

**EXPLORING THE USE OF AUTOMATED WRITING EVALUATION ON
DIFFERENT PROFICIENCY LEVELS OF EFL STUDENTS' ACADEMIC
WRITING**

UNDERGRADUATE THESIS

Submitted in Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements for *Sarjana Pendidikan* Degree
in English Language Education



by

Adila Maryam Karimah

2102722

**ENGLISH LANGUAGE EDUCATION STUDY PROGRAM
FACULTY OF LANGUAGE AND LITERATURE EDUCATION
UNIVERSITAS PENDIDIKAN INDONESIA
2025**

Adila Maryam Karimah, 2025

*EXPLORING THE USE OF AUTOMATED WRITING EVALUATION ON DIFFERENT PROFICIENCY LEVELS
OF EFL STUDENTS' ACADEMIC WRITING*

Universitas Pendidikan Indonesia | repository.upi.edu | perpustakaan.upi.edu

EXPLORING THE USE OF AUTOMATED WRITING EVALUATION ON DIFFERENT PROFICIENCY LEVELS OF EFL STUDENTS' ACADEMIC WRITING

Oleh
Adila Maryam Karimah

Sebuah skripsi yang diajukan untuk memenuhi salah satu syarat memperoleh gelar
Sarjana Pendidikan pada Fakultas Pendidikan Bahasa dan Sastra

© Adila Maryam Karimah 2025
Universitas Pendidikan Indonesia
September 2025

Hak Cipta dilindungi undang-undang.
Skripsi ini tidak boleh diperbanyak seluruhnya atau sebagian,
dengan dicetak ulang, difoto kopi, atau cara lainnya tanpa ijin dari penulis.

APPROVAL PAGE

An Undergraduate Thesis

EXPLORING THE INFLUENCE OF AUTOMATED WRITING EVALUATION ON DIFFERENT PROFICIENCY LEVELS OF EFL STUDENTS' ACADEMIC WRITING

By
Adila Maryam Karimah
2102722

Approved by:

Supervisor



Dr. Fazri Nur Yusuf, M.Pd.
NIP. 197308162003121002

Head of English Language Education Study Program



Prof. Emi Emilia, M.Ed., Ph.D.
NIP. 1966091619900112001

Adila Maryam Karimah, 2025

*EXPLORING THE USE OF AUTOMATED WRITING EVALUATION ON DIFFERENT PROFICIENCY LEVELS
OF EFL STUDENTS' ACADEMIC WRITING*

Universitas Pendidikan Indonesia | repository.upi.edu | perpustakaan.upi.edu

Exploring the Use of Automated Writing Evaluation on Different Proficiency Levels of EFL Students' Academic Writing

Adila Maryam Karimah
2102722

ABSTRACT

This qualitative case study explores how Automated Writing Evaluation (AWE) tools facilitate academic writing development among tertiary-level EFL students with different proficiency levels. Drawing on process writing theory and self-regulated learning (SRL), the study explores how three students with different levels of academic writing proficiency engaged with AWE tools during the drafting and revising of academic texts. Data were collected through the documents of students' two consecutive research proposal drafts and semi-structured interviews. Findings reveal that AWE tools primarily support surface-level improvements in grammar and vocabulary, with limited student use on content development and cohesion, particularly for lower-proficiency students. Participants' ability to interpret and apply feedback was closely linked to their proficiency levels, tool literacy, and revision strategies. These findings highlight the importance of guided AWE use, feedback literacy, and SRL development in maximizing the pedagogical potential of AWE tools in EFL academic writing instruction.

Keywords: Automated Writing Evaluation (AWE), academic writing, academic writing proficiency, self-regulated learning

Menjelajahi Penggunaan Evaluasi Penulisan Otomatis pada Berbagai Tingkat Kemahiran Penulisan Akademik Mahasiswa EFL

Adila Maryam Karimah
2102722

ABSTRAK

Studi kasus kualitatif ini mengeksplorasi bagaimana perangkat Evaluasi Penulisan Otomatis (AWE) memfasilitasi pengembangan tulisan akademis di kalangan mahasiswa EFL tingkat tinggi dengan tingkat kemahiran yang berbeda. Mengacu pada teori *process writing* dan *self-regulated learning* (SRL), studi ini mengeksplorasi bagaimana tiga mahasiswa dengan tingkat kemahiran menulis akademis yang berbeda terlibat dengan perangkat AWE selama penyusunan dan revisi teks akademis. Data dikumpulkan melalui dokumen dari dua draf proposal penelitian mahasiswa yang berurutan dan wawancara semi-terstruktur. Temuan mengungkapkan bahwa perangkat AWE lebih mendukung peningkatan tata bahasa dan kosakata dan penggunaan yang terbatas pada pengembangan konten dan kohesi, terutama bagi mahasiswa dengan kemahiran yang lebih rendah. Kemampuan peserta untuk menafsirkan dan menerapkan masukan terkait erat dengan tingkat kemahiran, literasi perangkat, dan strategi revisi mereka. Temuan ini menyoroti pentingnya penggunaan AWE terpandu, literasi umpan balik, dan pengembangan SRL dalam memaksimalkan potensi pedagogis perangkat AWE dalam pengajaran menulis akademis EFL.

Kata Kunci: Evaluasi Penulisan Otomatis (AWE), penulisan akademis, kemahiran menulis akademis, pembelajaran mandiri

TABLE OF CONTENTS

APPROVAL PAGE.....	i
STATEMENT OF AUTHORIZATION.....	ii
PREFACE.....	iii
ACKNOWLEDGMENTS.....	iv
ABSTRACT.....	vi
TABLE OF CONTENTS.....	vii
LIST OF TABLES.....	ix
LIST OF FIGURES.....	x
CHAPTER I INTRODUCTION.....	1
1.1 Background of the Study.....	1
1.2 Research Question.....	3
1.3 Purpose of the Study.....	3
1.4 Scope of the Study.....	4
1.5 Significance of the Study.....	4
1.6 Clarification of the Key Terms.....	5
1.7 Organization of the Paper.....	6
CHAPTER II LITERATURE REVIEW.....	8
2.1 Academic Writing in Tertiary EFL Settings.....	8
2.2 Automated Writing Evaluation (AWE).....	10
2.2.1 Definition and Core Concept of AWE.....	11
2.2.2 Capabilities and Limitations of AWE.....	12
2.2.3 AWE as a Support Tool in EFL Academic Contexts.....	14
2.3 AWE Use Across Proficiency Levels.....	16
CHAPTER III METHODOLOGY.....	22
3.1 Research Design.....	22
3.2 Research Site and Participants.....	22

3.3	Participants Context Overview.....	23
3.4	Data Collection.....	24
3.4.1	Document.....	24
3.4.2	Interview.....	25
3.5	Data Analysis.....	26
3.5.1	Document analysis (students' essays).....	26
3.5.2	Interview analysis.....	27
CHAPTER IV FINDINGS AND DISCUSSION.....		30
4. 1	Influence of AWE on Students' Writing Process by Writing Aspects.....	30
4.1.1	Grammar and Mechanics.....	30
4.1.2	Vocabulary and Academic Tone.....	33
4.1.3	Content Development.....	37
4.1.4	Organization and Cohesion.....	39
4.2	Students' Experiences and Challenges with AWE Feedback.....	41
4.3	Students' Strategy in Utilizing AWE Tools.....	44
4.4	Students' Awareness of Writing and Learning with AWE.....	45
4.5	Discussions.....	47
4.5.1	AWE's Influence in Different Aspects of Academic Writing.....	48
4.5.2	Students' Experiences and Challenges with AWE feedback.....	51
4.5.3	Students' Strategies in Utilizing AWE Tools.....	52
4.5.4	Students' Awareness of Writing and Learning with AWE.....	54
CHAPTER V CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS.....		57
5.1	Conclusion.....	57
5.2	Limitation.....	58
5.3	Recommendation.....	59
REFERENCES.....		60
APPENDICES.....		72

LIST OF TABLES

Table 3.1 Participants overview.....	23
--------------------------------------	----

LIST OF FIGURES

Figure 4.1 Asoka's text with an error flagged by Grammarly	31
Figure 4.2 Asoka's revised text	31
Figure 4.3 Zinnia's text with an error flagged by Grammarly	32
Figure 4.4 Raflesia's first draft	33
Figure 4.5 Raflesia's second draft	34
Figure 4.6 Asoka's first draft	34
Figure 4.7 Asoka's second draft with highlighted revision	35
Figure 4.8 Part of Zinnia's draft	35
Figure 4.9 Another part of Zinnia's draft	36
Figure 4.10 Part of Raflesia's first draft	39
Figure 4.11 Part of Raflesia's second draft	39

REFERENCES

- Alam, S., Usama, M., Alam, M. M., Jabeen, I., & Ahmad, F. (2023). Artificial Intelligence in Global World: A Case Study of Grammarly as e-Tool on ESL Learners' Writing of Darul Uloom Nadwa. *International Journal of Information and Education Technology*, 13(11), 1741–1747. <https://doi.org/10.18178/ijiet.2023.13.11.1984>
- Aldosemani, T. I., Assalahi, H., Lhothali, A., & Albsisi, M. (2023). Automated Writing Evaluation in EFL contexts. *International Journal of Computer-Assisted Language Learning and Teaching*, 13(1), 1–19. <https://doi.org/10.4018/ijcallt.329962>
- Algburi, E., Razali, A. B., Nimehchisalem, V., & Ismail, L. (2024). Combination of AWE (Criterion) Feedback with the Process Approach and Its Impact on EFL Writing Content/Idea Development and Organization. *International Journal of Academic Research in Progressive Education and Development*, 13(1). <https://doi.org/10.6007/ijarped/v13-i1/20082>
- Allen, L. K., Likens, A. D., & McNamara, D. S. (2018). A multi-dimensional analysis of writing flexibility in an automated writing evaluation system. *Proceedings of the 8th International Conference on Learning Analytics and Knowledge*, 380–388. <https://doi.org/10.1145/3170358.3170404>
- AlMarwani, M. (2020). Academic Writing: Challenges and Potential Solutions. *Arab World English Journal*, 6(6), 114–121. <https://doi.org/10.24093/awej/call6.8>
- Ambarwati, E. K. (2021). Indonesian university students' appropriating Grammarly for formative feedback. *ELT in Focus*, 3(1), 1-11, doi: 10.35706/eltinf.v4i1.5216
- Anson, C. (2006). Can't touch this: Reflections on the servitude of computers as readers. In P. Freitag, Ericsson & R. Haswell (Eds.), *Machine scoring of student essays* (pp. 38-56). Utah State University Press.
- 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. <https://doi.org/10.29407/jetar.v7i2.17988>
- Asnas, S. A. M., & Hidayanti, I. (2024). Uncovering EFL students' frequent difficulties in academic writing and the coping strategies: The case of a

- college in Indonesia. *JEFL/Journal on English as a Foreign Language*, 14(1), 124–151. <https://doi.org/10.23971/jefl.v14i1.7472>
- Attali, Y. (2004). *Exploring the Feedback and Revision Features of Criterion*. Paper Presented at the Meeting of the National Council on Measurement in Education (NCME), San Diego.
- Attali, Y. & Burstein, J. (2006). Automated Essay Scoring With e-rater® V.2. *Journal of Technology, Learning, and Assessment*, 4(3).
- Bai, L., & Hu, G. (2016). In the face of fallible AWE feedback: how do students respond? *Educational Psychology*, 37(1), 67–81. <https://doi.org/10.1080/01443410.2016.1223275>
- Bitchener, J., & Ferris, D. (2012). *Written corrective feedback in second language acquisition and writing*. Routledge.
- Cao, C., & Wang, Z. (2023). A Review of the Effects of Automated Writing Evaluation on Learners English Writing Ability. *Lecture Notes in Education Psychology and Public Media*, 13(1), 160–165. <https://doi.org/10.54254/2753-7048/13/20230874>
- Cotos, E. (2014). *Genre-based automated writing evaluation for L2 research writing : from design to evaluation and enhancement*. Palgrave Macmillan.
- Council of Europe. (2020). Common European Framework of Reference for Languages: Learning, Teaching, Assessment—Companion Volume. Council of Europe Publishing.
- Creswell, J. W., & Poth, C. N. (2018). *Qualitative inquiry and research design: Choosing among five approaches* (4th ed.). Sage Publications.
- Curtis, C. (2019). The effects of writing proficiency on cognitive skills development among international students. *Journal of Global Education and Research*, 3(1), 71–84. <https://doi.org/10.5038/2577-509x.3.1.1026>
- Dewi, U. (2022). Grammarly as automated writing evaluation: Its effectiveness from EFL students' perceptions. *Lingua Cultura*, 16(2), 155–161. <https://doi.org/10.21512/lc.v16i2.8315>
- Dizon, G., & Gayed, J. M. (2021). Examining the impact of Grammarly on the quality of mobile L2 writing. *The JALT CALL Journal*, 17(2), 74–92. <https://doi.org/10.29140/jaltcall.v17n2.336>

- Dizon, G., & Gold, J. (2023). Exploring the effects of Grammarly on EFL students' foreign language anxiety and learner autonomy. *The JALT CALL Journal*, 19(3), 299–316. <https://doi.org/10.29140/jaltcall.v19n3.1049>
- Ericsson, P. F., & Haswell, R. H. (2006). Machine scoring of Student Essays: Truth and Consequences. In *Utah State University Press eBooks*. <https://ci.nii.ac.jp/ncid/BA83504683>
- Fahmi, M. A., & Cahyono, B. Y. (2021). EFL students' perception on the use of Grammarly and teacher feedback. *JEES (Journal of English Educators Society)*, 6(1), 18–25. <https://doi.org/10.21070/jees.v6i1.849>
- Faigley, L., & Witte, S. (1981). Analyzing Revision. *College Composition and Communication*, 32(4), 400. <https://doi.org/10.2307/356602>
- 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), 2023, 23-42. doi: <http://dx.doi.org/10.21462/jeltl.v8.i1.1006>
- Fitria, T. N. (2021). Grammarly as AI-powered English Writing Assistant: Students' Alternative for Writing English. *Metathesis: Journal of English Language, Literature, and Teaching*, 5(1), 65–78. <https://doi.org/10.31002/metathesis.v5i1.3519>
- Fitriana, K., & Nurazni, L. (2022). Exploring Students' Perception of Using Grammarly to Check Grammar in Their Writing. *JET (Journal of English Teaching)*, 8(1), 15–25. <https://doi.org/10.33541/jet.v8i1.3044>
- Geng, J., & Razali, A. B. (2022). Effectiveness of the Automated Writing Evaluation Program on Improving Undergraduates' Writing Performance. *English Language Teaching*, 15(7), 49. <https://doi.org/10.5539/elt.v15n7p49>
- Guo, Q., Feng, R., & Hua, Y. (2021). How effectively can EFL students use automated written corrective feedback (AWCF) in research writing? *Computer Assisted Language Learning*, 35(9), 1–20. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09588221.2021.1879161>
- Han, Y., & Hyland, F. (2015). Exploring learner engagement with written corrective feedback in a Chinese tertiary EFL classroom. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 30, 31–44. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jslw.2015.08.002>
- Han, Y., Zhao, S., & Ng, L. (2021). How Technology Tools Impact Writing Performance, Lexical Complexity, and Perceived Self-Regulated Learning

- Strategies in EFL Academic Writing: A Comparative Study. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 12, 752793. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2021.752793>
- Harsch, C. (2016). Proficiency. *ELT Journal*, 71(2), ccw067. <https://doi.org/10.1093/elt/ccw067>
- Hockly, N. (2018). Automated writing evaluation. *ELT Journal*, 73(1), 82–88. <https://doi.org/10.1093/elt/ccy044>
- Huang, S., & Renandya, W. A. (2018). Exploring the integration of automated feedback among lower-proficiency EFL learners. *Innovation in Language Learning and Teaching*, 14(1), 15–26. <https://doi.org/10.1080/17501229.2018.1471083>
- Hung, R.-T., Chang, K.-H., Chen, K. T.-C., & Chuang, Y.-S. (2024). Impact of Automated Writing Evaluation System and Revision Processes on College Students' Writing Skills in English as a Foreign Language Course. *IEEE ICEIB 2024*, 74(1), 52. <https://doi.org/10.3390/engproc2024074052>
- Hyland, K. (2013). Writing in the university: education, knowledge and reputation. *Language Teaching*, 46(1), 53–70. <https://doi.org/10.1017/s0261444811000036>
- Hyland, K. (2019). *Second Language Writing*. Cambridge University Press.
- Hyland, K., & Hyland, F. (2019). Contexts and Issues in Feedback on L2 Writing. In K. Hyland & F. Hyland (Eds.), *Feedback in Second Language Writing* (pp. 1–22). Cambridge University Press <https://doi.org/10.1017/9781108635547.003>
- Khadawardi, H. A. (2022). Saudi Learners' Perceptions of Academic Writing Challenges and General Attitude Towards Writing in English. *Journal of Language Teaching and Research*, 13(3), 645–658. <https://doi.org/10.17507/jltr.1303.21>
- Kitjaroonchai, N., Kitjaroonchai, T., & Sanitchai, P. (2022). The Effects of Process Genre-Based Writing and Process Writing Approaches on Asian EFL Pre-University Students' Writing Performance. *Journal of Language Teaching and Research*, 13(4), 860–871. <https://doi.org/10.17507/jltr.1304.19>
- Klimova, B. (2015). The Role of Feedback in EFL Classes. *Procedia - Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 199, 172–177. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.sbspro.2015.07.502>

- Koltovskaia, S. (2020). Student engagement with automated written corrective feedback (AWCF) provided by Grammarly: A multiple case study. *Assessing Writing*, 44, 100450. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.asw.2020.100450>
- Kumar, R. (2019). *Research methodology: A step-by-step guide for beginners* (5th ed.). Sage.
- Li, C. (2022). Foreign language learning boredom and enjoyment: The effects of learner variables and teacher variables. *Language Teaching Research*, 136216882210903. <https://doi.org/10.1177/13621688221090324>
- Liu, M. (2021). Focus and effects of peer and machine feedback on Chinese University EFL learners' revisions of English argumentative essays. *Theory and Practice of Second Language Acquisition*, 7(1), 75–98. <https://doi.org/10.31261/tapsla.8642>
- Liu, W. (2024). A Systematic Review of Automated Writing Evaluation Feedback: Validity, Effects and Students' Engagement. *Language Teaching Research Quarterly*, 45, 86–105. <https://doi.org/10.32038/ltrq.2024.45.05>
- Listyani (2018). Promoting Academic Writing Students' Skills through "Process Writing" Strategy. *Advances in Language and Literary Studies*.
- Marzuki, M., Widiati, U., Rusdin, D., Darwin, D., & Indrawati, I. (2023). The impact of AI writing tools on the content and organization of students' writing: EFL teachers' perspective. *Cogent Education*, 10(2). <https://doi.org/10.1080/2331186x.2023.2236469>
- Mason, L. H., Harris, K. R., & Graham, S. (2011). Self-Regulated Strategy Development for Students With Writing Difficulties. *Theory into Practice*, 50(1), 20–27. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00405841.2011.534922>
- Matsuda, P. K. (2003). Process and post-process: A discursive history. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 12(1), 65–83. [https://doi.org/10.1016/s1060-3743\(02\)00127-3](https://doi.org/10.1016/s1060-3743(02)00127-3)
- Miranty, D., & Widiati, U. (2021). Automated Writing Evaluation (AWE) in Higher Education: Indonesian EFL students' Perceptions about Grammarly Use across Student Cohorts. *Pegem Journal of Education and Instruction*, 11(4). <https://doi.org/10.47750/pegegog.11.04.12>
- Miranty, D., Widiati, U., Cahyono, B. Y., & Suzila, T. I. (2023). Automated writing evaluation tools for Indonesian undergraduate English as a foreign language students' writing. *International Journal of Evaluation and Research in Education*, 12(3), 1705–1705. <https://doi.org/10.11591/ijere.v12i3.24958>

- Nawangsih, N., Fajaryani, N., & Abrar, M. (2024). Navigating Academic Writing: EFL Students Teachers' Challenges and Solutions. *Edukasi: Jurnal Pendidikan Dan Pengajaran*, 11(02), 6–22. <https://doi.org/10.19109/6gkfyw37>
- Nemati, M., Alavi, S. M., Mohebbi, H., & Masjedlou, A. P. (2017). Speaking out on behalf of the voiceless learners: Written corrective feedback for English language learners in Iran. *Issues in Educational Research*, 27(4), 822–841.
- Nesi, H., & Gardner, S. (2012). *Genres across the disciplines: student writing in higher education*. Cambridge University Press.
- Nova, M. (2018). UTILIZING GRAMMARLY IN EVALUATING ACADEMIC WRITING: A NARRATIVE RESEARCH ON EFL STUDENTS' EXPERIENCE. *Premise: Journal of English Education*, 7(1), 80. <https://doi.org/10.24127/pj.v7i1.1300>
- Pasaribu, A. N., Pasaribu, T. K., Siahaan, R. B., & Sitompul, D. S. (2024). CHALLENGES FOR INDONESIAN EFL STUDENTS IN ENGLISH ACADEMIC WRITING. *English Review: Journal of English Education*, 12(2), 527–536. <https://doi.org/10.25134/erjee.v12i2.9780>
- Patterson, N. (2005). Computerized writing assessment: Technology gone wrong. *Voices from the Middle*, 13(2), 56–57.
- Pratama, Y. D. (2021). The investigation of using Grammarly as an online grammar checker in the process of writing. *English Ideas: Journal of English Language Education*, 1(2).
- Puri, N. G., & Setiamunadi, A. A. (2023). The use of Grammarly by tertiary English language learners in their online writing classes. *English Education Journal of English Teaching and Research*, 8(2), 163–179. <https://doi.org/10.29407/jetar.v8i2.20981>
- Rahimi, M., Fathi, J., & Zou, D. (2024). Exploring the impact of automated written corrective feedback on the academic writing skills of EFL learners: An activity theory perspective. *Education and Information Technologies*, 30. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10639-024-12896-5>
- Ranalli, J. (2014). Technology-Mediated L2 Strategy Instruction and Its Potential to Enhance Evaluation and Research. *International Journal of Computer-Assisted Language Learning and Teaching*, 4(4), 46–58. <https://doi.org/10.4018/ijcallt.2014100104>

- Ranalli, J. (2018). Automated written corrective feedback: how well can students make use of it? *Computer Assisted Language Learning*. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09588221.2018.1428994>
- Ranalli, J., & Yamashita, T. (2022). Automated written corrective feedback: Error correction performance and timing of delivery. *Language Learning & Technology*, 26(1), 1–25. <http://hdl.handle.net/10125/73465>
- Riadil, I. G., Rahman, A. N. I., & Chonpracha, P. (2023). INVESTIGATING EFL LEARNERS' DIFFICULTIES AND STRATEGIES IN ACADEMIC WRITING SKILL: A QUALITATIVE STUDY. *ELP (Journal of English Language Pedagogy)*, 8(1), 66–76. <https://doi.org/10.36665/elp.v8i1.691>
- Rich, C. S. (2012). The Impact of Online Automated Writing Evaluation: A Case Study from Dalian. *Chinese Journal of Applied Linguistics*, 35(1), 063-079. <https://doi.org/10.1515/cjal-2012-0006>
- Shang, H. F. (2019). Exploring online peer feedback and automated corrective feedback on EFL writing performance. *Interactive Learning Environments*, 30(1), 4-16. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10494820.2019.1629601>
- Shermis, M. D., & Burstein, J. (2013). *Handbook of Automated Essay Evaluation: Current Applications and New Directions*. Routledge.
- Shiyao, W. (2021). Understanding the Effects of Automated Writing Corrective Feedback on L2 Writing Accuracy Across Proficiency Levels. *Frontiers in Educational Research*, 4(11), 94–98. <https://doi.org/10.25236/fer.2021.041117>
- Stevenson, M., & Phakiti, A. (2014). The effects of computer-generated feedback on the quality of writing. *Assessing Writing*, 19, 51-65. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.asw.2013.11.007>
- Stevenson, M., & Phakiti, A. (2019). Automated Feedback and Second Language Writing. In K. Hyland & F. Hyland (Eds.), *Feedback in Second Language Writing* (pp. 125-142). Cambridge University Press. <https://doi.org/10.1017/9781108635547.009>
- 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*, 20(3), 1874–1895. <https://doi.org/10.52783/jes.3904>
- Tambunan, A. R. S., Andayani, W., Sari, W. S., & Lubis, F. K. (2022). Investigating EFL students' linguistic problems using Grammarly as automated writing

- evaluation feedback. *Indonesian Journal of Applied Linguistics*, 12(1), 16–27. <https://doi.org/10.17509/ijal.v12i1.46428>
- Tardy, C. M. (2010). Writing for the World: Wikipedia as an Introduction to Academic Writing. *English Teaching Forum*, 48(1), 12. <https://eric.ed.gov/?id=EJ914884>
- Thamrin, A. H. (2024). Exploring the use of automated writing evaluation (AWE) in English language education: A systematic review. *Proceedings of the International CALL Research Conference*, 281–288. <https://doi.org/10.29140/9780648184485-42>
- Wang, P. (2013). Can Automated Writing Evaluation Programs Help Students Improve Their English Writing? *International Journal of Applied Linguistics & English Literature*, 2(1), 6–12. <https://doi.org/10.7575/ijalel.v.2n.1p.6>
- Wang, P. (2015). Effects of an Automated Writing Evaluation Program: Student Experiences and Perceptions. *Electronic Journal of Foreign Language Teaching*, 12(1), 79–100.
- Wang, F., & Wang, S. (2012). A comparative study on the influence of automated evaluation system and teacher grading on students' English writing. *Procedia Engineering*, 29, 993–997. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.proeng.2012.01.077>
- Wangchuk, N. (2023). ACADEMIC WRITING: CHALLENGES AND WAYFORWARD A PERSPECTIVE FROM UNDERGRADUATE STUDENTS. *Journal of English Language and Literature*, 10(02), 16–26. <https://doi.org/10.54513/joell.2023.10202>
- Ware, P. (2011). Computer-Generated Feedback on Student Writing. *TESOL Quarterly*, 45(4), 769–774. <https://doi.org/10.5054/tq.2011.272525>
- Ware, P. (2014). Feedback for Adolescent Writers in the English Classroom: Exploring Pen-and-Paper, Electronic, and Automated Options. *Writing & Pedagogy*, 6(2), 223–249. <https://doi.org/10.1558/wap.v6i2.223>
- Weigle, S. C. (2013). English language learners and automated scoring of essays: Critical considerations. *Assessing Writing*, 18(1), 85–99. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.asw.2012.10.006>
- Xu, J., & Zhang, S. (2021). Understanding AWE Feedback and English Writing of Learners with Different Proficiency Levels in an EFL Classroom: A Sociocultural Perspective. *The Asia-Pacific Education Researcher*, 31. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s40299-021-00577-7>

- Yoandita, & Hasnah, Y. (2024). QUILLBOT AS AN ALTERNATIVE WRITING TOOL: EXAMINING ITS USES ON THE ACADEMIC WRITING PERFORMANCE OF EFL LEARNERS. *Esteem Journal of English Education Study Programme*, 7(2), 401-412.
- Zeng, C. (2025). An Investigation into EFL Students' Perceptions towards the Integration of Automated Writing Evaluation in L2 Writing Classrooms: A Case Study. *English Language Teaching*, 18(6), 78. <https://doi.org/10.5539/elt.v18n6p78>
- Zhang, J., & Zhang, L. J. (2022). The effect of feedback on metacognitive strategy use in EFL writing. *Computer Assisted Language Learning*, 37(5-6), 1198–1223. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09588221.2022.2069822>
- Zhang, S. (2021). Review of automated writing evaluation systems. *Journal of China Computer-Assisted Language Learning*, 1(1), 170–176. <https://doi.org/10.1515/jccall-2021-2007>
- Zhang, Z. V. (2017). Student engagement with computer-generated feedback: a case study. *ELT Journal*, 71(3), ccw089. <https://doi.org/10.1093/elt/ccw089>
- Zhang, Z. V. (2020). Engaging with automated writing evaluation (AWE) feedback on L2 writing: Student perceptions and revisions. *Assessing Writing*, 43, 100439. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.asw.2019.100439>
- Zhang, Z. V., & Hyland, K. (2018). Student engagement with teacher and automated feedback on L2 writing. *Assessing Writing*, 36(5), 90–102. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.asw.2018.02.004>
- Zimmerman, B. J. (2002). Becoming a self-regulated learner: an Overview. *Theory into Practice*, 41(2), 64–70. https://doi.org/10.1207/s15430421tip4102_2
- Zupanc, K., & Bosnić, Z. (2015). Advances in the Field of Automated Essay Evaluation. *Informatica*, 39(4), 383–395.