

Technology Meets Education: Exploring College Students' Insights on Using Ginger Writer to Boost Writing Skills

Mariyati

Universitas Islam Ogan Komering Ilir, Kayuagung, South Sumatra, Indonesia
marya240303@gmail.com

Habsyah

Universitas Islam Ogan Komering Ilir, Kayuagung, South Sumatra, Indonesia
habsyah130905@gmail.com

Dewi Sartika

Universitas Islam Ogan Komering Ilir, Kayuagung, South Sumatra, Indonesia
dewisartika@uniski.ac.id

Abstract

This study aimed to explore college students' perceptions of using Ginger Writer to enhance their English as a Foreign Language (EFL) writing skills. Employing a descriptive quantitative methodology, data were collected through a closed-ended questionnaire using a Likert scale. The participants were 19 students from the English Language Education Study Program at the Islamic University of Ogan Komering Ilir, Kayuagung, consisting of five male and fourteen female students who had prior experience using Ginger Writer. The questionnaire comprised 20 items addressing the use of Ginger Writer, its strengths in subject–verb agreement and sentence structure, and its perceived weaknesses. Data were analyzed using descriptive statistical techniques. The findings revealed that most students held positive perceptions of Ginger Writer, particularly regarding its ability to improve grammatical accuracy, sentence structure, writing quality, confidence, and efficiency in detecting errors. Students strongly agreed that the tool was effective in identifying subject–verb agreement errors and enhancing sentence clarity and coherence. However, some limitations were reported, including restricted features in the free version and the relatively high cost of the premium version. Overall, Ginger Writer is perceived as an effective and supportive tool for enhancing EFL students' writing skills when used as a complementary aid alongside teacher guidance. The study suggests that AI-based writing tools can foster learner confidence and autonomy if pedagogically integrated, and it recommends future research employing qualitative approaches and longitudinal designs to examine long-term impacts on writing development.

Keywords: *English writing skills, Ginger Writer, artificial intelligence, EFL learners, writing support tools*

1. INTRODUCTION

Writing is a crucial skill in learning English, yet it remains one of the most challenging areas for many students, particularly in the English as a Foreign Language (EFL) context. Writing requires continuous cognitive processes, such as planning, decision-making, evaluation, and revision, which demand high levels of mental flexibility and self-regulation (Novitaningrum, 2023). Despite its importance, many EFL learners struggle to balance linguistic accuracy with idea development, often resulting in anxiety, hesitation, and low confidence in expressing ideas in written form (Dwimaaulani et al., 2024). Structural differences between students' first language and English further contribute to difficulties in organizing ideas, using appropriate vocabulary, and applying correct writing mechanics (Sartika & Nery, 2018). Therefore, mastering writing in EFL settings requires not only linguistic competence but also emotional resilience and cognitive adaptability.

Among Indonesian EFL students, particularly those at the early stages of university study, writing is frequently perceived as the most demanding language skill. While many students can express ideas orally, they often struggle to organize and articulate those ideas coherently in written texts. These challenges arise

from both linguistic limitations and psychological barriers, including fear of making errors and low self-efficacy (Hadiani, 2024). Consequently, effective writing instruction should address not only grammatical accuracy but also students' confidence, self-expression, and reflective awareness. From a qualitative literacy perspective, affective and metacognitive development are essential indicators of writing growth, as they support learners' ability to engage meaningfully with the writing process (Sartika & Rachmanita, 2017). In this sense, writing pedagogy must adopt a holistic approach that integrates linguistic, affective, and reflective dimensions of learning.

From a sociocultural perspective, writing is understood as a socially mediated practice rather than an isolated activity. Learners construct meaning through interactions with peers, teachers, and technological tools that extend their learning agency (Supiatman et al., 2024). When integrated meaningfully, technology functions as a mediating artifact that supports the exploration of ideas, iterative revision, and reflective learning. Digital scaffolds, such as visual and interactive feedback tools, have been shown to enhance writing content, organization, and mechanics while encouraging learner autonomy and active engagement in text production (Sartika et al., 2024). Thus, sociocultural and technological mediation provide a supportive environment that fosters both collaboration and independent learning in writing.

The integration of automated writing evaluation (AWE) tools such as Ginger Writer has been widely recognized for its capacity to enhance students' writing quality, engagement, and self-regulated learning. Previous studies indicate that AI-powered writing assistants provide timely and individualized feedback that supports improvements in grammar, coherence, and overall writing performance, particularly for second-language learners (Nazari et al., 2021; Fleckenstein et al., 2023). When implemented appropriately, AWE tools encourage deeper involvement in the writing process by promoting revision and reflection, which ultimately leads to improved writing quality (Alharbi, 2023). Students also tend to demonstrate higher motivation and engagement when they perceive such tools as beneficial, fostering a sense of ownership and responsibility for their writing development (Chan & Hu, 2023; Wischgoll, 2017). In summary, previous studies show that AWE tools such as Ginger Writer are effective in supporting students' writing development. By providing immediate and personalized feedback, these tools help improve writing accuracy, increase student engagement, and encourage independent learning. When used appropriately, Ginger Writer can support students in revising their work and developing better writing skills, especially in EFL contexts.

Beyond writing quality, Ginger Writer contributes to the development of self-regulated learning by enabling learners to independently monitor, evaluate, and revise their writing. Structured and continuous feedback supports self-efficacy and strategic revision practices that are essential for sustained writing improvement (Zimmerman & Kitsantas, 2002; Kellogg, 2008). From an instructional perspective, the automation of initial feedback allows teachers to focus on higher-level pedagogical support and individualized guidance, increasing instructional efficiency, particularly in large classroom contexts (Alharbi, 2023). These findings collectively suggest that Ginger Writer serves not only as a learning aid for students but also as a scalable instructional support tool for educators.

Recent advancements in artificial intelligence (AI) and AWE systems have further transformed writing pedagogy by enabling immediate and adaptive feedback on grammar, structure, and language use (Cao et al., 2025). However, scholars emphasize that such tools must be pedagogically guided to avoid overreliance and diminished critical reflection (Maharani, 2022). When positioned as collaborative mediators rather than replacements for instruction, AI-assisted tools can enhance learners' linguistic awareness while preserving the teacher's essential role in fostering critical thinking. Within a process-based writing framework that views writing as a recursive cycle of planning, drafting, revising, and reflecting (Rahman et al., 2024), AI tools function most effectively as scaffolds that support, rather than replace, the writing process. In other words, the effectiveness of AI-assisted writing tools depends on their thoughtful integration as supportive scaffolds that complement the writing process and instructional guidance, rather than functioning as standalone solutions.

Ginger Writer exemplifies such an AI-assisted tool, utilizing natural language processing to provide real-time feedback on grammar, spelling, sentence structure, and language clarity (Ginger Software Ltd., 2023). By offering contextual explanations and alternative sentence constructions, Ginger Writer enables learners to understand and learn from their errors instead of merely correcting them. Its features—such as subject-verb agreement detection, sentence rephrasing, and clarity enhancement—are particularly beneficial for EFL learners who often struggle with accuracy and coherence. As an AWE tool, Ginger Writer provides formative feedback during the revision stage, promoting self-editing, iterative

improvement, and learner autonomy (Ranalli et al., 2017). Previous research suggests that such immediate and personalized feedback can reduce writing anxiety, increase confidence, and support independent learning (Bitchener & Ferris, 2012). In conclusion, Ginger Writer serves as a supportive digital scaffold that facilitates accurate, reflective, and autonomous writing practices, particularly for EFL learners during the revision process.

To address challenges in EFL writing, recent advancements in artificial intelligence (AI) have introduced automated writing evaluation (AWE) tools that function as digital scaffolds in the writing process. Among these tools, Ginger Writer has gained increasing attention for its capacity to provide real-time, individualized feedback on grammar, sentence structure, and language clarity, particularly in EFL contexts. Despite growing quantitative evidence supporting the effectiveness of Ginger Writer in improving linguistic accuracy, limited research has explored students' subjective experiences with this tool during the writing process. Qualitative inquiry is therefore necessary to understand how learners perceive, interpret, and respond to AI-assisted feedback (Creswell & Poth, 2018). Grounded in an interpretive paradigm, this study aims to explore college students' perceptions of using Ginger Writer to support their English writing development by examining how technology-mediated feedback influences motivation, confidence, and learner autonomy, thereby offering pedagogical insights into the effective integration of AI tools as supportive partners in developing reflective and autonomous EFL writers in the digital era.

2. METHODOLOGY

This study employed a descriptive quantitative approach using a closed-ended questionnaire with a Likert scale to capture students' perceptions of Ginger Writer. According to Sugiyono (2019), descriptive quantitative research is conducted to describe phenomena or characteristics of a population using numerical data without testing hypotheses or manipulating variables. This approach was selected because it allows for the systematic measurement of learners' attitudes and experiences using numerical data, enabling the identification of general trends without manipulating variables. By employing descriptive statistics, the study aims to provide an objective overview of how students perceive the role of Ginger Writer in supporting their EFL writing process.

This study employed a descriptive quantitative approach using a closed-ended questionnaire with a Likert scale to capture students' perceptions of Ginger Writer. This approach was selected because it allows for the systematic measurement of learners' attitudes and experiences using numerical data, enabling the identification of general trends without manipulating variables. By employing descriptive statistics, the study aims to provide an objective overview of how students perceive the role of Ginger Writer in supporting their EFL writing process.

The samples of this study consisted of 19 college students from the Islamic University of Ogan Komering Ilir Kayugung. The sample consisted of 5 male students and 14 female students. The participants were selected using purposive sampling, which means that only students who had experience using Ginger Writer as part of their writing activities were included. Etikan (2019) explains that purposive sampling is appropriate when participants are chosen based on specific characteristics relevant to the research objective. This sampling method was used to ensure that the participants could provide relevant and meaningful responses based on their experience with the application.

The data were collected using a closed-ended questionnaire designed to gather detailed and descriptive responses from participants. The questionnaire consisted of 20 items and had four indicators such as the use of Ginger Writer (1-5), the strengths of Ginger Writer in terms of subject-verb agreement (6-10), the strengths of Ginger Writer in terms of sentence structure (12-17), and the weaknesses of Ginger Writer (18-20), which were adapted from Kholishatuzzahra (2025). A closed-ended question is a question that restricts respondents' answers to a set of predetermined options, such as yes/no choices or rating scales, rather than allowing free-form responses (Creswell, 2014). The data collection process was executed online via Google Forms. Questionnaires were distributed to students who participated in classes using the Ginger Writer. Within the questionnaire, respondents were presented with five response options: Strongly Disagree (1), Disagree (2), Neutral (3), Agree (4), and Strongly Agree (5).

3. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

The results section presents descriptive statistical findings derived from students' questionnaire

responses, while the discussion section interprets these findings in relation to relevant theories and previous studies. The results indicate that students generally perceived Ginger Writer as a useful tool for supporting their writing activities, particularly in improving grammatical accuracy, sentence structure, and confidence. These findings are discussed in relation to prior research on automated writing evaluation tools, which highlights the role of immediate and individualized feedback in enhancing writing performance and learner engagement.

The results show the percentage of students' perceptions of the effectiveness of Ginger Writer in boosting their writing skills, as indicated in a questionnaire. The Scales used for this research question are Strongly Disagree (SD), Disagree (D), Neutral (N), Agree (A), and Strongly Agree (SA), divided into four sections. The results for the first section asked about the use of Grammarly, which a percentage of students use in developing their writing skills with the Ginger Writer. The results of the first section on the use of Ginger Writer are shown in Table 1.

Table 1. Percentage of the Use of Ginger Writer

No.	Statement	SD	D	N	A	SA
1.	1. I use Ginger Writer in writing	0	0	15.8 (3)	68.4 (13)	15.8 (3)
	2. Ginger Writer helps me in writing	0	0	10.5 (2)	10.5 (2)	79.0 (15)
	3. Ginger Writer helps me improve the quality of my writing	0	0	10.5 (2)	5.2 (1)	84.1 (16)
	4. I feel more confident with my writing when using Ginger Writer	0	0	10.5 (2)	26.3 (5)	63.1 (12)
	5. Ginger Writer is saving my time in detecting writing errors	0	0	10.5 (2)	10.5 (2)	79.0 (15)

In the aspect of using Ginger Writer, 19 students were given five statements to answer based on their experience with Ginger Writer. The first statement was *"I use Ginger Writer in writing"*. It shows that 13 students (68.4%) agree, while three students (15.8%) are neutral and three students (15.8%) strongly agree that the students use Ginger Writer in their writing. Meanwhile, no one (0%) stated 'disagree' or 'strongly disagree'. It can be concluded that students agree and mostly use Ginger Writer in their writing.

The second statement was *"Ginger Writer helps me in writing"*. There were 15 students (79.0%) who strongly agree, two students (10.5%) who agree, and two students (10.5%) who were neutral. However, no one (0%) stated 'disagree' or 'strongly disagree'. According to the percentage results, in the second statement, most students felt that Ginger Writer helped them with their writing.

The third statement was, *"Ginger Writer helps me improve the quality of my writing."* The results showed that 16 students (84.1%) strongly agreed, two students (10.5%) were neutral, and one student (5.2%) agreed. Meanwhile, no one (0%) chose to disagree and chose strongly disagree. According to some of the percentage results, most students reported that Ginger Writer helped them improve their writing.

The fourth statement was, *"I feel more confident with my writing when using Ginger Writer."* The results showed that 12 students (63.1%) chose "strongly agree," 2 students (10.5%) chose "neutral," and five students (26.3%) stated that when using Ginger Writer, they felt more confident with their writing. On the other hand, no one (0%) stated 'disagree' or 'strongly disagree'. The highest percentage of students who chose to agree indicates that most students felt more confident in exploring ideas in their writing because of Ginger Writer.

The fifth statement was, *"Ginger Writer is saving my time in detecting writing errors."* It received a positive response from 15 students (79.0%), who stated they strongly agreed, two students (10.5%) answered neutral, and two students (10.5%) said they agreed with the statement. On the other hand, no one (0%) chose "disagree" or "strongly disagree." The students agreed that Ginger Writer can save time in detecting errors and mistakes in writing.

The second section focuses on Ginger Writer's strengths related to subject-verb agreement, and the corresponding percentage results are shown in Table 2.

Table 2. The Strengths of Ginger Writer in Terms of Subject-Verb Agreement

No.	Statement	SD	D	N	A	SA
-----	-----------	----	---	---	---	----

2.	6.	Ginger Writer helps me to understand the connection between subjects and verbs in complex sentences	0	0	36.8 (7)	47.3 (9)	15.8 (3)
	7.	Ginger Writer helps me to identify mistakes in subject-verb agreement that I am not aware of	0	0	10.5 (2)	15.8 (3)	73.6 (14)
	8.	Ginger Writer provides clear explanations regarding subject-verb agreement errors	1 (5.2)	0	26.3 (5)	52.6 (10)	15.8 (3)
	9.	Ginger Writer is effective in detecting and correcting my writing errors in the subject-verb agreement	0	0	10.5 (2)	21.0 (4)	68.4 (13)
	10.	I rarely make grammar mistakes, especially subject-verb agreement, after using Ginger Writer.	0	0	10.5 (2)	0	89.4 (17)
	11.	Ginger Writer helps me to know when to use the singular or plural forms in verbs	0	0	10.5 (2)	26.3 (5)	63.1 (12)

In terms of the strength of Ginger Writer in subject-verb agreement, the researcher provided six statements that required answers based on students' experiences with Ginger Writer. The sixth statement was "*Ginger Writer helps me to understand the connection between subjects and verbs in complex sentences*". The result showed that 9 students (47.3%) stated agree, seven students (36.8%) neutral, and three students (15.8%) chose strongly agree that Ginger Writer helps them to know and understand the connection between subject and verb agreement in complex sentences. On the other hand, no one (0%) chose to disagree and chose strongly disagree. Based on the most significant percentage, most students agreed that Ginger Writer helped them feel more familiar with the connection between subjects and verbs in complex sentences.

The seventh statement was "*Ginger Writer helps me to identify mistakes in subject-verb agreement that I am not aware of*". It can be described that a small number of students (15.8%) 3 students said they agree that they felt helped by Ginger Writer to identify mistakes in subject-verb agreement that they were not aware of. Almost all students, 14 students (73.6%), strongly agree with this statement. On the other hand, two students (10.5%) expressed neutrality, and no one (0%) chose 'disagree' or 'strongly disagree'. It can be concluded that the student agreed and felt helped by Ginger Writer in identifying mistakes in subject-verb agreement that they were not aware of.

The eighth statement was "*Ginger Writer provides clear explanations regarding subject-verb agreement errors*". The result showed that a small number of the students (3 students) said strongly agree (15.8%), and 10 students (52.6%) chose to agree with the statement given. Meanwhile, five students (26.3%) stated 'neutral', no one stated 'disagree', and only one student (5.2%) stated 'strongly disagree'. To sum up, the students agreed that Ginger Writer provides a clear explanation regarding subject-verb agreement errors.

The ninth statement was "*Ginger Writer is effective in detecting and correcting my writing errors in the subject-verb agreement*". There were four students (20.0%) who stated agree, and more than half of the students (68.4%) stated strongly agree that Ginger Writer is effective in detecting and correcting their writing errors in subject-verb agreement. While two students (10.5%) chose to answer 'neutral', no one (0%) chose 'disagree', and no one (0%) chose 'strongly disagree' with the statement. In short, the students agreed on the effectiveness of Ginger Writer in detecting and correcting their writing errors related to subject-verb agreement.

The tenth statement was, "*I rarely make grammar mistakes, especially subject-verb agreement, after using Ginger Writer*." There were 17 students (9.4%) who strongly agreed that they rarely make grammar mistakes, especially in subject-verb agreement, after using Ginger Writer. Additionally, two students (10.5%) chose neutral, while none (0%) chose agree, disagree, or strongly disagree. To sum up, the results indicated that students rarely made grammatical mistakes, especially in subject-verb agreement, after using Ginger Writer.

The eleventh statement was "*Ginger Writer helps me to know when to use singular or plural forms in verbs*". The results showed that 2 students (63.1%) strongly agreed, and five students (26.3%) agreed that Ginger Writer can help them know when to use the singular or plural form of verbs. While only two students (10.5%) chose neutral, and no one (0%) chose to answer 'disagree' or 'strongly disagree' with the statement. To conclude, most students strongly agreed that Ginger Writer helped them recognize when to use singular or plural forms in verbs.

The results for the third section, which examines the strengths of Ginger Writer in terms of sentence

structure, are presented in Table 3.

Table 3. The Strengths of Grammarly in Terms of Sentence Structure

No.	Statement	SD	D	N	A	SA
3.	12. Ginger Writer is effective in assisting me in correcting the sentence structure in my writing.	0	0	10.5 (2)	15.8 (3)	73.6 (14)
	13. Ginger Writer provides relevant suggestions to improve my sentence structure.	0	0	10.5 (2)	21.0 (4)	68.4 (13)
	14. Ginger Writer helps me to identify sentences that are not parallel or illogical.	0	0	10.5 (2)	74.6 (14)	15.8 (3)
	15. Ginger Writer helps me provide suggestions to add certain elements to make my sentences clearer.	0	0	10.5 (2)	5.2 (1)	84.1 (16)
	16. Ginger Writer helps me to understand how to make sentences more coherent and structured.	1 (5.2)	0	10.5 (2)	5.2 (1)	79.0 (15)
	17. Ginger Writer provides frequent suggestions to correct sentences that are too long or ambiguous in my writing.	2 (10.5)	1 (5.2)	10.5 (2)	0	73.6 (14)

In this part, the students were given six statements or points to answer related to the strengths of Ginger Writer in terms of sentence structure. The twelfth statement was *"Ginger Writer is effective in assisting me to correct the sentence structure in my writing"*. The results showed that three students (15.8%) chose to answer "agree", and more than half of the students (73.6%) chose to answer "strongly agree" that using Ginger Writer made them feel effective in correcting sentence structure in their writing. Additionally, two students (15%) expressed neutrality, no one (0%) disagreed, and no one (0%) strongly disagreed with the statement. Ginger Writer is effective in helping students correct sentence structure in their writing.

The thirteenth statement was *"Ginger Writer provides relevant suggestions to improve my sentence structure"*. The results showed that 13 students (68.4%) strongly agreed with the statement, and four students (21.0%) agreed. In comparison, two students (10.5%) said 'neutral', no one (0%) said 'disagree', and no one strongly disagreed with the statement given. It can be inferred that they agree that Ginger Writer provides relevant suggestions to improve their sentence structure.

The fourteenth statement was *"Ginger Writer helps me to identify sentences that are not parallel or illogical"*. It was described that 14 students (73.6%) stated they agreed, three students (15.8%) stated they strongly agreed, and two students (10.5%) stated they were neutral about the effectiveness of Ginger Writer in helping them correct sentence structure in their writing. In comparison, no one (0%) disagreed, and no one (0%) strongly disagreed with the statement. Based on the data obtained, it was known that the students agreed with the assistance of Ginger Writer that they can identify sentences that were not parallel or illogical.

The fifteenth statement was *"Ginger Writer helps me in providing suggestions to add certain elements to make my sentences clearer"*. There were a small number of students (10.5%) who chose to answer neutral, 16 students (84.1%) chose to answer strongly agree, and one student (5.2%) chose to answer agree that by using Ginger Writer, it could provide suggestions to add certain elements to make their sentences more straightforward. While no one (0%) chose to answer 'disagree' or 'strongly disagree' with the statement. The students agree that they felt helped by Ginger Writer in providing suggestions to add certain elements that make their sentences clearer.

The sixteenth statement was *"Ginger Writer helps me to understand how to make sentences more coherent and structured"*. There were 15 students (79.0%) who strongly agreed, and only one student (5.2%) agreed that using Ginger Writer can help them understand how to make sentences more coherent and structured. Meanwhile, a small number of students (10.5%) stated that they were neutral, no one (0%) stated that they disagreed, and one student (5.2%) stated that they strongly disagreed with this statement. The result showed that the students agreed that Ginger Writer helped them to understand how to make sentences more coherent and structured.

The seventeenth statement was *"Ginger Writer provides frequent suggestions to correct sentences that are too long or ambiguous in my writing"*. It showed that 14 students (73.6%) strongly agreed, and

two students (10.5%) said they were neutral, that Ginger Writer provides frequent suggestions to correct sentences that are too long or ambiguous in their writing. Then, no one (0%) stated that they were neutral, only one (5.2%) disagreed, and two students (10.5%) strongly disagreed with this statement. It can be concluded that the students agreed that Ginger Writer could provide frequent suggestions to correct sentences that are too long or ambiguous in their writing.

The result of the percentage for the fourth section, which asks about the weakness of Ginger Writer. The results are shown in Table 4.

Table 4. The Weakness of Ginger Writer

No.	Statement	SD	D	N	A	SA
4.	18. I have to double-check when using Ginger Writer to get an optimal result in writing	12 (63.1)	4 (21.0)	15.8 (3)	0	0
	19. The premium version of Ginger Writer is expensive for me as a student at university	1 (5.2)	0	31.6 (6)	42.1 (8)	21.0 (4)
	20. I have limitations in checking word errors when using the free version of Ginger Writer	0	1 (5.2)	10.5 (2)	15.8 (3)	68.4 (13)

Three statements were given to the students regarding the weaknesses of Ginger Writer. The eighteenth statement was, *"I have to double-check when using Ginger Writer to get an optimal result in writing."* It was indicated that 12 students (63.1%) chose to answer 'strongly disagree', four students (21.0%) chose to answer 'disagree', and three students (15.8%) chose to answer 'neutral'. When using Ginger Writer, they had to double-check to get an optimal result in writing. No one (0%) chose to answer 'strongly agree' with this statement. Referring to the data, it can be concluded that the students strongly disagree about whether they had to double-check when using Ginger Writer to get optimal results in writing.

The second statement was *"The premium version of Ginger Writer is expensive for me as a student at university"*. There were four students (21.0%) who chose 'strongly agree', eight students (42.1%) answered 'agree', and six students (31.6%) stated 'neutral' with the statement. In comparison, no one (0%) stated 'disagree', and one student (5.2%) stated 'strongly disagree' if the premium version of Ginger Writer is expensive. It can be concluded that the students agreed that the premium version of Ginger Writer is too expensive for them as university students.

The third statement was, *"I have limitations in checking word errors when using the free version of Ginger Writer."* It showed that 13 students (68.4%) strongly agreed, and three students (15.8%) agreed that the free version of Ginger Writer has limitations in checking word errors. On the other hand, only two students (10.5%) chose neutral, no one (0%) chose to disagree strongly, and one student (5.2%) chose to disagree with the statement. When using the free version of Ginger Writer, there were limitations in checking word errors.

The findings of this study reveal that Ginger Writer is positively perceived by students as an effective AI-assisted writing tool, particularly in supporting writing practice, grammatical accuracy, and sentence-level development. Across the four indicators examined, the results suggest that Ginger Writer functions not only as a technical aid but also as a pedagogical scaffold that supports learners' confidence, autonomy, and engagement in the writing process.

Regarding the **use of Ginger Writer (statements 1–5)**, the high level of student acceptance indicates that the tool is widely embraced as part of students' writing practices. The absence of disagreement across all usage-related statements reflects a strong perceived usefulness and ease of integration into academic writing tasks. Students reported that Ginger Writer helps them write more efficiently, improves writing quality, increases confidence, and saves time in detecting errors. These findings align with previous studies suggesting that AI-based writing tools can create a more engaging and supportive learning environment by reducing anxiety and cognitive overload during writing (Li et al., 2015; Widiawati et al., 2023). The increase in confidence reported by students further suggests that immediate and non-judgmental feedback plays a crucial role in fostering positive writing experiences, particularly for EFL learners who often fear making grammatical mistakes. Thus, Ginger Writer appears to function as a formative learning tool that encourages frequent writing and sustained engagement.

In terms of the **strengths of Ginger Writer related to subject–verb agreement (statements 6–10)**, the findings demonstrate that the tool is particularly effective in detecting and correcting errors. Most students strongly agreed that Ginger Writer helped them identify subject–verb agreement errors that they

had previously overlooked and reduced the frequency of such errors over time. This supports existing research emphasizing the role of automated feedback in enhancing grammatical accuracy by making learners more aware of recurring mistakes (Alharthi, 2021; Fitrawati & Safitri, 2021). However, the relatively high percentage of neutral responses regarding conceptual understanding of subject–verb relationships and clarity of explanations suggests that while Ginger Writer is effective diagnostically, it may not fully support deep grammatical understanding for all learners. This finding underscores the importance of pedagogical mediation, as grammar tools are most effective when used in conjunction with explicit instruction and reflection (Ciesielkiewicz, 2015). Nevertheless, Ginger Writer’s ability to support singular–plural verb distinctions indicates its value as a practical scaffold for common ESL grammatical challenges.

Regarding the **strengths of Ginger Writer in sentence structure development (statements 12–17)**, the data reveal overwhelmingly positive perceptions. Students reported that Ginger Writer effectively assists in correcting sentence structure, providing relevant suggestions, improving clarity, enhancing coherence, and addressing issues related to sentence length and ambiguity. These results suggest that Ginger Writer supports higher-level writing concerns beyond surface grammar, aligning with process-based writing theories that emphasize revision and refinement (Flower & Hayes, 1980; Kellogg, 2008). By highlighting illogical or non-parallel constructions and offering suggestions for clearer expression, the tool appears to reduce cognitive load, allowing students to focus more on meaning-making. This supports the notion that AI-assisted feedback can serve as a cognitive aid, helping learners internalize structural patterns through repeated exposure and revision (Graham et al., 2015). Consequently, Ginger Writer contributes to the development of coherence and readability, which are critical components of effective academic writing.

Despite its strengths, the findings also reveal **weaknesses of Ginger Writer (statements 18–20)** that warrant consideration. Students’ strong disagreement with the need to double-check Ginger Writer’s suggestions indicates a high level of trust in the tool’s accuracy. While this reflects confidence, it also raises pedagogical concerns about potential overreliance and reduced critical engagement. This finding echoes Maharani’s (2022) caution that unguided use of AI tools may limit learners’ reflective thinking. Additionally, students perceived the premium version as expensive and acknowledged limitations in the free version, particularly in error-checking capabilities. These financial and functional constraints may restrict equitable access and sustained use, especially for students with limited resources. As previous studies suggest, affordability and access significantly influence students’ adoption of educational technologies (Bolton et al., 2003; Baicker et al., 2013). Therefore, while Ginger Writer is effective, its optimal use depends on institutional support and pedagogical guidance.

Overall, the discussion indicates that Ginger Writer serves as a valuable AI-assisted writing tool that enhances writing accuracy, sentence quality, and learner confidence in EFL contexts. Its strengths lie in providing immediate feedback, supporting revision, and promoting learner autonomy. However, its limitations highlight the importance of guided implementation, critical reflection, and consideration of accessibility issues. When integrated thoughtfully into writing instruction, Ginger Writer can function as a complementary tool that supports, rather than replaces, meaningful writing pedagogy.

4. CONCLUSION

This study examined college students’ perceptions of using Ginger Writer as an AI-assisted writing tool in the EFL context and found that the tool was positively received as a supportive aid throughout the writing process. The findings indicate that Ginger Writer contributes to improved grammatical accuracy, sentence structure, writing confidence, and efficiency, functioning as a formative digital scaffold that promotes learner autonomy. The primary contribution of this study lies in its focus on students’ perceptions of Ginger Writer, offering empirical insight into how AI-assisted feedback is experienced by EFL learners in higher education. Despite its strengths, the study also highlights limitations related to potential overreliance on automated feedback and issues of accessibility due to cost and feature restrictions. Therefore, Ginger Writer should be integrated into writing instruction with clear pedagogical guidance to encourage critical reflection and balanced technology use. Future research is recommended to employ mixed-method or longitudinal designs to further investigate the sustained impact of AI-assisted writing tools on learners’ writing proficiency and self-regulated learning skills.

5. ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The authors sincerely thank the 19 students of the English Language Education Study Program at

the Islamic University of Ogan Komering Ilir Kayuagung, for their voluntary participation and valuable responses. Appreciation is also extended to the lecturers of the program for their academic support during data collection, as well as to all individuals and institutions who contributed to the completion of this study.

REFERENCES

- Alharbi, W. (2023). AI in the foreign language classroom: A pedagogical overview of automated writing assistance tools. *Education Research International*, 2023, Article 4253331, 1–15. <https://doi.org/10.1155/2023/4253331>
- Alharthi, S. M. (2021). From instructed writing to free-writing: A study of EFL learners. *SAGE Open*, 11(1). <https://doi.org/10.1177/21582440211007112>
- Baicker, K., Taubman, S., Allen, H., Bernstein, M., Gruber, J., Newhouse, J., & Finkelstein, A. (2013). The Oregon experiment—Effects of Medicaid on clinical outcomes. *New England Journal of Medicine*, 368(18), 1713–1722. <https://doi.org/10.1056/NEJMSA1212321>
- Bitchener, J., & Ferris, D. R. (2012). *Written corrective feedback in second language acquisition and writing*. Routledge.
- Bolton, L. E., Warlop, L., & Alba, J. W. (2003). Consumer perceptions of price (un)fairness. *Journal of Consumer Research*, 29(4), 474–491. <https://doi.org/10.1086/346244>
- Cao, Y., Wang, J., & Li, M. (2025). Artificial intelligence–based writing assistants and their impact on EFL writing development. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 68, 100965. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jslw.2024.100965>
- Chan, C., & Hu, W. (2023). Students’ voices on generative AI: Perceptions, benefits, and challenges in higher education. *International Journal of Educational Technology in Higher Education*, 20(1), Article 43. <https://doi.org/10.1186/s41239-023-00411-8>
- Ciesielkiewicz, M. (2015). Error analysis and its relevance to teaching ESL composition. *International Journal of Linguistics*, 7(5), 119–132. <https://doi.org/10.5296/ijl.v7i5.8076>
- Creswell, J. W. (2014). *Research design: Qualitative, quantitative, and mixed methods approaches* (4th ed.). SAGE Publications.
- Creswell, J. W., & Poth, C. N. (2018). *Qualitative inquiry and research design: Choosing among five approaches* (4th ed.). SAGE.
- Dwimaulani, S., Setiawan, D., & Risviana, M. (2024). Students’ difficulties in writing English descriptive texts: A case study at a senior high school in Pontianak. *Journal of English Education Program*, 7(1), 22–33. <https://jurnal.untan.ac.id/index.php/JEEP/article/view/87825>
- Etikan, I. (2019). Sampling methods in research methodology. *International Journal of Academic Research*, 5(1), 215–217. <https://doi.org/10.6007/IJARBSS/v7-i1/2605>
- Fitrawati, F., & Safitri, D. (2021). Students’ grammatical errors in essay writing: A pedagogical grammar reflection. *International Journal of Language Education*, 5(2), 74–84. <https://doi.org/10.26858/ijole.v5i2.16128>
- Fleckenstein, J., Liebenow, L., & Meyer, J. (2023). Automated feedback and writing: A multi-level meta-analysis of effects on students’ performance. *Frontiers in Artificial Intelligence*, 6, Article 1162454. <https://doi.org/10.3389/frai.2023.1162454>
- Flower, L., & Hayes, J. R. (1980). The cognition of discovery: Defining a rhetorical problem. *College Composition and Communication*, 31(1), 21–32. <https://doi.org/10.2307/356630>
- Ginger Software Ltd. (2023). *Ginger writing assistant: Features and technology overview*. <https://www.gingersoftware.com>
- Graham, S., Harris, K. R., & Santangelo, T. (2015). Research-based writing practices and the Common Core. *The Elementary School Journal*, 115(4), 498–522. <https://doi.org/10.1086/681964>
- Hadiani, S. (2024). The use of genre-based approach to improve descriptive writing skills of Indonesian EFL learners. *Language and Language Teaching Journal*, 27(1), 55–68. <https://e-journal.usd.ac.id/index.php/LLT/article/view/1803>
- Kellogg, R. T. (2008). Training writing skills: A cognitive developmental perspective. *Journal of Writing Research*, 1(1), 1–26. <https://doi.org/10.17239/jowr-2008.01.01.1>
- Kholishatuzzahra, F. (2025). *The use of Grammarly in improving students’ ability in writing skills at UIN*

- Maulana Malik Ibrahim Malang (Undergraduate thesis). Universitas Islam Negeri Maulana Malik Ibrahim Malang.
- Li, J., Link, S., & Hegelheimer, V. (2015). Rethinking the role of automated writing evaluation (AWE) feedback in ESL writing instruction. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 27, 1–18. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jslw.2014.10.004>
- Maharani, D. A. (2022). Integrating artificial intelligence in EFL writing instruction: Teacher roles and student autonomy. *Jurnal Santiaji Pendidikan*, 12(2), 187–197. <https://ejournal.unmas.ac.id/index.php/jsp/article/view/5196>
- Nazari, N., Shabbir, M., & Setiawan, R. (2021). Application of artificial intelligence-powered digital writing assistant in higher education: A randomized controlled trial. *Heliyon*, 7(5), e07014. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.heliyon.2021.e07014>
- Novitaningrum, I. (2023). Cognitive strategies in EFL writing: Enhancing students' self-regulated learning through prewriting techniques. *Mastery: Journal of English Language Teaching and Learning*, 2(1), 11–21. <https://ejournal.stitmiftahulmidad.ac.id/index.php/mastery/article/view/61>
- Rahman, A., Apriyanti, M., & Ramadhan, R. (2024). Implementing the process approach to improve students' academic writing in an EFL context. *Attractive: Innovative Education Journal*, 6(1), 33–42. <https://attractivejournal.com/index.php/aj/article/view/1096>
- Ranalli, J., Link, S., & Chukharev-Hudilainen, E. (2017). Automated writing evaluation for formative assessment of second language writing: Investigating the accuracy and usefulness of feedback. *System*, 65, 1–14. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.system.2016.12.006>
- Sartika, D., & Nery, R. (2018). The effect of PLEASE strategy and writing interest toward students' writing skill. *Edu-Ling: Journal of English Education and Linguistics*, 2(1), 20–32.
- Sartika, D., & Rachmanita. (2017). The effect of self-regulated strategy development (SRSD) on students' writing ability at the English Department of Muhammadiyah University of Bengkulu. *Journal of English Education and Teaching (JEET)*, 1(1), 34–44. <https://doi.org/10.33369/jeet.1.1.34-44>
- Sartika, D., Fitriati, S. W., Suwandi, H., & Pratama, H. (2024). Investigating the effects of four-square writing technique on EFL students' writing performance in Indonesia. *The New Educational Review*, 76(2), 149–162. <https://doi.org/10.15804/tner.2024.76.2.11>
- Sugiyono. (2019). *Metode penelitian kuantitatif, kualitatif, dan R&D* (2nd ed.). Alfabeta.
- Supiatman, S., Nurhaliza, D., & Rahmawati, R. (2024). Technology integration and learner autonomy in EFL classrooms: Teachers' perspectives in the digital era. *Jurnal Sindoro: Journal of Educational Innovation*, 5(3), 210–222. <https://ejournal.cahayailmubangsa.institute/index.php/sindoro/article/view/4526>
- Widiawati, X., Ammade, S., & Nasrullah, N. (2023). The practice of Ginger Writer application to improve students' descriptive text. *Jurnal Pendidikan Bahasa Inggris Undiksha*, 10(3), 330–336. <https://doi.org/10.23887/jpbi.v10i3.51595>
- Wischgoll, A. (2017). Improving undergraduates' and postgraduates' academic writing skills with strategy training and feedback. *Frontiers in Education*, 2, Article 33. <https://doi.org/10.3389/feduc.2017.00033>
- Zimmerman, B. J., & Kitsantas, A. (2002). Acquiring writing revision and self-regulatory skill through observation and emulation. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, 94(4), 660–668. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-0663.94.4.660>