Arab World English Journal
INTERNATIONAL PEER REVIEWED JOURNAL ISSN: 2229-9327

Arab World English Journal (AWEJ) Special Issue on Artificial Intelligence, No. 3. 2026. Pp.303-315
DOI: https://dx.doi.org/10.24093/awej/AI3.19

QuillBot as an AI Writing Support Tool in English Academic Writing: MA TESOL Students' Perceived Challenges and Solutions

Amal Alghamdi
English Language Institute, King Abdulaziz University, Jeddah, Saudi Arabia
Corresponding Author: aalghamdi4595@stu.kau.edu.sa

Abeer Ahmed Madini
[2]English Language Institute, King Abdulaziz University, Jeddah, Saudi Arabia
E-mail: amadini@kau.edu.sa

Received:10/21/2025 Accepted:12/30/2025 PPublished:01/24/2026

Abstract

This study investigates Master of Arts in Teaching English to Speakers of Other Languages students' perceptions of QuillBot, an artificial intelligence–powered paraphrasing and writing support tool, in enhancing English academic writing and preparing texts for publication. The study is significant as it provides empirical insights into how artificial intelligence–based writing tools are perceived by postgraduate students and informs pedagogical practices for responsible technology integration in academic writing instruction. Fifteen female students from the English Language Institute at King Abdulaziz University participated in semi-structured interviews to examine how QuillBot influences grammatical accuracy, sentence clarity, paraphrasing strategies, and writing confidence in scholarly texts. Thematic analysis revealed predominantly positive perceptions, with participants viewing QuillBot as a supportive tool that addresses common linguistic challenges and improves writing efficiency. Nevertheless, concerns emerged regarding overreliance, stylistic distortion, and ethical considerations associated with the use of artificial intelligence in academic publishing. The findings underscore the need for critical awareness and pedagogical guidance to ensure the responsible integration of artificial intelligence in writing instruction. Limitations include the study's small, gender-specific, and single-institution sample, which may affect generalizability. Overall, the study contributes to ongoing discussions on the responsible integration of artificial intelligence in English academic writing and publishing, highlighting its potential to enhance student performance while safeguarding academic integrity.

Keywords: Artificial intelligence tools, academic writing, English as a foreign language students, Master of Arts, paraphrasing tools, QuillBot, Teaching English to Speakers of Other Languages, writing pedagogy

How to cite: Alghamdi, A., & Madini, A. A. (2026). QuillBot as an AI Writing Support Tool in English Academic Writing: MA TESOL Students' Perceived Challenges and Solutions. *Arab World English Journal, Special Issue on Artificial Intelligence,* (3):303-315.https://dx.doi.org/10.24093/awej/AI3.19

Introduction

Artificial intelligence has increasingly become a pivotal component of higher education, particularly in English academic writing and publishing. Students are increasingly adopting artificial intelligence–supported tools to enhance clarity, grammatical accuracy, and structural coherence in scholarly texts. In Teaching English to Speakers of Other Languages programs, research writing pedagogy emphasizes adherence to rigorous academic standards, including proper paraphrasing, sentence variety, and accurate citation practices (Hyland, 2019). However, despite formal instruction and pedagogical support, many Master of Arts in Teaching English to Speakers of Other Languages students continue to face persistent difficulties in producing academic writing suitable for publication. These challenges include limited grammatical range, paraphrasing inaccuracies, and reduced confidence in expressing complex ideas. Such persistent difficulties highlight the need to explore supportive tools that can scaffold academic writing development while maintaining ethical and scholarly standards.

Consequently, examining the role of artificial intelligence–assisted writing tools has become increasingly relevant in contemporary academic contexts (Shi, 2024; Wei et al., 2023). AI-supported platforms can provide immediate feedback, alternative phrasing options, and structural suggestions, which may help students navigate complex writing tasks more efficiently. Among these tools, QuillBot, an artificial intelligence–powered paraphrasing and editing platform, has gained popularity for refining vocabulary, restructuring sentences, and reducing cognitive load during revision. While previous studies have examined artificial intelligence writing tools broadly, there remains a lack of qualitative research focusing on postgraduate Teaching English to Speakers of Other Languages students' lived experiences with such tools in the specific context of English academic writing and publishing. Understanding students' perceptions is essential for informing pedagogical practices that maximize the benefits of artificial intelligence while addressing potential risks, including overreliance, semantic distortion, and academic integrity concerns (Shi, 2024; Son, Ružić, & Philpott, 2023).

In response to the identified research problem, this study aims to explore Master of Arts in Teaching English to Speakers of Other Languages students' perceptions of using QuillBot to support English academic writing and publishing, as well as to identify the perceived benefits and challenges associated with the use of QuillBot in preparing scholarly texts. To address these objectives, the study is guided by the following research questions:

1. How do MA TESOL students perceive the role of QuillBot in supporting English academic writing and publishing?
2. What benefits and challenges do students identify when using QuillBot in preparing scholarly texts?

By focusing on postgraduate students' first-hand experiences, this study contributes to a more nuanced understanding of AI-assisted academic writing and informs the responsible integration of technology into TESOL research writing pedagogy.

Literature Review

AI Tools and Second Language Writing

The integration of artificial intelligence into second-language writing instruction has attracted growing scholarly attention, particularly regarding its potential to enhance English academic writing and support publishing practices in Teaching English to Speakers of Other Languages (TESOL) contexts. AI writing tools encompass a wide array of technologies, including

automated writing evaluation systems, paraphrasing tools, grammar checkers, and generative language models. These tools are increasingly adopted by learners to improve grammatical accuracy, lexical variety, sentence cohesion, and overall textual quality, serving as both cognitive aids and pedagogical supports (Shi, 2024).

Rather than functioning as replacements for traditional instruction, AI tools are often conceptualized as supplementary resources that scaffold the writing process, offering immediate feedback, alternative expressions, and revision guidance while reducing cognitive load. In second-language writing, where learners must manage multiple linguistic and rhetorical demands simultaneously, such support can facilitate more fluent and accurate text production, particularly during drafting and revision stages.

As Wei, Wang and Dong, 2023 research indicates that learners' engagement with AI tools is shaped not only by their technical capabilities but also by perceptions of usefulness, ease of use, reliability, and ethical appropriateness. In academic publishing, second-language writers face heightened pressures to maintain originality, adhere to formal conventions, and express complex ideas clearly. Understanding how learners evaluate and interact with AI writing support is therefore critical for informing pedagogical decisions, curriculum design, and instructional guidance (Wei, Wang and Dong, 2023). Moreover, students' attitudes toward AI tools can influence not only tool adoption but also the effectiveness of integration, highlighting the importance of reflective, responsible, and contextual awareness of use in EFL and TESOL academic writing settings.

Paraphrasing Tools and Automated Feedback Systems

Within the broader category of AI writing tools, automated writing evaluation systems and paraphrasing tools serve distinct yet complementary functions. Automated writing evaluation systems, such as Grammarly, primarily provide real-time feedback on grammar, mechanics, and sometimes style. Studies examining automated written feedback report generally positive effects on grammatical accuracy and lexical complexity, particularly when learners receive adequate training in tool use (Wei et al., 2023). However, learner responses to automated feedback vary considerably, with some students questioning the transparency and pedagogical value of algorithm-generated corrections (Shi, 2024).

Paraphrasing tools, by contrast, focus on sentence restructuring and lexical reformulation rather than error detection. In English as a foreign language context, studies consistently indicate that students perceive paraphrasing tools as helpful for improving fluency, expanding vocabulary, and facilitating revision (Alammar, 2023). At the same time, concerns persist regarding overreliance, semantic distortion, and potential violations of academic integrity. Understanding students' perceptions of artificial intelligence–based writing tools is essential for informing pedagogical practices that maximize their benefits while addressing potential challenges in academic writing. Previous research published in *Arab World English Journal* indicates that EFL learners generally perceive AI paraphrasing tools as valuable resources for improving grammatical accuracy, vocabulary choice, and overall clarity in research writing. For example, Alammar and Amin (2023) found that EFL students viewed AI paraphrasing tools as effective in supporting paraphrasing tasks and reducing linguistic difficulties, while simultaneously expressing concerns about meaning distortion and overdependence. Similarly, Alyami, Alotaibi, and Khan (2025) reported that Saudi EFL learners held largely positive attitudes toward the use of artificial intelligence in writing, particularly for language accuracy and revision, although ethical concerns and the need for guided use were consistently emphasized. Collectively, these findings suggest

that while AI-supported writing tools can enhance academic writing performance, their integration into EFL instruction requires pedagogical guidance to ensure responsible use and the maintenance of academic integrity.

Importantly, paraphrasing tools such as QuillBot differ from ChatGPT-style generative artificial intelligence. While generative models can produce extended original texts, paraphrasing tools operate on user-provided input and are primarily used for reformulation and revision. This functional distinction has ethical and pedagogical implications, particularly in academic publishing contexts where originality and authorial control are critical.

Technology Acceptance Model and AI Writing Tools

The Technology Acceptance Model (TAM) provides a well-established and widely applied theoretical framework for examining learners' adoption and use of educational technologies. Originally proposed by Davis (1989), TAM posits that two core construct are: perceived usefulness and perceived ease of use that shape users' attitudes toward a technology, which in turn influence their intention to use and actual usage behavior. Perceived usefulness refers to the degree to which individuals believe that a particular system enhances their performance, while perceived ease of use concerns the extent to which the system is perceived as requiring minimal effort. In academic writing contexts, these constructs are particularly salient, as students tend to adopt technological tools when they perceive clear improvements in writing quality, efficiency, and accuracy, alongside ease of operation and accessibility.

Within English academic writing, especially in EFL and TESOL contexts, learners face heightened linguistic and cognitive demands related to grammar, paraphrasing, lexical choice, and textual coherence. AI-assisted writing tools have emerged as potential support in addressing these challenges by offering immediate feedback, alternative formulations, and revision assistance. From a TAM perspective, students are more likely to accept and use AI writing tools when they believe that such tools can meaningfully enhance their academic writing performance, reduce time spent on revision, and support clarity and accuracy without requiring extensive technical expertise.

The application of TAM is particularly appropriate for examining QuillBot, as its use is largely voluntary and driven by individual perceptions rather than institutional mandates. QuillBot's effectiveness relies heavily on users' subjective evaluations of its ability to improve grammatical accuracy, sentence clarity, and paraphrasing quality, as well as its user-friendly interface and accessibility. For MA TESOL students, who are both advanced language learners and future educators, these perceptions play a crucial role in determining not only whether the tool is adopted, but also how it is integrated into academic writing practices.

Previous research applying the Technology Acceptance Model to AI-assisted writing tools indicates that students' acceptance is strongly associated with perceived performance gains and usability rather than the technical sophistication of the system itself (Son, Ružić and Philpott, 2023). Studies have shown that when learners perceive AI tools as reliable, efficient, and supportive of their writing goals, they are more inclined to incorporate them into their writing processes. However, TAM-based research also suggests that positive perceptions do not automatically translate into effective or responsible use, particularly when issues of overreliance, ethical concerns, and reduced learner autonomy arise.

In this study, TAM serves as a theoretically grounded lens for exploring how MA TESOL students evaluate and engage with QuillBot in English academic writing. By examining participants' perceptions of usefulness and ease of use, the model helps explain variations in tool

adoption, feature selection, and attitudes toward AI-supported paraphrasing and revision. Integrating TAM into the analysis allows for a nuanced understanding of how AI writing tools can be positioned as supportive pedagogical resources rather than replacements for independent writing and critical language development.

Despite the rapidly growing body of research on artificial intelligence in second-language writing, a clear gap remains in our understanding of how AI-supported tools are perceived and utilized by advanced learners. Most existing studies have concentrated on undergraduate populations, focused primarily on automated writing evaluation systems, or relied heavily on quantitative measures such as error reduction, accuracy rates, or overall writing scores. While these investigations provide valuable insights into tool effectiveness, they do not capture the nuanced experiences, attitudes, and decision-making processes of learners as they interact with AI writing technologies. Qualitative studies examining postgraduate students' perspectives, particularly those enrolled in Teaching English to Speakers of Other Languages programs, are notably scarce. This is significant because advanced learners often face more complex linguistic, rhetorical, and ethical challenges in academic writing, including the need to maintain originality, navigate paraphrasing responsibly, and express sophisticated ideas with clarity and precision. Consequently, little is known about how these learners regulate the use of paraphrasing tools, critically assess AI suggestions, negotiate issues of academic integrity, and integrate AI assistance into their scholarly writing practices.

Addressing this gap, the present study seeks to provide in-depth qualitative insights into Master of Arts in Teaching English to Speakers of Other Languages students' experiences with QuillBot. By exploring perceptions of usability, usefulness, and ethical implications, this study contributes to a more nuanced understanding of AI-assisted academic writing and offers guidance for the responsible integration of technology in postgraduate TESOL pedagogy, highlighting strategies that enhance writing performance while safeguarding learner autonomy and academic integrity.

Method

This study involved 15 female Master of Arts in Teaching English to Speakers of Other Languages students enrolled in the English Language Institute at King Abdulaziz University. Participants were purposefully selected to ensure that they possessed relevant experience or informed expectations regarding the use of QuillBot in academic writing contexts. Specifically, participants either had prior experience using QuillBot for academic or teaching-related writing tasks or expressed a clear interest in using the tool in the future. This participant selection rationale was based on the assumption that individuals with direct or anticipated engagement with QuillBot would be able to provide rich, reflective, and contextually grounded insights into its pedagogical role as an artificial intelligence–supported writing tool (Creswell & Poth, 2018). The selection of accessible participants also facilitated timely and practical data collection within the institutional setting. All participants provided informed consent, and ethical approval was obtained from King Abdulaziz University, ensuring adherence to established research ethics and participant protection standards.

Data were collected through semi-structured interviews, a method particularly suitable for capturing in-depth and nuanced perspectives on participants' experiences (Kallio, Pietilä et al., 2016). The interview protocol comprised eight open-ended questions informed by prior literature on artificial intelligence writing tools in English as a foreign language context (e.g., Alharbi, 2023;

Aljuaid, 2024). The questions focused on multiple dimensions, including QuillBot's role in supporting grammatical accuracy and sentence variety, its impact on writing confidence, issues related to plagiarism, dependency, and ethical use, the most frequently used features of QuillBot, and whether participants would recommend the tool to other Teaching English to Speakers of Other Languages professionals.

Interviews were conducted synchronously via Zoom, each lasting approximately 20–30 minutes and were audio-recorded with participants' permission. Field notes were also taken to capture non-verbal cues, tone, and contextual observations, thereby enriching the dataset and supporting interpretive depth.

Following data collection, all interviews were transcribed verbatim, and the data were analyzed using thematic analysis guided by Braun and Clarke's (2006) six-phase framework. This analytic approach involved familiarization with the data, generation of initial codes, searching for themes, reviewing themes, defining and naming themes, and producing the final report. Thematic analysis was selected for its flexibility and its capacity to capture both participants' perceptions and the underlying rationales informing their views, making it particularly appropriate for exploring pedagogical and contextual experiences with artificial intelligence–assisted writing tools in English academic writing and publishing.

To enhance methodological rigor and trustworthiness, the study addressed credibility through careful transcription and systematic coding, dependability through consistent application of the analytic framework, and transferability by providing detailed contextual descriptions of the study setting and participants. By adopting this methodological approach, the study captures both the potential benefits and challenges of artificial intelligence–assisted paraphrasing tools, thereby informing responsible and effective integration of such technologies into Teaching English to Speakers of Other Languages research writing pedagogy.

Results

Fifteen participants (P1–P15) voluntarily participated in semi-structured interviews, having previously indicated willingness to participate in an online survey reported in a separate quantitative study. The interviews were transcribed verbatim and analyzed using NVivo, guided by Braun and Clarke's (2006) six-phase thematic analysis framework. Eight key themes emerged, reflecting participants' perceptions of QuillBot's role in supporting EFL academic writing and publishing. Findings are presented descriptively, with illustrative quotes highlighting patterns across participants.

The semi-structured interview questions used to guide data collection are provided in Appendix A. The participants' profiles, including academic status, tool usage frequency, and preferred features, are summarized in Appendix B (Table 1). Participants' engagement with QuillBot ranged from frequent to rare use, reflecting differences in writing needs, experience levels, and individual strategies. Feature preferences, such as Standard mode, Fluency, Grammar Check, Synonyms, and Multiple Modes, demonstrate that students selectively applied the tool to support specific aspects of academic writing and publishing tasks.

The summary of qualitative themes, including supportive perspectives and critical concerns, is presented in Appendix C (Table 2). The following sections elaborate on these key themes with illustrative examples from participant interviews.

Expectations and Perceived Usefulness

Participants expressed clear expectations regarding QuillBot's role in supporting multiple aspects of their academic writing. Most participants (P1–P6, P8–P15) anticipated that the tool would assist with grammar correction, paraphrasing, sentence structuring, and overall clarity (see Table 2, Appendix C). P1 explained, "with grammar, with paraphrasing, with structuring… with brainstorming and also with clarity," illustrating the perception of QuillBot as a multifunctional writing aid. These responses indicate that participants viewed the tool as a comprehensive support system capable of addressing common linguistic challenges encountered in academic writing. While expectations were largely positive, some participants (P7, P9, P11) noted limitations in contextual sensitivity. P9 observed, "Sometimes it gives suggestions that don't fully fit the context," highlighting the need for careful evaluation of AI output to ensure appropriateness within specific academic and disciplinary contexts.

Impact on Paraphrasing

Most participants (P1–P6, P8–P15) reported that QuillBot positively influenced their paraphrasing strategies by generating clearer, more accurate, and cohesive sentences. P3 noted, "It helps me rephrase sentences correctly without changing meaning," emphasizing the tool's ability to maintain semantic integrity while improving linguistic expression. P5 commented, "It made me focus on simpler sentences and correct linking words," suggesting that QuillBot supports not only rephrasing but also sentence-level coherence and readability. However, some participants (P7, P9, P11) expressed concerns about meaning preservation and contextual accuracy, indicating that users must critically assess AI suggestions to avoid unintended semantic shifts. These findings underscore the dual function of paraphrasing tools: enhancing clarity and efficiency while requiring user judgment to preserve meaning.

Effect on Writing Confidence

Participants reported mixed effects of QuillBot on their confidence. Several participants (P1, P2, P4, P5, P8–P10, P12, P14) felt reassured and supported, with P4 stating, "I feel more confident knowing I have support for my writing." This suggests that AI tools can serve as a confidence scaffold, particularly for complex academic writing tasks. Conversely, other participants (P3, P6, P7, P9, P11, P13, P15) reported decreased confidence or hesitation, exemplified by P9: "Sometimes I doubt if the suggestions are correct; it makes me hesitant." This variability underscores the dual role of AI tools as both confidence boosters and sources of uncertainty, highlighting the importance of user familiarity and critical engagement with the output.

Role in Improving Writing Skills

Most participants acknowledged QuillBot's effectiveness in enhancing grammar and structural accuracy (P1–P6, P8–P10, P12–P15). P2 highlighted, "It helps immensely with grammar and accuracy," reflecting the tool's perceived contribution to producing polished and academically acceptable texts. Nevertheless, some participants (P3, P7, P9, P11, P13, P15) expressed that the tool did not foster independent skill development, with P9 noting, "It corrects sentences, but I don't feel I learn how to improve on my own." These findings suggest that QuillBot functions best as a supplementary tool rather than a replacement for direct instruction or autonomous learning, supporting refinement but not necessarily the acquisition of deeper writing strategies.

Concerns and Challenges

All participants (P1–P15) identified potential challenges, including AI detectability, contextual limitations, and risk of overreliance. Participants emphasized that excessive dependence could undermine originality and critical engagement. P1 expressed, "My work might be detected as AI-generated," while P2 added, "It doesn't always consider context," and P9 cautioned, "I sometimes rely on it too much, which worries me." These insights reflect the ethical and pedagogical concerns surrounding AI use in academic settings, emphasizing the need for balanced integration and critical oversight.

QuillBot as Support vs. Primary Tool

Participants unanimously agreed that QuillBot is most effective as a supplementary aid rather than as a primary writing tool (P1–P15). P11 stated, "I mainly use it for proofreading and grammar checks," and P2 emphasized, "I use it as a supporting tool, not a main tool." Several participants (P3, P5, P6, P9, P12, P14, P15) explicitly warned against primary reliance, reinforcing the idea that AI should enhance, not replace, active learning and critical engagement.

Feature Utility and Interest

Participants valued features that aligned with their writing needs (P1–P6, P8–P15). P13 preferred the Standard mode for clarity, while P14 highlighted the usefulness of Synonyms and minor paraphrasing support. Some participants noted limitations, such as rigid or unnatural suggestions (P4, P7, P9, P11), indicating that output must be critically assessed to maintain intended style and meaning. These findings underscore the importance of selective and informed use of AI features to support specific writing goals.

Likelihood of Recommendation

Participants' recommendations varied, reflecting their experiences with QuillBot. Many (P1, P2, P4, P5, P8–P10, P12, P14) endorsed it as a supplementary tool, with P1 stating, "It's a quick way to improve and elevate writing." Others (P3, P6, P7, P9, P11, P13, P15) recommended caution, emphasizing awareness of its limitations (P9: "I would recommend it only if students are aware of its limitations").

Overall, participants perceived QuillBot as a practical and efficient complementary tool that supports writing accuracy and efficiency while emphasizing the importance of responsible, selective use to safeguard learning outcomes, academic integrity, and independent writing skills. The results highlight the nuanced ways in which postgraduate MA TESOL students interact with AI-assisted writing tools, balancing the benefits of efficiency and scaffolding with concerns regarding autonomy and ethical use.

Discussion

This study addresses two primary research questions: how MA TESOL students perceive the role of QuillBot in supporting English academic writing and publishing, and what benefits and challenges they identify when using QuillBot in preparing scholarly texts.

In response to the first research question, participants consistently perceived QuillBot as a practical, supplementary tool that supports multiple aspects of academic writing, including grammar, sentence structure, paraphrasing, and overall clarity. Trainees emphasized that QuillBot provides scaffolding without replacing independent writing, reflecting an informed and reflective

approach to technology integration. These perceptions align with prior research suggesting that AI-based writing assistants can enhance writing accuracy, support cognitive processes involved in writing, and serve as a resource for EFL learners to refine their language use (Alharbi, 2023; Aljuaid, 2024). The emphasis on using QuillBot as a complement rather than a substitute underscores participants' awareness of the importance of maintaining ownership of their writing and engaging critically with AI-generated suggestions.

Regarding the second research question, participants identified multiple benefits of QuillBot, particularly in improving paraphrasing strategies. Most trainees reported that the tool simplified complex sentences, refined linking words, and provided alternative expressions, enhancing both linguistic accuracy and textual cohesion. These findings corroborate prior observations that AI tools can scaffold writing tasks effectively while reducing cognitive load and allowing learners to focus on higher-order writing processes (Alharbi, 2023). At the same time, participants noted several challenges, including occasional distortion of meaning, contextual limitations, AI detectability, and potential overreliance. Some trainees reported hesitation when AI suggestions conflicted with their own linguistic understanding, echoing concerns identified in prior research about the dual effects of AI tools on confidence and skill development (Aljuaid, 2024). These findings emphasize that AI tools, while efficient and supportive, require critical evaluation and selective use to ensure responsible and effective integration in academic writing contexts.

Participants' cautious yet purposeful use of QuillBot reflects the principles of the Technology Acceptance Model (TAM), in which perceived usefulness and ease of use influence adoption but do not automatically guarantee skill acquisition (Davis, 1989). Trainees demonstrated selective engagement with features according to their writing needs and competence, indicating that human judgment mediates the effective integration of AI in learning and teaching. This aligns with the view that AI should act as a scaffold rather than a substitute, supporting pedagogical guidance while fostering autonomous skill development.

This study contributes to the existing literature by providing qualitative insights into MA TESOL trainees' perspectives, a group often overlooked in research focusing primarily on quantitative outcomes. By linking participants' experiences to prior studies, the findings show that AI tools like QuillBot can enhance grammatical accuracy, sentence variety, and paraphrasing strategies, while highlighting the need for pedagogical guidance to prevent overreliance and semantic distortion. The results underscore the importance of reflective practice in teacher education and provide a practical framework for integrating AI tools responsibly into writing instruction.

Finally, several limitations must be acknowledged. The sample consisted of 15 female MA TESOL trainees from a single institution, which may limit the generalizability of the findings. Additionally, the study focused exclusively on perceptions rather than on measurable writing outcomes. Future research could expand the participant pool to include diverse contexts and incorporate longitudinal designs to examine the long-term impact of AI tools on both teaching practices and student writing proficiency. Moreover, mixed-method approaches could explore how perceptions translate into actual writing improvements, offering a more comprehensive understanding of AI-assisted academic writing in postgraduate TESOL programs.

Conclusion

The current study aimed to investigate MA TESOL students' perceptions of QuillBot as an AI-supported tool for enhancing EFL students' grammatical accuracy and sentence variety in

research writing. The findings indicate that QuillBot is perceived as a valuable and practical supplementary resource, providing immediate feedback, scaffolding complex writing tasks, and promoting more confident and structured writing practices. Participants emphasized that AI tools should complement, rather than replace, traditional pedagogical strategies, as overreliance or uncritical use may hinder the development of independent writing skills and critical thinking.

The study also highlighted several practical implications for teacher education and writing instruction. Educators should provide clear guidance on when and how to use AI tools, fostering responsible use while supporting learners' autonomy and critical engagement with language. By adopting such an approach, AI tools can enhance the effectiveness of writing instruction without undermining fundamental skill development. The selective and reflective use of QuillBot by MA TESOL trainees underscores the importance of balancing technological affordances with pedagogical judgment.

For future research, studies could expand the participant pool to include male and female students from multiple institutions and cultural contexts and examine both perceptions and measurable impacts on writing outcomes. Longitudinal studies could investigate the sustained effects of AI tools on learner autonomy, writing proficiency, and pedagogical decision-making, while integrating both student and teacher perspectives to provide a more comprehensive understanding of AI-assisted writing instruction.

Funding: This research is not funded.

Acknowledgements: The authors acknowledge the use of an AI-assisted tool for language polishing and proofreading. All ideas, analyses, and interpretations presented in this paper are entirely the authors' own.

Conflicts of Interest: The authors declare no conflict of interest.

Authenticity: This manuscript is an original work

Artificial Intelligence Statement: An AI-assisted tool was used solely for language polishing and proofreading during the preparation of this manuscript. All ideas, analyses, interpretations, and conclusions are entirely the authors' own, and the AI tool did not contribute to the study design, data analysis, or intellectual content of the paper.

About the Authors :

Amal Alghamdi, MA TESOL student at the English Language Institute, King Abdulaziz University. Amal specializes in EFL research writing and integrating AI tools like QuillBot to enhance students' grammatical accuracy, writing skills, and academic writing confidence. She has strong experience in technology-enhanced language learning and writing pedagogy.
ORCID ID: https://orcid.org/0009-0003-0073-0329

Abeer Ahmed Madini, Head of the Department at the Tourism College (Women's Main Campus), King Abdulaziz University, and a TESOL expert in English. Dr. Madini is an experienced educator and researcher with expertise in curriculum design and development, integrating technology in education, and academic writing pedagogy. She focuses on student-centered learning and has numerous publications in English language teaching and EFL research.
ORCID ID: https://orcid.org/0000-0002-1122-1111

References

Alammar, A., & Amin, E. A. (2023). EFL students' perceptions of using AI paraphrasing tools in English language research projects. *Arab World English Journal, 14*(2), 345–360. https://doi.org/10.24093/awej/vol14no2.18

Alammar, A. (2023). EFL students' perception of using AI paraphrasing tools in English language research projects. *Arab World English Journal (AWEJ), 14*(2). https://doi.org/10.24093/awej/vol14no2.18

Alharbi, M. F. (2023). Artificial intelligence tools in EFL academic writing: Exploring student attitudes toward AI-based writing assistants. *Journal of Language and Education, 9*(2), 45–60. https://doi.org/10.17323/jle.2023.15422

Aljuaid, H. (2024). The impact of artificial intelligence tools on academic writing instruction in higher education: A systematic review. *Arab World English Journal (AWEJ), Special Issue on ChatGPT*, 26–55. https://doi.org/10.24093/awej/ChatGPT.2

Alyami, A., Alotaibi, S., & Khan, W. (2025). Saudi EFL learners' perceptions of using artificial intelligence and its impact on their writing skills. *Arab World English Journal*. https://awej.org/saudi-efl-learners-perceptions-of-using-artificial-intelligence-and-its-impact-on-their-writing-skills/

Braun, V., & Clarke, V. (2006). Using thematic analysis in psychology. *Qualitative Research in Psychology, 3*(2), 77–101. https://doi.org/10.1191/1478088706qp063oa

Davis, F. D. (1989). Perceived usefulness, perceived ease of use, and user acceptance of information technology. *MIS Quarterly, 13*(3), 319–340. https://doi.org/10.2307/249008

Hyland, K. (2019). *Second language writing* (2nd ed.). Cambridge University Press.

Kallio, H., Pietilä, A.-M., Johnson, M., & Kangasniemi, M. (2016). Systematic methodological review: Developing a framework for a qualitative semi-structured interview guide. *Journal of Advanced Nursing, 72*(12), 2954–2965. https://doi.org/10.1111/jan.13031

Shi, H. (2024). Systematic review of AI-based automated written feedback research. *Recall (Cambridge), 36*(2), 125–146. https://www.cambridge.org/core/journals/recall/article/systematic-review-of-aibased-automated-written-feedback-research/28A670C4C7F2F1F30C7EA36EC489F867

Son, J.-B., Ružić, N. K., & Philpott, A. (2023). Artificial intelligence technologies and applications for language learning and teaching. *Journal of Computer-Assisted Language Learning, 36*(6), 1150–1169. https://doi.org/10.1515/jccall-2023-0015

Wei, P., Wang, X., & Dong, H. (2023). The impact of automated writing evaluation on second language writing skills of Chinese EFL learners: A randomized controlled trial. *Frontiers in Psychology, 14*, Article 1249991. https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2023.1249991

Appendices

Appendix A

Semi-Structured Interview Questions

1. How does QuillBot help you support EFL students in improving grammatical accuracy in their academic writing?
2. In what ways do you think QuillBot enhances students' ability to use varied sentence structures in their research writing?
3. Do you observe an increase in students' confidence in writing after using QuillBot? Why or why not?

4. How do you think QuillBot contributes to preventing plagiarism in student writing?
5. What challenges have you encountered when integrating QuillBot into grammar instruction?
6. Do you view QuillBot as a tool students rely on heavily, or as a supportive aid to their writing process?
7. Which QuillBot features do you find most useful for enhancing grammatical range and accuracy, and why?
8. Would you recommend QuillBot to other TESOL professionals for teaching grammar in academic writing? Why or why not?

Appendix B
Participant Profiles and Feature Preferences

Table 1. *Individual participant characteristics and tool usage*

Participant	Academic Status	Usage Frequency	Preferred Features	Primary Use Case
P1	Thesis Stage	Frequent	Standard mode	Proofreading and grammar
P2	Graduated	Frequent	Fluency feature	Paraphrasing support
P3	Second-year	Occasional	Synonyms	Vocabulary enhancement
P4	Thesis Stage	Occasional	Multiple modes	Sentence structuring
P5	First-year	Rare	Grammar check	Error correction
P6	Thesis Stage	Frequent	Standard mode	Minor corrections
P7	Second-year	Frequent	Fluency feature	Sentence refinement
P8	Thesis Stage	Occasional	Standard mode	Grammar support
P9	First-year	Rare	Synonyms	Word choice improvement
P10	Thesis Stage	Frequent	Fluency feature	Paraphrasing and clarity
P11	Graduated	Occasional	Multiple modes	Sentence restructuring
P12	Thesis Stage	Frequent	Standard mode	Proofreading and grammar
P13	Second-year	Rare	Synonyms	Vocabulary improvement
P14	First-year	Occasional	Grammar check	Minor corrections
P15	Thesis Stage	Frequent	Fluency feature	Paraphrasing support

Appendix C
Thematic Analysis Items

Table 2. *Summary of qualitative themes: Supportive perspectives and critical concerns*

Theme	Definition	Representative Codes
Expectations & Perceived Usefulness	Participants' anticipation of how QuillBot supports writing	"Grammar support", "paraphrasing aid", "sentence structure", "clarity improvement", "writing scaffold"

	tasks such as grammar, paraphrasing, and clarity	
Impact on Paraphrasing	How QuillBot influences participants' strategies for rephrasing sentences and simplifying text	"Sentence simplification", "correct usage of linking words", "meaning preservation", "alternative phrasing"
Effect on Writing Confidence	Participants perceived changes in writing confidence due to QuillBot	"Backup support", "AI detection fear", "output confusion", "reliability concerns", "moderate confidence boost"
Role in Improving Writing Skills	Perceived contribution of QuillBot to grammar, structural accuracy, and long-term writing development	"Grammar accuracy", "structural support", "independent skill development", "writing guidance"
Concerns and Challenges	Limitations and issues encountered when using QuillBot	"Context limitations", "over-reliance", "dependency concerns", "rigid suggestions", "plagiarism concerns"
QuillBot as Support vs. Primary Tool	Participants' view on whether QuillBot should be a supplementary resource or a primary writing tool	"Supplementary tool", "proofreading aid", "minor corrections only", "not a replacement"
Feature Utility and Interest	Evaluation of specific QuillBot features based on usefulness and relevance to writing tasks	"Standard mode", "fluency feature", "synonyms", "minor paraphrasing", "formal mode", "cohesion support"
Likelihood of Recommendation	Participants' willingness to recommend QuillBot to other TESOL professionals and conditions for use	"Conditional recommendation", "quick improvement", "skill-dependent advice", "limited use endorsement"