
Identifying The Student's Interlanguage Errors By Using Grammarly App : A Study of The 10th Grade Students Of SMA Immanuel Pontianak

Asry Fiancee Manalu

Universitas Tanjungpura, Indonesia

E-mail : F2201221007@student.untan.ac.id

Article History:

Received: 26 Juni 2026

Revised: 22 September 2026

Accepted: 07 Oktober 2026

Keywords: *Interlanguage Errors, Grammarly, Writing Performance, English as a Foreign Language (EFL), Error Analysis.*

Abstract: *This study investigates the interlanguage errors made by tenth-grade students of SMAK Immanuel Pontianak in English writing and examines the role of Grammarly in identifying these errors and supporting students' writing improvement. This study aims to identify the types of interlanguage errors detected by Grammarly, investigate the factors contributing to these errors, and explore students' perceptions of Grammarly's feedback in improving their English writing. Data were collected through students' writing assignments analyzed using Grammarly, interviews, and questionnaires. The findings are expected to reveal the most frequently occurring types of interlanguage errors in students' writing, identify the linguistic and cognitive factors contributing to these errors, and demonstrate students' perceptions regarding Grammarly as a learning tool. The predominance of omission and misformation errors suggests that Indonesian high school students experience particular difficulty with grammatical elements absent from their first language. Articles, tense markers, auxiliary verbs, and subject-verb agreement emerged as recurring areas of difficulty. These findings support interlanguage theory, which predicts that learner language will exhibit systematic developmental patterns influenced by both first-language transfer and intralingual processes.*

INTRODUCTION

Selinker (Tarone, 2018) proposed that the learner language used by adults when they attempt meaningful communication using a language they are in the process of learning (target language) is underpinned by an interlanguage system (IL) at a time when no systematic research on second language acquisition was being done. He advocated for study to determine the psycholinguistic mechanisms that influence interlanguage over time and to compare the structure of the learner language to the structure of the learner's native language and the target language. The area of second language acquisition (SLA) was created as a result of this request for research papers. This article outlines the key components of the interlanguage hypothesis as it was put

forth in 1972, including the five psycholinguistic processes Selinker hypothesized as potentially influential: native language transfer, overgeneralization, transfer of training, communication strategies, and learning strategies; his contentious claims that all interlanguages fossilize; and the assertion that the pertinent data for the study of interlanguage should be limited to. The entry examines how the interlanguage hypothesis has changed in relation to a number of themes, including the expansion of the hypothesis to include students of all ages and to view IL as a natural language that adheres to universal grammar rules, the investigation of the influence of social context and agency on IL psycholinguistic processes, including processes of fossilization and cross linguistic influence, and the expansion of the hypothesis to include learners of all ages. The fundamental premise that interlanguage is systematic still guides data collecting and analysis in the SLA discipline.

Interlanguage can fossilize in any of its developmental stages. Interlanguage fossilization is a stage during second language acquisition. It refers to a permanent cessation of progress toward the TL. This linguistic phenomenon, IL fossilization, can occur despite all reasonable attempts at learning (Wei, 2008). Fossilization includes those items, rules, and sub-systems that L2 learners tend to retain in their IL, that is, all those aspects of IL that become entrenched and permanent. It has also been noticed that this occurs particularly in adult L2 learners' IL systems.

The increasing demand for English proficiency in the era of globalization has encouraged many Indonesian schools to adopt bilingual education programs in which English is used alongside Indonesian as the medium of instruction. Immanuel Senior High School Pontianak is one such institution that has implemented a bilingual curriculum to prepare students for academic and professional competition in international contexts. Through the integration of English across subjects, including science and mathematics, the school creates an immersive learning environment that promotes students' communicative competence in listening, speaking, reading, and writing. English is consistently used in classroom interaction, assessment, extracurricular activities, and project-based learning, enabling students to develop stronger language proficiency than those in conventional schools. Although the bilingual curriculum is designed to foster globally competitive graduates, the increasingly diverse educational backgrounds of incoming students present new challenges for English language instruction, particularly in developing academic writing skills.

Despite studying in a bilingual environment, many tenth-grade students at Immanuel Senior High School previously attended regular Indonesian schools where exposure to English was relatively limited. Consequently, these students often experience difficulties in adapting to the linguistic demands of bilingual education, especially in English writing. Their compositions frequently contain grammatical inaccuracies, inappropriate vocabulary choices, punctuation errors, and poorly constructed sentence structures, reflecting the characteristics of interlanguage development. Interlanguage refers to the evolving linguistic system constructed by second-language learners as they gradually acquire the target language, often influenced by their first language and incomplete knowledge of English. The discrepancy between the curriculum's expectations and students' actual language competence becomes particularly evident during writing tasks, where learners must simultaneously express ideas and apply correct language forms. This situation highlights the need for instructional support that not only assists students in revising their writing but also helps teachers identify recurring language problems efficiently.

One technological innovation that has attracted considerable attention in English language learning is Grammarly, an artificial intelligence (AI)-powered writing assistant that provides immediate feedback on grammar, spelling, punctuation, vocabulary, clarity, and writing style. The availability of automated feedback enables students to revise their writing

.....

independently while allowing teachers to facilitate formative assessment more effectively. Previous studies have demonstrated the educational potential of grammar-checking tools. (Domeij et al., 2002) and Knutsson (2002) reported that students using grammar-checking software identified substantially more language errors than those who revised without technological assistance. Similarly, (Huang et al., 2020) found that Grammarly significantly improved English as a Foreign Language (EFL) students' writing performance and received positive evaluations from learners after a sixteen-week implementation. Nevertheless, (Yang Hye Jin, 2018) argued that Grammarly does not always accurately identify every language error and that excessive reliance on the application may result in overlooked or misinterpreted corrections. These findings suggest that while Grammarly offers valuable pedagogical benefits, its effectiveness depends on how learners interpret and utilize the feedback it provides.

Although previous research has examined Grammarly as a writing-support tool, limited attention has been given to its application in analyzing interlanguage errors among high school students enrolled in bilingual programs, particularly those transitioning from non-bilingual educational backgrounds. Most existing studies have focused on university students or have primarily evaluated Grammarly's effectiveness in improving writing quality without exploring the nature of learners' interlanguage development. This study addresses this gap by investigating how Grammarly identifies recurring interlanguage errors in students' English writing, the factors contributing to these errors, and students' perceptions of Grammarly's feedback during the writing process. The study offers a unique perspective by focusing on learners who are expected to meet bilingual academic standards despite having limited prior exposure to English-intensive learning environments, thereby providing a clearer understanding of the relationship between students' educational backgrounds and their language development.

Based on these considerations, this study aims to investigate the types of interlanguage errors most frequently detected by Grammarly in the English writing of tenth-grade students at Immanuel Senior High School Pontianak, identify the factors contributing to the occurrence of these errors, and explore students' perceptions of Grammarly as a tool for improving their writing skills. The findings are expected to contribute both theoretically and practically to English language teaching by enriching the literature on interlanguage analysis and AI-assisted writing instruction. Furthermore, the study provides insights for English teachers seeking to integrate digital writing tools into bilingual classrooms while maintaining the essential role of teacher feedback. Rather than replacing teachers, Grammarly may function as an effective complementary tool that supports students' language awareness, encourages autonomous learning, and facilitates more efficient formative assessment in English writing instruction.

METHOD

This study employed a qualitative research design to investigate the interlanguage errors found in the English writing of tenth-grade students at Immanuel Senior High School Pontianak and to examine how Grammarly identifies these errors. A qualitative approach was selected because it enables an in-depth analysis of students' language production and provides a comprehensive understanding of the factors contributing to interlanguage development. The analysis followed the procedures of error analysis. First, students' written compositions were collected as the primary source of data. The collected essays were then analyzed using Grammarly to identify linguistic deviations, while the researcher manually verified and labeled the errors according to their linguistic characteristics with an appropriate degree of precision. Subsequently, the identified errors were classified into different interlanguage error categories based on their grammatical and linguistic features. After the classification process, the relative

frequency of each error type was calculated to determine the most frequently occurring errors in students' writing. The final stage involved identifying the major areas of difficulty experienced by students in learning English as a foreign language by interpreting the recurring error patterns and relating them to possible causes of interlanguage development. Through these systematic procedures, the study provides a comprehensive description of students' interlanguage errors and demonstrates the potential of Grammarly as an AI-powered writing tool for supporting error analysis and English writing instruction.

Participant

The participants of this study were selected purposively to meet the objectives of the research. This study was conducted at Immanuel Senior High School Pontianak and involved tenth-grade students enrolled in the bilingual program. The participants were primarily students who had previously studied in non-bilingual schools, as they were expected to experience greater challenges in adapting to English academic writing. To collect the data, the English teacher assigned one writing task based on a predetermined topic, and the students' compositions served as the primary data for the analysis of interlanguage errors using Grammarly.

Instrument

The primary instrument used in this study was Grammarly, an AI-powered writing assistant, which was employed to identify interlanguage errors in students' English writing. Grammarly was selected because it provides automated feedback on grammar, spelling, punctuation, sentence structure, and writing clarity, allowing the researcher to systematically examine students' linguistic performance. The students' written compositions served as the primary data source, while Grammarly functioned as the analytical tool for detecting language errors.

Data collection was conducted in several stages. First, the English teacher assigned a writing task based on a predetermined topic to the participants. Second, students completed and submitted their essays electronically. Third, each composition was uploaded to Grammarly to generate automated feedback, after which the researcher reviewed and verified the identified errors to ensure their relevance to interlanguage analysis.

The collected data were analyzed using the qualitative procedures of error analysis. The analysis began with the collection of students' writing samples, followed by the identification and labeling of language errors according to the nature of each deviation. The identified errors were then classified into interlanguage error categories, and the frequency of each error type was calculated to determine the most common patterns. Finally, the recurring errors were interpreted to identify the major areas of difficulty encountered by students in learning English, providing a comprehensive understanding of their interlanguage development.

RESULT AND DISCUSSION

Based on the data result, the total number of errors identified using the Surface Strategy Taxonomy was 134, consisting of 57 omission errors, 21 addition errors, 51 misinformation errors, and 5 misordering errors. These errors were identified through Grammarly's feedback and subsequently verified and classified by the researcher according to (Amelia et al., 2021). The findings indicate that omission errors occurred most frequently, followed by misinformation, addition, and misordering errors.

Distribution of Error Types		
Error Type	Frequency	Percentage (%)
Omission	57	42.54

Addition	21	15.67
Misformation	51	38.06
Misordering	5	3.73
Total	134	100

The analysis revealed that omission errors were the dominant error type, accounting for 57 occurrences (42.54%) of the total errors. Most omission errors involved missing articles, auxiliary verbs, prepositions, conjunctions, punctuation, and plural markers that are essential for constructing grammatically correct English sentences. These findings suggest that many students experienced difficulties applying obligatory grammatical elements consistently in their writing. Such errors commonly occur among English as a Foreign Language (EFL) learners because English grammatical markers often differ from those in their first language.

The second most frequent category was misformation, with 51 errors (38.06%). These errors primarily consisted of incorrect verb forms, subject-verb agreement, inappropriate tense usage, incorrect noun forms, wrong prepositions, pronoun errors, adjective forms, and inappropriate word choices. Several students also demonstrated difficulties maintaining parallel sentence structures and selecting suitable lexical items. The high frequency of misformation errors indicates that although students attempted to apply English grammatical rules, they often selected incorrect linguistic forms, reflecting an incomplete mastery of English grammar and vocabulary.

In contrast, addition errors occurred 21 times (15.67%), while misordering errors appeared only 5 times (3.73%). Addition errors generally involved unnecessary words, redundant expressions, repeated grammatical markers, and excessive conjunctions, such as using "the reason... is because" instead of "the reason... is that." Meanwhile, misordering errors mainly involved incorrect word order, misplaced modifiers, and improper sentence structure. The relatively low number of misordering errors suggests that most students were able to organize sentence elements in an acceptable sequence, although occasional problems with English syntax remained.

Overall, the findings demonstrate that Grammarly effectively identified a wide range of grammatical issues in students' writing, while the researcher further categorized these errors into the four Surface Strategy Taxonomy classifications. The predominance of omission and misformation errors indicates that students' major challenges lie in applying English grammatical structures accurately rather than organizing sentence order. These findings imply that English writing instruction should place greater emphasis on the correct use of grammatical markers, verb forms, subject-verb agreement, and appropriate word selection. Furthermore, Grammarly can serve as a valuable supporting tool for teachers and students by providing immediate feedback that facilitates error identification and promotes greater grammatical awareness during the writing process.

Discussion

Omission Errors and Interlanguage Development

Omission emerged as the most dominant error category. Most omissions involved articles, auxiliary verbs, and grammatical markers. For example, students frequently omitted the article *the* in phrases such as *to Digital Era* rather than *to the Digital Era*. This pattern reflects negative transfer from Bahasa Indonesia, which does not employ an article system equivalent to English. Such findings support interlanguage theory, which posits that learners draw upon their first language when constructing hypotheses about the target language (Wei, 2008) (Selinker, 1972).

Addition Errors and Overgeneralization

Addition errors primarily resulted from overgeneralization. Learners often applied grammatical rules beyond their appropriate contexts. Examples included double marking of tense, such as *didn't used* instead of *didn't use*. These findings align with developmental perspectives in SLA, suggesting that learners actively formulate and test grammatical rules during acquisition (Kearney & Ellis, 1995).

Misformation Errors and Partial Rule Acquisition

Misformation errors represented the second-largest category. Frequent examples included incorrect verb forms, inappropriate prepositions, and subject-verb agreement errors. These findings suggest that students possessed partial knowledge of grammatical structures but had not yet achieved full mastery. Such patterns are characteristic of transitional interlanguage systems (Selinker & Gass, 2008).

Misordering Errors and Syntactic Development

Although misordering errors occurred less frequently, they remain important indicators of syntactic development. Difficulties in word order, adverb placement, and question formation reveal that learners are still refining their understanding of English sentence structure. The relatively low frequency of these errors may indicate that Indonesian learners acquire basic English word order earlier than morphological features such as tense and agreement.

CONCLUSION

This study examined the interlanguage of tenth-grade students in the bilingual program at Immanuel Senior High School Pontianak by analyzing grammatical errors in their English writing. The findings showed that the students produced four types of errors based on the Surface Strategy Taxonomy: omission, addition, misformation, and misordering. Omission and misformation were the most frequent errors, indicating that students still experienced difficulties with English grammatical features such as articles, auxiliary verbs, verb forms, and subject-verb agreement. These findings suggest that the students are still developing their interlanguage as they learn English as a foreign language.

The results also demonstrate that error analysis is a useful tool for understanding students' language development. Instead of viewing errors simply as mistakes, teachers can use them to identify students' learning needs and provide more appropriate instruction. Since the participants were tenth-grade bilingual students at Immanuel Senior High School Pontianak, the findings provide valuable information for teachers in designing classroom activities and corrective feedback that focus on the grammatical areas where students experience the greatest difficulty.

Finally, this study contributes to English language teaching by providing empirical evidence of the interlanguage characteristics of Indonesian EFL learners in a bilingual high school context. Although the study was limited to one class at Immanuel Senior High School Pontianak and focused only on students' written work, the findings offer practical implications for improving grammar instruction and corrective feedback. Future research may involve students from different grade levels or schools, include speaking performance, and investigate the effectiveness of different corrective feedback strategies in reducing grammatical errors and promoting language development.

This study reinforces the findings of previous research that learner errors are a natural part of interlanguage development and should be viewed as opportunities for learning rather than merely as deficiencies. English teachers, particularly those teaching bilingual classes, are encouraged to conduct regular error analysis to identify recurring grammatical problems and provide corrective feedback that is timely, meaningful, and appropriate to students' proficiency

levels. Such practices can help students gradually improve both grammatical accuracy and communicative competence.

The findings of this study also provide a foundation for ongoing research on interlanguage development among Indonesian EFL learners. Future classroom-based studies are encouraged to investigate how different corrective feedback strategies, such as direct feedback, indirect feedback, metalinguistic feedback, and peer feedback influence students' grammatical development over time. Longitudinal research may offer deeper insights into how learners' interlanguage evolves and how specific instructional interventions contribute to reducing persistent grammatical errors.

Finally, future research should broaden the scope of investigation by involving participants from different educational levels, schools, and learning contexts, as well as examining both written and spoken language production. Researchers may also explore the integration of digital writing assistants, such as Grammarly or other artificial intelligence based tools, with teacher feedback to determine their effectiveness in facilitating interlanguage development. Such studies are expected to contribute to the development of more evidence-based pedagogical practices and strengthen English language teaching in Indonesian EFL contexts.

REFERENCES

- Amelia, B. R., Rachmajanti, S., & Anugerahwati, M. (2021). An Analysis of Grammatical Errors in Writing Recount Texts by the Tenth Graders. *JoLLA: Journal of Language, Literature, and Arts*, 1(1). <https://doi.org/10.17977/um064v1i12021p15-24>
- Domeij, R., Knutsson, O., & Eklundh, K. S. (2002). Different ways of evaluating a Swedish grammar checker. *Proceedings of the 3rd International Conference on Language Resources and Evaluation, LREC 2002*.
- Huang, H. W., Li, Z., & Taylor, L. (2020). The Effectiveness of Using Grammarly to Improve Students' Writing Skills. *ACM International Conference Proceeding Series*. <https://doi.org/10.1145/3402569.3402594>
- Kearney, J., & Ellis, R. (1995). The Study of Second Language Acquisition. *TESOL Quarterly*, 29(3). <https://doi.org/10.2307/3588082>
- Selinker, L., & Gass, S. M. (2008). Second language acquisition. *Lawrence Erlbaum Ass.*
- Tarone, E. (2018). Interlanguage. In *The Encyclopedia of Applied Linguistics*. <https://doi.org/10.1002/9781405198431.wbeal0561.pub2>
- Wei, X. (2008). Implication of IL Fossilization in Second Language Acquisition. *English Language Teaching*, 1(1). <https://doi.org/10.5539/elt.v1n1p127>
- Yang Hye Jin. (2018). Efficiency of Online Grammar Checker in English Writing Performance and Students' Perceptions. *Korean Journal of English Language and Linguistics*, 18(3). <https://doi.org/10.15738/kjell.18.3.201809.328>