviation (SD=.756) suggests a moderate spread in responses and more agreement among respondents on the items.

Likewise, items with the most frequent use includes 'style' (M=3.00, SD=.858). The (M=3.00) aligns with the "Sometimes" category. However, 'Grammar check' (M=3.20, SD=.615) retained moderate response. The mean is above 3.00, leaning toward the "Sometimes" category. Most participants report using grammar checks "Sometimes". For 'clarity and conciseness (M=3.15, SD=.812), the mean is close to the overall average. 'Vocabulary enhancement' has a mean score of (M=3.25, SD=.638). The mean is slightly higher than the overall average. 'Detecting Plagiarism' gained (M=3.25, SD=.638). 'Tone detection' is found (M=3.35, SD=.745). The item 'editing common writing errors' (M=3.55, SD=.686) becomes the most frequently used item, with a mean score in the "Sometimes" category. 'Genre conventions' remains (M=3.15, SD=.745). This shows that it is practiced "Sometimes". "Hereafter, the findings in general reveals that EFL instructors sometimes use the software in EFL writing.

Table 3: Descriptive statistics on the challenges of using Grammarly software

Items	Mean	SD
1. Lack of training and support	4.95	.759
2. Technological barriers	4.90	.788
3. Internet dependency	4.90	.718
4. Limited features for free version	4.85	.587
5. Misinterpretation of context	4.90	.552
6. Inaccurate feedback	4.85	.812
7. Lacks nuanced understanding of a human editor	3.05	.759
8. Constant upgrade prompts	4.95	.604
Overall Mean	4.66	.697

Keys: - 5=Always, 4=Usually, 3=Sometimes, 2=Rarely, 1=Never

In Table 3, the total mean score is found ($M=4.66$, $SD=.697$), which falls between "Usually" on the frequency scale. This means using Grammarly software is highly challenging in the study area. Among the challenges, a limited feature for free version is found ($M=4.85$, $SD=.587$), and it was the most frequently reported challenge. The item 'inaccurate feedback' has ($M=4.85$, $SD=.812$), which depicts users' hindrance with the Grammarly's feedback. 'Technological barriers' with a mean score of ($M=4.90$, $SD=.788$) and 'internet dependency' ($M=4.90$, $SD=.718$) were among the moderately frequent challenges, respectively. Technical issues and reliance on a stable internet connection are common challenges for users. Besides, 'misinterpretation of context' with a mean score of ($M=4.90$, $SD=.552$) become frequently hindering challenge. Lack of training and support ($M=4.95$, $SD=.759$) is also frequent problem. Constant upgrade prompts with ($M=4.95$, $SD=.604$) is among the collective problem. 'Grammarly software lacks nuanced understanding of a human editor' having ($M=3.05$, $SD=.759$) is the least frequent issue.

After all, the above result depicted that EFL instructors regularly face several challenges with Grammarly software in their academic writing, with the frequency of most issues clustered around the "Usually" mark. The most significant and agreed-upon critical points are lack of training and support and constant upgrade prompts. Other key areas of concern are technological barriers, internet dependency and misinterpretation of context.

Table 4: Descriptive statistics on the drawbacks of Grammarly software

Items	Mean	SD
1. Grammarly sometimes offers incorrect or misleading suggestions.	4.90	.553
2. Grammarly's suggestions sometimes change the intended meaning of my sentences.	4.75	.638
3. Grammarly focuses too much on surface-level errors and neglects higher-order writing issues (e.g., coherence, argumentation).	4.60	.680
4. Over-reliance on Grammarly may hinder the development of my own independent editing skills.	4.60	.680
5. I find it challenging to choose between Grammarly's suggestions and my own writing style.	4.90	.552
6. There are differences in American and British English conventions that cause errors in Grammarly's suggestions.	4.55	.686
7. Grammarly sometimes offers incorrect or contextually inappropriate suggestions.	4.75	.716
8. I find it difficult to settle Grammarly's rigid rules with my own academic writing style.	4.65	.670
9. Grammarly's passive voice suggestions can be counterproductive for certain types of formal academic writing.	4.60	.680
Overall Mean	4.70	.575

Keys: - 5=Strongly Agree, 4=Agree, 3=Undecided, 2=Disagree, 1=Strongly Disagree

Table 4 clearly depicted that the overall respondents showed 'strong agreement' regarding the drawbacks of Grammarly software in their academic writing. The overall mean score is found (M=4.70, SD=.575), which remains in the "Agree" scale. The overall standard deviation (SD=.575) is relatively low, suggesting a parallel consensus among respondents regarding the drawbacks of Grammarly software. The item termed 'There are differences in American and British English conventions that cause errors in Grammarly's suggestions.' (M=4.55; SD=.686) is the most strongly agreed-upon drawback. Mean score of 4.60 is shared by three items, highlighting them as significant and commonly held concerns, including 'Grammarly focuses too much on surface-level errors and neglects higher-order writing issues (e.g., coherence, argumentation).', 'Over-reliance on Grammarly may hinder the development of my own independent editing skills.' and 'Grammarly's passive voice suggestions can be counterproductive for certain types of formal academic writing.'

The analyzed data depict a strong consensus among respondents that Grammarly software, despite its benefits, presents several notable drawbacks. The most significant perceived issues relate to its limitations in handling language variations (British vs. American English), its focus on surface-level corrections at the expense of higher-level writing issues, and the risk of over-reliance potentially harming a writer's independent skills. This indicates the need for critical analysis of Grammarly's suggestions rather than hastily accepting its advice.

3.1.2. Instructors' Interview

After the questionnaire had administered and collected back, interview was held to gain pertinent data from the respondents. Here, instructors' practices, challenges, and drawbacks of Grammarly software were the concern of interview. Analysis made on instructors' interview data revealed that instructors utilize Grammarly software to correct written errors, including spelling, grammar, punctuation, and style, and to improve clarity and tone and detect plagiarism. In respect to this, I5 stated that "...I run Grammarly software in my computer to develop my writing because Grammarly potentially helps me use correct grammar, punctuation, and tone." Besides, some of the respondents use Grammarly software to generate citation. In respect, I3 depicted, "...In some cases, I run Grammarly software in my personal computer, including to check grammar, choose word and expressions, and check plagiarism in online." It is agreed by the respondents that Grammarly software can boost academic writing. Likewise, I1 reported, "...I track Grammarly software during academic writing as per it helps me edit my write up." The data gained regarding the first research question clearly showed that instructors utilize Grammarly software for the betterment of their academic writing.

Conversely, instructors reported that it is challenging for them to use Grammarly software during writing. Among the reported challenges, Grammarly's dependency on an internet connection, the limited features in the free version, its cost for the premium version, and potential inaccuracies due to its automated nature, and lack of training were the commons. Regarding to this, I4 reported that "...However Grammarly provide support for my academic writing, its dependency on internet connection continuously interrupts the utilization in editing texts, checking plagiarism, and vocabulary." Similarly, I4 revealed that "...Delegating only Grammarly software for academic writing should be avoided because it may hinder the development of instructors' critical thinking skills, and independent editing skills." Majority of the respondents agreed that Grammarly software suggests incorrect and misleading editing, and focuses on surface-level errors and neglects higher-order writing issues. Thus, suggest

that it is better to refine Grammarly's suggestion than simply accepting it. Hence, there is a need for critical analysis of Grammarly's recommendations rather than hastily accepting its advice.

3.2. Discussions

The current study examined EFL instructors' experiences, challenges, and perceptions of pedagogical drawbacks of Grammarly software in their academic writing: Salale University, Ethiopia. The researcher utilized descriptive survey research design. The researcher collected sufficient and relevant data via questionnaire and interview. The analyzed data depicted respondents 'sometimes' use Grammarly software in their academic writing. Besides, the item entitled "editing common writing errors" is used frequently "usually", while "citation generator" is used less frequently ("Sometimes"). The overall standard deviation gained suggests a moderate spread in responses and more agreement among respondents on the items. The results of the interview also revealed that the research area's EFL instructors use Grammarly software to detect plagiarism, improve clarity and tone, and fix textual faults such as spelling, grammar, punctuation, and style. Moreover, the respondents utilize Grammarly to generate citation. The respondents revealed that using Grammarly software helps improve academic writing. Consistent with the above finding, Fitria (2021), Wu (2024), Mohd, Noordin & Ahmad (2025) depicted that Grammarly software is used by academic writers including students and teachers to check grammar, identify and correct errors in spelling, grammar, punctuation, and style, as well as suggesting improvements for clarity and tone, and detecting plagiarism. Ashrafganjoe, Rezai & Elhambakhsh (2022), Wu (2024) & Ha & Ho (2025) revealed that writers use Grammarly software to evaluate elements like clarity and engagement.

Regarding the second research question, the mean score falls in the "Usually" on the frequency scale. This means using Grammarly software is highly challenging in the study area. A limited feature for free version, and inaccurate feedback were among users hindrance with the Grammarly's feedback. Technological barriers, internet dependency and misinterpretation of context were among the moderately frequent challenges. EFL instructors regularly face several challenges with Grammarly software in their academic writing, with the frequency of most issues clustered around the "Usually" mark. The most significant and agreed-upon critical points are lack of training and support and constant upgrade prompts. Other key areas of concern are technological barriers, internet dependency and misinterpretation of context. In the interview sessions, the instructors stated that using

Grammarly software while writing is difficult for them. Grammarly's reliance on an online connection, the limited functionality of the free edition, the price of the premium version, the possibility of errors because of its automated nature, and the need of training were among the issues that were frequently mentioned. Similarly, Fahmi&Rachmijati (2021), Sharadgah&Sa'di (2022), Indiah, Alvindi, Dimas & Sadri (2025) reported that Grammarly software is internet dependent, constantly interrupts by upgrade prompts, and has limited features for free version.

For the third objective, the overall respondents showed 'strong agreement' that Grammarly software have several drawbacks. The overall mean score indicates an agreement scale between "Strongly Agree" and "Agree". The overall standard deviation is relatively low, suggesting a parallel consensus among respondents regarding the drawbacks of Grammarly software. The instructors agreed that depending on Grammarly software may hinder the development of their critical thinking skills, and independent editing skills. In the interview, the instructors agreed that it is not advisable to assign academic work solely to Grammarly software as this could impede the growth of instructors' critical thinking and autonomous editing abilities. Majority of the respondents believed that Grammarly software offers erroneous and deceptive editing, and focuses on surface-level faults and neglects higher-order writing concerns and contexts. At the same time, Mat (2024), Gavina&Ibay-Pamo (2024) &Mohd, Noordin& Ahmad (2025) showed that Grammarly software can limit writers' ability of editing by their own, it focuses too much on surface-level errors and neglects higher-order writing issues (e.g., coherence, argumentation), and Grammarly software may not understand context and provides inaccurate feedback.

4. Conclusions and Recommendations

In the study area, EFL instructors 'sometimes' use Grammarly software. They run Grammarly software to check grammar, edit common writing errors, generate citation, and enhance vocabulary. Conversely, using Grammarly software becomes challenging because of its internet dependency, has limited features of free version, continuous upgrade prompts, and technological barrier. The total mean score falls between "Always" and "Usually" on the frequency scale regarding challenges of using Grammarly software. The respondents showed 'strong agreement' regarding the drawbacks of Grammarly software in their academic writing. Regarding the drawbacks, the overall mean score remains between "Strongly Agree" and "Agree". The drawbacks include Grammarly's focuses of the surface-level errors and neglects higher-order writing issues (e.g., coherence, argumentation), and depending on

Grammarly software reduces writers' skills of writing and editing. Thus, stable internet connection should be set up by the University. Besides, technical and pedagogical supports are likely to be at hand, and adequate infrastructures are expected to be set up by the University.

Acknowledgment

I need to express my thanks to my dearest wife, Yemarshet Bekele Techan, for her encouragement. Also, I want to thank my dearest son, Leul Yonas Tamiru, for his love. Besides, I would like to thank my colleagues, EFL instructors of Salale University, for their time and participation in this study.

Declaration of conflict of interest

The author of this research declares that there is no conflict of interest.

Funding: Not funded by any institution.

5. References

- Alshehri, M. (2025). Integrating Automated Writing Evaluation into Saudi EFL Students' Writing Practice. *Arab World English Journal*, 16(1):70-87. <https://dx.doi.org/10.24093/awej/vol16no1.5>
- Ashrafganjoe, M., Rezai, M. J., & Elhambakhsh, S. E. (2022). Providing computer-based feedback through Grammarly® in writing classes. *Journal of Language and Translation*, 12(2), 163-176. <https://doi.org/10.30495/tlt.2022.690747>
- Creswell, J. (2014). *Research Design: Qualitative, Quantitative, and Mixed Methods Approaches* (4th Ed). London: Sage Publication Inc. https://www.ucg.ac.me/skladiste/blog_609332/objava_105202/fajlovi/Creswell.pdf
- Daroina, A., Febriani, W. E., Aulianisa, A., & Fadlia, W. A. (2022). Systematic Literature Review: Grammarly as a Medium in Analyzing Grammar for University Students. *Conference on English Language Teaching*, 2, 276-289. <https://doi.org/10.24090/celti.v2.56>
- Dewi, U. (2022). Grammarly as Automated Writing Evaluation: Its Effectiveness from EFL Students' Perceptions. *Lingua Cultural*, 16(2), 155-161. <https://doi.org/10.21512/lc.v16i2.8315>

- Dizon, G., & Gayed, J. M. (2021). Examining the impact of Grammarly on the quality of mobile L2 writing. *JALT CALL Journal*, 17(2), 74-92. <https://doi.org/10.29140/jaltcall.v17n2.336>
- El-Ebyary, K., & Windeatt, S. (2010). The impact of computer-based feedback on students' written work. *International Journal English Studies*, 10(2), 121-142. <http://dx.doi.org/10.6018/ijes.10.2.119231>
- Fahmi, M. A., & Cahyono, B. Y. (2021). EFL students' perception on the use of Grammarly and teacher feedback. *Journal of English Educators Society*. 6(1), 18-25. <https://doi.org/10.21070/jees.v6i1.849>
- Fahmi, S., & Rachmijati, C. (2021). Improving students' writing skill using Grammarly application for second grade in senior high school. *Professional Journal of English Education*. 4(1), 69-74. <http://dx.doi.org/10.22460/project.v4i1.p69-74>
- 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. <http://dx.doi.org/10.21462/jeltl.v8i1.1006>
- Fitria, T. N. (2021). Grammarly as AI-powered English writing assistant: Students' alternative for English writing. *Metathesis Journal of English Language Literature and Teaching*, 5(1), 65-78. <http://dx.doi.org/10.31002/metathesis.v5i1.3519>.
- Gavina, M. A., & Ibay-Pamo, L. M. (2024). Effect of Automated Writing Evaluation in Higher Education Academic Writing Performance. *EDULANGUE*, 6(2), 118-137. <https://doi.org/10.20414/edulangue.v6i2.8300>
- Ghufron, M. A., & Rosyida, F. (2018). The role of Grammarly in assessing English as a Foreign Language (EFL) writing. *Lingua Cultural*, 12(4), 395-403. <https://doi.org/10.21512/lc.v12i4.4582>.
- Ha, Y. N., & Ho, N. P. (2025). EFL postgraduate students' perceptions on the use of Grammarly and peer feedback to improve their academic writing skills. *International Journal of TESOL & Education*, 5(1), 25-49. <https://doi.org/10.54855/ijte.25512>
- Hakiki, G. N. R. (2021). EFL students' perception of the use of Grammarly application in writing class. *Eduvelop: Journal of English Education and Development*, 4(2), 99-106. <https://doi.org/10.31605/Eduvelop.V4i2.891>

- Halim, A., Sharina, .S., & Zur, S. (2022). Grammarly as a Tool to Enhance Students' Self-Directed Learning. *KnE Social Sciences*, 7(8), 5-13. <https://doi.org/10.18502/kss.v7i8.10719>
- Huang, H. W., Li, Z., & Taylor, L. (2020). The effectiveness of using Grammarly to improve students' writing skills. *Proceedings of the International Conference on Distance Education and Learning*, 5, 122-127. 10. <https://doi.org/10.30595/jssh.v2i1.2297>
- Indiah, P. I., Alvindi, A., Dimas, D., & Sadri, I. (2025). Exploring Students' Perceptions of Grammarly as a Tool for Enhancing Grammar Accuracy in Writing. *Vision: Jurnal Bahasa Dan Pendidikan*, 20(2), 90. <https://doi.org/10.30829/vis.v20i2.4192>
- Mat, A. C. (2024). Automated Writing Evaluation: Users' Perception and Expectations. *International Journal of Information and Education Technology*, 14(2), 183-192. <https://doi.org/10.18178/ijiet.2024.14.2.2039>
- Mohd, S, N., Noordin, N., & Ahmad, N.K. (2025). Exploring Students' Perception Towards the Use of Grammarly to Improve Grammatical Accuracy in Essay Writing. *Arab World English Journal*. 16(3), 227-243. <https://dx.doi.org/10.24093/awej/vol16no3.13>
- Richards, J.C, and T.S. Rodgers. (2016). Approaches and Principles in Language Teaching. (3rded.) Delhi: Cambridge University Press. <https://doi.org/10.1017/9781009024532>
- Sharadgah, T. A., & Sa'di, R. A. (2022). A systematic review of research on using artificial intelligence in English language teaching and learning (2015-2021): What are the current effects? *Journal of Information Technology Education Research*, 21, 337-377. <https://doi.org/10.28945/4999>
- Slater, T., & Li, J. (2025). Grammar in Language Teaching and Education. *The Encyclopedia of Applied Linguistics*, 1-9. <https://doi.org/10.1002/9781405198431.wbeal0479.pub2>
- Su, Y. (2024). A Correlation Study of Automated Writing Evaluation System (Grammarly) and Chinese EFL Learners' Writing Self-Efficacy in Their Self-Regulated Learning. *Journal of Electrical Systems*. 1874-1895. <https://doi.org/10.52783/jes.3904>

Wu, X. (2024). AI in L2 learning: a meta-analysis of contextual, instructional, and social-emotional moderators. *System*, 126, 103498. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.system.2024.103498>