

DOI: 10.5281/zenodo.121126200

EFL LEARNERS' MOTIVATION TO WRITE: A STUDY OF THE EFFICACY OF QUILLBOT AND GRAMMARLY

Arif Ahmed Mohammed Hassan Al-Ahdal^{1*}, Paiker Fatima Mazhar Hameed²

¹Department of English Language and Literature, College of Languages and Humanities, Qassim University, Buraydah, Saudi Arabia. Email: aa.alahdal@qu.edu.sa

²Department of English Language and Literature, College of Languages and Humanities, Qassim University, Saudi Arabia. Email: f.paiker@qu.edu.sa

Received: 19/09/2025
Accepted: 22/01/2026

Corresponding Author: Arif Ahmed Mohammed Hassan Al-Ahdal
(aa.alahdal@qu.edu.sa)

ABSTRACT

Mobile phones and their tools are today changing the language learning environments like never before. As a skill, writing is perceived as a bigger challenge than any other but mobile-assisted writing practice is changing this perception for EFL learners. This study adopts a quasi-experimental design with 52 EFL learners at Qassim University to examine how writing motivation and performance are impacted by the application of MAWP. Intervention was used with the experimental group (40) while the control group (12) continued with the prevalent pen-paper practice. Identical weekly tasks were designed for the groups where the intervention comprised the application of Quillbot and Grammarly. The study lasted six weeks and pre-post tests were used to determine effects if any. In addition to this, an adapted version of Gardner's (1983) Attitude/Motivation questionnaire was administered to the Experimental Group to gather perceptions towards MAWP. Statistical tools were used to analyze the pre-post test results for both the groups which established the efficacy of the intervention as language use and mechanics in EG showed marked improvement. Data also showed that the EG were unanimously in support of the tools vis-à-vis writing motivation and learning satisfaction. Not only the tangible results, but intrinsic gains were also reported by them, this was not the case with CG. Moreover, younger participants were found to have better perception of the tools when age correlation was examined. Thus, the study concludes that MAWP is enhanced by the use of mobile assisted writing tools, adding to the learners' motivation to write and giving them a higher sense of fulfilment. The study concludes with pertinent recommendations for the stakeholders.

KEYWORDS: Mobile-Assisted Writing Practice, Writing Motivation, Learner Satisfaction, Grammarly, Quillbot, Mobile Technologies, Research Work.

1. INTRODUCTION

Language research is replete with studies that point out the significance of writing proficiency for learners in a globalized world (Cummins, 2019; Izzatullakhon, 2024). Yet, the challenges to attaining this proficiency are many for EFL learners and mastering the skill remains a dream (Ahmed, 2019; Al-Ahdal et al., 2014). Among the reasons for this are the complex processes that writing involves, requires of the writer to follow many rules, and is dependent on knowledge of grammar and vocabulary (Deane et al., 2008). Traditionally, writing was product-oriented and hence, teacher was the leader in the writing classroom, accuracy rather than fluency was the objective causing many learners to be demotivated and un-engaged (Lee, 2019; Albelihi & Al-Ahdal, 2022).

Contemporarily, much like other spheres of human existence, technology has found an enviable place in education. From the rise of Computer-Assisted Language Learning, the prevalent practice is rooted in Mobile-Assisted Language Learning (Iftikhar, 2025). Mobile-Assisted Language Learning takes advantage of the fact that every learner has direct or indirect access to smartphones, facilitating learning anytime and anywhere (Aljaber, 2021; Kukulska-Hulme & Shield, 2008). Studies in Mobile-Assisted Language Learning have shown that it is effective in vocabulary acquisition, reading comprehension, and listening skills (Burston & Giannakou, 2022; Jeong, 2022; Albelihi & Al-Ahdal, 2022). Even amongst a wide range of these tools, Grammarly and Quillbot provide sophisticated, immediate feedback, bringing about a paradigm shift in error correction, potentially empowering learners to become more autonomous editors of their work (Raheem et al., 2023). In addition, learning is optimised when there is harmony between extrinsic infrastructure (pedagogy, aids, etc.) and intrinsic elements (engagement, motivation, scaffolding, etc.). Motivational theories in second language acquisition emphasise the centrality of attitude towards learning situations. Contemporary frameworks like Liu's (2024) L2 Motivational Self System and Deci and Ryan's (2024) Self-Determination Theory provide deeper insights into learners' internal drives. Digital tools, with their choice, instant feedback, and collaborative potential, are theorised to support these needs directly.

In this theoretical background, this study seeks to answer the following research questions:

1. To what extent do mobile-assisted writing tools impact the overall writing performance of EFL learners at the entry level at Qassim University?

2. To what extent do Quillbot and Grammarly impact the writing motivation of EFL learners at the entry level at Qassim University?
3. What are the experiences and perceptions of EFL learners regarding the use of mobile writing apps in developing their writing skills?

2. LITERATURE REVIEW

2.1. *The Challenges of EFL Writing*

Writing in a foreign language challenges the learners' cognitive system. Mohsen (2024) emphasised that writing in EFL differs from L1 writing, often being more challenging, slower, and less efficient. EFL learners encounter difficulties on various levels, linguistic, cognitive and sociocultural (Malik et al., 2021). These problems often make students very anxious about writing, which can kill their motivation and make them avoid writing (Zhang et al., 2023). Conventional pedagogical methods that focus on the result and entail protracted, frequently burdensome teacher feedback can intensify this anxiety, transforming writing into a source of frustration instead of a medium for communication and expression (Bakar, 2021).

2.2. *Mobile-Assisted Language Learning (MALL) and Writing (MALW)*

Early research in mobile-assisted learning focused on SMS and other simple apps, but modern smartphones support a rich plethora of complex applications (Zitouni et al., 2021; Ahmed et al., 2023; Alqasham & Al-Ahdal, 2022; Alqasham et al., 2021; Alrefaee et al., 2025). The defining features of MALL make it uniquely appropriate to support language learning outside the classroom (Martínez et al., 2025). When used in writing, these features became clear advantages. The freedom afforded in MALL takes off many of the challenges that mar the language classroom (Jabeen et al., 2025). In addition, each learner can learn at their own pace with the added pro of immediate feedback (Al-Raimi et al., 2024). Using mobile devices for blogging (Alharbi, 2025), collaborative writing (Joudi, 2024), and dictionary apps (Senthamarai, 2024) has been revealed to have positive learning outcomes.

2.3. *Intelligent Writing Assistants: Grammarly and Quillbot*

Grammarly is an English language writing assistant software tool that reviews spelling, grammar, and tone of a piece of writing, identifying possible instances of plagiarism. Founded in 2009, Grammarly today has over 40 million individual

users and 50,000 organisations. Quillbot is a paraphrasing and summarisation tool that uses artificial intelligence to rewrite text while preserving meaning (Thohir et al., 2024). While its use in academic situations is recent, it can be a powerful tool for representing sentence variety and reformulation strategies (Junaedi, 2025). The pedagogical significance of these tools lies not in replacing the writer, but in acting as a support, providing the immediate, reliable feedback that a teacher cannot practicably provide to every student on every draft (Zou et al., 2024).

2.5. Gap in the Literature and Present Study

While existing literature establishes the potential of MALL and the importance of motivation, there is a scarcity of empirical studies that directly investigate the impact of modern, AI-powered writing assistants on both the writing performance and the writing motivation of EFL learners, using a robust mixed-methods design. Most studies focus on one aspect or the other. This study aims to fill this gap by providing a holistic examination of the cognitive and affective outcomes of mobile-assisted writing practice (henceforth MAWP).

3. METHODOLOGY

3.1. Research Design

This study is quasi-experimental, utilising a pre-post-test design. This design was selected to establish cause-and-effect relationships between the independent variable and the dependent variables- writing performance and motivation.

3.2. Participants

The study sample comprised 52 EFL learners enrolled at the entry level at Qassim University.

Forty students were taught English using the MAWP (experimental group), and 12 were taught using the traditional way (control group). These specific learners were selected as learners at this stage have foundational knowledge but still struggle significantly with accuracy and fluency, making them likely to benefit from the intervention. Participants' ages ranged from 18 to 25, and they were all native Arabic speakers.

3.3. Instruments

3.3.1. Pre-Post-Test Writing Essays

Two pre- and post-writing tasks were assigned to both groups. These were narrative in nature and are a part of the regular course curriculum. A standardised rubric adapted from Jacobs et al. (1981) was used to score the writing samples. This rubric has four subscales, and inter-rater reliability was obtained from the inputs of two experienced EFL teachers. Only ten essays were selected from both groups at the beginning of the study. After the intervention was completed, ten essays were selected from the experimental group and ten essays from the control group. To have more depth about EFL learners' perceptions, a questionnaire was distributed to the experimental group students.

3.3.2. Questionnaire

The writing motivation subscale of Gardner (1983) was administered to the experiment group to check the efficacy and the impact of mobile-assisted tools on learners' writing motivation and performance. Responses were sought across a five-point Likert scale to measure Motivation, Writing Performance, Learning Experience, Attitude and Satisfaction towards mobile-assisted tools. Table 1 below depicts the internal consistency of the questionnaire items.

Table 1: Reliability Statistics of the Questionnaire.

No	Dimension	Cronbach's Alpha	N of Items	
1	Motivation	0.665	6	One statement deleted
2	Writing Performance	0.676	6	
3	Learning Experience	0.575	7	
4	Attitude and Satisfaction	0.947	6	
5	Total	0.852	25	

The overall Cronbach's alpha value of the questionnaire was 0.852, indicating high overall internal consistency.

Table 2 below summarises the demographic data of the participants.

Table 2: Demographic Data.

Age		18-20	21-23
Experimental Group		29	11
%		72.50%	27.50%
Control Group		7	5
%		58.33%	41.66%

3.4. Data Analysis and Results

Quantitative data from the writing scores and questionnaire were analysed using SPSS (Version 27). Descriptive statistics (percentages, frequencies and means) were computed for all pre- and post-test scores. To test for significant differences between the EG and CG while controlling for pre-existing

differences, a paired sample t-test was employed, using the pre-test scores as the covariate and the post-test scores as the dependent variable. The scale for coding the score was 90-100 for excellent to very good, 80-89 for good to average, 60-79 for fair to poor and below 60 was for very poor. The following Table 3 summarises the pre-test performance of the CG in all components included in the rubric.

Table 3: Performance of CG in the pre- and post-tests.

	Content Level	Organization Level	Vocabulary Level	Language Use Level	Mechanics Level
pre	173	116	103	111	27
post	274	183	181	215	45

Table 3 shows that in the pre-test stage, the control group scored very poorly in all five criteria. This means that they did not use a variety of words, and they made a lot of grammatical mistakes. At the individual level, the scores in the mechanic's criteria were unanimously low, 1 or 2 out of 5, which indicates problems with spelling, punctuation, and capitalisation. The post-test results for the same group show significant improvement in all aspects of

EFL writing performance after the instruction period. Content scores increased significantly, as did vocabulary and language use scores. Mechanics scores also improved, though not as much as the other criteria. These improved post-test scores indicate good progress and provide a strong basis for comparing the effects of other interventions, such as MAWP, on EFL learner outcomes.

Table 4: Performance of EG in the Pre- and Post-Tests.

	Content Level	Organization Level	Vocabulary Level	Language Use Level	Mechanics Level
Pre	180	126	102	115	27
Post	292	198	197	243	48

The EG participants were found to grapple with consistency and paragraphing heavily in the pre-test. They also found difficulty with vocabulary and language use, and their writing was found to suffer from poor spelling, punctuation, and capitalisation. All in all, the total pre-test scores were comparable to those of the CG, representing their low writing skills at the beginning of the study. This level of performance compared to the control group, supporting the good chance for implementing the study, as both groups before intervention had a similar and, establishing a foundation for assessing the effects of MAWP.

In the post-test, MAWP significantly improved the EG's English writing skills, as enhanced

performance was noted in content, organisation, vocabulary, language use, and mechanics, with better output in the use of complex structures, grammar, punctuation, and spelling. The post-test results consistently showed higher scores than the control group, indicating that students developed and systematised their ideas more comprehensively. The participants used a wider vocabulary range, they also showed better control of grammatical rules, and wrote with fewer mechanical errors. This suggests that mobile-assisted writing is an effective method for teaching EFL students to write better and motivate them to do so. The following tables (tables 5 and 6) reveal the statistical differences between the two groups.

Table 5: Paired Samples Statistics of both groups in pre-test (pre-intervention).

		Mean	N	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
Pair 1	Control group	1.00 ^a	10	.000	.000
	Expermetal group	1.0000 ^a	10	.00000	.00000

**The correlation and P-value cannot be computed because the standard error of the difference is 0.*

Table 5 shows the paired samples statistics for both the control and experimental groups on the pre-

test. The mean scores for both groups are identical in terms of performance, with a standard deviation and

standard error of 0.000 for each group. This means that the scores were identical for all participants across both groups in the pre-test condition. Because there is no variability in the data, the correlation and P-value cannot be computed; the standard error of the difference is zero for all participants. In practical

terms, this absolute uniformity indicates that, at baseline, the two groups started from the same level of measured performance. This gives the researchers full confidence that all participants have, if not identical, a similar proficiency at the beginning of the intervention.

Table 6: Paired Samples Test of both groups in post-test.

	Paired Differences					t	df	Sig. (2-tailed)
	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean	95% Confidence Interval of the Difference				
				Lower	Upper			
CG - EG	-.40000-	.51640	.16330	-.76941-	-.03059-	-2.449-	9	.037

Table 6 shows the results of a paired samples t-test that compared the post-test scores of the control group and the experimental group after the intervention. The p-value was less than 0.05, which means that there is a statistically significant difference between the performance of the control group and the experimental group after the intervention. The negative mean difference indicates that the experimental group outperformed the control group on the post-test assessment. These responses indicate that the intervention—MAWP—significantly improved EFL learners' writing

performance, and led to better performance compared to the performance of the control group which used conventional instruction.

As indicated earlier, this study also aimed to evaluate learners' perceptions of motivation towards writing as a result of the mobile-based aids. Table 7 below summarizes the findings as per the questionnaire reverts. In all four factors were included under motivation, viz., motivation to write, writing performance, learning experience, and attitude and satisfaction, responses to each are analysed below.

Table 7: Motivation to Write.

No	Statement	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly Agree	Std. Deviation	Mean
1	Using mobile devices makes me more motivated to practice writing in English.	0	0	11	8	21	1.27073	3.975
		0	0	27.50%	20.00%	52.50%		
2	I enjoy writing assignments more when I can use mobile technology.	2	5	5	8	20	0.84694	4.275
		5.00%	12.50%	12.50%	20.00%	50.00%		
3	I find mobile writing tools helpful for correcting my mistakes.	0	1	7	12	20	1.31168	3.85
		0	2.50%	17.50%	30.00%	50.00%		
4	Using mobile technology increases my interest in learning English writing.	0	0	7	19	14	0.85896	4.325
		0	0	17.50%	47.50%	35.00%		
5	The feedback I receive through mobile-assisted writing tools helps improve my motivation.	5	0	7	12	16	0.99228	4.3
		12.50%	0	17.50%	30.00%	40.00%		
6	I feel motivated to write more when technology supports my learning.	0	1	7	10	22	1.00128	4.15
		0	2.50%	17.50%	25.00%	55.00%		

Table 7 presents students' responses to MAWP. Positive perceptions were reported across all items, demonstrating that mobile-assisted writing substantially enhances EFL learners' motivation, helping them feel more interested, supported, and engaged in their writing development. These in turn

indicate a positive affective response to incorporating mobile technologies in writing instruction, supporting research showing that digital tools promote writing motivation and learning autonomy in EFL contexts.

Table 8: Writing Performance.

No	Statement	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly Agree	Std. Deviation	Mean
1	Mobile-assisted writing helps me organise my essays better.	0	3	6	7	24	1.0012	4.425
		0	7.50%	15.00%	17.50%	60.00%		
2	My vocabulary has expanded thanks to mobile-assisted tools and writing practice.	0	3	8	9	20	0.8129	4.425
		0	7.50%	20.00%	22.50%	50.00%		
3	Mobile-assisted tools help me produce longer and more detailed writing.	0		8	7	25	0.8770	4.5
		0		20.00%	17.50%	62.50%		
4	Mobile-assisted writing tools practice makes me more aware of my writing errors.	0	1	7	3	29	0.9577	4.425
		0	2.50%	17.50%	7.50%	72.50%		
5	I have seen improvement in my writing test scores since using mobile-assisted tools.	0	2	7	3	28	0.9922	4.3
		0	5.00%	17.50%	7.50%	70.00%		
6	Mobile-assisted writing tools prepare me better for academic writing tasks.	0	2	9	4	25	0.9388	4.125
		0	5.00%	22.50%	10.00%	62.50%		

Table 8 shows agreement that mobile tools are highly beneficial for organisation, vocabulary development, error and corrections, and academic readiness. In other words, integrating digital tools

can boost content, organisation, fluency, performance, engagement, autonomy, and metacognitive awareness, thereby almost improving overall learning outcomes.

Table 9: Learning Experience.

No	Statement	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly Agree	Std. Deviation	Mean
1	The mobile writing tool is easy to use for learning.	0	2	9	11	18	1.1206	4.025
		0	5.00%	22.50%	27.50%	45.00%		
2	I find the mobile-assisted tasks interesting and enjoyable.	0	6	6	9	19	1.1668	3.85
		0	15.00%	15.00%	22.50%	47.50%		
3	Mobile writing practice fits well with my daily schedule.	0	6	12	4	18	1.2184	3.55
		0	15.00%	30.00%	10.00%	45.00%		
4	I prefer mobile-assisted learning over paper-based learning for writing.	1	9	9	9	12	0.8828	4.3
		2.50%	22.50%	22.50%	22.50%	30.00%		
5	I get immediate feedback through mobile tools, which helps my learning.	0	2	5	12	21	1.0848	4.05
		0	5.00%	12.50%	30.00%	52.50%		
6	The interactive exercises on mobile apps keep me motivated.	0	4	10	6	20	0.9054	4.275
		0	10.00%	25.00%	15.00%	50.00%		
7	Mobile tools reduce my anxiety when writing in English.	0	2	6	11	21	0.9001	4.4
		0	5.00%	15.00%	27.50%	52.50%		

Data in Table 9 shows that the students' perceptions of their learning experience using MAWP were positive. As they reported that these tools are easy to use, provide immediate feedback, and make learning fun and interesting. The responses also revealed that mobile learning environments were more pleasurable and inspiring than the traditional pen-and-paper

method. The participants favoured mobile learning over traditional methods, as they offered both convenience and interactivity. It was also found that mobile learning made students less anxious when writing in English, indicating a more flexible digital environment. Most participants found mobile writing practice to fit their daily programs well.

Table 10: Attitude and Satisfaction.

No	Statement	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly Agree	Std. Deviation	Mean
1	I am satisfied with the mobile-assisted writing practice provided by my instructor.	0	2	5	8	25	1.3577	3.95
		0	5.00%	12.50%	20.00%	62.50%		
2	Mobile-assisted instruction has changed my attitude toward learning English writing positively.	1	9	4	3	23	0.8165	4.5
		2.50%	22.50%	10.00%	7.50%	57.50%		
3	The mobile-assisted writing activities match my learning needs.	0	1	5	7	27	0.89299	4.15
		0	2.50%	12.50%	17.50%	67.50%		
4	I feel that my English writing skills will improve faster using mobile tools.	0	3	4	17	16	0.93336	4.275
		0	7.50%	10.00%	42.50%	40.00%		
5	The mobile writing platform encourages me to practice regularly.	0	3	4	12	21	1.09515	4.075
		0	7.50%	10.00%	30.00%	52.50%		
6	I appreciate the variety of writing tasks provided through mobile technology.	1	4	4	13	18	0.85896	4.325
		2.50%	10.00%	10.00%	32.50%	45.00%		

According to the data in Table 10, the utilisation of MAWP was found to provide students with assistance in writing; the students' levels of motivation, attitudes, and self-assurance in relation to the improvement of their English writing abilities were increased to a great extent. The vast majority of participants expressed contentment with the writing tasks and training that they received from the tools. Students showed a greater interest in learning how to write in English as a result of mobile-assisted instruction, which made the process entertaining and more accessible. In addition to this, MAWP encouraged students to pursue autonomous learning. To summarise, when students are taught to write with the assistance of mobile devices, they report higher levels of satisfaction, as well as increased levels of motivation, positivism, and confidence in their ability to improve their English writing skills.

4. DISCUSSION

Results from the pre-test showed that the participants in both groups were very poor at writing in all five criteria. In both groups, grammar, spelling, and cohesion were clearly weak, and students had a limited vocabulary and ability to develop ideas. These comparable initial levels validated that both groups were equivalent prior to the intervention.

After the intervention period, despite that both groups – as control group received traditional and the experimental group received MAWP- saw clear improvements in their post-test scores, but the experimental group saw higher improvements, with the majority of scores falling in the "good to very good" range for the experimental group.

This enhancement in their performance indicates that though focused traditional instruction is effective, resulting in content development, organisation, and mechanical precision, mobile-assisted writing assistance is far superior in terms of learning outcomes.

The paired samples t-test result indicated that the experimental group significantly outperformed the control group on the post-test, with a p-value of 0.037. These evidence indicate that EFL learners stand to gain in writing from the application of mobile technology.

Data indicates that MAWP led to positive perceptions and real gains for the learners in terms of motivation since their writing proficiency was enhanced when writing as a task was not seen as tedious and un-doable but enjoyable, not a threat to their limited abilities but a real tool that helped them organize their materials, build the vocabulary and

write cohesively and coherently. In addition, autonomy in terms of self correction was seen as empowering because now they could use instant feedback. These findings echo those of Rebill (2025) and Zare et al. (2025), who reported metacognitive gains and better learner engagement in the collaborative, individual paced feedback mechanisms afforded by mobile tools.

The learners also reported emotionally assured and found the intervention effective as it was easy to use, was enjoyable, and did not criticize their shortcomings, thus boosting their confidence to write. In other words, mobile technologies greatly reduce learning anxiety, create welcoming, comfortable learning environments, and help boost learner autonomy. This finding echoes Li (2024), which also established the efficacy of interactive mobile learning in EFL writing.

The learners in the study reported a sense of satisfaction which again shows that the role of mobile technologies in the language classroom supports pedagogy as much as individual needs. When learning is enjoyable, higher motivation is also an outcome. Learners were positive that MAWP was enjoyable and enhanced the pace of learning. Similar gains were reported by Ozer and Kılıç (2018), positive correlations exist between technology acceptance and learning in addition to cognitively balanced, positive learning environments.

5. CONCLUSION

The foregoing sections establish the high efficacy of MAWP in enhancing EFL learners' writing performance and motivation to write. The intervention caused building of positive attitudes and learning satisfaction in writing. The study used a pre-post test and survey to collate data, triangulation of these indicated that learners preferred the MAWP to traditional approaches as they added to their anxiety and demotivated them. The flexibility and individual pace that these afforded were also reported to be highly appreciated features of these tools as much as immediate feedback and complete handholding that they assured.

Our understanding of MAWP also expands to the other gains such as learner autonomy and enhanced metacognition as learners become active participants in the learning process, writing and correcting themselves leading to a positive loop of independent learning. Further, it was seen that gender did not affect the perceptions of the learners as they unanimously reported enhanced motivation and learning satisfaction thus making a case for mobile technologies in the EFL classrooms.

5.1. Recommendations

The findings of this study elicit the following recommendations:

EFL teachers should contemplate integrating MAWP in their writing classes, as MAWP was found to be effective for promoting accuracy and building learner confidence.

Curriculum designers should design writing activities that pull the strengths of mobile technology, emphasising process writing, drafting, and self-editing. The role of the teacher can then shift from teacher-centred to learner-centred.

Professional development programs should train teachers on the pedagogical applications of these

tools to reduce technophobia and enable them to guide their students effectively.

5.2. Limitations and Future Research

Though a unique contribution to the Saudi EFL context, this study has a few limitations. The sample was homogeneous in terms of L1 and proficiency level, limiting generalizability. The short-term nature (6 weeks) of the intervention raises questions about long-term retention of benefits.

Future research should involve longer intervention periods, participants of different proficiency levels and L1 backgrounds, and a thorough investigation of which specific features of the tools are most beneficial.

Acknowledgement: The Researchers would like to thank the Deanship of Graduate Studies and Scientific Research at Qassim University for financial support (QU-APC-2025).

REFERENCES

- Ahmed, H., Kaiser, S., & Mohammed, O. (2023). Social Networking Sites Mediated Course Reflections on Instructional Technology: A Case Study of Female Students at Women's University. *TESOL and Technology Studies*, 4(2), 36-48.
- Ahmed, P. H. (2019). Major writing challenges experienced by EFL learners in Soran University. *Journal of University of Human Development*, 5(3), 120-126. <https://doi.org/10.21928/juhd.v5n3y2019.pp120-126>
- Al-Ahdal, A. A. M. H., Alfallaj, F., Al-Awaied, S., & Al-Hattami, A. A. (2014). A comparative study of proficiency in speaking and writing among EFL learners in Saudi Arabia. *American International Journal of Contemporary Research*, 4(2), 141-149.
- Albelihi, H. H. M., & Al-Ahdal, A. A. M. H. (2022). EFL students' writing performance: A study of the role of peer and small-group feedback. *Journal of Language and Linguistic Studies*, 17(4).
- Alharbi, A. S. (2025). Hidden dialogues: The power of informal peer feedback in EFL online reflective blogging. *Education and Information Technologies*, 1-30. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10639-025-13593-7>
- Aljaber, A. A. M. (2021). The reality of using smartphone applications for learning in higher education of Saudi Arabia (Doctoral dissertation, University of Glasgow). <https://doi.org/10.5525/gla.thesis.81974>
- Alqasham, F. H., & Al-Ahdal, A. A. M. H. (2022). Effectiveness of mind-mapping as a digital brainstorming technique in enhancing attitudes of Saudi EFL learners to writing skills. *Journal of Language and Linguistic Studies*, 17(2). <https://www.jlls.org/index.php/jlls/article/view/3819>
- Alqasham, F. H., Al-Ahdal, A. A. M. H., & Babekir, A. H. S. (2021). Coherence and cohesion in Saudi EFL learners' essay writing: A study at a tertiary-level institution. *Asian EFL Journal*, 28(11), 8-25.
- Al-Raimi, M., Mudhsh, B. A., Al-Yafaei, Y., & Al-Maashani, S. (2024). Utilizing artificial intelligence tools for improving writing skills: Exploring Omani EFL learners' perspectives. In *Forum for Linguistic Studies (Transferred)* (Vol. 6, No. 2, pp. 1177-1177). <https://doi.org/10.59400/fls.v6i2.1177>
- Alrefaei, S. M. A. S., Afzal, K. M., & Mohammed, O. A. (2025). The Use and Perception of Online Learning among EFL Faculty Members in Yemen. *TESOL and Technology Studies*, 6(1), 1-15.
- Bakar, S. (2021). Investigating the dynamics of contemporary pedagogical approaches in higher education through innovations, challenges, and paradigm shifts. *Social Science Chronicle*, 1(1), 1-19.
- Bandura, A. (1997). *Self-efficacy: The exercise of control*. W.H. Freeman and Company.
- Braun, V., & Clarke, V. (2006). Using thematic analysis in psychology. *Qualitative Research in Psychology*, 3(2), 77-101. <https://doi.org/10.1191/1478088706qp063oa>
- Burston, J. (2015). Twenty years of MALL project implementation: A meta-analysis of learning outcomes. *ReCALL*, 27(1), 4-20. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0958344014000159>
- Burston, J., & Giannakou, K. (2022). MALL language learning outcomes: A comprehensive meta-analysis 1994-2019. *ReCALL*, 34(2), 147-168.

- Cummins, J. (2019). The emergence of translanguaging pedagogy: A dialogue between theory and practice. *Journal of Multilingual Education Research*, 9(13), 1-16.
- Deane, P., Odendahl, N., Quinlan, T., Fowles, M., Welsh, C., & Bivens-Tatum, J. (2008). Cognitive models of writing: Writing proficiency as a complex integrated skill. *ETS Research Report Series*, 2008(2), i-36.
- Gardner, R. C. (1983). Learning another language: A true social psychological experiment. *Journal of language and social psychology*, 2(2-3-4), 219-239.
- Iftikhar, N. (2025). Mobile-assisted language learning (MALL): Revolutionizing second language acquisition. *Journal of Applied Linguistics and TESOL (JALT)*, 8(1), 1038-1045.
- Izzatullakhon, S. (2024). Writing their future: how academic writing skills drive success in studies and careers for bachelor's students. *Eurasian Journal of Academic Research*, 4(11), 110-120.
- Jabeen, S. S., Mankash, M. A., & Zaman, M. (2025). Impact of K-pop Fan Engagement on Informal English Proficiency among Pakistani Gen Z: <https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.17150457>. *Liberal Journal of Language & Literature Review*, 3(3), 1426-1435. <https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.17150457>
- Jacobs, H. L., Zingraf, S. A., Wormuth, D. R., Hartfiel, V. F., & Hughey, J. B. (1981). *Testing ESL composition: A practical approach*. Newbury House.
- Jeong, K. O. (2022). Facilitating sustainable self-directed learning experience with the use of mobile-assisted language learning. *Sustainability*, 14(5), <https://doi.org/10.3390/su14052894>
- Joudi, N. (2024). Online blogging versus conventional methods: An exploratory study of EFL Lebanese secondary school teachers' perceptions on teaching writing. *Gloria: International Multidisciplinary Studies*, 1(1), 23-58.
- Junaedi, S. (2025). English lecturers' perceptions towards the quillbot app: An alternative for students in paraphrasing and rewriting english writing. *International Journal of Research in Education*, 5(1), 149-156.
- Kukulska-Hulme, A., & Shield, L. (2008). An overview of mobile assisted language learning: From content delivery to supported collaboration and interaction. *ReCALL*, 20(3), 271-289. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0958344008000335>
- Lee, I. (2019). Teacher written corrective feedback: Less is more. *Language Teaching*, 52(4), 524-536. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0261444819000247>
- Li, T. (2024). The Role of Interactive Mobile Learning in Enhancing University Students' Foreign Language Writing Skills. *International Journal of Interactive Mobile Technologies*, 18(14).
- Liu, M. (2024). Mapping the landscape of research on the L2 motivational self system theory (2005-2021): A bibliometric and text network analysis. *System*, 120, . <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.system.2023.103180>
- Malik, S., Qin, H., & Oteir, I. (2021). Perceived Psychological, Linguistic and Socio-Cultural Obstacles: An Investigation of English Communication Apprehension in EFL Learners. *International Journal of Instruction*, 14(4), 733-752.
- Martínez, J. A. Á., Gómez, J. F., & Botero, J. C. R. (2025). Mobile-Assisted Language Learning (MALL) for Improving English Language Teaching and Learning in Higher Education: A Systematic Literature Review. *Knowledge Management & E-Learning*, 17(2), 258-277.
- Mohsen, M. A. (2024). L1 versus L2 writing processes: What insight can we obtain from a keystroke logging program?. *Language Teaching Research*, 28(6), 2251-2275. <https://doi.org/10.1177/13621688211041292>
- Noels, K. A., Pelletier, L. G., Clément, R., & Vallerand, R. J. (2000). Why are you learning a second language? Motivational orientations and self-determination theory. *Language Learning*, 50(1), 57-85. <https://doi.org/10.1111/0023-8333.00111>
- Ozer, O., & Kılıç, F. (2018). The effect of mobile-assisted language learning environment on EFL students' academic achievement, cognitive load and acceptance of mobile learning tools. *EURASIA Journal of Mathematics, Science and Technology Education*, 14(7), 2915-2928.
- Raheem, B. R., Anjum, F., & Ghafar, Z. N. (2023). Exploring the profound impact of artificial intelligence applications (Quillbot, Grammarly and ChatGPT) on English academic writing: A systematic review. *International Journal of Integrative Research (IJIR)*, 1(10), 599-622. <https://doi.org/10.59890/ijir.v1i10.366>
- Robillos, R. J. (2025). Integrating computer-aided argument mapping and the flipgrid application to foster self-directed learning and enhance students' argumentative writing skills. *Studies in Self-Access Learning Journal*, 16(2), 320-341. <https://doi.org/10.37237/160204>

- Ryan, R. M., & Deci, E. L. (2024). Self-determination theory. In *Encyclopedia of quality of life and well-being research* (pp. 6229-6235). Cham: Springer International Publishing.
- Senthamarai, T. (2024). The Evolution of Technical Jargons in Communicative English Among Bachelor of Engineering and Bachelor of Technology Students. *Frontiers in Health Informatics*, 13(7).
- Thohir, L., Udin, U., Isnaeni, M., & Putera, L. J. (2024). The effectiveness of integrating QuillBot for paraphrasing in writing instruction. *Journal of Languages and Language Teaching*, 12(4), 2112-2122. <https://doi.org/10.33394/jollt.v12i4.12780>
- Yan, D., & Zhang, S. (2024). L2 writer engagement with automated written corrective feedback provided by ChatGPT: A mixed-method multiple case study. *Humanities and Social Sciences Communications*, 11(1), 1-14.
- Zare, J., Ranjbaran Madiseh, F., & Derakhshan, A. (2025). Generative AI and English essay writing: Exploring the role of ChatGPT in enhancing learners' task engagement. *Applied Linguistics*, <https://doi.org/10.1093/applin/amaf045>
- Zhang, J., Zhang, L. J., & Zhu, Y. (2023). Development and validation of a genre-based second language (L2) writing self-efficacy scale. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 14, 1181196.
- Zitouni, M., Al-Traif, H., Zemni, B., Mohammed, O. S., & Aljasser, M. (2021). Utilization of YouTube to improve the pronunciation skills of Saudi learners in translation departments. *Asian ESP Journal*, 17(2), 133-154.
- Zou, S., Guo, K., Wang, J., & Liu, Y. (2024). Investigating students' uptake of teacher-and ChatGPT-generated feedback in EFL writing: A comparison study. *Computer Assisted Language Learning*, 1-30. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09588221.2024.2447279>.

Table 1: Pupil No Group Topic Date.

	Score	Level	Criteria
CONTENT	30-27	Excellent to Very Good	knowledgeable; substantive; thorough development of thesis; relevant to assigned topic
	26-22	Good to Average	some knowledge of subject; adequate range; limited development of thesis; mostly relevant to topic, but lacks detail
	21-17	Fair to Poor	limited knowledge of subject; little substance; inadequate development of topic
	16-13	Very Poor	does not show knowledge of subject; non-substantive; not pertinent; not enough to evaluate
ORGANIZATION	20-18	Excellent to Very Good	fluent expression; ideas clearly stated/supported; succinct; well-organized; logical sequencing; cohesive
	17-14	Good to Average	somewhat choppy; loosely organized; main ideas stand out; limited support; logical but incomplete sequencing
	13-10	Fair to Poor	non-fluent; ideas confused or disconnected; lacks logical sequencing and development
	9-7	Very Poor	does not communicate; no organization; not enough to evaluate
VOCABULARY	20-18	Excellent to Very Good	sophisticated range; effective word/idiom choice and usage; word form mastery; appropriate register
	17-14	Good to Average	adequate range; occasional errors of word/idiom form, choice, usage; meaning not obscured
	13-10	Fair to Poor	limited range; frequent errors of word/idiom form, choice, usage; meaning confused or obscured
	9-7	Very Poor	Essentially, translation; little knowledge of English vocabulary, idioms, word form, not enough to evaluate
LANGUAGE USE	25-22	Excellent to Very Good	effective complex constructions; few errors of agreement, tense, number, word order/function, articles, pronouns, prepositions
	21-18	Good to Average	effective but simple constructions; minor problems in complex constructions; several errors of agreement, tense, number, word order/function, articles, pronouns, prepositions, but meaning seldom obscured
	17-11	Fair to Poor	major problems in simple/complex constructions; frequent errors of negation, agreement, tense, number, word order/function, articles, pronouns, prepositions, and/or fragments, run-ons, deletions; meaning confused or obscured
	10-5	Very Poor	virtually no mastery of sentence construction rules; dominated by errors; does not communicate; not enough to evaluate
MECHANICS	5	Excellent to Very Good	demonstrates mastery of conventions; few errors of spelling, punctuation, capitalisation, and paragraphing
	4	Good to Average	occasional errors of spelling, punctuation, capitalisation, and paragraphing, but meaning not obscured
	3	Fair to Poor	frequent errors of spelling, punctuation, capitalisation, paragraphing; poor handwriting; meaning confused or obscured
	2	Very Poor	no mastery of conventions; dominated by errors of spelling, punctuation, capitalisation, paragraphing; handwriting illegible; does not communicate; not enough to evaluate

The questionnaire

Dear participants,

We are conducting a research on

The Impact of Mobile-Assisted Writing Practice on EFL Learners' Writing Motivation and Performance

. We would be very thankful if you would kindly answer this questionnaire honestly.

Your cooperation is highly appreciated.

Part (A) Demographic information

Name.....(optional).

Gender: Male Female

Age :

Part (B)- The Questionnaire

Please put a (√) in the box that represents your opinion. Only one box should be ticked

Motivation Dimension

1. Using mobile devices makes me more motivated to practice writing in English.
2. I enjoy writing assignments more when I can use mobile technology.
3. Mobile-assisted writing practice helps me feel confident in my English writing skills. (Deleted)

4. Writing on mobile devices feels more engaging than traditional methods.
5. I find mobile writing apps helpful for correcting my mistakes.
6. Using mobile technology increases my interest in learning English writing.
7. The feedback I receive through mobile-assisted writing helps improve my motivation.
8. I feel motivated to write more when technology supports my learning.

Writing Performance Dimension

1. Mobile-assisted writing helps me organize my essays better.
2. My vocabulary has expanded thanks to mobile writing practice.
3. Mobile tools help me produce longer and more detailed writing.
4. Mobile writing practice makes me more aware of my writing errors.
5. I have seen improvement in my writing test scores since using mobile-assisted tools.
6. Mobile-assisted writing prepares me better for academic writing tasks.

Learning Experience Dimension

1. The mobile writing tool is easy to use for learning.
2. I find the mobile-assisted tasks interesting and enjoyable.
3. Mobile writing practice fits well with my daily schedule.
4. I prefer mobile-assisted learning over paper-based learning for writing.
5. I get immediate feedback through mobile tools, which helps my learning.
6. The interactive exercises on mobile apps keep me motivated.
7. Mobile tools reduce my anxiety when writing in English.

Attitude and Satisfaction Dimension

1. I am satisfied with the mobile-assisted writing practice provided by my instructor.
2. Mobile-assisted instruction has changed my attitude toward learning English writing positively.
3. The mobile-assisted writing activities match my learning needs.
4. I feel that my English writing skills will improve faster using mobile tools.
5. The mobile writing t encourages me to practice regularly.
6. I appreciate the variety of writing tasks provided through mobile technology.