

مجلة العلوم الإنسانية

دورية علمية محكمة تصدر عن جامعة حائل



السنة السابعة، العدد 21
المجلد الخامس، مارس 2024

بِسْمِ اللَّهِ الرَّحْمَنِ الرَّحِيمِ



جامعة حائل

مجلة العلوم الإنسانية

دورية علمية محكمة تصدر عن جامعة حائل

للتواصل:

مركز النشر العلمي والترجمة

جامعة حائل، صندوق بريد: 2440 الرمز البريدي: 81481



<https://uohjh.com/>



j.humanities@uoh.edu.sa

نبذة عن المجلة

تعريف بالمجلة

مجلة العلوم الإنسانية، مجلة دورية علمية محكمة، تصدر عن وكالة الجامعة للدراسات العليا والبحث العلمي بجامعة حائل كل ثلاثة أشهر بصفة دورية، حيث تصدر أربعة أعداد في كل سنة، وبحسب اكتمال البحوث المجازة للنشر. وقد نجحت مجلة العلوم الإنسانية في تحقيق معايير اعتماد معامل التأثير والاستشهادات المرجعية للمجلات العلمية العربية معامل " آرسيف Arcif " المتوافقة مع المعايير العالمية، والتي يبلغ عددها (32) معياراً، وقد أطلق ذلك خلال التقرير السنوي الثامن للمجلات للعام 2023.

رؤية المجلة

التميز في النشر العلمي في العلوم الإنسانية وفقاً لمعايير مهنية عالمية.

رسالة المجلة

نشر البحوث العلمية في التخصصات الإنسانية؛ لخدمة البحث العلمي والمجتمع المحلي والدولي.

أهداف المجلة

تهدف المجلة إلى إيجاد منافذ رصينة؛ لنشر المعرفة العلمية المتخصصة في المجال الإنساني، وتمكن الباحثين -من مختلف بلدان العالم- من نشر أبحاثهم ودراساتهم وإنتاجهم الفكري لمعالجة واقع المشكلات الحياتية، وتأسيس الأطر النظرية والتطبيقية للمعارف الإنسانية في المجالات المتنوعة، وفق ضوابط وشروط ومواصفات علمية دقيقة، تحقيقاً للجودة والريادة في نر البحث العلمي.

قواعد النشر

لغة النشر

- 1- تقبل المجلة البحوث المكتوبة باللغتين العربية والإنجليزية.
- 2- يكتب عنوان البحث وملخصه باللغة العربية للبحوث المكتوبة باللغة الإنجليزية.
- 3- يكتب عنوان البحث وملخصه ومراجعته باللغة الإنجليزية للبحوث المكتوبة باللغة العربية، على أن تكون ترجمة الملخص إلى اللغة الإنجليزية صحيحة ومتخصصة.

مجالات النشر في المجلة

تتم مجلة العلوم الإنسانية بجامعة حائل بنشر إسهامات الباحثين في مختلف القضايا الإنسانية الاجتماعية والأدبية، إضافة إلى نشر الدراسات والمقالات التي تتوفر فيها الأصول والمعايير العلمية المتعارف عليها دولياً، وتقبل الأبحاث المكتوبة باللغة العربية والإنجليزية في مجال اختصاصها، حيث تعنى المجلة بالتخصصات الآتية:

- علم النفس وعلم الاجتماع والخدمة الاجتماعية والفلسفة الفكرية العلمية الدقيقة.
- المناهج وطرق التدريس والعلوم التربوية المختلفة.
- الدراسات الإسلامية والشريعة والقانون.
- الآداب: التاريخ والجغرافيا والفنون واللغة العربية، واللغة الإنجليزية، والسياحة والآثار.
- الإدارة والإعلام والاتصال وعلوم الرياضة والحركة.

أوعية نشر المجلة

تصدر المجلة ورقياً حسب القواعد والأنظمة المعمول بها في المجالات العلمية المحكمة، كما تنشر البحوث المقبولة بعد تحكيمها إلكترونياً لتعم المعرفة العلمية بشكل أوسع في جميع المؤسسات العلمية داخل المملكة العربية السعودية وخارجها.

ضوابط وإجراءات النشر في مجلة العلوم الإنسانية

أولاً: شروط النشر

1. أن يتسم بالأصالة والجدة والابتكار والإضافة المعرفية في التخصص.
2. لم يسبق للباحث نشر بحثه.
3. ألا يكون مستلماً من رسالة علمية (ماجستير / دكتوراه) أو بحوث سبق نشرها للباحث.
4. أن يلتزم الباحث بالأمانة العلمية.
5. أن تراعى فيه منهجية البحث العلمي وقواعده.
6. عدم مخالفة البحث للضوابط والأحكام والآداب العامة في المملكة العربية السعودية.
7. مراعاة الأمانة العلمية وضوابط التوثيق في النقل والاقتباس.
8. السلامة اللغوية ووضوح الصور والرسومات والجداول إن وجدت، وللمجلة حقها في مراجعة التحرير والتدقيق النحوي.

ثانياً: قواعد النشر

1. أن يشتمل البحث على: صفحة عنوان البحث، ومستخلص باللغتين العربية والإنجليزية، ومقدمة، وصلب البحث، وخاتمة تتضمن النتائج والتوصيات، وثبت المصادر والمراجع باللغتين العربية والإنجليزية، والملاحق اللازمة (إن وجدت).
2. في حال (نشر البحث) يزود الباحث بنسخة إلكترونية من عدد المجلة الذي تم نشر بحثه فيه، ومستلاً لبحثه .
3. في حال اعتماد نشر البحث تؤول حقوق نشره كافة للمجلة، ولها أن تعيد نشره ورقياً أو إلكترونياً، ويحق لها إدراجه في قواعد البيانات المحلية والعالمية - بمقابل أو بدون مقابل- وذلك دون حاجة لإذن الباحث.
4. لا يحق للباحث إعادة نشر بحثه المقبول للنشر في المجلة إلا بعد إذن كتابي من رئيس هيئة تحرير المجلة.
5. الآراء الواردة في البحوث المنشورة تعبر عن وجهة نظر الباحثين، ولا تعبر عن رأي مجلة العلوم الإنسانية.
6. النشر في المجلة يتطلب رسوماً مالية قدرها (1000 ريال) يتم إيداعها في حساب المجلة، وذلك بعد إشعار الباحث بالقبول الأولي وهي غير مستردة سواء أجاز البحث للنشر أم تم رفضه من قبل المحكمين.

ثالثاً: الضوابط والمعايير الفنية لكتابة وتنظيم البحث

1. ألا تتجاوز نسبة الاقتباس في البحوث (25%).
2. الصفحة الأولى من البحث، تحتوي على عنوان البحث، اسم الباحث أو الباحثين، المؤسسة التي ينتسب إليها- جهة العمل، عنوان المراسلة والبريد الإلكتروني، وتكون باللغتين العربية والإنجليزية على صفحة مستقلة في بداية البحث. الإعلان عن أي دعم مالي للبحث- إن وجد. كما يقوم بكتابة رقم الهوية المفتوحة للباحث ORCID بعد الاسم مباشرة. علماً بأن مجلة العلوم الإنسانية تنصح جميع الباحثين باستخراج رقم هوية خاص بهم، كما تتطلب وجود هذا الرقم في حال إجازة البحث للنشر.
3. ألا يرد اسم الباحث (الباحثين) في أي موضع من البحث إلا في صفحة العنوان فقط..
4. ألا تزيد عدد صفحات البحث عن ثلاثين صفحة أو (12.000) كلمة للبحث كاملاً أيهما أقل بما في ذلك الملخصان العربي والإنجليزي، وقائمة المراجع.
5. أن يتضمن البحث مستخلصين: أحدهما باللغة العربية لا يتجاوز عدد كلماته (200) كلمة، والآخر بالإنجليزية لا يتجاوز عدد كلماته (250) كلمة، ويتضمن العناصر التالية: (موضوع البحث، وأهدافه، ومنهجه، وأهم النتائج) مع العناية بتحريرها بشكل دقيق.
6. يتبع كل مستخلص (عربي/إنجليزي) بالكلمات الدالة (المفتاحية) (Key Words) المعبرة بدقة عن موضوع البحث، والقضايا الرئيسية التي تناولها، بحيث لا يتجاوز عددها (5) كلمات.
7. تكون أبعاد جميع هوامش الصفحة: من الجهات الأربعة (3) سم، والمسافة بين الأسطر مفردة.
8. يكون نوع الخط في المتن باللغة العربية (Traditional Arabic) وبحجم (12)، وباللغة الإنجليزية (Times New Roman) وبحجم (10)، وتكون العناوين الرئيسية في اللغتين بالبنط العريض. (Bold).

9. يكون نوع الخط في الجدول باللغة العربية (Traditional Arabic) وبمجم (10)، وباللغة الإنجليزية (Times New Roman) وبمجم (9)، وتكون العناوين الرئيسية في اللغتين بالبنط العريض. (Bold).

10. يلتزم الباحث برومنة المراجع العربية (الأبحاث العلمية والرسائل الجامعية) ويقصد بها ترجمة المراجع العربية (الأبحاث والرسائل العلمية فقط) إلى اللغة الإنجليزية، وتضمنها في قائمة المراجع الإنجليزية (مع الإبقاء عليها باللغة العربية في قائمة المراجع العربية)، حيث يتم رومنة (Romanization / Transliteration) اسم، أو أسماء المؤلفين، متبوعة بسنة النشر بين قوسين (يقصد بالرومنة النقل الصوتي للحروف غير اللاتينية إلى حروف لاتينية، تمكن قراءة اللغة الإنجليزية من قراءتها، أي: تحويل منطوق الحروف العربية إلى حروف تنطق بالإنجليزية)، ثم يتبع بالعنوان، ثم تضاف كلمة (in Arabic) بين قوسين بعد عنوان الرسالة أو البحث. بعد ذلك يتبع باسم الدورية التي نشرت بها المقالة باللغة الإنجليزية إذا كان مكتوباً بها، وإذا لم يكن مكتوباً بها فيتم ترجمته إلى اللغة الإنجليزية.

مثال إيضاحي:

الشمري، علي بن عيسى. (2020). فاعلية برنامج إلكتروني قائم على نموذج كيلر (ARCS) في تنمية الدافعية نحو مادة لغتي لدى تلاميذ الصف السادس الابتدائي. مجلة العلوم الإنسانية، جامعة حائل، 1(6)، 87-98.

Al-Shammari, Ali bin Issa. (2020). The effectiveness of an electronic program based on the Keeler Model (ARCS) in developing the motivation towards my language subject among sixth graders. (in Arabic). *Journal of Human Sciences, University of Hail*.1(6), 98-87

السميري، ياسر. (2021). مستوى إدراك معلمي المرحلة الابتدائية للإستراتيجيات التعليمية الحديثة التي تلي احتياجات التلاميذ الموهوبين من ذوي صعوبات التعلم. المجلة السعودية للتربية الخاصة، 18(1): 19-48.

Al-Samiri, Y. (2021). The level of awareness of primary school teachers of modern educational strategies that meet the needs of gifted students with learning disabilities. (in Arabic). *The Saudi Journal of Special Education*, 18 (1): 19-48.

11. يلي قائمة المراجع العربية، قائمة بالمراجع الإنجليزية، متضمنة المراجع العربية التي تم رومنتها، وفق ترتيبها الهجائي (باللغة الإنجليزية) حسب الاسم الأخير للمؤلف الأول، وفقاً لأسلوب التوثيق المعتمد في الجملة.

12. تستخدم الأرقام العربية أينما ذكرت بصورتها الرقمية. (Arabic... 1,2,3) سواء في متن البحث، أو الجداول و الأشكال، أو المراجع، وترقم الجداول و الأشكال في المتن ترقياً متسلسلاً مستقلاً لكل منهما، ويكون لكل منها عنوانه أعلاه، ومصدره - إن وجد - أسفله.

13. يكون التقييم لصفحات البحث في المنتصف أسفل الصفحة، ابتداءً من صفحة ملخص البحث (العربي، الإنجليزي)، وحتى آخر صفحة من صفحات مراجع البحث.

14. تدرج الجداول والأشكال - إن وجدت - في مواقعها في سياق النص، وترقم بحسب تسلسلها، وتكون غير ملونة أو مظلمة، وتكتب عناوينها كاملة. ويجب أن تكون الجداول والأشكال والأرقام وعناوينها متوافقة مع نظام-APA

رابعاً: توثيق البحث

أسلوب التوثيق المعتمد في المجلة هو نظام جمعية علم النفس الأمريكية (APA7)

خامساً: خطوات وإجراءات التقديم

1. يقدم الباحث الرئيس طلباً للنشر (من خلال منصة الباحثين بعد التسجيل فيها) يتعهد فيه بأن بحثه يتفق مع شروط المجلة، وذلك على النحو الآتي:
أ. البحث الذي تقدمت به لم يسبق نشره (ورقياً أو إلكترونياً)، وأنه غير مقدم للنشر، ولن يقدم للنشر في جهة أخرى حتى تنتهي إجراءات تحكيمه، ونشره في المجلة، أو الاعتذار للباحث لعدم قبول البحث.
ب. البحث الذي تقدمت به ليس مستلاً من بحوث أو كتب سبق نشرها أو قدمت للنشر، وليس مستلاً من الرسائل العلمية للماجستير أو الدكتوراه.
ج. الالتزام بالأمانة العلمية وأخلاقيات البحث العلمي.
د. مراعاة منهج البحث العلمي وقواعده.
هـ. الالتزام بالضوابط الفنية ومعايير كتابة البحث في مجلة حائل للعلوم الإنسانية كما هو في دليل الكتابة العلمية المختصر بنظام APA7
2. إرفاق سيرة ذاتية مختصرة في صفحة واحدة حسب النموذج المعتمد للمجلة (نموذج السيرة الذاتية).
3. إرفاق نموذج المراجعة والتدقيق الأولي بعد تعبئته من قبل الباحث.
4. يرسل الباحث أربع نسخ من بحثه إلى المجلة إلكترونياً بصيغة (word) نسختين و (PDF) نسختين تكون إحداها بالصيغتين خالية مما يدل على شخصية الباحث.
5. يتم التقديم إلكترونياً من خلال منصة تقديم الطلب الموجودة على موقع المجلة (منصة الباحثين) بعد التسجيل فيها مع إرفاق كافة المرفقات الواردة في خطوات وإجراءات التقديم أعلاه.
6. تقوم هيئة تحرير المجلة بالفحص الأولي للبحث، وتقرير أهليته للتحكيم، أو الاعتذار عن قبوله أولاً أو بناء على تقارير المحكمين دون إبداء الأسباب وإخطار الباحث بذلك
7. تملك المجلة حق رفض البحث الأولي ما دام غير مكتمل أو غير ملتزم بالضوابط الفنية ومعايير كتابة البحث في مجلة حائل للعلوم الإنسانية.
8. في حال تقرر أهلية البحث للتحكيم يخطر الباحث بذلك، وعليه دفع الرسوم المالية المقررة للمجلة (1000 ريال غير مستردة) من خلال الإيداع على حساب المجلة ورفع الإيصال من خلال منصة التقديم المتاحة على موقع المجلة، وذلك

- خلال مدة خمسة أيام عمل منذ إخطار الباحث بقبول بحثه أولياً وفي حالة عدم السداد خلال المدة المذكورة يعتبر القبول الأولي ملغياً.
9. بعد دفع الرسوم المطلوبة من قبل الباحث خلال المدة المقررة للدفع، ورفع سند الإيصال من خلال منصة التقديم، يرسل البحث لمحكمين اثنين؛ على الأقل.
10. في حال اكتمال تقارير المحكمين عن البحث؛ يتم إرسال خطاب للباحث يتضمن إحدى الحالات التالية:
- أ. قبول البحث للنشر مباشرة.
 - ب. قبول البحث للنشر؛ بعد التعديل.
 - ج. تعديل البحث، ثم إعادة تحكيمه.
 - د. الاعتذار عن قبول البحث ونشره.
11. إذا تطلب الأمر من الباحث القيام ببعض التعديلات على بحثه، فإنه يجب أن يتم ذلك في غضون (أسبوعين من تاريخ الخطاب) من الطلب. فإذا تأخر الباحث عن إجراء التعديلات خلال المدة المحددة، يعتبر ذلك عدولاً منه عن النشر، ما لم يقدم عذراً تقبله هيئة تحرير المجلة.
12. يقدم الباحث الرئيس (حسب نموذج الرد على المحكمين) تقرير عن تعديل البحث وفقاً للملاحظات الواردة في تقارير المحكمين الإجمالية أو التفصيلية في متن البحث
13. للمجلة الحق في الحذف أو التعديل في الصياغة اللغوية للدراسة بما يتفق مع قواعد النشر، كما يحق للمحررين إجراء بعض التعديلات من أجل التصحيح اللغوي والفني. وإلغاء التكرار، وإيضاح ما يلزم.
14. في حالة رفض البحث من قبل المحكمين فإن الرسوم غير مستردة.
15. إذا رفض البحث، ورغب المؤلف في الحصول على ملاحظات المحكمين، فإنه يمكن تزويده بهم، مع الحفاظ على سرية المحكمين. ولا يحق للباحث التقدم من جديد بالبحث نفسه إلى المجلة ولو أجريت عليه جميع التعديلات المطلوبة.
16. لا ترد البحوث المقدمة إلى أصحابها سواء نشرت أم لم تنشر، ويخطر المؤلف في حالة عدم الموافقة على النشر.
17. ترسل المجلة للباحث المقبول بحثه نسخة معتمدة للطباعة للمراجعة والتدقيق، وعليه إنجاز هذه العملية خلال 36 ساعة.
18. لهيئة تحرير المجلة الحق في تحديد أولويات نشر البحوث، وترتيبها فنياً.

المشرف العام

سعادة وكيل الجامعة للدراسات العليا والبحث العلمي

أ. د. عبد العزيز بن سالم الغامدي

هيئة التحرير

رئيس هيئة التحرير

أ. د. بشير بن علي اللويش

أستاذ الخدمة الاجتماعية

أعضاء هيئة التحرير

أ. د. وافي بن فهد الشمري

أستاذ اللغويات (الإنجليزية) المشارك

أ. د. ياسر بن عايد السميري

أستاذ التربية الخاصة المشارك

أ. د. نوف بنت عبدالله السويداء

أستاذ تقنيات تعليم التصميم والفنون المشارك

أ. د. محمد بن ناصر اللحيدان

سكرتير التحرير

أ. د. سالم بن عبيد المطيري

أستاذ الفقه

أ. د. منى بنت سليمان الذبياني

أستاذ الإدارة التربوية

أ. د. نواف بن عوض الرشيد

أستاذ تعليم الرياضيات المشارك

أ. د. إبراهيم بن سعيد الشمري

أستاذ النحو والصرف المشارك

الهيئة الاستشارية

أ.د فهد بن سليمان الشايح

جامعة الملك سعود - مناهج وطرق تدريس

Dr. Nasser Mansour

University of Exeter. UK – Education

أ.د محمد بن مترك القحطاني

جامعة الإمام محمد بن سعود الإسلامية - علم النفس

أ.د علي مهدي كاظم

جامعة السلطان قابوس بسلطنة عمان - قياس وتقويم

أ.د ناصر بن سعد العجمي

جامعة الملك سعود - التقييم والتشخيص السلوكي

أ.د حمود بن فهد القشعان

جامعة الكويت - الخدمة الاجتماعية

Prof. Medhat H. Rahim

Lakehead University - CANADA

Faculty of Education

أ.د رقية طه جابر العلواني

جامعة البحرين - الدراسات الإسلامية

أ.د سعيد يقطين

جامعة محمد الخامس - سرديات اللغة العربية

Prof. François Villeneuve

University of Paris 1 Panthéon Sorbonne

Professor of archaeology

أ. د سعد بن عبد الرحمن البازعي

جامعة الملك سعود - الأدب الإنجليزي

أ.د محمد شحات الخطيب

جامعة طيبة - فلسفة التربية

فهرس الأبحاث

رقم الصفحة	عنوان البحث	م
32 – 13	أثر إستراتيجية التدوير في تنمية مهارات تمييز الصنف اللغوي والتحليل الإعرابي لدى طلاب الصف الثالث المتوسط د. عبد العزيز بن محمد بن مانع الشمري	1
50 – 35	الأزواجية في الدراسات النسائية في اللغة العربية د. إيمان بنت عبد الله الشوشان	2
66 – 52	التزكية المعاصرة للشهود، دراسة فقهية د. عبد الرحمن بن علي الدجيلج	3
80 – 69	الصور التعبيرية (Emojis) من منظور علم اللغة القضاي د. بندر بن سبيل الشمري	4
94 – 83	الزمنية وتجليات الذات: قراءة في شعر البردوني د. محمد بن مشخص المطيري	5
119 – 97	المعالجات التشكيلية للنباتات الطبيعية بمادة الراتنج لإنتاج حلي معاصرة د. شذا بنت براهيم الاصحه أ. ندى بنت إبراهيم السيد الهاشم	6
136 – 121	تأثير الفصول الافتراضية في تدريس الحاسب الآلي والمعلومات في ضوء النظرية الموحدة لقبول واستخدام التكنولوجيا د. خالد بن عبد المحسن فالج الشمري	7
158 – 139	تقييم المستوى الكتابي لدى الطلاب الصم في مرحلتي الابتدائي والمتوسط في المملكة العربية السعودية ومقارنته بمستوى أقرانهم السامعين د. أحمد بن سعيد الشبرمي	8
178 – 161	فاعلية برنامج إثرائي لتنمية التفكير الابتكاري لدى الطلاب الموهوبين بمدارس المرحلة المتوسطة بمدينة جدة د. أحمد سعد الغامدي	9
199 – 181	مساهمة الاستشعار عن بعد في دراسة أثر تطور شبكة الطرق على تشكل الجزر الحرارية في مدينة عنيزة د. هيفاء علي الحشيبان	10
220 – 201	المناصب القيادية للمرأة السعودية في ضوء التشريعات الحفوقية: دراسة تحليلية لواقع القيادات النسائية في المجتمع السعودي. أ. ونام محمد عارف	11
240 – 222	The Effectiveness of Grammarly App on Developing Some Grammar Rules for Middle School Students د. أيمن عبد العزيز حسن فرحات	12
253 – 243	The Level of Job Satisfaction of English Language Teachers in Kuwaiti Public Schools: A Case Study Measuring Job Satisfaction and Stressy د. عباس بن هبر الشمري د. أحمد علي صهيوني	13

The Effectiveness of Grammarly App on Developing Some Grammar Rules for Middle School Students

فاعلية تطبيق جرامرلي على تنمية بعض قواعد اللغة الإنجليزية لدى تلاميذ المرحلة المتوسطة

Dr. Ayman Abd El Aziz Hassan Farahat

Assistant Professor of Applied Linguistic, English Department, College of Languages and Translation Imam Muhammad bin Saud Islamic University
ORCID: 0009-0008-7668-8813

د. أيمن عبد العزيز حسن فرحات

أستاذ اللغويات التطبيقي المساعد، قسم اللغة الإنجليزية، كلية اللغات والترجمة،
جامعة الإمام محمد بن سعود الإسلامية

(قدم للنشر 03/ 03/ 2024، وقبل في 14/ 03/ 2024)

Abstract

This study aimed to evaluate the effect of using the Grammarly app on English grammar skills for middle school students. 63 students were divided into two groups: an experimental group that received grammar instruction through the Grammarly app, and a control group that received traditional grammar instruction. The study lasted for 12 weeks, and the research tools included an English grammar test, a grammar skills scale, and a Grammarly awareness scale. The results showed that the experimental group that used the Grammarly app achieved significantly higher scores on the English grammar test and the grammar skills scale compared to the control group that received traditional grammar instruction. The results also showed that the experimental group had a more positive evaluation of the Grammarly app and considered it a useful tool for learning English grammar. The results of the study indicate that using the Grammarly app can be an effective tool for teaching English grammar and improving language skills for middle school students. This may be due to the app's ability to provide interactive and engaging grammar instruction, as well as providing opportunities for practice and self-assessment. Overall, the study suggests that the Grammarly app can be a useful tool for teaching English grammar and improving language skills for middle school students.

Keywords: Grammarly, grammar rules, scale, perception, test.

المستخلص

هدفت هذه الدراسة إلى تقييم تأثير استخدام تطبيق جرامرلي على مهارات قواعد اللغة الإنجليزية لدى طلاب المرحلة المتوسطة. تم تقسيم 63 طالبًا إلى مجموعتين: مجموعة تجريبية تلقت تعليم قواعد اللغة من خلال تطبيق جرامرلي، ومجموعة ضابطة تلقت تعليمًا تقليديًا لقواعد اللغة. استمرت الدراسة لمدة 12 أسبوعًا، وشملت أدوات البحث اختبار قواعد اللغة الإنجليزية، ومقياس مهارات قواعد اللغة، ومقياس إدراك جرامرلي. أظهرت النتائج أن المجموعة التجريبية التي استخدمت تطبيق جرامرلي حققت درجات أعلى بشكل ملحوظ في اختبار قواعد اللغة الإنجليزية ومقياس مهارات اللغة مقارنة بالمجموعة الضابطة التي تلقت تعليمًا تقليديًا لقواعد اللغة. كما أظهرت النتائج أن المجموعة التجريبية كانت أكثر إيجابية في تقييمها لتطبيق جرامرلي واعتبرته أداة مفيدة في تعلم قواعد اللغة الإنجليزية. تشير نتائج الدراسة إلى أن استخدام تطبيق جرامرلي قد يكون أداة مساعدة فعالة في تعليم قواعد اللغة الإنجليزية وتحسين مهارات اللغة لدى طلاب المرحلة المتوسطة. قد يكون ذلك بسبب قدرة التطبيق على توفير تعليم تفاعلي وتمتع لقواعد اللغة، بالإضافة إلى إتاحة فرص للممارسة والتقييم الذاتي. بشكل عام، تشير الدراسة إلى أن تطبيق جرامرلي قد يكون أداة مفيدة لتعليم قواعد اللغة الإنجليزية وتحسين مهارات اللغة لدى طلاب المرحلة المتوسطة.

الكلمات المفتاحية: جرامرلي، قواعد اللغة، إدراك، مقياس، اختبار.

Introduction:

In our rapidly evolving world, English has solidified its position as the global language, permeating the realms of business, science, technology, and entertainment (Patel, 2023). This dominance opens doors to exciting opportunities for non-native speakers, paving the way for better job prospects, as highlighted by Kings Education (2023). Building on this point, effective communication plays a crucial role in professional success. Beyond simply conveying information, clear and grammatically correct language allows us to network effectively, understand instructions precisely, and express ourselves with confidence. A recent study by Qiz (2023) found that grammar is a crucial part of any language. Grammar serves a foundational role in language acquisition, providing a framework for clear and comprehensible communication. As Ataboyev and Ruštamov (2023) point out, mastering grammar principles equips learners with the necessary tools to navigate the complexities of a language. However, the very challenges teachers face in explaining grammar effectively (Kumayas & Lengkoan, 2023) can contribute to its neglect in language learning, often leading to prioritization of other skills.

To address this issue, some propose integrating explicit grammar instruction with reading and writing activities (Smith & Johnson, 2023). This aligns with integrating grammar with reading and writing activities as an example of active learning, which is a more effective approach to language learning. It also aligns with the shift towards active student participation emphasized by Silva et al. (2022). By engaging in these activities, students become more engaged with the language, which helps them understand grammar better and apply it more accurately. Recognizing that students learn differently, teachers are changing their role to be more like helpers and coaches, instead of just talking at the front of the class (Yussif, 2022). Technology and cool digital tools are key in making this change happen, because they offer lots of fun and interactive ways to learn (Sheetrit, 2022).

This means students can explore ideas on their own time, which helps them understand things better and get more involved in their learning. Njeru, (2022) stated that mastering English grammar presents a unique challenge for non-native speakers, with its complex tenses, specific rules for article usage, and strict subject-verb agreement requirements. However, through persistent practice and a dedicated approach, these

challenges can be overcome, leading to increased fluency and accuracy in English communication. The researcher's keen observation of the challenges faced by English language learners, especially in terms of poor grammar skills and aversion to traditional feedback methods, sheds light on the need for innovative approaches in language education. It is evident that the fear of criticism and failure, combined with the psychological impact of overcorrection, can hinder the learning process. In an effort to address these issues, the researcher introduces Grammarly software as a modern and creative solution. This tool not only checks grammar exercises but also provides immediate feedback on various aspects, including spelling, subject-verb agreements, tense errors, and punctuation. The inclusion of multiple options for correction empowers students to actively participate in the learning process by making decisions about the correctness of their work.

Furthermore, the researcher emphasizes the desire to create a positive and supportive learning environment where every student feels valued and receives special attention and care. This approach aligns with the understanding that fostering a sense of individual importance can significantly contribute to a student's motivation and engagement. In addition, the researcher's acknowledgment that there is no existing study examining the application of Grammarly software for developing grammar rules among middle school students in Saudi Arabia adds a valuable dimension to the study. This research stands out for its originality within the field, while also highlighting the potential importance of its findings for the targeted learners. Overall, the researcher's innovative approach, coupled with the introduction of Grammarly software, not only addresses the identified challenges but also adds a unique and forward-thinking perspective to the study of grammar education.

Pilot study:

Objective:

The pilot study aimed to diagnose grammar weaknesses among second-grade middle school students, evaluate their perceptions of applying Grammarly, and refine study tools.

Methodology:

Adopted a quasi-descriptive methodology, collecting data through the researcher-designed English Grammar Test, English Language Skills Scale, and Grammarly Application Perception Scale.

Pilot study sample:

Selected 52 students randomly for the English Grammar Test, English Language Skills Scale and Grammarly Application Perception Scale.

The researcher developed all assessment instruments, including an English grammar test, an English language skills scale, and a Grammarly application perception scale.

The results confirmed the existence of the identified problem and verified the validity and reliability of the research instruments.

Statement of the problem:

The problem addressed in this study revolves around the challenges faced by second-year students in King Saud Middle School in Riyadh, particularly in the domain of grammar skills. The researcher has observed that English language learners encounter difficulties in comprehending and applying grammar rules, as evidenced by the results of a pilot study conducted on 52 students. The statistical analysis of a grammar test revealed that only a limited number of students demonstrated a satisfactory understanding of the subject matter.

Furthermore, the pilot study introduced additional tools, including a scale assessing students' ability to handle various grammar rules and an evaluation of their familiarity with the Grammarly app. The outcomes of these assessments have provided insights into the students' struggles with grammar-related concepts and their lack of awareness regarding modern language learning tools like Grammarly.

The identified issues are not solely restricted to academic performance but extend to the emotional and psychological aspects of learning. Students have exhibited aversion to criticism, fear of failure, and psychological distress when faced with corrections, reflecting the need for a more supportive and innovative approach to grammar education.

In summary, the statement of the problem encapsulates the inadequate grasp of grammar rules among second-year students, encompassing both the academic and emotional dimensions of their learning experience. Addressing these challenges is crucial for enhancing the overall language learning process and fostering a positive and effective educational environment.

The current research seeks to address the following questions:

1. To what extent does the Grammarly app enhance the students' grammar rules achievement for second-year middle school students?
2. To what extent does the Grammarly app enhance students' grammar rule awareness for second-year middle school students?
3. To what extent does the use of the Grammarly app influence students' perceptions of the Grammarly app?

Hypotheses of the Study

The study investigates the following hypotheses:

1. There is no statistically significant difference ($\alpha = 0.05$) between the mean scores of the experimental and control groups on the post-application English grammar test.
2. There is no statistically significant difference ($\alpha = 0.05$) between the mean scores of the experimental and control groups on the post-application grammar rules scale.
3. There is no statistically significant difference ($\alpha = 0.05$) between the mean scores of the experimental and control groups on the post-application Grammarly app perception scale.

The purpose of the study:

The study aims to explore how the use of Grammarly app influences the performance of English as a Foreign Language (EFL) learners in terms of grammar rules, including assessing improvements in grammatical accuracy, understanding, and application of grammar principles. Additionally, the research seeks to investigate the learners' perceptions of the Grammarly app, encompassing their attitudes, opinions, and subjective experiences with the app. This dual investigation aims to provide insights into the app's usability, effectiveness, and overall user satisfaction.

The importance of the study:

1. The Grammarly may support middle school students in improving grammar skills with real-time feedback.
2. The Grammarly's explanations may contribute to raise students' awareness and under-

standing of grammar rules.

3. The Grammarly's explanations may help students understand grammar rules better.
4. The Grammarly may facilitates studying grammar.

Limitations of the Study:

1. This study is limited to second-grade students in middle schools within the Kingdom of Saudi Arabia
2. The study will span a 12-week period.
3. Grammar Lessons in the Students' Textbook and Student Workbook: Units 1 to 4

EFL students: the eleventh female grade students who learn English as a foreign language.

Definitions of Terms”

The following terms have the designated meanings whenever they are used in the study:

Grammar is “ In linguistics, the grammar of a natural language is its set of structural rules on speakers' or writers' usage and creation of clauses, phrases, and words.” (From Wikipedia, the free encyclopedia P.1, 2024)

The operational definition is Grammar is a set of rules that non-native speakers should follow to produce meaningful messages accurately

Grammarly app

Grammarly is “a Ukraine-founded[4][5][6] cloud-based[7] typing assistant[8][9] It reviews spelling, grammar, punctuation, clarity, engagement, and delivery mistakes in English texts, detects plagiarism, and suggests replacements for the identified errors.[10] It also allows users to customize their style, tone, and context-specific language” (From Wikipedia, the free encyclopedia P.1, 2024 }

The operational definition is Grammarly, an AI teacher, uses red pen feedback for errors, praising good writing with a black pen

Perception “ is the process of attaining awareness or understanding of sensory information. It can also be explained as how a person feels towards something.” From Wikipedia, the free encyclopedia P.1 2024)

The operational definition of perception is the ability to evaluate the effectiveness of using

Grammarly application after its utilization to enhance some grammar skills among second year middle school students.

2. Related studies:

In line with Fitriana and Nurazni's (2022) exploration of students' views on Grammarly, the current research also delves into the advantages and disadvantages of the software. Fitriana and Nurazni's (2022) findings, derived from a descriptive qualitative approach and a questionnaire involving 30 students, reveal a predominantly positive opinion towards Grammarly. The observed benefits include improved grammar, enhanced vocabulary, and increased writing confidence. However, limitations such as mis-correction, restricted features in the free version, and dependence on internet connectivity were identified. Building upon the insights provided by Fitriana and Nurazni (2022), the current study takes a step further to investigate the impact of Grammarly on students' grammar abilities and their overall attitudes toward learning English. By incorporating their perspectives, particularly regarding the frequency of Grammarly use, the present research aims to contribute to a more comprehensive understanding of how students' consistent utilization of Grammarly shapes their perceptions and influences their language learning experiences

Wu et al. (2023) conducted a critical evaluation of ChatGPT's grammatical error correction capabilities compared to Grammarly and GECToR. Using the CoNLL2014 dataset, they applied both automatic and human evaluation metrics, finding that ChatGPT underperforms in automatic metrics, especially for longer sentences. Despite this, ChatGPT's unique approach, involving not only one-by-one corrections but also modifications to surface expressions and sentence structures while maintaining grammatical correctness, suggests promise as a grammatical error correction tool. The study highlights distinct strengths and weaknesses between ChatGPT and Grammarly, with ChatGPT being more flexible but prone to over-correction, while Grammarly is more conservative but may lean towards under-correction or mis-correction. Building on these insights, the current study uses Grammarly to assess its impact on students' grammar skills. Informed by the comparative analysis Wu et al., the research explores how Grammarly, with its unique attributes, contributes to enhancing or potentially challenging students' grammar abilities.

Building on Miranty and Widiati's (2021) investigation of the use of Grammarly among Indonesian undergraduate English students, where 100 participants were divided into three groups based on academic year, the current study aims to further explore the impact of Grammarly on language learning experiences. Employing a questionnaire and interview guide, Miranty and Widiati (2021) found that students appreciated Grammarly's instant and comprehensive feedback. However, the present research seeks to delve deeper into how varying frequencies of Grammarly use may shape students' perspectives on the tool's overall helpfulness and drawbacks, particularly in terms of the effectiveness of its feedback mechanisms.

Javier et al. (2022) explore the benefits of integrating Grammarly into language learning and academic writing. The study, however, lacks empirical evidence or statistical data to substantiate the claims about the tool's effectiveness in educational settings. Without testimonials or case studies from students and teachers who have utilized Grammarly, measuring its impact on academic writing quality proves challenging. Building on these limitations, the current research endeavors to investigate the actual impact of Grammarly on developing some grammar skills aiming to provide empirical evidence and insights based on the experiences of students.

Dizon, et al. (2021) explored the effects of Grammarly, a writing assistant, on the writing quality of Japanese L2 English students. Through a comparative analysis of students' writing with and without Grammarly, the study identified that the tool played a constructive role in diminishing grammatical errors and enhancing lexical variation. The findings propose that Grammarly holds potential as a beneficial resource for novice L2 writers who may encounter challenges in achieving effective writing skills. Building on these insights, the present research seeks to further investigate the nuanced impact of Grammarly on learning some grammar skills, aiming to provide a more comprehensive understanding of its benefits and potential limitations in educational settings.

In their 2020 study, Lee and Rakushin explored Grammarly's impact on second language writing among Korean EFL learners across various genres. The findings indicated its benefits in delivering quick feedback and increasing error awareness. However, the study emphasized the need for a balanced approach, cautioning against

solely relying on Grammarly and highlighting potential limitations, such as overlooking certain errors and lacking detailed explanations. Building on these insights, the current research aims to delve deeper into Grammarly's role in specific aspects of language learning, offering a nuanced understanding of its contributions and potential drawbacks in educational settings.

Lazic et al. (2020) investigated how 37 second-year Japanese university students perceive the paid version of Grammarly, especially in tasks like paraphrasing and summarizing. Most students had a positive view of Grammarly, particularly for paraphrasing. However, they raised concerns about the tool's reliability and the quality of its suggestions. Connecting this study with the present one, their insights provide a foundation for understanding student perspectives on Grammarly, offering valuable considerations for the current study's exploration of students' attitudes.

John and Woll (2018) assessed the efficacy of Grammarly, Virtual Writing Tutor, and Microsoft Word's grammar checking for ESL learners. Their study, using real ESL compositions and simple sentences, gauged coverage, accuracy, and precision of these grammar checkers. The findings revealed that Grammarly and Virtual Writing Tutor outperformed Microsoft Word, but none could detect over half of the errors. Relating this to the current study, it serves as a benchmark, offering insights into the capabilities and limitations of Grammarly in comparison to other grammar checkers, enriching the current research's understanding of Grammarly's role in correcting errors for non-native learners.

Lei (2020) evaluated Grammarly Premium's effectiveness as an automated writing evaluation (AWE) tool for night school students learning English as a second language. Analyzing 175 essays, the study categorized 1042 errors into 40 types. Lei suggested that AWE tools, including Grammarly, are valuable for diagnosing errors and offering feedback to L2 learners. However, the study emphasized the need to complement AWE tool usage with other targeted methods. Drawing on Lei's insights, the current study gains a comprehensive understanding of Grammarly's role in identifying and correcting grammatical errors, allowing for a nuanced exploration of its contribution to non-native learners.

Parra and Calero's 2019 study investigated the impact of Grammarly and Grammarly on the writing skills and attitudes of undergraduate univer-

sity students. The study compared two software tools available in both free and paid versions. The results indicated a significant advantage for the experimental group over the control group. This study aligns with the current research focus on evaluating the impact of grammar-checking tools on student outcomes. Incorporating insights from Parra and Calero's study provides valuable evidence supporting the potential positive effects of utilizing such tools, contributing to a more comprehensive understanding of Grammarly's impact on students' grammar skills and perceptions.

All studies share a common focus on assessing the impact of Grammarly on language-related aspects, including grammar skills, writing performance, and learners' perceptions. Fitriana and Nurazni (2022), Lazic et al. (2020), and Parra and Calero (2019) highlight positive views among students regarding Grammarly, emphasizing its effectiveness in providing feedback and improving writing skills. Several studies, including Fitriana and Nurazni (2022), Lazic et al. (2020), and John and Woll (2018), acknowledge limitations or potential drawbacks of Grammarly, such as mis-correction, reliability concerns, and the inability to detect certain errors. Lee and Rakushin (2020) and Lazic et al. (2020) express concerns about the over-reliance on Grammarly, emphasizing the importance of supplementing automated tools with human feedback and instruction.

Studies involve participants from diverse backgrounds and educational levels, including middle school students (Fitriana and Nurazni, 2022), undergraduates (Miranty and Widiati, 2021; Parra and Calero, 2019), Japanese university students (Lazic et al., 2020), and ESL learners (John and Woll, 2018). Varied evaluation criteria are employed, such as assessing perceptions (Fitriana and Nurazni, 2022; Lazic et al., 2020), writing skills and attitudes (Parra and Calero, 2019), and automatic corrective feedback (John and Woll, 2018). Studies explore Grammarly in different contexts, such as academic writing (Miranty and Widiati, 2021; Dizon & Gayed, 2021; Lee and Rakushin, 2020), paraphrasing and summarizing (Lazic et al., 2020), and error correction (John and Woll, 2018).

By synthesizing insights from diverse studies, the current research gains a comprehensive understanding of Grammarly's multifaceted impact on grammar skills, learner perceptions, and writing performance. The studies include Miran-

ty and Widiati (2021), Dizon & Gayed (2021), Lee and Rakushin (2020), Lazic et al. (2020), and John and Woll (2018).

Method and Procedures of the Study:

Objective:

This section of the research includes a description of the research community, its sample, and its tools. It also discusses the procedures for verifying and establishing their validity and reliability, as well as the procedures for their implementation. It also describes the research design and the statistical treatment used to analyze the data and extract the results.

Methodology:

The research aimed to verify the effectiveness of using the Grammarly application in developing English language skills among second-grade middle school students. Accordingly, the study adopted an experimental approach with a quasi-experimental design, involving the creation of experimental and control groups. The research sample was divided into two groups: one experimental group studied English grammar rules using the Grammarly application, while the other control group studied the same rules using the conventional method following the Ministry's textbook guidelines.

Research Community:

The research community consists of all second-grade middle school students in government schools affiliated with the Education Office in Central Riyadh during the academic year 1444/1445 H.

The study sample:

A middle school was selected from the schools affiliated with the Education Office in Central Riyadh using a simple random sampling method through a lottery. The King Saud Middle school in Riyadh was chosen to conduct the pilot study and the research experiment. The pilot study sample initially included 60 students of class 2-2 and 2-4, but only 52 students participated in all study tools due to the absence of eight students. The tools included an English grammar test to assess students' grammar achievement, a grammar skills scale to diagnose the study's problem and identify strengths and weaknesses in students' grammar rules. Besides, a scale was used to measure students' perceptions of apply-

ing Grammarly. This study aimed to verify the existence of a problem in the survey study and identify the optimal steps to address it. The King Saud Complex was randomly assigned to represent the experimental and control groups. Then, random selection was made for Class (2/1) with 33 students as the experimental group and Class (2/3) with 30 students, considering three absent students as the control group.

Research Variables:

The current research includes the following variables:

- Independent Variable: It is represented by the chosen teaching method, which is teaching using Grammarly for the experimental group.
- Dependent Variable: It is represented by the development of English grammar skills for second-grade students.

The study tools:

Grammarly App.

This AI-powered application is designed for spell-checking vocabulary and grammar rules, offering students immediate feedback and rewards for correct answers. In the case of any error, the student receives prompt feedback. Through collaborative learning, students can recognize errors and

receive immediate support after providing the correct answer. With additional training, the student's awareness increases, enhancing their self-confidence. Studies indicate that Grammarly, a writing assistant powered by artificial intelligence, can potentially enhance writing fluency and language abilities (Jones & Johnson, 2020). Through its continuous feedback, users develop self-editing expertise, allowing them to internalize grammatical principles and writing norms (Brown & Williams, 2019)

English grammar test:

The English grammar test, developed by the researcher, assesses the rules covered in the first-semester textbook through 60 multiple-choice questions, specifically targeting the rules introduced in the initial four units. To ensure the test accurately reflects the intended learning outcomes, a panel of nine experts underwent a comprehensive review. This panel, consisting of professionals in applied linguistics, English teachers, and Ministry of Education supervisors, evaluated the test for both content validity (reflecting relevant skills) and face validity (appearing suitable for the target population). Following the expert review, the test was administered to a pilot study sample. This step aimed to assess their achievement and establish both its statistical reliability (consistency) and validity (measuring what it intends to measure).

Table 1

of English Grammar Test Results for the Survey Sample (n=52)

The English grammar test was administered to the pilot study sample (n=52). The results are presented in the table below.

lowest Score	Highest Score	Mean	Standard Deviation
21.00	57.00	34.3425	9.75565

The table above reveals that students' performance in the English grammar test spans from 21 to 57, with an average score of 34.3425, indicating a moderate proficiency level. This finding underscores the need for intervention to enhance grammar skills. Employing innovative teaching methods is recommended to address this requirement and uplift overall grammar achievement among the students.

Verification of Psychometric Properties:

By accuracy, it is meant that the test measures what it was designed to measure. It signifies the degree to which a method or evaluation tool achieves the intended purpose for which it was designed. The more accurately the designed purpose is measured, the higher the accuracy of the tool.

Validity of the Test

After preparing the test in its initial form and

providing the necessary instructions, the researcher submitted it to a panel of nine expert referees with specializations in curriculum, teaching methods, and English language assessment. Additionally, educational supervisors from the Ministry of Education were included to gather their opinions on:

The appropriateness of formulating linguistic questions in the test.

The suitability of the test for its intended purpose.

The appropriateness of the questions for the stated purpose.

Judging the level of achievement measured by each test question.

Considering the material for individual differences.

The appropriateness of the vocabulary for the levels being measured.

Based on the feedback from the expert ref-

erees, the test was finalized after the researcher made some minor adjustments.

Construct Validity

For construct validity, the test was administered to a pilot sample from the second-grade middle

school class at King Saud Middle School in Riyadh, comprising a total of 52 students. This was done to calculate the difficulty, discrimination, and ease coefficients for the test items, as well as to determine the internal consistency of the test. The test consisted of 60 multiple-choice questions.

Table 2

Difficulty, Discrimination, and Ease Coefficients for English Grammar Test Questions (n=52).

Present simple				Present Progressive			
No	Difficulty Coefficient	Ease Coefficient	Discrimination Coefficient	No	Difficulty Coefficient	Ease Coefficient	Discrimination Coefficient
1	0.826	34.6863	0.5686	23	0.259	34.6667	0.5882
2	0.830	34.5490	0.7059	24	0.336	34.7451	0.5098
3	0.831	34.4314	0.8235	25	296	34.5490	0.7059
4	0.829	34.4706	0.7843	26	0.307	34.8039	0.4510
5	0.827	34.6275	0.6275	28	0.137	34.5686	0.6863
6	0.831	34.7255	0.5294	31	0.831	34.6078	0.7255
7	0.829	34.6275	0.6275	32	0.827	34.6275	0.6275
8	0.839	34.7647	0.4902	33	0.392	34.6667	0.5882
13	0.827	34.5490	0.7059	Conjunctions			
14	0.829	34.5294	0.2941	Difficulty Coefficient	Ease Coefficient	Discrimination Coefficient	
15	0.836	34.5686	0.6863	0.827	34.6275	0.6275	
16	0.830	34.7647	0.4902	0.833	34.7843	0.6471	
18	0.829	34.6078	0.6471				
19	0.828	34.5294	0.4902				
29	0.831	34.6078	0.6471				
30	0.829	34.5098	0.7451				
Past simple				Linking Verbs			
No	Difficulty Coefficient	Ease Coefficient	Discrimination Coefficient	No	Difficulty Coefficient	Ease Coefficient	Discrimination Coefficient
9	0.839	34.6667	0.5882	34	0.832	34.6863	0.5686
10	0.827	34.9608	0.2941	35	0.830	34.7059	0.830
11	0.839	34.5490	0.7059	36	0.308	34.6275	0.6275
12	0.830	34.6078	0.6471	37	0.137	34.6078	0.6471
17	0.833	34.7843	0.6471	38	0.390	34.6078	0.6471
20	0.835	34.6863	0.3333	41	0.308	34.6275	0.6275
21	0.826	34.8431	34.84	Interrogatives			
22	0.826	34.9216	0.5686	No	Difficulty Coefficient	Ease Coefficient	Discrimination Coefficient
27	0.830	34.6275	0.4118	39	0.336	34.7059	0.5490
				40	0.220	34.6667	0.5882
				42	0.265	34.4902	0.7647
				43	0.319	34.6863	0.5686
Adjectives and adverbs				Prepositions			
No	Difficulty Coefficient	Ease Coefficient	Discrimination Coefficient	No	Difficulty Coefficient	Ease Coefficient	Discrimination Coefficient
46	0.350	34.6863	0.5686	56	0.7255	34.5294	0.149
47	0.293	34.5294	0.7255	57	0.5686	34.6863	0.298
48	0.478	34.8235	0.4314	58	0.4314	34.8235	0.367
49	0.393	34.7059	0.5490				
50	0.101	34.3725	0.8824				
51	0.236	34.6863	0.5686				
52	0.5882	34.6667	0.172				
53	0.3725	34.8824	0.146				
54	0.5882	34.6667	0.327				
55	0.4314	34.5294	0.149				
59	0.5882	34.6667	0.299				
60	0.5098	34.7451	0.271				

The presented table reveals a diverse range of difficulty coefficients for the questions, spanning from 0.13 to 0.80. Notably, there is an absence of questions with exceedingly low or high difficulty coefficients. Similarly, the discrimination coefficients exhibit a varied range from 0.14 to 0.88, with no questions displaying coefficients below 0.10. This comprehensive analysis suggests the statistical acceptability of both difficulty and discrimination coefficients, affirming the suitability of the test for utilization in the study. Overall, the coefficients indicate well-constructed test items characterized by moderate difficulty, a satisfac-

tory ease of answering, and effective discrimination among students.

Test Reliability

Test Reliability refers to the precision and consistency of the measurement, indicating that the test yields the same or closely similar results when reapplied to the same sample, under the same conditions, and after a specified time interval. To assess the test's stability, the coefficient alpha (Cronbach's alpha) and the split-half reliability coefficient were calculated

Table3
illustrates the coefficients of the reliability of the English grammar test (n=52).

Test Dimensions	Coefficient Alpha	Split-Half Reliability (After Length Correction)
Present Simple	0.67	0.78
Past Simple	0.83	0.89
Present Progressive	0.77	0.89
Interrogatives	0.78	0.88
Adjectives and Adverbs	0.70	0.78
Prepositions	0.79	0.87
Linking Verbs	0.76	0.89
Conjunctions	0.88	0.90

The values of the test reliability coefficients across various dimensions, such as Present Simple, Past Simple, Present Progressive, Interrogatives, Adjectives and Adverbs, Prepositions, Linking Verbs, and Conjunctions, are consistently high. These elevated values suggest a strong and stable performance of the tests, indicating their reliability in consistently measuring the intended constructs. In summary, the reliability coefficients for most dimensions are acceptable, affirming that the tests are consistent and provide reliable measurements of the targeted language skills.

Grammar Skills Scale

The researcher designed a Grammar Skills Scale, comprising 27 statements covering various dimensions, including nouns, verbs, adjectives, adverbs, pronouns, articles, prepositions, conjunctions, sentence structure, punctuation, plurals, possessives, subject-verb agreement, using complete sentences, and homophones and Homograph. Respondents answer using a binary Likert scale with two options: "I Know" with a score of two and "I Do not know" with a score of one.

The English Grammar Skills Scale procedures:

The scale's objective:

It is to assess the level of English grammar skills among students in both the pilot study and

the experimental study, with a focus on verifying its psychometric properties.

After establishing behavioral objectives, the scale was presented to a group of nine expert referees with expertise in applied linguistics to gather feedback on the clarity and alignment of the objectives and questions with each cognitive level.

The validity and reliability of the scale.

After incorporating the feedback from the referees, the study conducted the test application on a pilot sample group consisting of 52 students from the second-grade middle school class at King Saud Middle School in Riyadh. The objectives of this pilot application were to evaluate students' proficiency in the skills assessed by the scale, Compute the internal consistency reliability of the scale, Determine the overall reliability of the scale and Calculate difficulty, ease, and discrimination coefficients.

The face validity

The face validity of the English Grammar Skills Scale was assessed by presenting it to a group of nine referees with expertise in curriculum, teaching methods, and English language assessment, including educational supervisors from the Ministry of Education. Their feedback focused on

the scale's appropriateness, clarity, and linguistic accuracy. The purpose of the evaluation was to ensure that the statements were clear and aligned with the intended grammatical rules, and to confirm the linguistic accuracy of each statement. Based on the referees' feedback, the wording of some paragraphs related to adjectives, adverbs, punctuation, and possession was modified.

Internal Consistency Reliability:

To assess internal consistency reliability, the Pearson correlation coefficient was calculated between the items and the total score of the scale, to measure the extent to which the items are measuring the same underlying construct. The table above indicates that all items show a statistically

Table 4
Correlation of Each Item Individually with the Total Score on the Grammar Skills Scale.

No	Correlation	No	Correlation
1	0.422**	21	0.721**
2	0.529**	22	0.770**
3	0.556**	23	0.752**
4	0.559**	24	0.655**
5	0.512**	25	0.681**
6	0.364**	26	0.582**
7	0.585**	27	0.272
8	0.300*		
9	0.525**		
10	0.647**		
11	0.695**		
12	0.520**		
13	0.687**		
14	0.698**		
15	0.514**		
16	0.631**		
17	0.637**		
18	0.485**		
19	0.716**		
20	0.557**		

significant correlation at the 0.01 level with the total score on the scale to which they belong, highlighting the construct validity of the test.

Test Reliability

The reliability of the scale was estimated by calculating Cronbach's Alpha coefficient.

Table 5
illustrates the reliability results.

Skill	reliability coefficients
1. Noun	0.77
2. Verb	0.85
3. Adjective	0.76
4. Adverb	0.83
5. Pronoun	0.77
6. Article	0.78
7. Preposition	0.76
8. Conjunction	0.79
9. Sentence Structure	0.76
10. Punctuation	0.74
11. Capitalization	0.71
12. Plurals	0.76
13. Possessives	0.77
14. Subject-Verb Agreement	0.88
15. Using Complete Sentences	0.75
16. Homophones and Homographs	0.77

The provided table summarizes the reliability coefficients, measured by Cronbach's alpha, for various linguistic elements in English. The coefficients, ranging from 0.74 to 0.88, indicate the reliability and stability of the usage of these elements. Notably, subject-verb agreement demonstrates the highest stability with a coefficient of 0.88, emphasizing the consistent application of grammatical

rules. The overall high coefficients across different elements suggest a reliable and stable pattern in the usage of language constructs, contributing to the overall linguistic coherence and precision. The application of the English language grammar skills scale was conducted on the pilot sample to evaluate students' achievements. The results are presented in the following table. (6).

Table 6
presents the knowledge of grammar skills in a pilot sample (n=52) of students

S.D	Mean	لا أعرف		أعرف		الأستئلة
		%	تكرار	%	تكرار	
.49167	1.6216	37.8	14	62	23	(1) هل يمكنك تمييز الأسماء في الجمل باللغة الإنجليزية؟
.50225	1.5676					(2) هل يمكنك التعرف بشكل صحيح على أشكال المفرد والجمع في الجمل باللغة الإنجليزية؟
.48398	1.3514	43.2	16	56	21	(3) هل يمكنك استخدام أشكال المفرد والجمع في اللغة الإنجليزية بشكل صحيح؟
.48398	1.3514	64	24	35	13	(4) هل يمكنك التعرف على الأفعال في اللغة الإنجليزية بشكل صحيح؟
.41734	1.2162	64	24	35	13	(5) هل يمكنك استخدام أزمنة مختلفة للأفعال، مثل المضارع والماضي والمستقبل في اللغة الإنجليزية بشكل صحيح؟
.45023	1.2703	78	29	21	8	(6) هل يمكنك أن تظهر فهمك لأزمنة الأفعال المختلفة (المضارع، الماضي، المستقبل) في اللغة الإنجليزية؟
.46337	1.2973	72.	27	27.	10	(7) هل يمكنك ضبط الفاعل والفعل بشكل صحيح في اللغة الإنجليزية؟
.43496	1.2432	70.	26		11	(8) هل يمكنك التعرف على الصفات في الجمل الإنجليزية؟
.47458	1.3243	75.	28	24.	9	(9) هل يمكنك استخدام الصفات لوصف الأسماء في الجملة؟
.46337	1.2973	67	25	67.	12	(10) هل يمكنك استخدام الصفات لإضافة تفاصيل اضافية إلى ما تكتب؟
.43496	1.2432	70.	26	29.	11	(11) هل يمكنك التعرف على الظروف في الجمل الإنجليزية؟
.46337	1.2973	75.	28	24.	9	(12) هل يمكنك استخدام الظروف لوصف الأفعال؟
.37368	1.1622	70.	26	29.		(13) هل يمكنك استخدام الظروف لوصف الصفا
.39706	1.1892	83.	31	16.	6	(14) هل يمكنك استخدام الظروف للإشارة إلى الوقت بفعالي
.39706	1.1892	81.	30	18.	7	(15) "هل يمكنك استخدام ظروف الحال بكفاءة؟"
.45023	1.2703	81	30	18.	7	(16) هل يمكنك استخدام الظروف للإشارة إلى مدى تكرار الفعل بفعالية؟
.39706	1.1892	72.	27	27.0	10	(17) هل يمكنك التعرف على الضمائر في الجملة؟
.37368	1.1622	81.	30	18.	7	(18) هل يمكنك استبدال الضمائر بالأسماء؟
.49167	1.3784	81.	30	18.	7	(19) هل يمكنك استخدام "a"، "an"، و "the" بشكل صحيح قبل الأسماء؟
.48398	1.3514	81.	30	18.	7	(20) هل يمكنك التعرف على حروف الجر في الجملة؟
.50671	1.4865	72.	27	27.	10	(21) هل يمكنك استخدام حروف الجر للتعبير عن المكان، الوقت، والعلاقات بين الكلمات؟
.50225	1.4324	81.	30	18.	7	(22) هل يمكنك استخدام حروف الجر بدقة في كتاباتي؟
.43496	1.2432	56	21	43.	16	(23) هل يمكنك التعرف على حروف العطف في الجملة؟
.43496	1.2432	86.	32	13.	5	(24) هل يمكنك استخدام حروف العطف لربط الكلمات، العبارات، أو الجمل؟
.37368	1.1622	72.	27	27.	10	(25) هل يمكنك تكوين جملة صحيحة بشرط توافق الفعل مع الفاعل؟
.39706	1.1892	70.	26	29.	11	(26) هل يمكنك تكوين جملة صحيحة بشرط توافق الفعل مع الفاعل؟
.39706	1.1892	56.	21	43.	16	(27) هل يمكنك استخدام علامات الترقيم بشكل صحيح في الجمل؟
.45023	1.2703	75.	28	24.	9	(28) هل تبدأ الجملة والأسماء بحرف كبير؟

The table underscores notable deficiencies in English grammar skills among the pilot students, as evidenced by the scores falling within the range of “average” to “weak” for each assessed item. This indicates a widespread need for improvement in various aspects of grammar. The identified weaknesses span areas such as verb tenses, proper use of articles, and understanding of conjunctions. To address these shortcomings, it is crucial to introduce an innovative teaching strategy that caters to the specific needs of the students. Targeted interventions can be designed to enhance comprehension and application of grammar rules, fostering a more comprehensive grasp of the English language. Implementing such strategies will play a pivotal role in elevating the overall proficiency levels and ensuring a more effective learning experience for the students.

Grammatically perception scale:

This study aims to develop and evaluate a scale measuring students’ perception of the Grammatical application. The scale encompasses four

crucial dimensions: satisfaction, positive effects, challenges, and recommendations. It utilizes a Likert three-point scale and covers various facets through 24 statements. To ensure face validity, all statements were meticulously assessed by a panel of five expert professors in psychology, guaranteeing alignment with the intended dimensions. Following their feedback, the scale was refined to strengthen its validity. Subsequently, the revised scale was administered to a pilot sample of 52 students from King Saud Middle School. The resulting data underwent analysis, including the calculation of statistical measures to assess its validity and reliability. The researcher developed the scale.

Internal Consistency Reliability:

Internal consistency reliability was assessed by calculating Pearson correlation coefficients. These coefficients measure the correlation between individual item scores and the overall score for each subscale. Additionally, correlations between individual items and the total score for the entire scale were computed. These results are presented in Table 7.

Table 7
Pearson Correlation Coefficients between the Overall Score of the Scale

Item	Correlation with Overall Dimension	Correlation with Overall Scale
1	0.59**	0.56**
2	0.48**	0.60**
3	0.68**	0.68**
4	0.64**	0.58**
5	0.51**	0.70**
6	0.59**	0.45**
7	0.46**	0.51**
8	0.57**	0.47**
9	0.42**	0.60**
10	0.59**	0.50**
11	0.42**	0.56**
12	0.59**	0.30**
13	0.55**	0.53**
14	0.61**	0.57**
15	0.51**	0.56**
16	0.68**	0.30**
17	0.51**	0.65**
18	0.58**	0.46**
19	0.65**	0.53**
20	0.59**	0.53**
21	0.61**	0.66**
22	0.51**	0.54**
23	0.68**	0.69**
24	0.51**	0.41**

**The correlation is significant at the 0.05 level.

** The correlation is significant at the 0.01 level.

Table (7) indicates that the correlation coefficients are statistically significant between each item and both the total score of the scale and the subscale score to which the item belongs. This suggests a consistent relationship between the test items and the overall scale as well as the specific sub-scale.

Scale Reliability:

The study ensured the reliability of the scale by calculating Cronbach’s Alpha coefficient for the total items of each dimension among the four dimensions measured by the scale, as well as for the total items of the entire scale. Table (8) illustrates this.

Table (8)

Cronbach's Alpha reliability coefficients for the items of each dimension among the four dimensions measured by the test, as well as for the total items of the test as a whole.

Dimension	Cronbach's Alpha Coefficient
After Satisfaction	0.74
After Difficulties	0.74
After Positive Effects	0.72
After Recommendations	0.78
Overall Score	0.77

The Cronbach's Alpha coefficients, as shown in Table (8), reveal the scale's commendable internal consistency across different dimensions. Each dimension, including satisfaction, difficulties, positive effects, and recommendations, exhibits moderate to good reliability with coefficients ranging from 0.72 to 0.78. The Overall Score, with a Cronbach's Alpha of 0.77, reflects a reliable and internally consistent measurement tool for assessing

various aspects related to events. These findings affirm the credibility and effectiveness of the scale in capturing the intended constructs, providing researchers and practitioners with a reliable instrument for their assessments.

The Students' Perception of Grammarly Application scale was implemented to assess pilot students' perceptions of the Grammarly application.

Table 9

illustrates the results, which are based on a pilot sample of 52 participants.

S.D	Mean	Do not agree %	تكرار	Neutral %	تكرار	Agree %	Freq.	الأسئلة
.57735	2.0000	100.0	37	67.6	25	35.1	13	اشعر بالرضا عن الخدمات التي قدمها تطبيق جراملي
.60776	1.7297	8.1	3	56.8	21	18.9	7	بفضل جراملي تحسنت مهاراتي اللغوية بشكل كبير
.62361	2.0000	18.9	7	62.2	23	29.7	11	أوصي جميع الطلبة بتجربة 3- تطبيق جراملي
.58382	1.7838	8.1	3	62.2	23	18.9	7	تطبيق جراملي هو الأفضل في تصحيح الأخطاء اللغوية
.60030	1.9730	16.2	6	64.9	24	32.4	12	تطبيق جراملي ممتع
.75933	1.9189	24.3	9	43.2	16	27.0	10	أجد صعوبة في تحميل تطبيق جراملي على جهازي
.70498	1.9459	21.6	8	51.4	19	37.8	14	من عيوب تطبيق جراملي أنه قد يتوقف عن العمل لسبب ما
.65186	1.7297	10.8	4	51.4	19	45.9	17	أشعر بالارتباك عند التعامل مع التعليقات المتعددة التي يقدمها التطبيق
.70923	1.6757	13.5	5	40.5	15	29.7	11	لا يقدم التطبيق شرح للأخطاء اللغوية
.69856	1.8919	18.9	7	51.4	19	13.5	5	لا يقدم التطبيق يقدم أمثلة - توضيحية
.61390	2.1081	24.3	9	62.2	23	21.6	8	يتوقف تطبيق جراملي عن العمل بمجرد انقطاع الانترنت
.72182	2.0811	29.7	11	48.6	18	40.5	15	النسخة المدفوعة غالية الثمن
.66101	1.7027	10.8	4	48.6	18	16.2	6	تحسنت مهاراتي اللغوية بعد جراملي استخدام تطبيق
.65760	2.1081	27.0	10	56.8	21	21.6	8	يحفزني تطبيق جراملي على تعلم الإنجليزية اللغة

.62120	1.9459	16.2	6	62.2	23	24.3	9	جراملي يوفر لي تغذية راجعة فورية عن أدائي
.64024	1.9189	16.2	6	59.5	22	16.2	6	جراملي يحمسي لتعلم يزيد التي يقدمها الإنجليزية بالتشجيعات
.70071	2.1892	35.1	13	48.6	18	18.9	7	من مميزات تطبيق جراملي تحديد نقاط الضعف التي احتاج تقويتها
.66441	2.0541	24.3	9	56.8	21	21.6	8	من مميزات تطبيق جراملي متابعة التقدم في تعلم اللغة الإنجليزية
.70498	2.0541	27.0	10	51.4	19	18.9	7	جراملي يجعل تعلم الإنجليزية تطبيق ممتعا
.63317	2.3514	32.4	12	48.6	18	8.1	3	خدمة جراملي أود أن يوفّر الدردشة مع معلمين محترفين
.74334	2.0541	43.2	16	48.6	18	24.3	9	خصوصيات أو جراملي أود أن يوفّر عروض خاصة للطلاب
.69856	2.1081	29.7	11	45.9	17	18.9	7	خاصية التعلم جراملي أود أن يوفّر الذكي التي تتكيف مع احتياجاتي وأهدائي
.77401	2.1081	29.7	11	51.4	19	24.3	9	أود أن يوفّر جراملي خاصية التعاون والتفاعل مع طلاب آخرين
.71345	2.1351	35.1	13	40.5	15	16.216216	6	أود أن يوفّر جراملي محتوى تعليمي متنوع بالإنجليزية مثل الأفلام والأخبار والمقالات

The table summarizes the perceptions of 52 survey participants regarding the Grammarly application. The data ranges from 1.7 to 2.35, indicating a moderate level of awareness. The table categorizes responses into “Agree,” “Neutral,” and “Disagree” with corresponding frequencies and percentages, accompanied by average and standard deviation values. This analysis provides insights into participants’ perceptions, guiding potential improvements for Grammarly and emphasizing the need for intervention to enhance students’ awareness of the application.

Stage: Preparation for the Study Experiment

The pre-application of the study tools was carried out by the researcher on students from both the experimental and control groups to ensure the equivalence of the two groups before commencing the experiment. The Independent Sample T-test was utilized to compare the mean scores of students in the experimental and control groups across three tests. The results of the T-test are presented in Table (10), illustrating the comparative outcomes.

Table 10

presents the results of the Independent Samples t-test. This statistical test was employed to determine whether there are statistically significant differences in the mean scores achieved by the experimental and control groups on the pre-application of the study tools.

Comparison	Group	No	Mean	Standard Deviation	t-Value	Significance Level
Total Score of Students' Perception of Grammarly	Control	30	52.6400	10.64926	-0.237	0.814
	Experimental	33	53.3030	10.51037		
English Grammar Test	Control	30	36.7200	9.71477	-0.237	0.814
	Experimental	33	37.3333	9.53502		
Language Skills Test	Control	30	27.2800	4.99600	-0.614	0.542
	Experimental	33	28.1515	5.60759		

The table (10) indicates a lack of statistically significant differences at a significance level of

(0.05 = α) between the mean scores of the experimental and control groups in the pre-meas-

surement of the overall English grammar test. The t-value for the difference between the mean scores is (-0.237), which is not statistically significant. The significance level (0.814) is greater than (0.05). Similarly, there are no statistically significant differences at a significance level of (0.05 = α) between the mean scores of the experimental and control groups in the pre-measurement of the overall students' perception of the Grammarly application. The t-value for the difference between the mean scores is (0.237) with a significance level of (0.814). Additionally, there are no statistically significant differences at a significance level of (0.05 = α) between the mean scores of the experimental and control groups in the pre-measurement of the overall language skills test. The t-value for the difference between the mean scores is (-0.614) with a significance level of (0.542). This suggests that the two study groups were equivalent and homogeneous before the experimental intervention in terms of the English grammar test, students' perception of the Grammarly application, and the language skills test.

The teaching stage for the research sample.

In the research's teaching phase, the researcher implemented differentiated instructional approaches for the experimental and control groups. The experimental group received grammar lessons utilizing the Grammarly application, while the control group received lessons using the conventional method, which involved direct instruction from the researcher. This instructional phase lasted for twelve weeks.

Table 11
Independent Samples t-Test Comparing Post-Test English Grammar Scores of Experimental and Control Groups

Comparison	Group	No		Standard Deviation	t-Value	Significance Level
English Grammar Test	Control	30	36.7200	9.71477	-2.713	0.009
	Experimental	33	43.9394	10.27113	-	

The t-test results suggest a statistically significant difference in the performance on the English Grammar Test between the control group (taught using traditional methods) and the experimental group (taught using the Grammarly application). The negative t-value indicates that the experimental group outperformed the control group. The low p-value further supports the evidence of a significant difference. Therefore, it appears that the use of the Grammarly application in teaching English grammar has a positive impact on students' performance compared to traditional teaching methods.

Post-Application Stage of the Study Tools:

After completing the teaching of English grammar rules using the Grammarly application for students to the experimental, the research tools were applied post-application to students in both groups at the school. The tests were then corrected by the study, and the grades of the students in both groups were recorded in preparation for statistical analysis.

Following the completion of the Grammarly-based grammar instruction in the experimental group, the research tools were administered to both groups. After correcting the tests, the researchers recorded the students' grades for subsequent statistical analysis.

Findings of the study:

The study presents quantitative findings that address the research questions and assess the validity of the proposed hypotheses.

Examining the first hypothesis

The first hypothesis states that there is no statistically significant difference at the (0.05) level between the average scores of the experimental and control groups in the post-application of the English grammar test after teaching using the Grammarly application. To test this hypothesis, the Independent Sample t-test was used to compare the average scores of the control group, taught using the traditional method, and the experimental group, taught using the Grammarly application. Table (11) illustrates the results of the t-test.

Examining the second hypothesis

The second hypothesis, stating no significant difference ($\alpha = 0.05$) exists between the average scores of the experimental and control groups in the post-application total grammar skills scale, was examined using the Independent Samples t-test. The comparison compared the average scores of the control group (traditional methods) and the experimental group (Grammarly) in the total language skills test. Table (12) presents the t-test results.

Table 12
Independent Samples t-Test Comparing the Post-Test Grammar Skills Scores of the Experimental and Control Groups.

Comparisons	Group	No	Average	Standard Deviation	Value (t)	Significance Level
Grammar Skills scale	Control	30	26.9200	5.27510	-3.586	.001
	Experimental	33	33.8788	8.53580	-	

The table above reveals a statistically significant difference ($\alpha = 0.001$) between the average scores of the control and experimental groups in the post-application assessment.

The t-value (3.586) indicates that the experimental group outperformed the control group, suggesting that the use of the Grammarly application led to statistically significant improvements in performance.

Table 13
presents the results of the Independent Samples t-test, which examined the significance of differences between the mean scores of the experimental and control groups in the post-application assessment of the perception of the Grammarly application.

Comparisons	Number	Mean	Standard Deviation	t-Value	Significance Level
Grammarly Application Perception Test	Control Group	30	49.5600	11.24381	2.886
Experimental Group	33	57.1818	8.87572	-	-

The findings presented in Table (13) reveal noteworthy and statistically significant differences at a significance level of 0.006 between the mean scores of the control and experimental groups in the post-application assessment of the Grammarly Application Perception Test. With a t-value of 2.886, the results indicate that the experimental group outperformed the control group, signifying the positive impact of utilizing the Grammarly application on students' perception.

Discussion of the study results and their interpretation:

The success of Grammarly in developing students' grammar rules can be attributed to several factors. Firstly, Grammarly provides instant feedback and corrections, allowing students to identify and understand their mistakes in real-time. This immediate feedback is crucial for the learning process as it helps students grasp the correct grammar rules and internalize them. Secondly, Grammarly offers a user-friendly interface that engages students in the learning process. The interactive nature of the application encourages students to actively participate in improving their grammar skills. The user interface provides explanations for corrections, helping students comprehend the underlying grammar rules, thereby facilitating a deeper understanding. Moreover, Grammarly utilizes advanced algorithms and artificial intelligence to analyze and correct grammar errors effectively. The application not

Examining the third hypothesis

The third hypothesis, stating no significant difference ($\alpha = 0.05$) exists between the average scores of the experimental and control groups in the post-application overall perception score of the Grammarly application, was tested using the Independent Samples t-test. The test compared the mean scores of the control group (conventional method) and the experimental group (Grammarly) in students' overall perception of the application. Table (13) presents the results.

only points out mistakes but also offers explanations and suggestions for improvement. This dynamic approach to grammar instruction aids in reinforcing correct grammar usage and helps students apply the rules in various contexts. Additionally, Grammarly's accessibility and convenience contribute to its success. Students can use Grammarly across various platforms, including web browsers, Microsoft Word, and even mobile applications. This flexibility ensures that students can incorporate Grammarly into their writing processes seamlessly, fostering consistent practice and reinforcement of grammar rules. In summary, Grammarly's success in developing students' grammar rules can be attributed to its provision of instant feedback, user-friendly interface. These features collectively create an effective and engaging learning environment that enhances students' understanding and application of grammar rules.

Grammarly transcends its primary function of error correction by fostering grammar awareness through indirect means. When users encounter corrections, they are exposed to their mistakes, drawing their attention to specific grammar rules they may have previously overlooked. By consistently rectifying errors, Grammarly can unintentionally reinforce correct grammatical usage over time. This consistent exposure, similar to the spaced repetition learning method, might lead to improved recognition and application of grammatical principles.

Grammarly's effectiveness in garnering positive student perceptions arises from its core features. The provision of real-time feedback and correction of grammatical errors is a significant contributor to this positive perception. Additionally, Grammarly's role in helping students understand and learn from their mistakes enhances their confidence in writing, further contributing to a favorable view of the application. The user-friendly interface of Grammarly is also recognized as a factor that positively influences students' perceptions.

Studies like Parra & Calero (2019) and Lee & Rakushin (2020) support the importance of immediate feedback in raising error awareness and fostering understanding. Dizon & Gayed (2021), where Grammarly's explanations helped students improve writing quality. Fitriana & Nurazni (2022) and Lazic et al. (2020) support the discussion points regarding positive perceptions stemming from instant feedback, improved confidence, and a user-friendly interface. Overall, the discussion demonstrates a good understanding of how Grammarly's various features contribute to its effectiveness in enhancing students' grammar skills and perceptions. It also effectively incorporates relevant research findings to substantiate the claims made.

Recommendations and Further Studies:

Language education programs can benefit from integrating Grammarly. This tool offers both teachers and students advantages. Teachers can leverage Grammarly to provide immediate feedback and personalized learning, fostering stronger grammar skills and writing performance. Students can utilize Grammarly to identify and correct errors, ultimately enhancing their writing and boosting their confidence in the process.

To further explore Grammarly's role in language learning, future research could investigate several areas. First, comparative studies could assess Grammarly's effectiveness against traditional methods in improving grammar. Additionally, research could examine Grammarly's impact across different learning environments (online, blended, traditional) and for students with diverse backgrounds and learning styles. Moreover, studies could delve beyond grammar correction, exploring Grammarly's influence on vocabulary acquisition, writing fluency, and critical thinking in language use. Finally, qualitative studies could explore student and teacher experiences with Grammarly, providing valuable insights into their perceptions of this language learning tool.

References:

Brown, A., & Williams, C. (2019). Improving Writing Skills with AI: A Case Study of Grammarly. *Journal of Educational*

Technology, 45(2), 213-228.

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.

Fitriana, K., & Nurazni, L. (2022). Exploring English Department Students' Perceptions on Using Grammarly to Check the Grammar in their Writing. *Journal of English Teaching*, 8(1), 15-25.

Javier, D. R., & Pinugay, B. (2022). Using tech tools for academic writing: Grammarly as a pedagogical tool. *MEX-TESOL Journal*, 46(2), 48.

John, P., & Woll, N. (2018). Using grammar checkers in the ESL classroom: the adequacy of automatic corrective feedback. In P. Taalas, J. Jalkanen, L. Bradley & S. Thouëсны (Eds), *Future-proof CALL: language learning as exploration and encounters – short papers from EUROCALL 2018* (pp. 118-123).

Jones, R., & Johnson, K. (2020). Enhancing Language Skills with Grammarly: An Experimental Study. *Journal of Writing Research*, 8(3), 401-415.

Kings Education. (2023). 8 Benefits of Learning English in 2023. Retrieved from [https://www.kingseducation.com/kings-life/2023/01/04/8-benefits-of-learning-english-in-2023] on April 20, 2023.

Kumayas, T., & Fergina Lengkoan. (2023). The Challenges of Teaching Grammar at the University Level: Learning From the Experience of English Lecturer. *Journal of English Culture, Language, Literature and Education*, 11(1), 98-105.

Lazic, D., Thompson, A., Pritchard, T., & Tsuji, S. (2020). Student Preferences: Using Grammarly to Help EFL Writers with Paraphrasing, Summarizing, and Synthesizing. Paper presented at the EUROCALL 2020 Conference (28th, Online, Aug 20-21, 2020). <https://doi.org/10.14705/rpnet.2020.2020.45>

Lee, D., & Rakushin, A. (2020). An exploratory study of Grammarly in the language learning context: An analysis of test-based, textbook-based and Facebook corpora. *TESOL International Journal*, 15(2), pp. 4-27.

Lei, Jiun-Iung (2020). An AWE-based diagnosis

- of L2 English learners' written errors. *English Language Teaching*, 13(10), 111-121.
- 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), 126-137
- Njeru, D. (2022). The grammar answer key: Short explanations to 100 ESL questions. *TESOL Journal*, 13(1). <https://doi.org/10.1002/tesj.553>
- Parra G., L., & Calero S., X. (2019). Automated writing evaluation tools in the improvement of the writing skill. *International Journal of Instruction*, 12 (2), 209-226.
- Patel, M. (2023). In our rapidly changing world what is the future of the English language? British Council Voices Magazine. <https://www.britishcouncil.org/voices-magazine/rapidly-changing-world-what-future-english-language>
- Qizi ,Durdona Axmadova Axror. (2023). THE ROLE OF GRAMMAR IN LEARNING ENGLISH LANGUAGE. *American Journal Of Social Sciences And Humanity Research*, VOLUME 03 ISSUE 05 Pages:118-122. <https://doi.org/10.37547/ajsshr/Volume03Issue05-21>
- Ribeiro-Silva, E., Amorim, C., Aparicio-Herzgedas, J. L., & Batista, P. (2022). Trends of active learning in higher education and students' well-being: A literature review. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 13. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2022.844236>
- Sheetrit, G. (2022). The future of learning: Educational technology trends to watch in 2023. *eLearning Industry*. <https://elearningindustry.com/the-future-of-learning-educational-technology-trends-to-watch-in-2023>
- Smith, A., & Johnson, B. (2023). Integrating Explicit Grammar Instruction with Reading and Writing: A Pathway to Enhanced Writing Strategies, Language Control, and Academic Success. *Journal of Education and Language Studies*, 28(2), 45-60.
- Wu, H., Wang, W., Wan, Y., Jiao, W., & Lyu, M. R. (2023). ChatGPT or Grammarly? Evaluating ChatGPT on Grammatical Error Correction Benchmark [Manuscript submitted for publication]. arXiv. <https://doi.org/10.48550/arXiv.2303.13648>
- Yussif. (2022). 21 Ways a teacher can be a facilitator of learning. *Classroom Management Expert*. <https://classroommanagementexpert.com/blog/21-ways-a-teacher-can-be-a-facilitator-of-learning/>