

Stavytska Iryna*PhD in Pedagogy (Candidate of Pedagogical Sciences)**National Technical University of Ukraine "Igor Sikorsky Kyiv Polytechnic Institute", Kyiv, Ukraine*E-mail: iryna_stavytska@ukr.netORCID ID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0003-4915-0141>

Researcher ID: I-4248-2017

Yamshynska Nataliia*Lecturer**National Technical University of Ukraine "Igor Sikorsky Kyiv Polytechnic Institute", Kyiv, Ukraine*Email: nyamshinskaya@ukr.netORCID ID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-0518-3657>**Kutsenok Neonila***Lecturer**National Technical University of Ukraine "Igor Sikorsky Kyiv Polytechnic Institute", Kyiv, Ukraine*E-mail: engnila@ukr.netORCID ID: <http://orcid.org/0000-0001-7111-0088>**Korbut Oksana***Senior Lecturer**National Technical University of Ukraine "Igor Sikorsky Kyiv Polytechnic Institute", Kyiv, Ukraine*E-mail: korbut@bigmir.netORCID ID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0001-6671-3925>**Learners' satisfaction with AI-based grammar correction tools: empirical study**

Artificial intelligence (AI) is increasingly becoming a part of everyday life, and the educational sector is at the forefront of this revolution. AI-based tools and platforms, specifically, provide new modes of learning and teaching languages in real-time with real-time, interactive comments and customized instructions. The technologies bring ESL (English as a Second Language) learners' extraordinary opportunities to learn and enhance their language proficiency by themselves and in classrooms.

This study examines the degree of satisfaction of ESL engineering students with AI-based grammar feedback software, probing their usage habits, beliefs about their effectiveness, and the constraints and challenges they face when using these applications. The information was collected via a targeted online questionnaire, in which 45 students from a single technical university in Ukraine took part. The questionnaire tool measured how familiar the students were with various AI grammar tools, including ChatGPT, Grammarly, and others, and their opinions regarding the impact of the tools on the accuracy of grammar, fluency, confidence, and overall quality of writing. Results show relatively high satisfaction levels with AI grammar tools among the students, by and large referring to ChatGPT for ease of use and flexibility. Most of the participants noted phenomenal progress in their grammatical competence, fluency, and confidence level in English writing. There were, nonetheless, a few issues complained of, including the potential over-reliance on them, the occasional computer feedback glitch, and limited contextual understanding, especially in more intricate writing tasks. However, the vast majority of respondents documented that they would be pleased to suggest AI grammar tools to fellow workers, which suggests overall positive acceptance.

The findings indicate that while AI grammar tools are a valuable ancillary tool in ESL teaching, their complete effect is realized by integrating them reflectively with traditional pedagogical practices and thoughtful student reflection. Integration can mitigate the tendency of overreliance and facilitate the development of authentic writing ability and critical thinking.

Keywords: AI-enhanced tools, grammar checkers, second language acquisition, grammar skills, grammar proficiency, writing fluency, grammar error correction, user perceptions, learner satisfaction.

Introduction. The advancement of artificial intelligence (AI) has transformed educational technology by developing new language learning possibilities. Present-day AI instruments offer more than static

drills or generic exercises because they give dynamic context-sensitive feedback and simulate real-world communication situations. The technological revolution transformed students' interaction with AI instruments and has improved their mastery of grammar and vocabulary, which has further assisted in building writing skills under an interactive learning regime. We can observe that such innovations not only promote the development of abilities but also stimulate students' engagement and cultivate their self-learning ability.

The increasing number of AI-based language learning tools has transformed how learners achieve independence in their learning process. It should be admitted that in traditional teaching, students mostly rely on teachers who are more inclined toward explicit grammar instruction and correction. Moreover, students feel more secure when they know that they will be given proper grammar corrective feedback. Feedback on errors is a necessary feature in second language acquisition and teaching, and it has effects on learners' linguistic accuracy and motivation (Ellis, 2009b).

One notable advantage of immediate, targeted feedback provided by AI-based grammar assessment tools is that it mitigates cognitive load on learners and identifies their specific areas of difficulty. These features empower students to analyze and edit their texts more consciously, with an understanding of word choice and form in context, as well as the exact grammatical structure or rule being applied.

These tools also contribute to maintaining consistency and improving clarity in written work because students learn and remember correct grammar and vocabulary over time, and at the same time, they teach students to notice and understand patterns in the language.

More and more studies have examined AI-based grammar feedback software, both reporting measurable improvements in grammar skills and illuminating reports of learners' experiences.

Stevens, J.P. (2025) elaborated on the application of AI in English grammar teaching. Their study proved that AI tools raise learner motivation, make instruction more individualised, and boost mastery of grammar. They identified AI as a helpful adjunct to language learning, citing its positive influence on learner motivation, quality of instruction, and overall achievement.

Jahan et al. (2024) of the Lahore University of Education conducted research with English students to observe how ChatGPT affected grammar learning.

Participants of the research completed grammar correction essays before and after guided ChatGPT use. Quantitative and qualitative analyses showed a notable reduction in grammatical errors and a greater appreciation of grammar concepts. The authors assert that AI tools can supplement traditional teaching by offering immediate, interactive feedback, hence validating their incorporation into language learning.

Lalira et al. (2024) found that AI tools like Grammarly and ChatGPT had the potential to significantly improve the grammar skills of students in various study programs, especially those who initially have relatively poor language abilities. The study suggests the potential of AI tools to improve grammar accuracy while concurrently creating concerns about over-dependence and the necessity of using AI in transparent ways within learning settings. Limitations include both the lack of qualitative data and long-term retention analysis.

Moon (2021) assessed the precision of corrective feedback given by Grammarly on essays produced by cyber university students. Grammarly identified more than 65% of the errors, especially doing an excellent job in spotting errors involving articles and prepositions.

While the tool generally suggested accurate corrections and produced few false alarms, it missed about 35% of errors, highlighting limitations in certain error categories.

Moon warns that while Grammarly has pedagogic value as an additional feedback tool, it cannot substitute for what teachers themselves can provide. Only through teacher awareness of the strengths and limitations of the tool can effective classroom integration happen.

Priya and Vijayalakshmi (2024) mention the shift from rule-based traditional grammar checkers to advanced AI-powered tools with deep learning and natural language processing abilities. They can provide instant, personalized feedback and adjust according to the individual requirements of a student with specific needs, thereby facilitating writing fluency and reducing errors. The study identifies the benefits of AI devices in responding to diverse learning styles and augmenting traditional teaching practices, with broader implications for their growing applicability to language instruction.

The research discussed presents that AI-based grammar applications significantly enhance learner competence, student engagement, and individualized learning outcomes. The technologies also increase fluency and accuracy in writing, but issues such as over-reliance and incomplete error detection are challenges. Therefore, judicious application of AI tools with conventional instruction will help to unlock their full potential and avoid their limitations in language acquisition.

Given that students' attitudes and levels of satisfaction achieved in previous research are different, it would be important to research further how ESL learners perceive and react to AI-based grammar feedback devices so that their strengths and weaknesses can be better understood.

The aims of the research. This paper aims to elucidate the role of grammar feedback tools based on AI in establishing grammar competence in ESL learners. This study aims to identify specific language learning dimensions that could be developed by using such tools. It also aims to demonstrate the relationship between knowledge of grammar and the improvement of the writing skills of the students.

To gain a better insight into the topic, this study measured the students' exposure to AI-based grammar checkers in terms of their perceived application, frequency of use, and level of satisfaction. It also looked into the students' opinions on the tools' effectiveness toward improving their grammar skills as well as writing. Data were collected with a standard survey questionnaire containing closed- and open-ended questions, allowing quantitative measurement of patterns of use and qualitative insight into user experience. The data collected were subsequently analysed to determine the viability of adopting AI-based grammar feedback tools into traditional language learning and teaching practice.

Methods. The tool for survey research was a specially prepared, structured online questionnaire. 45 ESL students (25 males and 20 females) studying for a degree in engineering at the National Technical University of Ukraine "Igor Sikorsky Kyiv Polytechnic Institute" were asked to respond about their attitude and experience of using AI-based grammar feedback software. Participants were not coerced by being informed that their participation would neither affect their grades nor be obliging in nature. The survey was divided into three general sections. Section 1 gathered background information such as English study period, self-perceived proficiency level, reasons for learning English, and experience with utilising AI grammar tools like Grammarly, Quillbot, ChatGPT, Microsoft Editor, and Gemini. The respondents were also asked about the settings and frequencies of tool usage (e.g., essays, academic writing, social media, emails), and the range of platforms they used. Section 2 contained Likert-scale items (Strongly Disagree = 1 to Strongly Agree = 5) assessing perceived effects of AI grammar assist tools on grammar and syntax accuracy, fluidity of writing, independent editing ability, clarity, confidence, and overall quality of writing and potential drawbacks such as over-reliance or reduced autonomous writing ability. Section 3 brought out limitations and problems faced by users (e.g., inability to detect some errors, inappropriate recommendations, lack of knowledge about the context, inconsistent quality of corrections, and technical issues) and asked if they would advise others to use them. The questionnaire had closed-ended, multiple-choice, and short-answer questions to gather both quantitative information and qualitative dimensions of learners' experience.

Approbation of research results. Analysis of respondents' English learning history revealed that most have considerable experience, as 28 students (62.2%) have studied English for over six years. Fewer than this percentage had learned the language for 4–6 years (17.8%), 1–3 years (15.6%), and fewer than one year (4.4%).

In terms of their English proficiency level now, the majority of the respondents self-assessed themselves as intermediate learners (51.1%), followed by advanced learners (28.9%) and beginners (20%). The distribution in this case indicates that most of the students possess English at a level that makes them qualified to be independent users. The determinant is likely to influence their use and knowledge of AI grammar tools. Respondents' reasons for learning English, in response to the question of why learn English, revealed that the most frequently cited was because of work or career (46.7%), then holiday or staying abroad (26.7%), study (15.6%), and personal interest (11.1%).

Based on these results, the majority of respondents consider English to be a strategic competence for international mobility and career development and not merely a tool to accomplish scholarly or personal objectives.

With regard to familiarity with AI grammar software, the highest answer rate was that of ChatGPT (37.8%), followed by Grammarly (20%), Gemini (15.6%), Quillbot (11.1%), and Microsoft Editor (6.7%), respectively. Four respondents (8.9%) said they never used any AI grammar software. This reflects quite a high level of exposure to AI-supported writing tools, with a lean towards making use of more sophisticated language assistance and interactive feedback tools.

Based on the frequency of use of AI grammar correction tools, "sometimes" (22.2%), "always" (17.8%), and "rarely" (17.8%) were less often reported.

The minority of respondents, 8.9% said that they never use AI grammar tools. These findings suggest that a significant portion of students incorporate such tools into their writing process regularly.

When considering the contexts in which AI grammar tools are used, most of the respondents indicated that they use the tools predominantly for emails and messages (16 students), then for posting on social media (13 students). Use in essays or reports (7 students) and academic writing (9 students) was less frequent but still prominent, indicating that while informal day-to-day communication is the predominant application, many students also use these tools to assist in more formal, academic endeavours.

This indicates that AI grammar tools have broad applicability across diverse writing contexts. All things considered, the findings show that the majority of ESL engineering students who were polled are experienced

English language learners who are mostly driven by their desire to advance in their careers and are already acquainted with ChatGPT and other AI grammar feedback technologies. The patterns of frequency of use indicate that many students' academic writing habits include these tools.

A set of statements was designed to examine respondents' perceptions of how AI grammar tools influence various aspects of their writing skills, including grammar, fluency, confidence, consistency, and potential over-reliance. These items were rated on a five-point Likert scale (1 = Strongly Agree, 5 = Strongly Disagree) (Table 1).

Table 1

STATEMENTS	strongly agree	agree	neutral	disagree	strongly disagree	Median	IQR
<i>Using AI grammar tools has improved my grammar and sentence structure.</i>	13	18	8	4	2	2	2
<i>These tools help me write more fluently and organize my ideas more clearly.</i>	14	20	9	2	0	2	1
<i>I have become more confident in editing and correcting my own writing after using AI tools.</i>	17	14	6	5	3	2	2
<i>AI grammar checkers help maintain consistency and clarity in my academic writing.</i>	16	18	7	4	0	2	1
<i>I am concerned that overusing AI tools may negatively affect my ability to write unaided.</i>	9	7	7	13	9	3	2

When asked whether using AI grammar tools has improved their grammar and sentence structure, respondents gave predominantly positive feedback, with 13 strongly agreeing and 18 agreeing. The mean rating of 2 demonstrates an overall strong conviction in these tools assisting in the improvement of grammar and structure, although there was a small minority (4 disagreed, 2 strongly disagreed) who were doubtful.

These results align with Stevens's (2025) determination that AI-improved teaching significantly enhanced grammar in a huge cohort of students in Sierra Leone, even though there was some opposition to the introduction. These results collectively indicate that AI-based tools for grammar are largely perceived as effective for their capacity to enhance grammar, sentence structure, fluency, confidence, consistency, and general quality of writing.

To the argument that AI tools help them write more fluently and express ideas more logically, feedback was even favorable: 14 strongly agreed and 20 agreed.

The mean score of 2 reflects very positive attitudes toward the role of AI tools in improving writing fluency and facilitating language acquisition.

Regarding greater confidence in editing and correcting their own writing after using AI tools, 31 respondents agreed or strongly agreed that employing AI tools increased their confidence in editing and fixing their own writing. Although a small percentage of users (5 disagree, 3 strongly disagree) did not agree, the mean score of 2 shows a significant improvement in confidence for the majority of users.

With 18 people agreeing and 16 strongly agreeing, it was also broadly accepted that AI grammar checkers contribute to the uniformity and clarity of academic writing. Consistency and clarity are usually seen as advantages of these instruments, as evidenced by the mean score of 2.

Finally, the belief that overuse of AI tools negatively affects one's ability to generate ideas for writing and leads to decreased creativity was validated by the minority – 16 only agreed (9 strongly agreed, 7 agreed), while more disagreed (13 disagreed, 9 strongly disagreed). These findings indicate that, although there remains some concern about over-dependence upon AI feedback to improve errors, the majority of respondents do not regard AI as a danger to independent writing ability or thought.

AI tools evidently enable users by providing genuine and useful feedback, and in this way, the confidence in writing tasks is increased. However, to overcome concerns of being too reliant on them, educators and users need to face challenges by starting with face-to-face interaction.

The user attitudes towards AI grammar tools were measured in the survey through six statements on a single five-point Likert scale (Table 2).

In relation to the usefulness of grammar suggestions provided by these tools, feedback was largely positive. The mean score of 2 indicates a strong tendency toward agreement, with 18 respondents who strongly agreed and 11 who agreed, though a small proportion (6 disagree, 3 strongly disagree) expressed reservations.

Table 2

Survey responses on the usefulness of AI grammar feedback							
STATEMENTS	strongly agree	agree	neutral	disagree	strongly disagree	Median	IQR
<i>The grammar suggestions from these tools are helpful.</i>	18	11	7	6	3	2	2
<i>The feedback is easy to understand.</i>	13	18	4	6	4	2	2
<i>I learn grammar rules by using these tools.</i>	9	13	8	10	5	3	2
<i>These tools have improved my writing over time.</i>	11	17	7	7	3	2	1
<i>I feel more confident in writing English after using grammar tools.</i>	19	15	7	4	0	2	1
<i>Overall, I am satisfied with the AI grammar tools I have used.</i>	19	15	8	3	0	2	1

The majority of respondents (Mean = 2) noticed that the feedback, which they get from AI grammar checkers, is understandable. Students with intermediate and above English comprehension (most of the respondents had been graded on a scale from intermediate to advanced) are aware of key grammar points and a rather extensive vocabulary, so it is less of a challenge for them to explain AI corrections. If students can spot and realize a grammar or vocabulary mistake, they will be more inclined to take in the rule and utilize new words or combinations of words in the future. Students who did not agree may struggle with understanding the grammar or vocabulary rule behind the correction, and therefore have a harder time learning from the feedback. In this context, here it would be more suitable if the instructors used prompt explanations to encourage such students in order to sustain motivation towards language learning and, at the same time, prevent overdependence on AI without critical thinking.

On the matter of learning grammar rules through AI grammar tools, respondents expressed the lowest level of agreement (Mean = 3). It indicates that participants see these tools as less effective for explicit grammar learning.

The belief that these tools have improved writing over time generated more positive responses, with 28 participants in agreement or strong agreement and a mean score of 2. This implies that users perceive a significant long-term improvement in writing performance.

Perceptions of greater confidence in writing English after using grammar tools were among the most favorable, with a mean score of 2. A large majority (33 respondents) agreed or strongly agreed, highlighting the tools' role in boosting self-assurance in writing.

In this context, the research of Milton, C., Vidhya, L., and Thiruvengadam, G. (2024) assumes special importance. Their article identifies the fact that while AI-based writing tools have been universally recognized as valuable assistance in academic writing, their sole use for generative work tends to damage students' independent writing abilities. The researchers stress teacher-guided instruction to facilitate students to use such technologies in a correct way for collaborative writing with respect for ethical values.

The final statement from the second set of the survey items on the usefulness of AI-based grammar tools ascertains the respondents' levels of satisfaction and acceptance of these tools.

The data indicate a highly positive perception of satisfaction with AI grammar tools among the respondents. A significant portion (34 out of 45, or 75.6%) agreed or strongly agreed with the statement that they were overall satisfied with the AI tools they use for grammar correction, suggesting a high overall level of satisfaction. The absence of any "strongly disagree" answers only adds to this upbeat trend, as only 3 participants (6.7%) disagreed. The neutral votes (8, or 17.8%) are confirmatory of a small group of respondents who are ambivalent, but in no way detract from the overall positive outlook. The IQR of 1 indicates a relatively tight distribution of the answers around the median, which implies similarity in the positive mood among most of the respondents.

Responses to this set of survey items showed a generally positive perception of AI-based grammar tools among respondents, with varying levels of agreement across different aspects. Notably, negative responses (combining "disagree" and "strongly disagree") did not exceed 20% for any individual statement.

Such a pattern of distribution indicates that while AI grammar tools help build confidence, satisfaction, and correctness in themselves, they may be inadequate as a whole, sole solution to learn or to acquire formal grammar rules, which would perhaps require more formal instruction. This is in agreement with past studies in educational technology, which attest that computer-based feedback mechanisms are particularly good at promoting accuracy and motivation but tend to need to be merged with explicit instruction to promote deeper understanding of grammar.

To the question regarding problems or issues with AI grammar tools, the most frequent problem was that sometimes these tools provide incorrect or misleading corrections, with 13% of the users indicating that such corrections were more defective than the original. Second, 9% of the users indicated that the tools fail to detect certain kinds of errors, such as the choice of verbs, prepositions, or incorrect use of pronouns.

These concerns correspond to Moon's (2021) evaluation of Grammarly's corrective feedback, which, despite achieving high error detection rates (over 65%) – particularly for articles and prepositions – still missed roughly 35% of errors. Similarly, Paul John and Woll (2020) found that while tools such as Grammarly and Virtual Writing Tutor offered reasonably accurate replacement suggestions, their overall coverage remained under 50%. In combination, these results emphasize that although AI grammar tools are useful, they still have the problem of limitations in terms of accuracy and breadth of error detection.

Concern that too much reliance on AI tools was having a detrimental effect on critical thinking and self-editing skills was expressed by 10% of participants. Additionally, 8% claimed that the tools lack an understanding of context and semantic nuance, especially when dealing with non-standard English. Technical access problems, privacy issues, and real-time accuracy problems were faced by 5% of participants. These findings reiterate that while AI grammar tools provide prescient assistance, one needs to remain cautious and critically evaluate automatic responses. These findings are corroborated by Daud et al. (2025), who cite the strengths of AI tools – i.e., writing support – but also raise concerns regarding overreliance, technical errors, and ensuring fair access and ethical use. Similarly, a British Council analysis highlights the necessity of AI literacy, warning against the blanket adoption of these tools lest they prove susceptible to prejudice and diminished critical faculties.

To answer whether they would recommend AI grammar tools to other ESL students, student responses, on a 5-point Likert scale (1 = Strongly recommend; 5 = Strongly do not recommend), were moderately positive overall. Ratings resulted in a median answer of 2 and an interquartile range (IQR) of 2, which reflected a strong skew towards positive answers. In total, 64.4% of the students strongly agreed (26.7%, 12 students) or agreed (37.7%, 17 students) with these resources.

A neutral stance was taken by 20% (9 students), while negative opinions were less common, with 8.9% (4 students). This distribution suggests that, while some reservations exist, the prevailing view is that AI grammar tools are valuable resources for English language learning.

These findings are consistent with Kim and Song's (2024) research, which also reported generally favorable perceptions across AI grammar tools such as Grammarly, Virtual Writing Tutor, and SpellCheckPlus, highlighting benefits in error identification and ease of use – although issues related to feedback adequacy and dependency were noted.

Conclusions. The findings of this study support the significant value that AI-informed grammar checker software can contribute to making the process of grammatical skill development in ESL students easier in technical higher education contexts. The study shows that all these computer programs are not only well-used but also much valued for facilitating grammatical improvement, sentence construction, fluency, ease, and upgrading the degree of clarity and coherence in messages being communicated. The participants reported considerable improvement in self-confidence and self-proofreading capacity, which indicates that AI-based feedback could be helpful for higher independence in writing. But the research also discloses the risks and

limitations of such technologies. Though AI grammar checkers give immediate, targeted feedback, their value in encouraging a deep, thoughtful understanding of the rules of grammar appears to be limited. In addition, issues of occasional error, inadequate identification of errors, and failure to take context into account suggest the necessity of critical user engagement with the provided feedback. Concerns over dependence, though not the most voiced by participants, indicate a challenge to independent writing and critical thinking skills in the event that these tools are used uncritically.

Pedagogically, the results fall in favor of an integrative model in which AI grammar feedback tools are used as supporting instruments to current pedagogies and not as sole ones. When used judiciously, integrated into language teaching curricula – in combination with explicit grammar instruction, peer review exercises, and feedback by the instructor – they can best supplement the effectiveness of traditional pedagogies to benefit linguistic correctness and communicative competence equally. The hybrid approach ensures that learners experience the strengths of the speed and tangibility of AI-based feedback but also continue to undergo cognitively demanding, one-to-one writing assignments to acquire long-term mastery.

Briefly, AI-driven grammar checking tools are a wonderful asset to the language learning arsenal, particularly for learners of English who want to get their English as good as academic and professional writing gets. Optimal use does require a juggling act of instruction design, fighting addiction without losing the creativity, imagination, and critical thinking necessary to generate sophisticated writing capabilities.

References

Ellis, R. (2009b). Corrective feedback and teacher development. *L2 Journal*, 1 (1), 2–18. <https://doi.org/10.5070/L2.V1I1.9054>.

Jahan, J., Arif, B., & Mustafa, U. (2024). Enhancing practical English grammar skills through AI: A study on the impact of ChatGPT-assisted feedback on student writing. *Contemporary Journal of Social Science Review*, 2 (4), 217–229.

Katsarou, D.V., Mantsos, E., Papadopoulou, S., Sofologi, M., Efthymiou, E., Vasileiou, I., Megari, K., Theodoratou, M., & Kougioumtzis, G. A. (2025). Exploring AI technology in grammar performance testing for children with learning disabilities. *Education Sciences*, 15 (3), 351. <https://doi.org/10.3390/educsci15030351>.

Khatira, M. (2025). The role of artificial intelligence in improving grammar and writing proficiency. *Scientific Work*, 19 (3). Retrieved from <https://www.europub.co.uk/articles/-A-763314>.

Lalira, J.E., & Pang, Y.A.T. (2024, December). Evaluating the impact of AI tools on grammar mastery: A comparative study of learning outcomes. *VELES (Voices of English Language Education Society)*, 8 (3), 701–713. <https://doi.org/10.29408/veles.v8i3.27856>.

Milton, C., Vidhya, L., & Thiruvengadam, G. (2024). Examining the impact of AI-powered writing tools on the independent writing skills of health science graduates. *Advanced Education*, 12 (25), 143–161. <https://doi.org/10.20535/2410-8286.315068>.

Moon, D. (2021). Evaluating corrective feedback generated by an AI-powered online grammar checker. *International Journal of Internet, Broadcasting and Communication*, 13 (4), 22–29. <https://doi.org/10.7236/IJIBC.2021.13.4.22>.

Priya, C., & Vijayalakshmi, R. (2024, October). Grammar correction AI tools for English language teachers in higher education. *International Journal of Innovative Research in Technology*, 11 (5).

Stevens, J.P. (2025). Artificial intelligence in the teaching of English grammar. *International Journal of Research and Innovation in Applied Science*, 10 (6). <https://doi.org/10.51584/IJRIAS.2025.10060066>.

Емпіричне дослідження рівня задоволення студентів інструментами корекції граматики на основі ШІ

Ставицька Ірина Василівна

кандидат педагогічних наук

Національного технічного університету України «Київський політехнічний інститут імені Ігоря Сікорського», Київ, Україна

Ямшинська Наталія Валентинівна

викладач

Національного технічного університету України «Київський політехнічний інститут імені Ігоря Сікорського», Київ, Україна

Куценок Неоніла Михайлівна

викладач

*Національного технічного університету України «Київський політехнічний інститут
імені Ігоря Сікорського», Київ, Україна***Корбут Оксана Григорівна**

старший викладач

*Національного технічного університету України «Київський політехнічний інститут
імені Ігоря Сікорського», Київ, Україна*

Штучний інтелект (ШІ) активно впроваджується у різні сфери життя, зокрема в освіту. AI-інструменти надають цінну підтримку у вивченні мов, пропонуючи інтерактивний зворотний зв'язок і персоналізовану допомогу. Вони дають студентам, які вивчають англійську як другу мову, можливість покращувати мовні навички як під час навчання в класі, так і автономно.

Дослідження оцінює задоволеність 45 студентів інженерних спеціальностей Національного технічного університету України «Київський політехнічний інститут» інструментами граматичної перевірки на базі ШІ. Результати показали, що більшість студентів задоволена цими інструментами та відзначає їхню ефективність для вдосконалення граматичних, лексичних умінь та навичок письма під час самостійного вивчення іноземної мови.

Проте деякі учасники висловили занепокоєння щодо надмірної залежності від інструментів, неточностей у рекомендаціях і обмеженого розуміння контексту. Незважаючи на це, більшість готова рекомендувати такі інструменти іншим.

Висновки свідчать про те, що хоча інструменти граматики на основі штучного інтелекту є цінним додатковим ресурсом у вивченні іноземної мови, проте вони реалізуються лише за умови обдуманого інтеграції з традиційними методами викладання та критичної рефлексії студентів. Така інтеграція може допомогти зменшити ризики, пов'язані з надмірною залежністю від технологій, і забезпечити розвиток автентичних навичок письма та критичного мислення.

Ключові слова: засоби перевірки граматики, вивчення другої мови, академічне письмо, плавність письма, виправлення помилок, сприйняття користувачами, граматичні навички, рівень задоволення студентів.



Received: August 22, 2025
Accepted: September 23, 2025
Published: October 21, 2025