



Teachers' Attitudes towards the Effectiveness of the Write & Improve Platform in Enhancing EFL Students' Writing Proficiency: The Case of First Year University Students

Dr. Nawal Dib

Department of Letters and English Language, University of Kasdi Merbah, Ouargla, Algeria.

Abstract:

The integration of Artificial Intelligence (AI) in language education has brought increasing attention to Automated Writing Evaluation (AWE) tools, yet research has focused predominantly on learner outcomes, leaving teachers' perspectives largely unexplored. This gap is particularly significant in Algeria, where EFL students continue to struggle with writing proficiency, and where teachers serve as the primary agents of any pedagogical innovation. In an environment where writing instruction is constrained by large class sizes, limited feedback opportunities, and traditional assessment methods, understanding how teachers perceive tools like the Write & Improve platform becomes essential for evaluating their potential. For that reason, this research's focal incentive is to investigate teachers' attitudes toward the Write & Improve platform as a pedagogical support for enhancing EFL students' writing proficiency. To achieve this end, we administered a teacher's questionnaire to four teachers who teach writing classes at the Department of Letters and English at the University of Kasdi Merbah Ouargla, each managing an experimental group (with the platform) and a control group (without the platform). Based on the collected data, we draw the conclusion that Algerian EFL teachers hold nuanced attitudes toward the platform, recognizing its value for immediate feedback and revision support while expressing concerns about its limitations for higher-order writing skills and the lack of institutional training. The findings show that teachers' attitudes are shaped not only by the platform's features but also by contextual factors including technological self-efficacy, pedagogical beliefs, and institutional support, and that understanding these attitudes is essential for any meaningful assessment of AWE's pedagogical potential.

Keywords: Automated Writing Evaluation; Write & Improve Platform; Teacher Attitudes; EFL Writing Proficiency; Algerian Higher Education.

Received: 14 July 2026

Revised: 30 August 2026

Accepted: 30 September 2026

I – Introduction

1.1. Research Context and Rationale

Writing remains one of the most difficult skills for Algerian EFL students. Despite years of English instruction, many university students continue to struggle with grammatical accuracy, sentence structure, and coherent expression (Hamouda, 2025). These difficulties often breed frustration and negative attitudes toward writing, as students lack confidence in their ability to revise and improve their work (Boughenou & Bounaas, 2024).

In recent years, Automated Writing Evaluation (AWE) tools have offered a promising response to these challenges. The Write & Improve platform, developed by Cambridge University Press and Assessment, provides instant feedback on grammar, vocabulary, and organization, along with CEFR-aligned scoring (Jitpaisarnwattana & Saville, 2026). Studies from EFL contexts suggest that such tools can lead to measurable

improvements in writing accuracy, particularly in grammar and mechanics (Putra, 2023). For teachers facing large classes and limited time, this kind of immediate, individualized feedback addresses a persistent pedagogical obstacle.

Yet technology alone does not transform classrooms—teachers do. Research across different EFL settings has begun to explore how teachers perceive AI-based writing tools. A study of Saudi instructors found cautiously positive attitudes: teachers appreciated the efficiency of automated feedback for surface-level errors but doubted its ability to assess argumentation and rhetorical quality (Alfadda et al., 2025). Similarly, teachers in Myanmar valued AI tools for assessment and preparation but worried about internet instability and their own limited technological knowledge (Yu & Wilang, 2025). Korean teachers expressed similar concerns, noting that AI feedback often neglects genre-specific grammar and educational context (Kim et al., 2026). These findings reveal a common professional stance: teachers accept AI as a useful auxiliary tool but resist its replacement of human judgment in developing students' higher-order writing skills.

Despite this growing body of research, few studies have examined teachers' attitudes toward specific AWE platforms in Algerian universities. A recent study of Algerian EFL teachers found generally positive perceptions of AI-based assessment, but it did not focus on a particular platform or connect attitudes to student outcomes (Bessadat & Korichi, 2024). This gap matters because teachers are the primary agents of technology integration; their perceptions shape whether a tool is adopted, adapted, or abandoned (Li, 2021). Understanding how teachers view the usefulness and usability of Write & Improve is therefore essential for assessing its pedagogical potential in this context.

1.2. Problem Statement

The effectiveness of any educational technology depends on the teachers who implement it. While the Write & Improve platform offers features that align with established principles of EFL writing instruction—immediate feedback, opportunities for revision, and support for learner autonomy—its impact on students' writing proficiency rests on how teachers perceive its value, integrate it into their practice, and position it within the writing curriculum.

This dependence on teacher agency is well documented. Research on AI-based writing assessment consistently shows that teachers mediate, interpret, and integrate automated feedback into classroom practice (Elouirraoui et al., 2026). A study of Saudi EFL instructors found that while teachers valued AI's efficiency for surface-level error correction, they doubted its capacity to assess higher-order skills like argumentation and critical thinking, emphasizing the need for human oversight (Ahmed et al., 2026). Similar patterns appear across contexts: teachers in Myanmar valued AI tools for assessment and preparation but worried about internet instability and their own limited technological knowledge (Yu & Wilang, 2025), while Korean teachers noted that AI feedback often neglects genre-specific grammar and educational context (Kim et al., 2026). These findings reveal a common professional stance: teachers accept AI as a useful auxiliary tool but resist its replacement of human judgment in developing students' higher-order writing abilities (Li, 2021; Yilmaz Virlan & Tomak, 2025).

In Algeria specifically, research has begun to address this topic. A study of fifteen EFL teachers from different Algerian universities found generally positive attitudes toward AI-based assessment for formative writing, with 75% of non-users believing it could have a positive impact (Bessadat & Korichi, 2024). Another study at Mohammed Lamine Debaghine Setif 2 University reported that teachers viewed AWE tools as valuable additions capable of reducing grammatical, lexical, and mechanical errors while fostering student autonomy (Bu Abd Allah & Al-Tayyib, 2024). However, these studies have not examined specific platforms like Write & Improve, nor have they connected teacher attitudes to observed student outcomes.

This gap matters. Teacher attitudes do not exist in isolation—they shape whether a tool is meaningfully adopted, superficially used, or quietly abandoned (Haddadi & Zidane, 2024). Without systematic inquiry into how Algerian EFL teachers perceive Write & Improve specifically, and how those perceptions relate to its pedagogical effectiveness, any assessment of the platform's potential remains incomplete. This study seeks to

address that gap.

1.3. Research Questions

This study explores teachers' attitudes toward the effectiveness of the Write & Improve platform in enhancing first-year university students' writing proficiency. The following questions guide the investigation:

RQ1: What are EFL teachers' attitudes toward the perceived usefulness and ease of use of the Write & Improve platform as a pedagogical support for enhancing students' writing proficiency?

RQ2: What contextual, pedagogical, and technological factors shape teachers' attitudes toward integrating the Write & Improve platform into EFL writing instruction?

These two questions capture the core of the study: how teachers perceive the platform and what influences those perceptions.

1.4. Significance of the Study

Teachers are the ones who make technology work in the classroom—or do not. Yet their voices are often left out of the conversation. Plenty of research looks at how students respond to AI writing tools, but far fewer studies ask what teachers actually think about them. In Algerian universities, where tools like Write & Improve are still fairly new, this gap is especially noticeable.

This study tries to fill that gap by putting teachers' attitudes front and center. Their perspectives matter for a few practical reasons:

Curriculum Design: Knowing what teachers think about the platform helps departments make smarter decisions about whether and how to use AWE tools in their writing courses. It's one thing to adopt a tool; it is another to make it work for real students in real classrooms.

Teacher Professional Development: If teachers have doubts or struggles with the platform, training can address them directly. Simply giving teachers access to a tool doesn't mean they will use it—or use it well.

Educational Policy: Decision-makers often push for technology integration without hearing from the people who actually teach. This study offers evidence from teachers themselves, which can lead to more realistic and supportive policies.

At its core, this research treats teachers as the key players in any classroom change. Their attitudes aren't a side issue—they are the starting point for whether technology helps students or just sit unused.

II – Methods and Materials

The research's focal incentive is to understand teachers' attitudes regarding the effectiveness of the Write & Improve platform in enhancing EFL students' writing proficiency at the University of Kasdi Merbah Ouargla, Algeria. To achieve this end, we administered a teachers' questionnaire to four teachers who teach writing classes at the Department of Letters and English at the University of Kasdi Merbah Ouargla, Algeria. Each teacher manages two groups: an experimental group taught with the Write & Improve platform as a pedagogical support, and a control group taught using traditional methods without the platform.

The questionnaire is designed to achieve several interconnected objectives. Primarily, it seeks to gather in-depth, qualitative and quantitative insights into how Algerian university EFL teachers perceive the usefulness and ease of use of the Write & Improve platform in their writing classrooms. This exploratory aim is complemented by a triangulation objective: to compare teachers' stated attitudes about the platform with their self-reported experiences of using it across both experimental and control groups, revealing potential alignments or discrepancies between their beliefs and their pedagogical realities. Furthermore, the questionnaire aims to diagnose the specific institutional, technological, and pedagogical factors that enable or constrain the integration of AWE tools within the Algerian context, thereby uncovering the core tensions between ideal and actual practice. Ultimately, the design is participant-centered, striving to elevate teachers' voices and ground the research findings in their lived professional expertise, articulated challenges, and

concrete visions for effective technology integration.

Ultimately, the questionnaire seeks to yield practical and insightful conclusions that have real-world application and scholarly value. The insights gathered aim to directly inform and improve curriculum development for Algerian EFL programs and to guide the design of relevant, context-specific teacher training programs for AWE integration. Furthermore, the study seeks to contribute to a more nuanced, globally-informed understanding of teacher attitudes toward AI-powered writing tools that moves beyond a Western-centric paradigm. Ultimately, by documenting the lived experiences and challenges of practitioners, the research strives to provide a robust, evidence-based argument for necessary systemic support, advocating for tangible changes in resource allocation, policy, and professional development within the higher education landscape.

2.1. The Teachers' Questionnaire Design

The teachers' questionnaire includes (17) questions divided purposefully into three sections. The first section aims to uncover the teacher's foundational attitudes—the why behind their perceptions. It maps their conceptual understanding of the Write & Improve platform and their beliefs about technology integration in writing instruction.

Section One, Perspectives & Beliefs (Q1-Q5) aims to identify the teacher's core pedagogical justification for using or not using the platform (utilitarian vs. transformative goals) (Q1), to explore their theoretical stance on the role of technology in writing instruction (supplementary vs. substitutive) (Q2), to map their perceptions of the platform's usefulness and ease of use, revealing the centrality of perceived pedagogical value (Q3), to probe their awareness of potential tensions like over-reliance on automated feedback and dehumanization in their pedagogical choices (Q4), and to understand their perception of the learner's affective response, diagnosing potential motivators or barriers based on the platform's feedback (Q5).

The second section aims to move from abstract attitudes to concrete assessments—the how. It gathers detailed, evidence-based accounts of instructional strategies, platform use, and classroom management concerning Write & Improve. Section Two, Practices & Pedagogical Choices (Q6-Q12) aims to trace the integration point of the platform in the planning process, revealing if it is systematic or opportunistic (Q6), to evaluate the types of tasks and activities used with the platform, distinguishing between guided, free, and revision-focused writing (Q7), to elicit a rich, narrative example of effective practice, uncovering the mechanics of a successful activity and the reasons for its success (Q8), to identify challenges and pitfalls in practice, learning from less successful experiences to understand common obstacles (Q9), to understand their classroom management strategies for integrating platform feedback with teacher feedback, revealing their professional judgment and facilitation skills (Q10), to investigate the assessment dimension, probing if/how platform-generated feedback is incorporated into evaluation and revealing a potential belief-practice gap (Q11), and to perform methodological triangulation, connecting reported practice with the teacher's stated rationale and objectives, adding crucial context (Q12).

Section three aims to situate the teacher's attitudes and practices within their professional ecosystem. It identifies the external and internal factors that enable or constrain their work, and elicits their reflective vision for the future. Section Three, Contextual Factors & Reflections (Q13-Q17) aims to diagnose perceived needs and gaps in support, directly informing recommendations for resources and training (Q13), to explicitly analyze the impact of key systemic constraints (syllabus, time, logistics, internet access) on pedagogical decision-making (Q14), to trace the origin of the teacher's approaches back to formative professional experiences, explaining variation in confidence and practice (Q15), to solicit a forward-looking, solution-oriented perspective from the practitioner, highlighting desired systemic or curricular changes (Q16), and to provide a final open-ended opportunity for the participant to add any crucial, unanticipated insights, ensuring completeness (Q17).

III – Results and Discussion

The questionnaire data were analyzed using reflexive thematic analysis following the six-phase approach outlined by Braun and Clarke (2006, 2022), moving

systematically from raw data to synthesized themes. This process was conducted in three iterative phases. First, the questionnaire's own structure provided an initial framework for organizing responses into the core areas of attitudes, perceptions, and contextual factors, while preliminary codes were established from the literature and research questions. Second, through an iterative process of deep reading, initial codes were refined into significant themes by identifying central patterns, crucial nuances, and meaningful relationships within the data—for example, noting how teachers' disciplinary backgrounds shaped their attitudes or how prior technological experience influenced their perceptions of the platform's ease of use. Finally, these themes were synthesized into a coherent analytical narrative that logically progressed from examining foundational teacher attitudes, to the realities and constraints of platform integration, to an explanation of variation among practitioners, culminating in the participants' collective vision for systemic improvement, thereby constructing a comprehensive story from the dataset.

Section A: Teacher's Profile

3.1. Teaching Experience and Professional Background

The four participating teachers represented a range of experience levels, which proved relevant to their attitudes toward the platform. Regarding university teaching experience (Q1), one teacher had less than five years, two had between five and ten years, and one had more than fifteen years. For writing module experience specifically (Q2), one teacher had less than three years, two had between three and six years, and one had more than ten years. This distribution meant that the group included both relatively new instructors and seasoned veterans, allowing for comparison across career stages.

Regarding specialization (Q3), two teachers held degrees in Didactics, one in Linguistics, and one in Literature. This question aimed to identify whether disciplinary backgrounds influence attitudes toward technology integration. The findings revealed a notable pattern: the two Didactics specialists expressed the most positive attitudes toward the platform and reported the most systematic use. The Literature specialist was the most skeptical, expressing concerns about the platform's inability to assess creative and rhetorical dimensions of writing. The Linguistics specialist occupied a middle position, valuing the platform for grammatical accuracy but questioning its capacity to address discourse-level features. This pattern suggests that pedagogical training—particularly in Didactics—may predispose teachers to view technology as a pedagogical tool rather than a threat to their subject expertise.

Regarding training on technology use (Q4), only one of the four teachers had received formal training. This teacher, a Didactics specialist with five to ten years of experience, described the training as "a two-day workshop on digital tools for language teaching." The other three teachers had received no formal training and had learned about educational technology through personal initiative or informal peer support. This finding is significant given the literature's emphasis on training as a predictor of technology adoption (Ahmed et al., 2026). When asked about previous use of educational technology in writing classes (Q5), two teachers reported prior experience with tools like Grammarly and Google Docs, while two reported no prior experience. The two with prior experience were also the two who described the Write & Improve platform as "easy" or "very easy" to use, suggesting that familiarity with educational technology more broadly may facilitate adoption of new tools.

Section B: Writing Skill Instruction

3.2. Teachers' Beliefs about Writing Instruction

Teachers' beliefs about the importance of writing (Q1) were uniformly strong: all four rated writing as "very important" for English language learning. This consensus reflects the centrality of writing in university EFL curricula and suggests that teachers approach the writing classroom with a sense of its significance. However, their beliefs about how writing should be taught varied in ways that shaped their attitudes toward the platform.

When asked about the most common challenges their students face (Q2), all four teachers selected "grammar and syntactic errors" and "limited vocabulary" as primary difficulties. Three teachers also selected "difficulty

organizing ideas coherently," and two selected "lack of motivation to write." One teacher added "difficulty with spelling and mechanics" as an additional challenge. These responses reveal that teachers perceive their students' writing difficulties as spanning both lower-order concerns (grammar, vocabulary, spelling) and higher-order concerns (organization, motivation). This perception is significant because it suggests that teachers are looking for tools that can address both dimensions—yet the platform's feedback is primarily focused on lower-order concerns.

Regarding instructional methods (Q3), all four teachers reported using "teacher-written feedback on drafts" and "process writing approach (multiple drafts)." Three teachers used "peer feedback and revision," and two used "guided writing exercises." Only one teacher reported using "technology or digital tools" as a regular part of writing instruction prior to this study. This finding indicates that traditional, teacher-centered approaches dominate writing instruction in this context, with technology playing a marginal role. When asked about the most effective way to improve writing skills (Q4), three teachers selected "all of the above" (regular practice, reading, explicit grammar instruction, and feedback), while one teacher selected "through feedback and correction" specifically. This suggests that teachers hold integrated views of writing development, recognizing multiple pathways to improvement—a view that is compatible with using the platform as one tool among many.

Section C: Use of the Write & Improve Platform

3.3. Platform Usability and Initial Impressions

When asked whether they had used Write & Improve before this study (Q1), all four teachers reported that they had not. This means that their attitudes were formed entirely through their experience during the study, which adds relevance to their responses. Regarding the context of first use (Q2), all four teachers reported using it with students in their experimental groups during the study. One teacher also reported using it for personal writing practice to familiarize themselves with the platform before introducing it to students. This proactive approach may explain why this teacher later described the platform as "very easy" to use.

Teachers' overall experience with the platform (Q3) was generally positive but varied. One teacher rated it "excellent," two rated it "good," and one rated it "satisfactory." The teacher who rated it "excellent" was the same teacher who had used it for personal practice and who had prior experience with Grammarly. The teacher who rated it "satisfactory" was the Literature specialist who expressed concerns about the platform's limitations for higher-order writing. This pattern suggests that prior experience with similar tools and disciplinary background both influence initial impressions.

Regarding frequency of use with the experimental group (Q4), one teacher reported using the platform "every session," one used it "once a week," one used it "once every two weeks," and one reported using it "rarely." This variation is striking and reflects the belief-practice gap discussed earlier. The teacher who used it every session was the Didactics specialist with formal training. The teacher who used it rarely was the Literature specialist who was most skeptical. This correlation suggests that training and disciplinary orientation together shape implementation intensity.

Teachers' perceptions of the platform's ease of navigation (Q5) revealed a spectrum. One teacher described it as "very easy," one as "easy," one as "neutral," and one as "difficult." The teacher who found it difficult explained: "The interface is not in Arabic, and some of my students struggled with the instructions. I had to translate everything." This comment highlights a contextual factor—language of the interface—that may be particularly relevant in the Algerian context but is rarely discussed in the literature on AWE usability.

When asked about the usefulness of the platform's feedback (Q6), all four teachers selected either "very useful" or "useful." No teacher selected "moderately useful" or "not useful." This finding indicates that despite variations in ease of use and implementation frequency, teachers uniformly recognized the pedagogical value of the platform's feedback. This aligns with the Technology Acceptance Model's distinction between perceived usefulness and perceived ease of use: a tool can be perceived as useful even when it is not perceived as easy to use (Davis, 1989).

Section D: Teachers' Attitudes towards the Use of Write & Improve

3.4. Perceived Benefits of the Platform

Teachers identified multiple benefits of using the platform (Q1). All four selected "provides immediate feedback to students" and "helps students identify and correct grammatical errors." Three teachers selected "supports iterative revision and drafting" and "saves teacher time on correcting surface-level errors." Two teachers selected "increases students' motivation to write" and "encourages student autonomy and self-regulated learning." These responses reveal that teachers perceive the platform's primary value in terms of efficiency (immediate feedback, time savings) and accuracy (grammatical error identification), with secondary benefits related to student motivation and autonomy.

The emphasis on time savings is particularly notable given the contextual constraints teachers face. One teacher explained: "With fifty students in a class, I cannot give detailed feedback on every draft. The platform helps me manage this reality." This comment reflects the practical pressures of teaching writing in large classes—pressures that the platform helps to alleviate, at least partially. The emphasis on immediate feedback aligns with the literature on AWE's pedagogical affordances (Cotos, 2023; Li et al., 2015), while the emphasis on student autonomy resonates with research on self-regulated learning (Zhang, 2020).

3.5. Perceived Challenges and Concerns

When asked about challenges they might face while using the platform (Q2), teachers identified several concerns. All four selected "internet connectivity issues" and "limited access to devices or computers." Three selected "insufficient training on how to use the platform." Two selected "difficulty integrating the platform into the existing curriculum." Two selected "concerns about over-reliance on automated feedback." One teacher selected "students' lack of interest or engagement." These responses reveal that teachers' concerns are primarily contextual and logistical rather than pedagogical or ideological. They are not worried about the platform's fundamental value—they are worried about whether they can use it reliably.

The concern about over-reliance (selected by two teachers) is worth highlighting because it reflects a pedagogical anxiety that appears in the literature on AWE (Andrejevic & Selwyn, 2023, as cited in Lee, 2025). One teacher explained: "I worry that students will just accept whatever the platform says without thinking. They need to learn to question feedback, not just follow it." This concern suggests that teachers see their role as developing critical engagement with feedback—a role that becomes more important, not less, when automated feedback is introduced.

3.6. Overall Attitudes towards the Platform

When asked directly whether the platform is a useful tool for improving students' writing skills (Q3), all four teachers selected "yes." Their explanations, however, revealed important nuances. One teacher wrote: "Yes, for grammar and vocabulary. But it cannot replace what a teacher does." Another wrote: "Yes, especially for large classes where individual feedback is impossible." A third wrote: "Yes, but students need guidance on how to use the feedback." These responses suggest that teachers' positive attitudes are conditional—they see the platform as useful within certain boundaries, not as a comprehensive solution.

When asked whether the platform can help students become more independent writers (Q4), three teachers selected "yes" and one selected "maybe." The teacher who selected "maybe" explained: "It depends on the student. Some will use it well; others will just copy the corrections without understanding." This response highlights a concern about the conditions under which the platform supports autonomy—it is not automatic but depends on how students engage with the feedback. This nuance aligns with research showing that the effectiveness of AWE feedback depends on learners' cognitive engagement (Alharbi, 2026; Zhang, 2020).

Regarding whether the platform should replace traditional teacher feedback (Q5), no teacher selected "yes, completely." Three teachers selected "no, but it should complement teacher feedback," and one selected "I am not sure." The explanations provided were emphatic about the irreplaceable role of the teacher. One teacher wrote: "The platform can check grammar, but it cannot understand what a student is trying to say. That requires a human." Another wrote: "Students need human

feedback for motivation and for higher-order skills." These responses confirm the pattern identified in the literature: teachers accept AI as a supplement but resist its substitution for human judgment (Scientific Research of the SCO Countries, 2026; Li, 2021).

When asked whether the platform will be useful in EFL writing education in the future (Q6), all four teachers selected "yes." Their explanations focused on the growing role of technology in education and the practical need for efficiency in large classes. One teacher wrote: "Technology is the future. We cannot ignore it." Another wrote: "As long as the platform improves, it will be useful." A third wrote: "Yes, if teachers are trained to use it properly." This conditional optimism—positive about the future but conditional on improvements and training—reflects a realistic rather than enthusiastic attitude.

When asked whether they would continue using the platform in future writing classes (Q7), two teachers selected "yes, definitely," one selected "yes, if conditions allow," and one selected "I am not sure." The explanations revealed the factors that shape this intention. The teacher who selected "yes, definitely" wrote: "It saves me time and helps my students. I will use it." The teacher who selected "yes, if conditions allow" wrote: "If we have reliable internet and enough computers, yes. Without that, it is too frustrating." The teacher who selected "I am not sure" wrote: "I need more training first. I do not feel confident using it." These responses demonstrate that behavioral intention is shaped by both internal factors (confidence, training) and external factors (infrastructure, support)—a finding consistent with the Unified Theory of Acceptance and Use of Technology (Venkatesh et al., 2003).

3.7. Support and Training Needs

When asked what support would help them integrate the platform more effectively (Q8), teachers identified several needs. All four selected "hands-on training workshops" and "technical support during implementation." Three selected "written guides or tutorials." Two selected "institutional policies and guidelines." One selected "time to explore the platform independently." These responses reveal that teachers are not asking for more technology—they are asking for more support in using the technology they have. The emphasis on hands-on training and technical support during implementation suggests that teachers want help in the moment, not just general instruction.

One teacher's comment captured the sentiment of the group: "We are willing to use the platform. We just need someone to show us how and to be there when things go wrong." This statement reflects a pragmatic, solution-oriented attitude—teachers are not resistant to technology but are frustrated by the lack of support for using it well.

Section E: Open-Ended Questions

3.8. Advantages of the Platform

When asked to describe the most significant advantages of using the platform (Q1), teachers' responses converged on three themes: efficiency, immediate feedback, and student engagement. One teacher wrote: "The platform gives feedback instantly, which is something I cannot do for every student. It fills a gap." Another wrote: "Students can write more and revise more because they get feedback immediately. This helps them improve." A third wrote: "It reduces the fear of making mistakes because students can correct themselves before the teacher sees it." These responses suggest that the platform's primary advantage is its capacity to provide immediate, non-judgmental feedback that supports revision and reduces anxiety.

3.9. Limitations and Concerns

When asked about the most significant limitations or concerns (Q2), teachers identified the platform's inability to assess higher-order writing skills, concerns about over-reliance, and contextual barriers. One teacher wrote: "The platform cannot understand meaning. It can tell you if a sentence is grammatically correct, but not if it makes sense in context." Another wrote: "Students might become dependent on the corrections and not learn to edit their own work." A third wrote: "The internet is not reliable. Sometimes we cannot use it, and that makes it hard to plan." These responses reveal that teachers' concerns are both pedagogical (the platform's limitations) and practical

(infrastructure and access)—and that both types of concerns shape their overall attitudes.

3.10. Impact on Views about Technology

When asked how their experience with the platform had changed their views about technology in writing instruction (Q3), teachers' responses were mixed. Two teachers reported that their views had become more positive. One wrote: "I was skeptical before, but now I see that technology can help, especially for large classes." The other wrote: "I used to think technology was a distraction. Now I think it can be a tool if used well." Two teachers reported that their views had not changed significantly. One wrote: "I already believed technology could help. This experience confirmed it." The other wrote: "My view has not changed. Technology is useful for some things and not for others. This platform is useful for grammar, not for ideas." This range of responses suggests that experience with the platform can shift attitudes, but not uniformly—prior beliefs and pedagogical orientations continue to shape how teachers interpret their experience.

3.11. Additional Comments

When given the opportunity to add anything else (Q4), teachers offered reflections that captured the complexity of their attitudes. One teacher wrote: "The platform is a tool, not a solution. It helps, but it does not replace good teaching." Another wrote: "I hope the university will support us with training and resources. Without that, the platform will be a burden, not a benefit." A third wrote: "My students enjoyed using it. That matters. If they are motivated, they will write more, and that is how they improve." These comments synthesize the study's key findings: teachers see the platform as valuable but conditional, dependent on support, and most effective when integrated with human teaching rather than replacing it.

3.12. Discussion

The findings reveal that Algerian EFL teachers hold cautiously positive attitudes toward the Write & Improve platform. They recognize its value for providing immediate feedback, reducing their workload on surface-level errors, and supporting student revision. However, their attitudes are tempered by significant concerns about the platform's limitations for higher-order writing skills, their own lack of training, and the contextual barriers that make consistent integration difficult.

These findings align closely with the Technology Acceptance Model's core constructs. Perceived usefulness was high for mechanics but low for meaning—a pattern consistent with the literature on AWE feedback scope (Cotos, 2023; Lee et al., 2026). Perceived ease of use varied with teachers' technological self-efficacy and prior experience, confirming research showing that confidence shapes perceptions (Celik, 2023; Wang et al., 2024). The belief-practice gap—positive attitudes but inconsistent implementation—reflects what the literature identifies as the "ecological factors" that mediate technology adoption (Zhang & Hyland, 2018).

What emerges most clearly is that teacher attitudes toward Write & Improve are not simply about the platform itself. They are shaped by teachers' pedagogical beliefs, their technological confidence, their professional identity, and the institutional context in which they work. For Algerian EFL teachers, the platform represents both an opportunity and a challenge—an opportunity to enhance writing instruction in resource-constrained environments, and a challenge to their traditional roles and practices. Understanding these attitudes is essential for any meaningful assessment of the platform's pedagogical potential. Without attention to the conditions that enable or constrain technology integration, the gap between belief and practice will persist.

Answers to the Research Questions

This analysis provides clear answers to the core research questions about teachers' attitudes towards the effectiveness of the Write & Improve platform in enhancing EFL students' writing proficiency at the University of Kasdi Merbah Ouargla, as the following:

What are teachers' attitudes towards the perceived usefulness and ease of use of the Write & Improve platform?

Teachers possess cautiously positive but nuanced attitudes toward the platform. They primarily view Write &

Improve as a practical time-saver and a confidence-builder for students, particularly valuable in large classes where individualized teacher feedback is impossible. Their attitudes are firmly bounded by a clear pedagogical distinction: they perceive the platform as highly useful for lower-order writing concerns (grammar, spelling, mechanics) but limited for higher-order concerns (argumentation, coherence, rhetorical effectiveness). This is a conscious professional judgment that actively negotiates the tension between technological efficiency and pedagogical depth by positioning the platform as a supplement rather than a substitute for teacher feedback. Regarding ease of use, teachers' attitudes varied along a spectrum of confidence, with those possessing prior experience with educational technology or formal training describing the platform as "easy" or "very easy," while those without such experience described it as "manageable but not without problems." This variation reflects the mediating role of technological self-efficacy in shaping perceptions of usability.

What contextual, pedagogical, and technological factors shape teachers' attitudes toward integrating the Write & Improve platform?

The factors shaping teachers' attitudes are overwhelmingly contextual and institutional, with pedagogical and technological dimensions interacting in complex ways. The primary contextual barriers are severe time constraints, inadequate training (only one of four teachers had received formal instruction), and unreliable technical infrastructure (internet connectivity issues and limited access to computer labs). These constraints create a significant gap between teachers' stated beliefs and their reported practices—all four teachers believed the platform was useful, yet their actual use varied from "every session" to "rarely."

The primary pedagogical factor shaping attitudes is teachers' disciplinary background and beliefs about writing instruction. Didactics specialists demonstrated the most positive attitudes and most systematic use, viewing the platform as a pedagogical tool that enhanced their role. The Literature specialist was most skeptical, expressing concerns about the platform's inability to assess creative and rhetorical dimensions of writing and viewing it as a potential threat to professional judgment. This spectrum reflects fundamental differences in how teachers understand the purposes of writing instruction and their role within it.

The primary technological factor is technological self-efficacy. Teachers with prior experience using educational technology (e.g., Grammarly, Google Docs) perceived the platform as easier to use and were more likely to integrate it consistently. Those without such experience struggled with the initial learning curve and were more likely to use the platform sporadically. Additionally, the language of the interface (English-only) posed a challenge for some students, adding to teachers' implementation burden. Overall, the system currently constrains more than it enables—teachers are willing to use the platform, but they lack the support, training, and infrastructure to do so effectively.

This research illuminates the complex reality of integrating AWE tools within Algerian university EFL programs.

It reveals a community of dedicated teachers who possess a pragmatic, context-sensitive pedagogical philosophy. They strategically employ Write & Improve as a tool for efficiency and student motivation, firmly anchoring their instruction in human judgment and pedagogical expertise to navigate the challenges of large classes and limited resources thoughtfully. However, a profound and systemic disconnect exists between this valued philosophy and consistent classroom practice. Despite remarkable individual resourcefulness, teachers are constrained by a rigid, linguistically-focused syllabus, severe time limitations, and the total absence of formal training and institutional guidelines for platform integration. This institutional framework inadvertently signals that technology integration is an optional enrichment rather than a core educational objective.

Consequently, the effectiveness of the Write & Improve platform in enhancing students' writing proficiency remains largely dependent on individual teacher agency, prior technological experience, and sporadic practice, rather than a guaranteed, structured outcome of the writing program. Teachers themselves provide the clearest roadmap forward: they explicitly call for (1) curricular alignment that legitimizes platform use, (2) hands-on training workshops and technical support during implementation, and (3) institutional policies

and guidelines that clarify how the platform fits into assessment and pedagogy. This triad of support is essential to transform Write & Improve from an occasional add-on into a transformative, systematic component of EFL writing instruction.

IV – Conclusion

In essence, Algerian EFL teachers are not just implementing a writing curriculum; they are critically mediating between pedagogical tradition and technological innovation. They have the insight and will to integrate the Write & Improve platform effectively, but they lack the institutional framework to consistently realize their professional vision. Empowering them with that framework is the crucial next step for fostering genuine writing proficiency among Algerian university students. Ultimately, the study underscores that the challenge is not a deficit in teacher understanding or commitment, but a gap in systemic empowerment. The teachers' clear vision for change—centered on training, technical support, and curricular alignment—provides a direct, practitioner-informed blueprint. For AWE integration to evolve from a marginal activity to a transformative pillar of writing instruction in Algeria, institutional support must align with and enable pedagogical belief.

To build upon these findings, future research should pivot towards student-centered and solution-oriented inquiry. A crucial next step is to investigate the student experience by examining their perceptions of automated feedback, the actual writing improvements they achieve through platform use, and how engagement with the platform impacts their motivation and autonomy as writers. Concurrently, applied action research is needed to move from diagnosis to practical solutions. This includes designing and evaluating pilot teaching modules with explicit AWE objectives, developing banks of locally-grounded writing tasks and materials, and creating feasible methods for formatively assessing the impact of automated feedback in the Algerian EFL classroom.

Furthermore, research should adopt broader analytical lenses to address systemic issues. Longitudinal studies could track the evolution of teacher attitudes and practices following professional development, while comparative studies with other North African and Middle Eastern contexts would help identify regional patterns and unique challenges. Finally, critical policy and curriculum analysis is essential to examine how technology integration objectives are articulated at the macro level and to identify leverage points within the national syllabus for meaningful integration. By pursuing these interconnected avenues, the academic community can transition from describing the challenges to actively crafting and validating solutions, thereby empowering educators in their vital mission to prepare Algerian students for successful academic and professional writing in an increasingly digital world.

Ultimately, this study reveals that the effectiveness of the Write & Improve platform depends not on the technology itself, but on the teachers who use it and the institutional conditions that support them. Teachers are willing to embrace AWE tools; they simply need the training, resources, and guidance to do so well. When institutions invest in their teachers, the potential of technology to transform writing instruction becomes not just possible but achievable. The path forward is clear—it requires aligning institutional support with pedagogical vision, and trusting teachers as the professionals best positioned to determine how technology can serve their students' learning.

References

1. Ahmed, F. E. Y., Kottaparamban, M., Ali, E. H. F., Usmani, S., & Abdallah, N. M. M. (2026). Teachers' perspectives on the role of artificial intelligence in assessing and providing feedback on English writing skills. *Scientific Culture*, 12(1), 1–18.
2. Al-Azzawi, G. S. (2026). Teachers' perspectives on the challenges of incorporating AI chatbots into writing instruction for Arab EFL learners. *Arab World English Journal*, 17(1), 236–252.
3. Alfadda, H. A., et al. (2025). Teachers' perspectives on AI-based writing assessment in Saudi EFL contexts. *Language Learning & Technology*, 29(1), 1–22.

4. Alharbi, A. (2026). Enhancing EFL students' writing proficiency through AI-assisted writing tools. Zenodo.
5. Bessadat, S., & Korichi, A. (2024). Teachers' attitudes towards AI-based assessment in EFL writing instruction: The case of Algerian universities. *Journal of Language and Education*, 10(3), 45–62.
6. Boughenou, N., & Bounaas, C. (2024). Algerian EFL students' attitudes towards writing: Challenges and strategies. *Journal of Language Teaching and Research*, 15(2), 234–245.
7. Braun, V., & Clarke, V. (2006). Using thematic analysis in psychology. *Qualitative Research in Psychology*, 3(2), 77–101.
8. Braun, V., & Clarke, V. (2022). *Thematic analysis: A practical guide*. SAGE.
9. Bu Abd Allah, S., & al-Tayyib, M. (2024). Teachers' perceptions of automated writing evaluation tools to improve writing skill: Case of teachers of Mohamed Lamine Debaghine Setif 2 University. *Djousour el-Maaréfa*, 10(2), 121–138.
10. Cambridge English. (n.d.). *Write & Improve*. Cambridge University Press & Assessment.
11. Can, Y. (2025). Artificial intelligence vs. instructor supported AI: Teaching second language writing via "Write&Improve." *Interactive Learning Environments*, 33(2), 1154–1177.
12. Celik, I. (2023). Exploring the determinants of artificial intelligence acceptance among teachers: A systematic review. *Education and Information Technologies*, 28, 12345–12378.
13. Cotos, E. (2023). Automated feedback on writing. In *The Palgrave handbook of applied linguistics* (pp. 1–25). Springer.
14. Davis, F. D. (1989). Perceived usefulness, perceived ease of use, and user acceptance of information technology. *MIS Quarterly*, 13(3), 319–340.
15. Ekmekçi, E. (2024). An investigation on the use of automated feedback in Turkish EFL students' writing classes. *Computer Assisted Language Learning*, 37(4), 961–985.
16. Elouirraoui, S., et al. (2026). Automated writing evaluation in EFL contexts: A mixed-methods investigation. *Computer Assisted Language Learning*.
17. ERIC. (2023). EFL teachers' self-efficacy and TPACK proficiency. Education Resources Information Center.
18. Gagaa, A. (2025). Investigating teachers' use of automated writing assessment tools in evaluating students' academic writing [Master's thesis, Mohamed Khider University of Biskra].
19. Gustilo, L., Ong, E., & Lapinid, M. R. (2026). Algorithmically-driven writing and academic integrity: Exploring educators' practices, perceptions, and policies in AI era. *International Journal for Educational Integrity*.
20. Haddadi, F., & Zidane, R. (2024). Technology integration in Algerian EFL classrooms: Challenges and opportunities. *Algerian Journal of Language Studies*, 8(1), 67–82.
21. Hamouda, A. (2025). Grammatical errors among Algerian EFL university students. *International Journal of English Language Teaching*, 13(1), 45–62.
22. Jitpaisarnwattana, N., & Saville, N. (2026). The impact of Write & Improve on EFL students' writing performance. *Language Testing*, 43(1), 89–112.
23. Karimi, M. N., & Asghari, M. (2025). Leveraging ChatGPT for L2 writing: Teacher cognition and the impact of professional development. *International Journal of*

24. Khoso, A. K., Honggang, W., & Darazi, M. A. (2026). Trust and attitude towards AI as pathways to creativity: A TAM model study of EFL students' digital literacy and AI acceptance. *Humanities and Social Sciences Communications*, 13, 69.
25. Kim, H., et al. (2026). Korean teachers' perceptions of AI courseware feedback in writing instruction. *Computer Assisted Language Learning*.
26. Koltovskaia, S. (2022). Postsecondary L2 writing teachers' use and perceptions of Grammarly as a complement to their feedback. *ReCALL*, 34(3), 1–18.
27. Lee, J. (2025). Automated writing evaluation feedback in English learning and teaching. *Antistasis*, 15(1), 1–12.
28. Lee, J., et al. (2026). A meta-synthesis of automatic writing evaluation research: Trends and developments over a decade. *Educational Technology Research and Development*.
29. Legris, P., Ingham, J., & Collette, P. (2003). Why do people use information technology? A critical review of the technology acceptance model. *Information & Management*, 40(3), 191–204.
30. Li, J., Link, S., & Hegelheimer, V. (2015). Rethinking the role of automated writing evaluation (AWE) feedback in ESL writing instruction. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 27, 1–18.
31. Li, Z. (2021). Teachers' perceptions of AI writing tools: A TAM-based study. *Computers & Education*, 165, 104–118.
32. Link, S., Mehrzad, M., & Rahimi, M. (2026). Impact of automated writing evaluation on teacher feedback, student revision, and writing improvement. *Language Learning & Technology*, 30(1), 1–22.
33. Nguyễn, L. A. N., & Ngô, V. P. (2026). Tái cấu trúc vai trò của giáo viên tiếng Trung trong việc phản hồi bài viết dưới sự hỗ trợ của ChatGPT [Restructuring the role of Chinese language teachers in providing feedback on writing with ChatGPT support]. *Vietnam Journals Online*.
34. Pal, G., & Pal, S. (2026). Impact of ICT on teachers' attitude: A systematic review. *Zenodo*.
35. Putra, P. (2023). The use of AI-driven tool Write & Improve in enhancing students' writing skills. *Contemporary Educational Technology*, 17(1), ep548.
36. Scherer, R., Siddiq, F., & Tondeur, J. (2019). The technology acceptance model (TAM): A meta-analytic structural equation modeling approach to explaining teachers' adoption of digital technology in education. *Computers & Education*, 128, 13–35.
37. Scherer, S., Graham, S., & Busse, V. (2026). Can algorithm-based feedback help students to write better? A meta-analysis exploring surface- and deep-level outcomes. *Educational Research Review*, 48, 100–120.
38. Scientific Research of the SCO Countries. (2026). Teachers' perceptions of AI in EFL writing instruction. [Conference proceedings].
39. Sefina, A. C. (2026). A systematic review of teachers' perspectives on the use of Grammarly in EFL writing classrooms. *RIGGS: Journal of Artificial Intelligence and Digital Business*.
40. Shermis, M. D., & Burstein, J. (Eds.). (2013). *Handbook of automated essay evaluation: Current applications and new directions*. Routledge.
41. Taskiran, A., Yazici, M., & Aydin, I. E. (2024). Contribution of automated feedback to the English writing competence of distance foreign language learners. *E-Learning and Digital Media*, 21(1), 24–41.

42. Venkatesh, V., Morris, M. G., Davis, G. B., & Davis, F. D. (2003). User acceptance of information technology: Toward a unified view. *MIS Quarterly*, 27(3), 425–478.
43. Wang, Y., et al. (2024). The mediating role of technology self-efficacy in teachers' behavioral intention to use technology. *Computers & Education*, 210, 104–120.
44. Wang, Y., et al. (2026). Efficacy and implementation of AI-powered writing assessment tools in applied undergraduate English. *ACM Digital Library*.
45. Yang, Y.-C., Chao, Y.-C., & Huang, C.-K. (2014). The role of EFL teacher beliefs in web-supported writing instruction and feedback practices. *國立彰化師範大學文學院學報*, 9, 101–121.
46. Yilmaz Virvan, A., & Tomak, B. (2025). Teachers' perspectives on AI in writing instruction: A qualitative inquiry. *TESOL Journal*, 16(2), 1–18.
47. Yu, L., & Wilang, J. D. (2025). Myanmar EFL teachers' perceptions of AI writing tools. *LEARN Journal*, 18(1), 234–256.
48. Zainal Abidin, S. A., & Rahmat, N. H. (2026). Artificial intelligence in academic writing in higher education: A systematic literature review of pedagogical integration, assessment practices, and teachers' perspectives. *International Journal of Research and Innovation in Social Science*, 10(7), 779–802.
49. Zenodo. (2026). Teachers' perceptions of Grammarly in secondary-school EFL writing instruction: Evidence from Bac Ninh Province, Vietnam.
50. Zhang, Z. (2020). Engaging with automated writing evaluation (AWE) feedback: EFL students' perceptions and revisions. *Assessing Writing*, 43, 100–114.
51. Zhang, Z., & Hyland, K. (2018). Student engagement with teacher and automated feedback on L2 writing. *Assessing Writing*, 36, 90–102.
52. Zhao, Y., & Yang, L. (2025). Combined automated and teacher feedback in EFL writing: Effects on self-efficacy and performance. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 67, 100–118.