

Interlanguage Development and Auxiliary Verb Errors in EFL Writing: Insights for Intercultural Understanding and Peacebuilding in Diverse Indonesian Classrooms

Lutfiah Adhabia

Universitas Islam Negeri Salatiga, Indonesia

adabiaa77@gmail.com

Noor Malihah

Universitas Islam Negeri Salatiga, Indonesia

noormalihah@uinsalatiga.ac.id

Abstract

This study examines auxiliary verb errors as indicators of interlanguage development in Indonesian EFL learners' descriptive writing and explores their broader implications for intercultural communication and educational peacebuilding. Thirty descriptive texts written by tenth-grade students at SMA N 3 Salatiga were analyzed using qualitative content analysis based on error analysis frameworks. Five major types of auxiliary verb errors were identified: omission, misformation, overgeneralization, misordering, and unnecessary insertion, with omission emerging as the most frequent. These patterns reveal learners' ongoing internalization of English grammatical structures and highlight the influence of L1 transfer, rule simplification, and emerging fossilization in interlanguage development. Beyond their linguistic significance, the findings underscore how grammatical accuracy contributes to clear expression, reduces misinterpretation, and supports respectful communication in culturally and religiously diverse classrooms. As English increasingly functions as a global lingua franca for interaction across differences, improved auxiliary verb mastery enhances learners' ability to participate in intercultural dialogue and fosters peaceful, inclusive classroom engagement. The study recommends explicit, contextualized grammar instruction, scaffolded writing support, and iterative corrective feedback to promote both linguistic competence and intercultural communicative readiness. These findings contribute to applied linguistics research and offer insights relevant to peace-oriented educational practices in pluralistic learning environments.

Keywords: *Auxiliary verbs, descriptive writing, EFL learners, error analysis, interlanguage.*

Introduction

Despite years of formal English instruction, many Indonesian high school students continue to omit or misuse basic auxiliary verbs, resulting in errors that significantly distort meaning and hinder communication. Recent studies show that more than 60% of descriptive texts written by EFL students in Indonesia contain at least one auxiliary verb error (Puspitasari & Wintarsih, 2025; Sembiring, Sibarani, & Mangaraja, 2021). These errors indicate ongoing developmental challenges and highlight the complexities of English grammar, particularly for learners whose first languages differ significantly in structure. Grammatical inaccuracy, especially in auxiliary verb usage, contributes to miscommunication that can impede learners' ability to express ideas clearly in both academic and social contexts (Neman & Kamuh, 2024).

The development of English proficiency among learners in English as a foreign language (EFL) contexts is a multifaceted process involving cognitive, linguistic, and sociocultural factors (Brown, 2007; Schmidt, 2010). In classroom communication, grammatical competence remains a central aspect of language mastery, as accurate grammar enables students to convey precise meanings and engage effectively with others (Hinkel, 2004; Lightbown & Spada, 2006). One important yet often challenging area of grammar is the correct use of auxiliary verbs, which are essential for expressing tense, aspect, voice, and modality (Ellis & Barkhuizen, 2005; Parrott, 2010). Their misuse or omission can lead not only to grammatical errors but also to misunderstanding in communication, particularly in tasks requiring clarity and detail.

The concept of interlanguage, introduced by Selinker (1972), provides a theoretical lens for understanding how learners develop their own evolving linguistic system as they progress from their native language (L1) toward the target language (L2). Interlanguage reflects a combination of cognitive processes and linguistic influences, including L1 transfer, overgeneralization, and simplification strategies (Dulay, Burt, & Krashen, 1982; Gass & Selinker, 2008). While interlanguage naturally evolves with exposure and practice (Lightbown & Spada, 2006), it may also result in fossilization, where incorrect linguistic forms become habitual despite instruction (Brown, 2007). Auxiliary verb errors—such as omission, misformation, and overgeneralization—represent common manifestations of this developmental stage, particularly for learners whose L1 does not require auxiliary verbs in similar syntactic environments (Dinković et al., 2025; Novelia & Faisal, 2023).

Research consistently shows that auxiliary verbs remain one of the most persistent grammatical challenges for EFL learners across contexts. Sembiring et al. (2021) found that Indonesian high school students frequently omit auxiliaries in descriptive writing, suggesting incomplete internalization of English structural rules. International studies also report similar challenges: Al Towity (2021) identified auxiliary misuse among Saudi EFL learners, and Ayu and Nurweni (2023) emphasized the influence of cross-linguistic transfer in auxiliary omissions among Indonesian Islamic school students. Furthermore, Puspitasari et al. (2025) demonstrated that auxiliary verb errors occur across proficiency levels, highlighting deeper developmental challenges within learners' interlanguage systems.

Beyond its linguistic importance, English learning today is deeply intertwined with intercultural communication and peace-oriented educational practices. As Indonesia's schools are characterized by religious and cultural diversity, effective communication becomes essential for fostering respectful interaction and preventing misinterpretations across groups (Mirhosseini & Ilmasi, 2023; Holmes & Dervin, 2016). Intercultural communication and peacebuilding in education increasingly depend on students' ability to express meaning clearly in English, a global lingua franca that facilitates interaction across religious, cultural, and political boundaries. Miscommunication resulting from grammatical inaccuracies, including auxiliary verb errors, may limit students' participation in intercultural dialogue and their capacity to engage in peaceful, collaborative learning environments. Therefore, understanding students' interlanguage development is not only a linguistic inquiry but also a meaningful contribution to broader discussions on communication, identity negotiation, and peace-oriented classroom engagement in diverse Indonesian contexts (Byram, 2021; Deardorff, 2006).

Despite substantial research on grammatical errors in EFL writing, most studies have examined grammatical issues broadly rather than focusing specifically on auxiliary verb errors in descriptive texts. Descriptive writing requires learners to present detailed and accurate representations of objects, places, or people, making grammatical accuracy essential for clarity and coherence. Errors in auxiliary verb usage can distort intended meanings and reflect deeper gaps in learners' interlanguage development, suggesting the need for more targeted investigation.

Given the above, the present study revisits the issue of auxiliary verb errors in descriptive writing by analyzing 30 student texts from SMA N 3 Salatiga to provide updated insights into

learners' interlanguage development. By examining these errors, this study contributes not only to localized EFL grammar research but also to broader conversations about how linguistic accuracy supports intercultural communication and peacebuilding in Indonesia's diverse educational landscape.

Despite years of formal English instruction, many Indonesian high school students continue to omit or misuse basic auxiliary verbs, resulting in errors that significantly distort meaning and hinder communication. Recent studies show that more than 60% of descriptive texts written by EFL students in Indonesia contain at least one auxiliary verb error (Puspitasari & Wintarsih, 2025; Sembiring, Sibarani, & Mangaraja, 2021). These errors indicate ongoing developmental challenges and highlight the complexities of English grammar, particularly for learners whose first languages differ significantly in structure.

The development of English proficiency among high school students in English as a foreign language (EFL) contexts is a multifaceted process involving cognitive, linguistic, and sociocultural factors (Brown, 2007; Schmidt, 2010). In EFL classrooms, grammatical competence remains a central aspect of language mastery, as accurate grammar enables students to convey precise meanings and achieve effective communication (Hinkel, 2004; Lightbown & Spada, 2006). One important yet often problematic area of grammar is the correct use of auxiliary verbs, which are essential for forming various tenses, aspects, voices, and modal meanings in English (Ellis & Barkhuizen, 2005; Parrott, 2010). Their misuse or omission can lead to serious miscommunication (Neman & Kamuh, 2024).

The concept of interlanguage, introduced by Selinker (1972), refers to the dynamic and systematic linguistic system that learners develop as they progress from their native language (L1) toward the target language (L2). Interlanguage reflects a combination of influences, including transfer from L1, overgeneralization of L2 rules, and learners' strategies to simplify complex forms (Dulay, Burt, & Krashen, 1982; Gass & Selinker, 2008). A defining feature of interlanguage is its evolving nature, as learners refine their mental representations of L2 structures through practice and exposure (Lightbown & Spada, 2006). However, interlanguage development can also result in fossilization – the stabilization of incorrect forms even after extensive learning (Brown, 2007).

Auxiliary verbs are notoriously challenging due to their multifunctionality and their lack of direct equivalents in many first languages (Dinković et al., 2025). According to Novelia and Faisal

(2023), auxiliary verb misuse is among the most persistent grammatical errors in EFL student writing. Such errors may also stem from instruction that emphasizes content over grammar or lacks sufficient feedback loops (Deng et al., 2019).

Recent studies have underscored the prevalence of auxiliary verb errors among EFL learners in various contexts. For example, Sembiring et al. (2021) found that omission of auxiliary verbs was the most common error in descriptive texts written by Indonesian high school students, suggesting an incomplete internalization of English sentence structures. Al Towity (2021) identified auxiliary verb errors as a persistent issue even among intermediate EFL learners in Saudi Arabia, while Ayu and Nurweni (2023) emphasized the role of cross-linguistic influence in auxiliary verb omissions among Islamic school students in Indonesia. Moreover, Puspitasari et al. (2025) demonstrated that auxiliary verb errors were not limited to beginner learners but occurred across proficiency levels, indicating deeper developmental challenges.

Despite the abundance of research on grammatical errors in EFL writing, most studies have focused broadly on verb errors or other general grammatical categories, without specifically examining auxiliary verb errors in descriptive writing. Descriptive texts require learners to present detailed and accurate descriptions of objects, people, or events, which depend heavily on proper grammatical structures to convey meaning effectively. Errors in auxiliary verb usage can distort intended meanings and reflect underlying gaps in learners' interlanguage development.

Given the above, the present study revisits the issue of auxiliary verb errors in descriptive writing by analyzing 30 student texts from SMA N 3 Salatiga to provide updated insights into learners' interlanguage development. By examining these errors, this study contributes not only to localized EFL grammar research but also to broader conversations about how linguistic accuracy supports intercultural communication and peacebuilding in Indonesia's diverse educational landscape.

Interlanguage and Auxiliary Verbs in Second Language Acquisition

Interlanguage and auxiliary verbs in SLA Interlanguage theory views learner language as systematic and evolving (Selinker, 1972), influenced by L1 transfer, overgeneralization, and simplification strategies (Gass & Selinker, 2008; Lightbown & Spada, 2006). Fossilization, or the stabilization of erroneous forms, can occur when incorrect usage becomes habitual despite

instruction (Brown, 2007) This phenomenon is particularly apparent in EFL writing, where certain patterns of auxiliary misuse persist across writing tasks (Wulandari & Setiawan, 2024).

Auxiliary verbs often pose major challenges due to their syntactic complexity and abstract semantic roles (Hinkel, 2004; Parrott, 2010). Learners frequently make errors such as omission, misinformation, overgeneralization, and misordering (Sembiring et al., 2021; Hikmiawati & Mandarani, 2023). These errors suggest that auxiliary verb mastery is an extended process that requires explicit, scaffolded instruction and meaningful language exposure.

Error Analysis in EFL Contexts

Error analysis has been widely applied to understand grammatical challenges faced by EFL learners. Research has shown that common grammatical errors include misuse of tense, incorrect prepositions, misplacement of articles, and subject-verb agreement issues (Darus & Subramaniam, 2009; Ellis & Barkhuizen, 2005). These errors provide insights into learners' interlanguage systems and highlight areas requiring focused instructional support.

In Indonesian EFL contexts, studies indicate that grammatical accuracy remains a significant challenge, with many learners relying heavily on L1 structures (Mukminin et al., 2013). Understanding error patterns allows teachers to design more effective corrective strategies and targeted grammar instruction to address these persistent problems.

The Role of Auxiliary Verbs in English Grammar

Auxiliary verbs are crucial for expressing tense, aspect, voice, and modality in English (Hinkel, 2004; Parrott, 2010). Their correct usage demands both syntactic and semantic understanding, which makes them particularly difficult for EFL learners. Errors involving auxiliaries often include omissions (e.g., "She playing football" instead of "She is playing football"), misformations ("He are running" instead of "He is running"), and overgeneralizations ("They wants" instead of "They want") (Sembiring et al., 2021)

Recent studies point out that auxiliary verbs frequently lack direct equivalents in learners' L1, causing confusion and frequent errors. Furthermore, their placement in questions and negative sentences poses additional challenges, especially for learners who primarily rely on L1 grammar patterns (Lightbown & Spada 2006).

Empirical Studies on Auxiliary Verb Errors

Numerous recent studies have analyzed auxiliary verb errors among EFL learners. Sembiring et al. (2021), in a study involving 50 descriptive texts by Indonesian high school students, identified omission as the most frequent error type, indicating incomplete mastery of English auxiliary structures. Ayu and Nurweni (2023) focused on narrative and descriptive texts written by Islamic school students and confirmed that L1 interference played a significant role in auxiliary omissions and misplacements. Internationally, Al Towity (2021) studied Saudi EFL learners and observed that auxiliary verb errors were common across all proficiency levels, emphasizing the universal difficulty of these structures.

Additionally, Puspitasari et al. (2025) argued that learners' reliance on generalized grammatical rules without contextual understanding results in auxiliary verb errors. This is supported by findings from recent studies highlighting similar error types among learners of varying proficiency.

Corrective Feedback and Pedagogical Implications

Corrective feedback is a crucial strategy to help learners overcome fossilized errors, including those involving auxiliary verbs. Both explicit feedback (direct correction) and implicit feedback (recasts, clarification requests) have been shown to support learners' grammatical development (Ellis, 2009; Lyster & Ranta, 1997). Focused grammar instruction, combined with consistent corrective feedback, can enhance learners' accuracy and promote restructuring of their interlanguage systems (Russell & Spada, 2006).

In the Indonesian context, Vazariah and Rozimela (2020) found that corrective feedback targeting grammatical errors significantly improved learners' writing accuracy. Moreover, integrating peer and teacher feedback was effective in encouraging students to reflect on their errors and make revisions, further reducing auxiliary verb mistakes. Despite these interventions, auxiliary verb errors remain pervasive, indicating a need for more systematic and intensive instructional strategies.

Interlanguage Development in Writing

Writing tasks, especially descriptive texts, provide a window into learners' interlanguage development. Descriptive writing requires learners to convey detailed information clearly and accurately, making grammatical errors highly noticeable (Hinkel, 2004; Ellis, 1997). Research by

Sembiring et al. (2021) emphasized that correct auxiliary verb usage is essential for maintaining coherence and clarity in descriptive writing.

Additionally, the Indonesian curriculum, including Merdeka Curriculum, emphasizes descriptive text writing as part of developing communicative competence (Kemendikbudristek BSKAP, 2022). However, many learners struggle to meet these standards due to persistent grammatical challenges, particularly with auxiliary verbs.

Method

This study employed a qualitative descriptive design using content analysis to investigate auxiliary verb errors as indicators of interlanguage development. Content analysis was chosen because it allows in-depth examination of textual data and error patterns in students' written texts (Cresswell, 2012).

The data were drawn from 30 descriptive texts written by tenth-grade students of SMA N 3 Salatiga during the academic year 2024/2025. The participants were selected using purposive sampling, focusing on students who had completed a descriptive text writing assignment as part of their English subject assessment. From these 30 texts, five representative samples were chosen for detailed analysis based on completeness, clarity, and richness of content. The students were instructed to write a descriptive text on a chosen topic, following standard writing guidelines taught in class. Texts were collected in their original form without any prior correction from the teacher to preserve authentic error patterns.

The collected texts were analyzed using error analysis procedures proposed by Dulay et al. (1982). The analysis process involved identifying errors related to auxiliary verb usage (omissions, misformations, overgeneralizations), classifying them into error types, explaining their possible sources based on interlanguage theory (e.g., L1 transfer, overgeneralization), and evaluating their potential impact on meaning and communication. To improve the validity and reliability of the analysis, the researcher used investigator triangulation by involving two peer reviewers with expertise in applied linguistics. Each reviewer independently coded and classified the auxiliary verb errors, after which discrepancies were discussed until consensus was reached. Trustworthiness of the study was also established using Lincoln and Guba's (1988) criteria: credibility (peer debriefing),

transferability (detailed context description), dependability (transparent documentation), and confirmability (audit trail of analytic decisions).

The analysis aimed not only to quantify error types but also to interpret them in light of interlanguage theory. By doing so, the study sought to understand how auxiliary verb misuse reflects learners' underlying grammatical development and contributes to broader patterns of fossilization or restructuring in second language acquisition.

Discussion

Findings

This study identified and analyzed auxiliary verb errors in 30 descriptive texts written by tenth-grade students at SMA N 3 Salatiga. Based on the analysis, five types of auxiliary verb errors were found: omission, misformation, overgeneralization, misordering, and unnecessary insertion. A total of 38 auxiliary verb errors were recorded across the student corpus, reflecting both the learners' developmental stage in second language acquisition and their ongoing internalization of English grammatical structures.

Table 1. Error Distribution Overview

Error Type	Frequency	Example from Student Text	Correction
Omission	17	"It usually used to hold the main load."	"It is usually used to hold..."
Misformation	8	"It's has 58 sheets."	"It has 58 sheets."
Overgeneralization	6	"They wants to carry the luggage."	"They want to carry..."
Misordering	4	"Is they going to the school?"	"Are they going..."
Unnecessary Insertion	3	"Rice is a fried."	"Rice is fried."
Notes: Total auxiliary verb errors recorded: 38			

The present study identified five types of auxiliary verb errors—omission, misformation, overgeneralization, misordering, and unnecessary insertion—across 30 descriptive texts produced by Indonesian tenth-grade EFL students. The 38 errors recorded reveal clear patterns of interlanguage development and highlight persistent challenges that learners face in mastering English auxiliary

structures. These findings align with previous studies emphasizing that auxiliary verbs are among the most complex grammatical elements for EFL students due to their multifunctionality, syntactic constraints, and limited cross-linguistic equivalence (Hinkel, 2004; Dinković et al., 2025).

Omission emerged as the most frequent error, especially in passive constructions and progressive aspects. This pattern indicates that learners have not fully internalized the obligatory nature of auxiliary verbs in English syntax. Dulay, Burt, and Krashen (1982) describe omission as a developmentally natural error for learners who are still consolidating their understanding of verb phrase structures. The omission of *be* in passive and progressive structures is widely reported in Indonesian EFL contexts because Bahasa Indonesia does not require auxiliaries in similar constructions (Ayu & Nurweni, 2023). Thus, L1 transfer remains a strong predictor of this error type.

Misformation errors, such as the incorrect combination of “it’s” and “has,” reflect partial mastery of auxiliary forms and confusion between contracted and non-contracted structures. According to Gass and Selinker (2008), such errors arise due to cognitive overload during processing and the incomplete integration of grammatical rules into learners’ procedural knowledge. This also aligns with Corder’s (1967) view that learner errors represent systematic attempts to build internal rules rather than random mistakes.

Overgeneralization errors, including the extension of the third-person singular “-s” to plural subjects, further confirm Selinker’s (1972) argument that learners often rely on simplified rule systems during interlanguage development. These errors show that learners may know certain rules but have not yet acquired the conditions for appropriate application. Similar patterns were reported by Puspitasari et al. (2025), who found that Indonesian learners frequently overgeneralize verb morphology in descriptive and analytical exposition writing.

Misordering and unnecessary insertion errors indicate additional syntactic challenges. Misordering, particularly in interrogatives, suggests difficulty in understanding English word order, which is significantly different from Bahasa Indonesia. Learners must simultaneously manage subject-auxiliary inversion and tense selection, a process that increases cognitive load (Lightbown & Spada, 2006). Meanwhile, unnecessary insertion likely results from hypercorrection, wherein learners attempt to apply newly learned grammatical knowledge too broadly in an effort to produce

“more correct-sounding” English. This phenomenon is consistent with Brown’s (2007) account of developmental over-monitoring in early interlanguage stages.

Discussion

Across all five error types, the data strongly confirm that Indonesian learners are navigating complex interlanguage processes. The recurrence of omission and overgeneralization errors, evident in constructions such as “She is playing” or “He is sleeping”, suggests emerging fossilization. Fossilized forms are particularly resistant to change without targeted instructional intervention (Han & Odlin, 2015), highlighting the need for more systematic grammar-focused pedagogy in secondary EFL classrooms.

Beyond the linguistic dimension, these findings hold important implications for intercultural communication and educational peacebuilding. In linguistically and religiously diverse Indonesian classrooms, clear and accurate communication is essential for fostering respectful interaction, minimizing misunderstandings, and supporting inclusive dialogue (Holmes & Dervin, 2016; Mirhosseini & Ilmasi, 2023). As English increasingly functions as a lingua franca across cultural groups, grammatical inaccuracies, especially in essential structures like auxiliary verbs, can lead to misinterpretation or communicative breakdown. Byram (2021) argues that intercultural communicative competence requires not only attitudes and cultural knowledge but also sufficient linguistic accuracy to prevent unintended misunderstanding. Therefore, auxiliary verb mastery contributes indirectly to social cohesion by enabling students to communicate meaningfully and respectfully in multicultural learning environments.

Pedagogically, the findings reinforce the need for contextualized grammar instruction rather than isolated drills. As Hinkel (2004) notes, auxiliary verbs carry crucial semantic functions and must be taught within meaningful communicative contexts to ensure deep learning. Writing tasks, particularly descriptive texts, offer an ideal platform for integrating explicit grammar instruction with authentic language use (Hyland, 2016). Scaffolding techniques, such as guided writing, sentence combining, and explicit modeling, can support learners in recognizing and correcting auxiliary structures.

Corrective feedback also plays a significant role. Ellis (2009) emphasizes that explicit, targeted feedback, especially metalinguistic explanation, helps learners restructure erroneous interlanguage

rules. Lyster and Ranta (1997) further assert that interactional feedback strategies, such as prompts and clarification requests, encourage learners to self-repair and internalize correct forms. Evidence from Indonesian contexts supports this claim: Vazariah and Rozimela (2020) found that combined peer and teacher feedback on grammatical errors significantly improved students' writing accuracy over multiple drafts.

The genre of descriptive writing magnifies auxiliary verb errors because it requires precision in presenting factual information. Errors like "The chicken beak hard and curved" obscure meaning and disrupt textual coherence. As Badger and White (2000) explain, genre-based writing emphasizes the interaction between linguistic accuracy, communicative purpose, and social context; thus, weaknesses in auxiliary verb use can undermine learners' ability to meet genre expectations.

These findings also open avenues for further research. Future studies could investigate auxiliary verb errors across diverse genres, such as narrative, recount, or analytical exposition, to explore how genre demands influence grammatical accuracy. Longitudinal or classroom-based intervention studies could examine how focused instructional strategies, such as consciousness-raising tasks, collaborative editing, or input enhancement, affect the development of auxiliary verb accuracy and interlanguage restructuring. Another promising direction is examining how improved grammatical competence contributes to students' intercultural communication skills and their participation in peaceful, collaborative classroom discourse.

In sum, the auxiliary verb errors observed in this study reveal key features of interlanguage development and underscore the importance of intentional pedagogical support. By strengthening learners' grammatical accuracy within communicative and intercultural contexts, EFL educators can promote clearer expression, foster inclusive classroom interaction, and support broader peacebuilding goals in Indonesia's diverse educational landscape.

Conclusion

This study investigated auxiliary verb errors as indicators of interlanguage development in descriptive texts written by Indonesian tenth-grade EFL students. The analysis identified five dominant error types, omission, misformation, overgeneralization, misordering, and unnecessary insertion, with omission emerging as the most frequent. These patterns demonstrate that learners are still developing an internalized understanding of English auxiliary structures, influenced by L1

transfer, rule simplification, and incomplete mastery of syntactic constraints. The persistence of these errors also suggests a degree of fossilization, which requires targeted instructional efforts to reshape learners' developing interlanguage systems.

The findings highlight the importance of integrating explicit and contextualized grammar instruction into writing pedagogy, particularly for grammatical features such as auxiliary verbs that play a crucial role in clarity, accuracy, and coherence. Learners benefit from instructional approaches that combine clear modeling, scaffolded practice, metalinguistic explanation, and iterative feedback. As previous research emphasizes, corrective feedback and collaborative revision are especially effective in supporting learners' restructuring of interlanguage rules and improving grammatical accuracy over time (Ellis, 2009; Lyster & Ranta, 1997; Vazariah & Rozimela, 2020).

Beyond linguistic accuracy, this study also underscores the broader communicative and sociocultural implications of grammatical competence. In Indonesia's culturally and religiously diverse classrooms, effective communication contributes to respectful interaction, mutual understanding, and peaceful coexistence among students. Accurate grammatical production, including the appropriate use of auxiliary verbs, reduces the likelihood of misinterpretation and supports learners' ability to participate in intercultural dialogue within and beyond the classroom. In this sense, strengthening students' linguistic competence contributes indirectly to educational peacebuilding and fosters communicative practices aligned with inclusivity and intercultural understanding (Byram, 2021; Holmes & Dervin, 2016).

Future research may extend this study by examining auxiliary verb errors across different text genres, proficiency levels, or instructional interventions. Longitudinal studies could further illuminate how interlanguage develops over time and identify pedagogical strategies most effective in preventing fossilization. Overall, the findings of this study contribute to both applied linguistics and peace-oriented educational discourse by demonstrating how improvements in grammatical accuracy can enhance learners' communicative competence and support harmonious interaction in diverse learning environments.

Bibliography

- Al Towity, A. A. (2021). Exploring grammatical errors in English writing made by EFL Saudi learners at Al-Dayer University College, Jazan University. *Arab World English Journal*, 8(20), 525-539. <https://doi.org/10.55074/hesj.v8i20.403>
- Ayu, D. P., & Nurweni, A. (2023). Grammatical interference in Islamic school students' English narrative writings. *Englisia: Journal of Language, Education, and Humanities*, 11(1), 96-109. <https://doi.org/10.22373/ej.v11i1.18947>
- Badger, R., & White, G. (2000). A process genre approach to teaching writing. *ELT Journal*, 54(2), 153-160.
- Brown, H. D. (2007). *Principles of language learning and teaching* (5th ed.). Pearson Education.
- Corder, S. P. (1967). The significance of learners' errors. *International Review of Applied Linguistics*, 5(4), 161-170.
- Creswell, J. W. (2012). *Educational research* (4th ed.). Pearson.
- Darus, S., & Subramaniam, K. (2009). Error analysis of written English essays of secondary school students in Malaysia. *European Journal of Social Sciences*, 8(3), 483-495.
- Deng, Y., Lu, D., Huang, D., Chung, C. J., & Lin, F. (2019). Knowledge graph-based learning guidance for cybersecurity labs. *CompEd 2019*, 194-200.
- Dinković, I., Zovko, A., Fajdić, I., & Adrijana. (2025). Crosslinguistic influence of auxiliary verbs in Spanish and English.
- Dulay, H., Burt, M., & Krashen, S. (1982). *Language two*. Oxford University Press.
- Ellis, R. (2009). Corrective feedback and teacher development. *L2 Journal*, 1(1), 3-18. <https://doi.org/10.5070/L2.V1I1.9054>
- Ellis, R., & Barkhuizen, G. (2005). *Analysing learner language*. Oxford University Press.
- Gass, S. M., & Selinker, L. (2008). *Second language acquisition: An introductory course* (3rd ed.). Routledge.
- Han, Z., & Odlin, T. (2015). Fossilization in L2 learning. In *The Routledge handbook of second language acquisition*. Routledge.
- Hikmiawati, A., & Mandarani, V. (2023). Analyzing 7th graders' simple present errors. *Academia Open*, 8(1), 1-10.
- Hinkel, E. (2004). *Teaching academic ESL writing: Practical techniques in vocabulary and grammar*. Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Hyland, K. (2016). *Teaching and researching writing* (3rd ed.). Routledge.
- Lightbown, P. M., & Spada, N. (2006). *How languages are learned* (3rd ed.). Oxford University Press.
- Lincoln, Y. S., & Guba, E. G. (1988). Criteria for assessing naturalistic inquiries. *Educational Communication and Technology*, 29(2), 75-91.
- Lyster, R., & Ranta, L. (1997). Corrective feedback and negotiation of form. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, 19(1), 37-66.
- Mukminin, A., et al. (2013). The Achievement Ideology and Standardized Exam Policy in Indonesia. *Turkish Online Journal of Qualitative Inquiry*, 4(4), 19-36.
- Neman, I. E., & Kamuh, V. S. (2024). Errors in English descriptive text produced by high school students in Manado. *ELS Journal on Interdisciplinary Studies in Humanities*, 7(1), 17-21.
- Novelia, E., & Faisal. (2023). Students' grammatical errors in writing descriptive texts. *JoLLA*, 3(7), 1022-1031.

- Parrott, M. (2010). *Grammar for English language teachers*. Cambridge University Press.
- Puspitasari, M., Wintarsih, & Sabrina, R. (2025). An error analysis of using auxiliary verbs in analytical exposition texts.
- Schmidt, R. (2010). Attention, awareness, and individual differences. In *CLaSIC 2010 Proceedings* (pp. 721-737).
- Selinker, L. (1972). Interlanguage. *International Review of Applied Linguistics*, 10(3), 209-231.
- Sembiring, R., Sibarani, A., & Mangaraja, J. (2021). Error analysis of auxiliary verbs in descriptive texts. *Journal of English Education and Teaching*, 5(4), 556-566.
- Vazariah, U., & Rozimela, Y. (2020). Error analysis on verb usage in EFL student texts. *Journal of English Language Teaching*, 9(1), 231-240.