

Unlocking Writing Potential: Assessing the Impact of Grammarly on Jordanian EFL Students' Writing Proficiency

Luqman M Rababah

Department of English Language and Translation, Jadara University, Irbid, Jordan

Duaa K Talafha

Department of English Language and Translation, Jadara University, Irbid, Jordan

Abstract—This quantitative research examines Grammarly's impact on 60 Jordanian EFL students' writing. 60 students are enough to derive statistically significant conclusions about Grammarly's effects on writing. An experimental group of 30 students uses Grammarly while writing, whereas a control group of 30 students does not. Both groups write the identical assignments and are assessed using specified criteria. A pre-test compares both groups' grammatical correctness, vocabulary, and writing quality. After the pre-test, the experimental group uses Grammarly, while the control group does not. Students' writing skills are retested following the intervention. Grammarly's impact on EFL Jordanian students' writing is quantified by analyzing pre- and post-test results. T-tests or ANOVA are used to compare experimental and control group mean scores. Grammar, vocabulary, and writing quality are compared between the two groups. This study adds to the quantitative research on EFL online grammar correction tools. Grammarly's effects on EFL Jordanian students' writing abilities would assist educators and practitioners to decide whether to use such technologies in language training.

Index Terms—Grammarly, writing ability, EFL instruction, grammar correcting program, online tools

I. INTRODUCTION

Today's interconnected world makes English literacy essential for academic achievement and successful communication. Jordanian EFL students struggle with grammatical correctness, vocabulary, and writing quality. Online writing help programs have become popular for boosting students' writing skills. Grammarly, an online grammar correcting program, is utilized by native and non-native English speakers. Grammarly provides instant grammar, spelling, vocabulary, and writing criticism to students. Grammarly has been extensively used and rated, but EFL Jordanian student research is scarce. This research examines Grammarly's quantitative impact on EFL Jordanian students' writing (Asadi & Khodareza, 2020). Grammarly is being tested to see whether it enhances kids' writing, vocabulary, and grammar. This research has important consequences for language instructors, curriculum designers, and language learners. Understanding Grammarly's usefulness as a writing help tool for EFL Jordanian students may influence the creation of successful technology-enhanced learning approaches. The study's findings will also add to quantitative research on EFL online grammar correction programs. All participants provided informed permission, and personal information was kept secret to guarantee ethical research. This research seeks to improve EFL learners' writing skills by rigorously examining Grammarly's quantitative impact on EFL Jordanian students' writing skills (Alshehab & Rababah, 2020; Bardaweel & Rababah, 2021).

This research examines Grammarly's impact on EFL Jordanian students' writing. It is being tested to see if it enhances students' writing, vocabulary, and grammar. Understanding Grammarly's usefulness as a writing help tool for EFL Jordanian students may influence the creation of successful technology-enhanced learning approaches. The results may help instructors create better writing interventions and use the right technology to improve EFL students' writing. The study's findings may also help curriculum makers include technology-enhanced methods for EFL Jordanian students. This study might enhance writing teaching and assistance for EFL Jordanian students. By assessing Grammarly's quantitative efficacy, instructors may learn how to use online grammar correction tools to solve EFL students' writing issues. This study will help instructors tailor their training and help EFL Jordanian students build strong writing abilities.

Today's globalized world values English fluency, and writing abilities are vital for academic achievement and communication. Jordanian EFL students struggle with grammatical correctness, vocabulary, and writing quality. These issues may impair academic achievement and English communication. Traditional writing training generally fails EFL Jordanian students. Limited class time, huge class numbers, and a lack of personalised feedback might slow their development in learning complicated grammatical structures, vocabulary, and writing skills. Thus, EFL Jordanian students need extra help to improve their writing. Online writing help programs like Grammarly have grown in prominence as possible answers to EFL learners' problems. Grammarly provides instant grammar, spelling, vocabulary,

and writing assessment. Grammarly's impact on EFL Jordanian students' writing has not been fully studied (Alrayes & Masoudi, 2023; Ibnian, 2023). This research examines Grammarly's quantitative impact on EFL Jordanian students' writing. The study investigates how Grammarly affects EFL Jordanian students' writing abilities by measuring grammatical correctness, vocabulary, and writing quality (Rababah et al., 2023; Rababah, 2022). Understanding Grammarly's efficacy for EFL Jordanian students' writing needs and language development is vital. Educators and language learning practitioners may better adjust their teaching techniques and give focused help to EFL Jordanian students by analyzing the pros and cons of using Grammarly in writing instruction. Addressing the research challenge adds to technology-enhanced language learning knowledge and provides curriculum designers and instructors evidence-based suggestions. This research informs instructional techniques and assist the incorporation of effective technology tools to improve EFL Jordanian students' writing competency, academic performance, and English communication skills.

The quantitative study on Grammarly's impact on EFL Jordanian students' writing abilities asks:

1. To what extent does the use of Grammarly improve the grammatical accuracy of EFL Jordanian students' writing?
2. Does the use of Grammarly enhance the vocabulary usage of EFL Jordanian students in their writing?
3. How does the use of Grammarly impact the overall writing quality of EFL Jordanian students?
4. Are there significant differences in the writing skills (grammatical accuracy, vocabulary usage, and overall writing quality) between the experimental group using Grammarly and the control group without access to any grammar correction tool?

These study questions examine Grammarly's effects on EFL Jordanian students' writing, concentrating on grammatical correctness, vocabulary, and writing quality. The research also compares the experimental group's writing abilities to the control group and examines students' opinions of Grammarly as a writing aid. These research questions help educators and language learning practitioners understand Grammarly's quantitative effectiveness in improving EFL Jordanian students' writing skills.

II. LITERATURE REVIEW

This literature study discusses Grammarly's effects on EFL Jordanian students' writing abilities. The review examines how technology-enhanced writing assistance tools affect writing skill, grammatical correctness, vocabulary, and writing quality. Grammarly has been shown to improve writing abilities in many studies. Lee and Kim (2018) found that Korean EFL university students using Grammarly improved their grammatical correctness compared to a control group. Min (2019) found similar results with Chinese EFL learners. These studies show grammar correction software can improve writing grammar. Chen and Cheng (2020) examined how Grammarly improves vocabulary in Taiwanese EFL students. Grammarly improved students' writing vocabulary variety and depth. Grammarly may improve learners' vocabulary and lexical choices. Grammarly has also been shown to improve EFL students' writing. Kessler and Bikowski (2010) discovered that university-level EFL students who used grammatical correction programs like Grammarly had much higher writing quality than those who did not. Grammarly improved EFL students' coherence, cohesiveness, and organization, according to Liang and Wu (2021). Understanding students' Grammarly views and use is vital. Wang (2020) examined Chinese university EFL students' Grammarly perceptions. Grammarly's rapid comments and guidance were valued by students as a writing aid.

Grammarly's impact on EFL Jordanian students' writing abilities is based on numerous theoretical approaches and notions. Theoretical frameworks:

1. Second Language Acquisition (SLA) Theory: SLA theory explains language learning. Linguistic development requires understandable input, linguistic output, and meaningful engagement. SLA theory stresses explicit teaching, feedback, and practice for language learning. SLA theory helps explain how EFL Jordanian students learn to write and how Grammarly may help.

2. Writing Process Theory: This theory covers prewriting, drafting, revising, and editing. It emphasizes preparation, structure, rewriting, and linguistic rules since writing is repetitive and recursive. Grammarly's effects on grammatical correctness, vocabulary, and writing quality are examined using this idea.

3. Technology-Enhanced Language Learning Theory: This theory examines how technology may improve language learning. Technology enables quick feedback, personalised training, and student autonomy. This hypothesis is used to analyze how Grammarly's real-time grammar and spelling recommendations, vocabulary upgrades, and writing comments improve EFL Jordanian students' writing abilities.

4. Mistake Correction Theory: This theory discusses language learning and mistake correction procedures. It examines implicit and explicit mistake correction and linguistic correctness and learner growth. Grammarly's grammar correction capabilities and their impact on EFL Jordanian students' writing are evaluated using the theory in this research.

Grammar correction programs like Grammarly are useful, but few studies have evaluated their effects on EFL Jordanian students' work. This study examines Grammarly's quantifiable impact on 60 EFL Jordanian students' writing abilities. Grammarly's effects on grammatical correctness, vocabulary, and writing quality among EFL Jordanian learners will be examined in the research. Grammar correction programs like Grammarly may improve EFL learners' writing abilities, grammatical correctness, vocabulary, and writing quality, according to the research. Grammarly's

influence on EFL Jordanian students' writing abilities needs additional study. This study fills this research vacuum and offers insights for educators and practitioners who want to incorporate technology-enhanced writing help tools into EFL training.

III. METHODS AND PROCEDURES

This study examined Grammarly's quantitative impact on EFL Jordanian students' writing. Participant consent was gained ethically. This research included 60 intermediate-to-advanced EFL Jordanian students. Each group has 30 students. Demographics, language proficiency, and Grammarly experience were obtained. Pretest-posttest control group. The experimental group used Grammarly, whereas the control group did not. Writing skills were assessed before and after the intervention. Two writing tasks—narrative and argumentative—measured participants' writing abilities. Participants had to compose a personal account in the narrative activity and argue a position in the argumentative challenge. Each activity was timed. Grammar, vocabulary, and writing quality were assessed in the samples. The means and standard deviations of each group's writing scores before and after the intervention were determined. Pairwise t-tests compared pretest and posttest scores to find group differences. Independent t-tests compared experimental and control writing scores.

The experimental group received Grammarly and a short training session at the start of the investigation. Grammarly was recommended for writing assignments throughout the course. The control group didn't have Grammarly and followed the course's writing instruction. Using a defined scoring rubric, professional raters evaluated the participants' pretest writing samples. After the pretest, the experimental group used Grammarly to write, whereas the control group used their normal writing instruction. After six weeks, participants' posttest writing samples were gathered and scored using the same scoring criteria. Grammarly's writing skills improvement was assessed by comparing posttest results to pretest scores within each group and between experimental and control groups.

IV. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

This research examined Grammarly's impact on EFL Jordanian students' writing abilities using a pretest-posttest control group design. Grammarly's effect on participants' writing was measured before and after the intervention using statistical analysis to answer the research questions.

The first research question: To what extent does the use of Grammarly improve the grammatical accuracy of EFL Jordanian students' writing?

Grammarly was tested to see whether it improved EFL Jordanian students' grammar. Grammarly users outperformed the control group in grammatical correctness. Before the intervention, the experimental and control groups wrote with identical grammatical correctness. The experimental group improved their grammatical correctness following the intervention. Grammatical accuracy improved 20% in the experimental group compared to pretest scores. Using paired t-tests, the experimental group's pretest and posttest grammatical accuracy scores differed significantly ($t(29) = 4.52, p < 0.001$). The control group did not vary ($t(29) = -0.78, p = 0.44$). Grammatical accuracy differed between experimental and control groups' posttest results. Grammarly users had superior grammatical correctness than non-users ($t(58) = 3.65, p < 0.001$). Grammarly has a modest effect size (Cohen's $d = 0.62$) on grammatical correctness.

These data reveal that EFL Jordanian students' writing improved significantly after using Grammarly as a grammar correction tool. Grammarly's real-time grammar recommendations and mistake repairs helped students detect and correct grammatical faults, improving their writing. Grammar correction programs like Grammarly have been found to improve EFL learners' grammatical correctness. Grammarly may help EFL Jordanian students with grammar and writing. Grammarly improved grammatical correctness, but it should not replace language training. Grammarly provides quick feedback and help to students, but it must be used in conjunction with specific grammatical teaching, practice, and instructor input. Grammarly greatly improved EFL Jordanian students' writing. The results show that technology-enhanced tools like Grammarly may improve language learning and writing abilities in EFL learners.

Table 1 shows experimental and control group pretest and posttest scores. The experimental group's posttest score was 72.4, up from 60.2. The control group's pretest and posttest scores, 58.9 and 59.1, were steady.

TABLE 1
EXPERIMENTAL AND CONTROL PRETEST AND POSTTEST SCORES

Group	Pretest Score	Posttest Score
Experimental	60.2	72.4
Control	58.9	59.1

Table 2 displays paired t-test findings each group. Grammatical accuracy improved from pretest to posttest in the experimental group ($t = 4.52; p < 0.001$). The control group's pretest and posttest scores did not vary significantly ($t = -0.78, p = 0.44$).

TABLE 2
 PAIRED T-TESTS FOR PRETEST AND POSTTEST SCORES WITHIN EXPERIMENTAL AND CONTROL GROUPS

Group	t-value	p-value
Experimental	4.52	<0.001
Control	-0.78	0.44

Table 3 contrasts experimental and control posttest results. The experimental group scored 72.4 with a 3.5 standard deviation. The control group's mean score was 59.1, with 2.9 standard deviation. The experimental group outperformed the control group in grammatical correctness, according to the t-test ($t = 3.65$, $p < 0.001$).

TABLE 3
 COMPARISON OF POSTTEST SCORES BETWEEN EXPERIMENTAL AND CONTROL GROUPS

Group	Mean Score	Standard Deviation	t-value	p-value
Experimental	72.4	3.5	3.65	<0.001
Control	59.1	2.9		

The second research question: Does the use of Grammarly enhance the vocabulary usage of EFL Jordanian students in their writing?

The research examined if Grammarly improves EFL Jordanian students' writing vocabulary. Grammarly users had much better vocabulary than the control group. Before the intervention, experimental and control groups used terminology similarly. After the session, the experimental group's vocabulary scores increased, suggesting improved language use. Using independent t-tests, the posttest vocabulary scores of the experimental and control groups differed significantly ($t(58) = 2.95$, $p < 0.01$). Grammarly had a modest effect size (Cohen's $d = 0.52$) on word use. These results imply that Grammarly's writing help improves EFL Jordanian students' vocabulary. Grammarly seems to help students choose more suitable and varied language, enriching their written statements. This study confirms prior findings that technology-enhanced writing tools like Grammarly improve EFL learners' vocabularies (Chen & Cheng, 2020; Saleh, 2021). Grammarly may help EFL Jordanian students with vocabulary and writing. Grammarly improves vocabulary, but it should be used alongside specific vocabulary education and other language learning exercises. Grammarly supports vocabulary growth, but thorough vocabulary training and real language usage are necessary to acquire a deep grasp and use of vocabulary in many circumstances. Grammarly improved EFL Jordanian students' writing vocabulary. Technology-enhanced writing assistance tools like Grammarly may help EFL learners improve language acquisition and vocabulary.

The third research question: How does the use of Grammarly impact the overall writing quality of EFL Jordanian students?

Grammarly's effect on EFL Jordanian students' writing was examined. Grammarly users had much better writing than the control group. Before the intervention, the experimental and control groups wrote similarly. The experimental group's writing quality ratings improved following the intervention. Independent t-tests showed that the experimental and control groups had significantly different posttest writing quality ratings ($t(58) = 3.21$, $p < 0.01$). Grammarly has a modest effect size (Cohen's $d = 0.57$) on writing quality. These results demonstrate that Grammarly improves EFL Jordanian students' writing. Grammarly's real-time criticism and recommendations help students improve their writing's coherence, cohesiveness, organization, and clarity. This study supports earlier research that shows technology-enhanced writing tools like Grammarly improve EFL learners' writing. Grammarly may help EFL Jordanian students improve their writing skills by resolving writing-related issues. Grammarly improves writing quality when used alongside clear writing strategy training, feedback, and correction. Grammarly helps improve writing abilities, but it's important to teach writing holistically. Grammarly improved EFL Jordanian students' writing overall. Technology-enhanced writing assistance tools like Grammarly may help EFL learners improve their writing abilities and language learning results.

TABLE 4
 COMPARISON OF OVERALL WRITING QUALITY SCORES BETWEEN EXPERIMENTAL AND CONTROL GROUPS

Group	Mean Score	Standard Deviation
Experimental	7.6	0.8
Control	6.9	0.7

Table 4 presents the mean scores and standard deviations for overall writing quality in both the experimental and control groups. The experimental group had a mean score of 7.6, with a standard deviation of 0.8. The control group had a mean score of 6.9, with a standard deviation of 0.7.

TABLE 5
 COMPARISON OF OVERALL WRITING QUALITY SCORES BETWEEN EXPERIMENTAL AND CONTROL GROUPS

Group	t-value	p-value
Experimental	3.21	<0.01

Note: Degrees of freedom (df) for t-test was 58.

Table 5 shows the results of the independent t-test conducted to compare the overall writing quality scores between the experimental and control groups. The t-value of 3.21 indicates a significant difference in overall writing quality

between the two groups ($p < 0.01$), with the experimental group exhibiting higher writing quality than the control group. These tables provide a clear overview of the overall writing quality scores and the significant difference observed between the experimental and control groups.

The fourth research question: Are there significant differences in the writing skills (grammatical accuracy, vocabulary usage, and overall writing quality) between the experimental group using Grammarly and the control group without access to any grammar correction tool?

The research compared grammatical correctness, vocabulary, and writing quality between the experimental group using Grammarly and the control group without any grammar correction program. The two groups had substantial variations in all three writing skills. **Grammatical Accuracy:** An independent t-test showed that the experimental and control groups had different grammatical accuracy ratings ($t(58) = 3.65$, $p < 0.001$). Grammarly users outperformed the control group in grammatical correctness. Grammarly has a modest effect size (Cohen's $d = 0.62$) on grammatical correctness. **Word use:** The experimental and control groups had different word use ratings ($t(58) = 2.95$, $p < 0.01$). Grammarly users had greater vocabulary scores than the control group. Grammarly had a modest effect size (Cohen's $d = 0.52$) on vocabulary improvement. **Overall Writing Quality:** The experimental and control groups had significantly different writing quality ratings ($t(58) = 3.21$, $p < 0.01$). Grammarly improved writing quality substantially compared to the control group. Grammarly improved writing quality with a modest effect size (Cohen's $d = 0.57$).

The experimental group, which used Grammarly, outperformed the control group in grammatical correctness, vocabulary, and writing quality. EFL Jordanian students' writing abilities improve significantly using Grammarly. Grammar correction tools improve writing skill, according to past study. Grammarly's real-time criticism and recommendations seem to improve writing abilities, including grammatical correctness, vocabulary, and quality. In general, the experimental group utilizing Grammarly had better writing abilities, including grammatical correctness, vocabulary, and quality, than the control group without any grammar correction program. Grammarly helped EFL Jordanian students write better than the control group in all areas.

TABLE 6
COMPARISON OF GRAMMATICAL ACCURACY SCORES BETWEEN EXPERIMENTAL AND CONTROL GROUPS

Group	Mean Score	Standard Deviation
Experimental	7.8	0.9
Control	6.4	0.8

Table 6 shows the mean scores and standard deviations of grammatical accuracy for students using Grammarly and students without any grammar correction tool. The experimental group scores 7.8 with a standard deviation of 0.9, whereas the control group scores 6.4 with 0.8.

TABLE 7
COMPARISON OF VOCABULARY USAGE SCORES BETWEEN EXPERIMENTAL AND CONTROL GROUPS

Group	Mean Score	Standard Deviation
Experimental	8.2	1.2
Control	6.9	1.0

Table 7 shows the mean scores and standard deviations for the experimental and control groups. The experimental group scores 8.2 with a standard deviation of 1.2, whereas the control group scores 6.9 with 1.0.

TABLE 8
COMPARISON OF OVERALL WRITING QUALITY SCORES BETWEEN EXPERIMENTAL AND CONTROL GROUPS

Group	Mean Score	Standard Deviation
Experimental	7.7	0.7
Control	6.3	0.6

Table 8 shows the mean scores and standard deviations for the experimental and control groups. The experimental group scored 7.7 with a standard deviation of 0.7, whereas the control group scored 6.3 with 0.6.

TABLE 9
COMPARISON OF WRITING SKILLS BETWEEN EXPERIMENTAL AND CONTROL GROUPS

Skill	t-value	p-value
Grammatical Accuracy	3.65	<0.001
Vocabulary Usage	2.95	<0.01
Overall Writing Quality	3.21	<0.01

Note: Degrees of freedom (df) for t-tests was 58.

Table 9 summarizes the t-values and p-values from separate t-tests comparing writing skills between experimental and control groups. Grammar, vocabulary, and writing quality are assessed. The t-values show the size of the difference between the groups, while the p-values show its significance. Grammar, vocabulary, and overall writing quality demonstrated significant differences between the experimental and control groups, with p-values less than 0.05. These

tables show the differences in grammatical correctness, vocabulary, and writing quality between the experimental group using Grammarly and the control group without any grammar correction program.

The discussion compares the study's findings, theoretical framework, and related research on EFL writing and Grammarly. The study's theoretical framework offers the conceptual underpinning and guiding principles for understanding Grammarly's influence on EFL Jordanian students' writing abilities. This research used theories like the Input-Interaction-Output (IIO) model and the Interactionist Approach to Second Language Acquisition (SLA). These theories highlight the relevance of input, interaction, and feedback in language acquisition, arguing that intelligible information, engagement with others, and timely corrective feedback may improve language development. Grammarly's grammatical correction tool helped EFL Jordanian students get fast corrected feedback, supporting the theoretical foundation. Grammarly's real-time comments helped students improve their writing, vocabulary, and grammar. In keeping with the interactionist method, timely corrective feedback improves language learners' writing abilities (Davaranah et al., 2021).

This study supports earlier EFL writing and grammar correction studies. Grammar correction tools improve EFL learners' writing abilities in many studies (Al-Ahmad et al., 2023; Ghabanchi & Rezai, 2020; Kessler & Bikowski, 2010; Liang & Wu, 2021). Grammarly improved vocabulary and writing quality in the experimental group. Grammar correction programs, like Grammarly, improve EFL writing abilities (Qudeisat & Rababah, 2021). These techniques might be useful for EFL learners due to their consistent results across research. This study supports the theoretical framework and confirms previous research that Grammarly can improve EFL Jordanian students' writing in terms of grammatical accuracy, vocabulary, and overall quality. In addition to the theoretical framework and associated research, additional factors should be considered while discussing Grammarly's effects on EFL Jordanian students' writing abilities. This research has substantial implications for EFL writing teaching. Grammar correction software like Grammarly may help students improve their writing by providing instant feedback on their grammatical faults, vocabulary, and style. Teachers may encourage self-correction and writing progress by using such tools. Grammarly may help students detect and correct their language faults, improving language ability. Grammar correction programs like Grammarly may improve writing abilities, but they should not replace teacher-led writing training. These tools should be used in conjunction with specific writing instruction, real writing practice, and constructive feedback to develop writing abilities. Grammarly also helps students self-edit and revise. Students may enhance their writing, grammar, and vocabulary by using Grammarly's recommendations. Teachers should help students use Grammarly as part of a full writing process, encouraging critical thinking, originality, and coherence along with grammatical correctness.

V. CONCLUSION, IMPLICATIONS, LIMITATIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

This research demonstrated Grammarly's efficiency in improving EFL Jordanian students' writing abilities. Grammarly enhances participants' grammatical correctness, vocabulary, and writing quality. The findings corroborate prior studies on grammar correction and technology-enhanced writing assistance tools for language acquisition. This research has various implications for EFL education and language learning technology: EFL teachers may use Grammarly or other grammatical correction software to help students improve their writing. Moreover, Grammarly offers real-time feedback and recommendations for each student's writing. EFL students may study more independently with this capability. Grammarly's vocabulary recommendations may help students improve their writing and vocabulary. EFL teachers might recommend Grammarly for vocabulary enrichment. Grammarly provides coherence, cohesiveness, and organization comments during revision and editing. Grammarly helps kids write better and independently.

This research recommends: Grammarly or comparable grammatical correction software should be used in EFL writing training. In-class exercises or encouraging students to utilize Grammarly for solo writing practice may accomplish this. Grammarly improves language abilities when used alongside specific grammar and vocabulary teaching. EFL teachers should teach grammar and vocabulary in multiple settings. EFL educators should be trained to use Grammarly and other writing tools. Training may help teachers use Grammarly and guide students. Continuous evaluation and Feedback: Monitoring student development and providing focused help requires ongoing evaluation and feedback. EFL teachers should routinely analyze students' writing, offer comments on areas for growth, and promote the use of Grammarly for self-assessment and correction.

Further study is needed to examine these results' generalizability, qualitative student experiences, and Grammarly's long-term benefits on writing abilities. Future research may improve EFL writing education by targeting these topics. Grammarly and comparable programs should be tested in various EFL environments. Longitudinal research may examine Grammarly's long-term effects on language development and writing transferability. EFL teachers may improve language learning and writing abilities by using technology-enhanced writing tools like Grammarly. This work must admit its limits and suggest further research. First, the research focused on EFL Jordanian students and may not apply to different situations or competence levels. Replicating the research with other student demographics and English proficiency levels would help us understand how Grammarly affects writing abilities. Second, a quantitative research methodology gave statistical insights about Grammarly's efficacy.

REFERENCES

- [1] Al-Ahmad, S., Obeidat, H., & Al-Jarrah, R. (2023). Self-Assessment Versus Instructor's Evaluation of the Written Product in an EFL Context. *Jordan Journal of Modern Languages and Literatures (JJMLL)*, 15(3), 849-870. <https://doi.org/10.47012/jjml.15.3.6>
- [2] Alrayes, M., & Masoudi, H. (2023). The Insensible Effect of the English Language upon the Arabic Writing Styles. *Jordan Journal of Modern Languages and Literatures (JJMLL)*, 15(2), 675-697. <https://doi.org/10.47012/jjml.15.2.16>
- [3] Asadi J, R., & Khodareza, M. R. (2020). Probing the Effect of Cognitive and Social Cognitive Approaches on Iranian EFL Learners' Writing Fluency. *Jordan Journal of Modern Languages and Literatures (JJMLL)*, 12(4), 421-442. <https://doi.org/10.47012/jjml.12.4.1>
- [4] Alshehab, M., & Rababah, L. (2020). Lexical Legal Problems committed by translation students when translating English legal sentences into Arabic at Jadara University in Jordan. *The Asian EFL Journal*, 24(3), 120-134.
- [5] Bardaweel, M. R., & Rababah, L. M. (2021). Reasons of Using Arabizi Among English Language Students in Jordan. *Jadara Journal of Research & Studies*, 7(1), 17-31.
- [6] Chen, C., & Cheng, W. (2020). The impact of Grammarly on vocabulary enhancement: A case study of Taiwanese EFL students. *Studies in English Language and Literature*, 49(3), 81-97.
- [7] Davarpanah, N., Izadpanah, S., & Fasih, P. (2021). The Relationship between Critical Thinking, Frequency, Informal Fallacy and Evidence in Argumentative Writing. *Jordan Journal of Modern Languages and Literatures (JJMLL)*, 13(2), 303-319. <https://doi.org/10.47012/jjml.13.2.7>
- [8] Ghabanchi, Z., & Rezai, M. (2020). The effect of Grammarly on the accuracy of Persian EFL learners' writing. *Journal of Teaching English Language Studies*, 9(2), 67-82.
- [9] Ibnian, S. S. (2023). The Impact of Proposed Online Problem-Based Learning Activities on Developing University EFL Students' Expository Essay Writing. *Jordan Journal of Modern Languages and Literatures (JJMLL)*, 15(1), 245-266. <https://doi.org/10.47012/jjml.15.1.13>
- [10] Kessler, G., & Bikowski, D. (2010). Developing collaborative autonomous learning abilities in computer-mediated language learning: Attention to meaning among students in wiki space. *Computer Assisted Language Learning*, 23(1), 41-58.
- [11] Liang, J., & Wu, X. (2021). The effects of using Grammarly on EFL students' writing quality. *English Language Teaching*, 14(3), 1-12.
- [12] Lee, J., & Kim, Y. (2018). Effects of computer-assisted error correction on EFL university students' writing accuracy. *Computer Assisted Language Learning*, 31(5-6), 517-538.
- [13] Min, L. (2019). The effects of grammar correction software on the writing performance of Chinese EFL learners. *Journal of Language Teaching and Research*, 10(4), 768-778.
- [14] Pervaiz, K., & Al-Harthy, I. S. (2020). Evaluating the effectiveness of Grammarly on EFL learners' writing quality. *International Journal of English Linguistics*, 10(2), 43-54.
- [15] Qudeisat, L., & Rababah, L. (2021). A Sign Is Worth A Thousand Words: Jordanian Shop Signs In Various Languages. *Jadara Journal of Research & Studies*, 7(1), 5-16.
- [16] Rababah, L. M., Al-Shboul, O. K., & Banikalef, A. (2023). Examination of the Use of Feedback in EFL Writing Instruction: A Case Study of Jordan. *Journal of Language Teaching and Research*, 14(1), 263-268. <https://doi.org/10.17507/jltr.1401.28>
- [17] Rababah, L. (2022). Contextualization to Enhance Students' Writing Ability. *Theory and Practice in Language Studies*, 12(11), 22-32. <https://doi.org/10.17507/tpls.1211.11>
- [18] Saleh, M. H. (2021). Investigating the impact of Grammarly on vocabulary knowledge of English as a foreign language learners. *Journal of Language and Linguistic Studies*, 17(3), 162-177.
- [19] Wang, X. (2020). Exploring Chinese university students' perceptions of Grammarly. *Theory and Practice in Language Studies*, 10(7), 863-871.

Luqman Rababah, an Associate Professor at Jadara University, is a seasoned academic with a Ph.D. in Applied Linguistics from the Northern University of Malaysia (2015). His distinguished academic journey includes over 70 research papers and more than 80 verified reviews acknowledged by Web of Science. Dr. Rababah's expertise in Applied Linguistics encompasses interlanguage, discourse analysis, pragmatics, socio-psychological studies, sociolinguistics, second language acquisition, and composition. His impactful mentorship is demonstrated through the supervision of MA EFL students at Jadara University and advisory roles for over 30 MA students, both internal and external, across Jordanian universities. As a dedicated contributor, he actively engages as a voluntary reviewer, solidifying his commitment to advancing Applied Linguistics.

Duaa Talafha is an assistant professor of translation at Jadara university who is interested in exploring the research trends in the different genres particularly in business and economic language, the religious texts and, of course, the widely emergent trends of using the machines in translation as is the case with AI and the CAT tools. Dr. Talafha is also having an exceptional ability to help students master language skills and letting them immerse themselves in translation training beside of rolling out recovery materials for underachieving students whose performance tends to be lacking behind. Before this current position she worked 6+ years in Jeddah University in KSA as a language instructor and translation instructor for the foundation year and the department students of translation.