



FROM ERRORS TO INSIGHTS: ANALYZING MORPHOLOGICAL MISTAKES IN NON-NATIVE ESL COMPOSITIONS

Kanwal Sajjad

Research Scholar, English Linguistics, Lahore Leads University, Punjab, Pakistan.

Email: kanwalsajjad024@gmail.com

Shahzad Mehmood

Assistant Education Officer (SED). Email: chshahzad333@gmail.com

Azhar Ahmad

Research Scholar, English Linguistics, Lahore Leads University, Punjab, Pakistan. Email:

azharscholar313@gmail.com

Abstract:

The present research aims to estimate the frequency and find out the potential causes of morphological errors. The study also addresses pedagogical implications on ELT that would minimize morphological errors among Pakistani ESL learners. This research adopts a pragmatic research paradigm (a mixed-methods approach) to analyze the morphological errors and derive practical implications for ELT (English Language Teaching) in Pakistan. The population of the study comprises matric level ESL students of Lahore district and forty students were selected as sample by utilizing purposive sampling technique. The results revealed that the forty students of matriculate level made different types of mistakes in their essay writing. The mostly errors made by these students were omission, addition, misformation and misordering, the results also revealed that these students totally made one hundred and forty-five errors. The results of table 5 highlights that the 40 non-native ESL learners committed 91 errors related to plural morphemes, 10 possessive, 2 third person singular, 1 past tense, 6 present participle and 2 comparative/superlative morphemes. They committed total 112 inflectional morphological errors. Table 6 highlights that the 40 non-native ESL learners committed 2 errors related to Parts of Speech Confusion, 8 Noun formation, 1 Adjective Formation, 2 Verb Formation, 2 Prefix Misuse, 3 Incorrect Spacing, 2 Incorrect Sequencing, 3 Incorrect Element Selection. The analysis presented in table 7 highlights that the most common factor behind the morphological incompetency of non-native ESL learners is the intralingual factor.

Key Words: Morphological Mistakes, ESL Learners, Error Analysis, English Language Teaching (ELT)

Background of Study

English has become an essential tool for communication all over the world. It has been recognized as an international language due to its significant use in all spheres of life. It is used in information technology, business communication and education etc. (Ahmad, Yousaf & Riaz, 2026). It has a unique and significant position in Pakistan. English language has been inherited to this post-colonial nation and retains a language of power, prestige and socio-economic mobility (Ahmad, Yousaf & Yousaf, 2026). Pakistan, once a part of the Indian subcontinent, remained under British colonial rule for over a hundred years. This was the time when English became the official language and was strongly connected with the elite group, particularly in educational institutions and higher learning (Ansari et al., 2025; Mehmood et al., 2026). The language remained the official language after independence and a key language in administration and education. This value of English was also emphasized by Quaid-e-Azam Muhammad Ali Jinnah in his first education conference. Even when Urdu was declared as the national language, he was always aware of the fact that English was still important to the newly formed state (Ahmad, Maitlo & Shaheen, 2026). It has an official status in all the spheres of life in Pakistan. It is the medium of instruction in universities, hence it is also necessary in the career growth of the non-native ESL students (Yousaf, Ahmad & Riaz, 2026). Nonetheless, this superior position also generates a language gap, in which English skills tend to become an indicator of social standing and educational opportunities (Ahmad,

Yousaf & Riaz, 2026). This dual status of English brings out the importance of effective English Language Teaching (ELT) in Pakistan.

Second language learning is a complicated activity and it is usually subject to errors that are an inevitable part of learning process. These errors are just like a window into the learner's developing linguistic system. The non-native ESL learners face many challenges, especially in academic writing which is a most difficult skill for them to master in English (Fatima et al., 2026; Yousaf, Riaz, Ahmad, 2026). For these learners, producing a coherent and well-organized written text becomes one of the most demanding components of language learning because writing serves as the primary medium through which meaning is conveyed from the writer to the reader. They commit errors while writing due to the lack of knowledge regarding morphology.

Morphological errors occur when learners wrongly use the morphemes and these errors reflect the grammatical competency of the learner (Sajjad et al., 2026) Despite its worldwide importance, mastering English continues to be difficult for many non-native speakers (Niez et al., 2025). Morphological errors occur when learners misapply or misunderstand the structural rules of words which affects the meaning and grammatical accuracy of the language. Even with prior knowledge, incorrect rule application leads to morphological errors (Zaid et al., 2017). The overall competency of students' writing is affected by the morphological errors (Sunandar, 2023). Morphological errors can be analyzed by using Error Analysis (EA) which is a systematic approach to identify, classify and explain these errors to understand the learning process and improvement of teaching practices. For non-native ESL learners, these challenges are multi-faceted including grammatical complexity, vast vocabulary and influence of their native language.

Research Objectives

- To estimate the frequency of the most frequent morphological errors.
- To find out the potential causes of these errors.
- To come up with pedagogical implications on ELT that would minimize morphological errors among Pakistani ESL learners.

Research Questions

1. Which specific English morphemes are most frequently misused or omitted, constituting the highest error rates in the learners' essays?
2. What are the primary contributing factors that account for the identified patterns of morphological inaccuracy?
3. What specific recommendations can be formulated for instructional design and teaching methodology to enhance the morphological accuracy among Pakistani ESL learners?

Delimitation of the study

This study is delimited to non-native ESL learners in Pakistan. The participants will be the male students of matric level, excluding students from other academic year or those with high level of proficiency. The research will be conducted only on the students of a public school, excluding the students from a private school. The analysis will clearly focus on errors found in essay writing and will not include spoken language or other forms of writing (e.g; creative writing, story writing etc). It will focus only on morphological errors (e.g; verb forms, pluralization and word formation) and will not include other types of grammatical or syntactic errors.

Conceptual Framework

A conceptual framework is a system or a plan of interlaced concepts that collectively provides a broad thought of a process (Arshad et al., 2025; Bakht et al., 2026). A conceptual

framework reflects general ideas about a phenomenon and provides a structured arrangement of concepts and propositions to support thinking, observing and interpreting data (Ahmad, Maitlo & Soomro, 2026; Riaz et al., 2026). This research will seek to analyze these morphological errors that non-native ESL learners make in writing of essays. The theoretical structure of the study depicts the methodological process of data gathering up to feasible suggestions. It begins with the Input of the essay data of the 40 learners who are non-native ESLs. This crude information is first analyzed at Level 1 Analysis by using Pit Corder's Theory of Error Analysis (EA) in combination with the Surface Strategy Taxonomy (SST) that is the Analysis Level 2. The systematical classification of the morphological errors that occur according to their surface expression (e.g., Omission or Misformation) occurs here in a systematic manner, thus giving a detailed description of the types of errors. These classifications then feed into Analysis Level 3, where Interlanguage Theory (IL) is applied to diagnose the factors of the errors, identifying whether they stem from L1 interference or intralingual overgeneralization. The synthesis of these analytical findings (error type and factor) directly informs the Output of the study: deriving specific Pedagogical Implications for ELT in Pakistan to address the identified learning deficits.

Approaches and Theories

- **Error Analysis:** Error Analysis is a systematic approach that is used to identify and explain the errors made by the second language learners. It helps to understand the root causes of such errors, whether they stem from the first language or overgeneralization of the new language.
- **Pit Corder's Theory:** In 1960, Pit Corder presented a theory that errors made by second language learners are not just mistakes to be corrected but are valuable and systematic clues to their learning process.
- **Surface Strategy Taxonomy (SST):** Surface Strategy Taxonomy is a framework which is used to classify errors based on how the morphemes are affected on the surface structure (e.g., omission, addition, misformation and misordering).
- **Interlanguage Theory:** Interlanguage Theory is a linguistic system constructed by a learner of an L2. This framework is used to discuss the cause of the classified errors, specifically attributing the source to either Intralingual Transfer (overgeneralization) or Interlingual Transfer (L1 interference).
- **Error Analysis (EA) in Second Language Acquisition (SLA):** The method used to identify errors in second language learning is called Error Analysis, which is a process based on thoroughly examining the errors students make. Error Analysis is commonly used to investigate the linguistic deviations among multiple second language learners it benefits not only learners but also helps teachers improve their instructional techniques.

Literature Review

Morphology in Second Language Acquisition

Writing is an effective language skill, which needs special efforts of the mind to create a sound writing; it is an efficient skill, is useful in learning language (Ahmad et al., 2023). A second language learner undergoes difficulties as he or she goes about producing a productive piece of writing rather than perseverance. Zoubi (2018) explains that writing is another skill that must be encouraged and taught in the classroom using the right methods. In the overall proficiency of English language learning, writing is one of its basic elements (Fitria, 2020). Writing and grammar are inseparable because adhering to grammatical rules is a prerequisite for learners before they produce written work (Sadiah & Royani, 2019). Writing is a complex skill that requires second language learners to attend to multiple components of the writing process (Yousaf et al., 2025). Writing is an ongoing and intricate expressive process, difficult

in a first language and even more demanding in a foreign one (Ngangbam, 2016). Accuracy in grammar depends largely on morphology, the study of how words are constructed. The study of word structure and how new words are created falls under the linguistic field of morphology. It is concerned with the grammar of words. Morphology is the structure of words that deals with how words are formed and fit together (Zaid et al., 2017).

Morphological Errors

English is a challenging subject for most learners (Raheem et al., 2014). Competence in English language is very crucial for ESL learners to master for producing a well-organized piece of writing. English language has four skills and writing is the most difficult skill (Pasaribu et al., 2017). Learners mainly struggle with writing in foreign languages due to several factors such as lack of reading, first language transfer and low writing practice (Raheem et al., 2014). Among the four macro skills, writing is considered as the most intricate and complex task (Malimas et al., 2017). A morphological error is a mistake in the structure or form of a word, which is the result of incorrect application of morphological rules. Morphological errors arise when learners use morphemes incorrectly. Such errors include affixes (Prefixes and Suffixes) or inflections. Morphological errors can make the meaning unclear and make it harder for readers to understand what the writer wants to say (Abdullah, 2021).

The non-native ESL learners face many challenges, particularly in academic writing which is a most difficult skill for them to master in English (Ahmad et al., 2023). If morphological rules are incorrectly applied by non-native learners, this means they have committed morphological errors, even though they have the prior knowledge pertaining to the rules. If learners put the incorrect morphemes together, ultimately, they get an incorrect word which is called morphological error (Maitlo et al., 2023). Such errors significantly impact the overall accuracy of a well-organized piece of writing. Morphological errors are formed or made when the morphological aspect of grammar is being tainted or misinformed (Zaid et al., 2017). By studying both the errors and the learners' morphological development, one can gain valuable insights into the specific areas and patterns that impede their linguistic progress (Calubing, 2024). Many argue that writing instruction often overlooks explicit morphological aspects (Zaid et al., 2017). Several factors contribute to the writing difficulties faced by EFL learners, including insufficient reading, L1 transfer and limited writing practice (Raheem et al., 2024).

Previous Related Researches

Gayo and Widodo (2018) examined the morphological and syntactical errors that emerge in the writing of students in English and the causes of the errors. Through a qualitative descriptive research design, the study examined the errors that were generated and their causes. Such morphological errors, according to the findings, include the omission category, the addition and misformation category, the elements of derivation and inflection. Other forms of syntactical errors include subject verb agreement, determiners and tense. This paper has also found that two broad sources of these errors are interlingual transfer (influence of the first language) and intralingual factors.

Mahmood et al. (2020) conducted a research on morphological errors and its sources at intermediate level by using qualitative research paradigm. Researchers took 100 ESL students as a sample and used their descriptive texts as an instrument for this research. Pit Corder's theory was used as a theoretical framework. According to the conclusion of this research, in case of morphological errors ESL students execute errors of inflectional morphemes. This research also throws light on the fact that intralingual and interlingual transfer are the two major causes of morphological errors.

Adha and Dania (2021) discussed the morphological errors students made when using word-formation processes in writing an essay. The type of word-formation that was determined in the work of the students was derivation and inflection. In this study, a descriptive qualitative approach was used. The sample was composed of 23 fourth-semester students undertaking English Department in University Putra Indonesia. The information was gathered using a writing exam. The results indicated that the students used to commit both derivational and inflectional morphological errors. The number of errors in derivation was 10 and the number of errors in inflection was 83. These outcomes reveal that the students still have difficulties with word-formation rules in their writing.

Pasaribu et al. (2021) conducted research to analyze the morphological errors in students' thesis writing. This study used data on ten students' undergraduate thesis by applying the Theory of Error Analysis. The results of this study concluded 24.54% errors in the use of verb, 24.39% errors due to wrong application of prepositions, 20.12% morphological errors, 12.58% errors in articles and 9.45% errors in writing passive voice. This study showed that students committed errors even they were guided by the supervisors. According to this research, it is crucial to pay attention to those factors that lead to such errors while writing thesis.

Haris and Sulhan (2022) performed a qualitative case study among 62 randomly selected students in SMA Negeri 1 Bangkinang Kota and compared the morphological and syntactic errors in descriptive writing. The tool was an error classification sheets in accordance with student writings. Its results indicated that: (1) Morphological errors (e.g. noun, verb, auxiliary) were most frequent in the auxiliary (14.67%). (2) Syntactic errors (e.g., tense, noun phrase, Subject-Verb Agreement) were the most common in Subject-Verb Agreement (23.04%) errors. (3) The two forms of errors were described as being characterized by omission, addition, misformation and misordering.

Manik et al. (2022) analyzed the descriptive writing errors in the morphology of students of the English Department at Nommensen HKBP University (NHU) Medan and concluded that students have problems in practically mastering the theoretical knowledge of Morphology by examining a total of 154 errors that were committed in four word classes namely the noun, verb, adjective and adverb. The study has come to the conclusion that the most prevalent ones were verb morphological errors (91 times, 59.0%). The errors of nouns were present in 52 (33.8%) cases, adjective (4.6%) and adverb (2.6%) errors were less prevalent. The verb errors were found to be high due to the central position of the verb in conveying ideas in a text.

Mufidah and Islam (2022) explores the most common grammatical mistakes among students' writing, categorizing the types of errors according to the Linguistic Category framework created by Dulay. The data was collected by observing, writing tests and documenting 26 students in the second grade of Nurul Jadid Islamic Senior High School. A total of 155 errors were found with omission errors accounting for 44%, addition errors 27%, misformation errors 23% and misordering errors 6%. The findings show that omission errors were the most common.

Haris (2023) examined the presence of morphological errors in descriptive writing of students. This analysis is a qualitative study that examined the descriptive writing of 70 Grade XI students who were randomly sampled in two classes. Those errors were classified according to the Surface Strategy Taxonomy. It was shown that there were mistakes at many different morphological levels including inflection, derivation, preposition, article, pronoun and auxiliary verbs. Inflection (39%), as well as preposition errors, were the most prevalent and

least common categories of errors respectively. Importantly, the researchers have come to the conclusion that the most significant type of errors is omission that constitutes 73% of all the errors and supports the idea that students are more likely to omit some crucial morphological elements in their writing (inflections, articles, auxiliaries, etc.).

Tahir et al. (2023) compared the morphological errors in the explanatory texts of 78 learners in Palu, junior high learners (male and female). They identified errors in affixation, reduplication and compounding using a qualitative multi-case method in which there were gender based differences in the former two categories. The results shed light on the critical areas of the enhancement of students' knowledge about the morphology of the Indonesian language. Calubing (2024) analyzed the morphological errors found in the written assignments completed by 11th grade students at Northern Abra National High School. Data was categorized through a systematic coding process by using qualitative analysis. Essay writing was used to collect data in this research. Inflectional errors were more prevalent, indicating the lack of understanding regarding fundamental morphological rules among the students. Derivational errors were 30%, highlighting the confusion about the correct application of suffixes and prefixes.

Imtiaz et al. (2024) analyzed spelling errors committed by ESL learners at secondary level. This study was conducted to highlight the causes behind such errors. It was a qualitative research conducted in Govt. High School Kangan Pur, district Kasur. 45 students were selected to collect data. Thematic analysis was done to gather information. The study found that omission errors were most frequent, largely caused by limited vocabulary, low reading exposure, lack of motivation, mother-tongue influence, the education system and untrained English teachers. But interference of mother tongue was the major cause of committing spelling errors.

Research Methodology

This research adopts a pragmatic research paradigm (a mixed-methods approach) to analyze the morphological errors and derive practical implications for ELT (English Language Teaching) in Pakistan. The pragmatic paradigm focuses on solving the research problem by combining two different types of data analysis: Qualitative approach for the error analysis itself and quantitative approach for the frequency counts of each error. This study adopts a specific research paradigm to identify and examine the common morphological deviations present in the written work of 40 non-native ESL students, ensuring that the methodology is flexible enough to provide both reliable and effective practical implications for ELT in Pakistan. The population of the study comprises matric level ESL students of Lahore district and forty students were selected as sample by utilizing purposive sampling technique.

Data Analysis

This part is devoted to the presentations and discussion of the findings obtained from the 40 essays of non-native ESL learners. The first part indicates a systematic classification procedure by adhering to the procedures of the Theory of Error Analysis by Pit Corder and specifically the classification of the common morphological errors. These fallacies are modeled in terms of structure with the help of the categories offered by the Surface Strategy Taxonomy. The data is also subjected to a systematic procedure in order to measure the number of all the morphological errors that are observed in the forty compositions. These types of errors are characterized structurally in relation to the categories that are provided by the Surface Strategy Taxonomy. Lastly, the error data is also critically analyzed through the Interlanguage Theory in an attempt to come up with the underlying factors or causes of these morphological errors in writing essay by non-native ESL learners.

Data Analysis of Morphological Errors

Table 1

Classification of Morphological Errors based on Surface Strategy Taxonomy

Participant	Omission	Addition	Misformation	Misordering	Total Errors
P-01	0	1	0	0	1
P-02	2	1	0	0	3
P-03	1	2	0	0	3
P-04	4	0	0	1	5
P-05	2	1	0	0	3
P-06	5	1	2	0	8
P-07	1	1	0	0	2
P-08	0	3	0	2	5
P-09	2	1	4	0	7
P-10	1	2	0	2	5

Table 1 highlights the errors made by the students of matriculation level based on surface strategy taxonomy. In this study, the researcher found that 1st participant committed total 1 error in terms of 0 omission, 1 addition, 0 misformation and 0 misordering. The 2nd participant got 3 total errors in terms of 2 omissions, 1 addition, 0 misformation and 0 misordering. The 3rd participant got 3 total errors in terms of 1 omission, 2 additions, 0 misformation and 0 misordering. The 4th participant got 5 total errors in terms of 4 omissions, 0 addition, 0 misformation and 1 misordering. The 5th participant achieved 3 overall errors of 2 omissions, 1 addition, 0 misformation and 0 misordering. The 6th participant received 8 total errors with 5 omissions, 1 addition, 2 misformations and 0 misordering. The 7th participant had a total error count of 2 including 1 omission, 1 addition, 0 misformation and 0 misordering. The 8th participant had 5 total errors in 0 omission, 3 additions, 0 misformation and 2 misordering. The 9th participant had 7 overall errors, which included 2 omissions, 1 addition, 4 misformations and no misordering. The 10th participant made 5 total errors in the form of 1 omission, 2 additions, 0 misformation and 2 misordering.

Participant	Omission	Addition	Misformation	Misordering	Total Errors
P-11	2	0	2	2	6
P-12	1	4	0	2	7
P-13	2	0	1	0	3
P-14	2	1	0	1	4
P-15	2	0	0	0	2
P-16	2	0	2	0	4
P-17	4	0	0	1	5
P-18	0	1	0	0	1
P-19	0	0	0	0	0
P-20	0	1	0	0	1

Table 2 highlights the errors made by the students of matriculation level based on surface strategy taxonomy. In this study, the researcher found that The 11th participant received 6 total errors in form of 2 omissions, 0 addition, 2 misformations and 2 misordering. The 12th participant had 7 total errors, in terms of 1 omission, 4, additions, 0 misformation

and 2 misordering. The 13th participant scored 3 overall errors; 2 omissions, 0 addition, 1 misformation and 0 misordering. The 14th participant made a total of 4 errors in the form of 2 omissions, 1 addition, 0 misformation and 1 misordering. The 15th participant had a total of 2 errors in 2 omission, 0 addition, 0 misformation and 0 misordering. The 16th participant had a total of 4 errors (2 omissions, 0 addition, 2 misformations and 0 misordering). The 17th participant had 5 total errors, 4 omissions, 0 addition, 0 misformation and 1 misordering. The 18th participant made 1 total error consisting of 0 omission, 1 addition, 0 misformation and 0 misordering. In terms of 0 omission, 0 addition, 0 misformation and 0 misordering, the 19th participant made 0 total errors. The 20th participant scored 1 total error in 0 omission, 1 addition, 0 misformation and 0 misordering.

Participant	Omission	Addition	Misformation	Misordering	Total
P-21	4	2	0	1	6
P-22	4	0	0	2	6
P-23	5	0	1	0	6
P-24	1	0	0	0	1
P-25	3	1	0	1	5
P-26	2	0	0	0	2
P-27	1	19	0	0	20
P-28	5	1	1	0	7
P-29	0	0	2	0	2
P-30	0	0	0	2	2

Table 3 highlights the errors made by the students of matriculation level based on surface strategy taxonomy. In this study, the researcher found that the 21st participant had 6 total errors in terms of 4 omissions, 2 additions, 0 misformation and 0 misordering errors. The 22nd participant made 6 overall errors in the form of 4 omissions, 0 addition, 0 misformation and 2 misordering. The 23rd participant scored 6 cumulative errors which include 5 omissions, 0 addition, 1 misformation, and 0 misordering. The 24th participant scored 1 total error that can be divided into 1 omission, 0 addition, 0 misformation and 0 misordering. The 25th participant had a total of 5 errors in 3 omissions, 1 addition, 0 misformation and 1 misordering. The 26th participant also had 2 total errors in 2 omissions, 0 addition, 0 misformation and 0 misordering. The 27th participant recorded 20 overall mistakes in the sense of 1 omission, 19, addition, 0 misformation and 0 misordering. The 28th participant had a total of 7 errors in the form of 5 omissions, 1 addition, 1 misformation and 0 misordering. The 29th one scored 2 total errors consisting of 0 omission, 2 additions, 0 misformation and 0 misordering. The 30th participant made 2, overall errors with 0 omission, 0 addition, 0 misformation and 2 misordering.

Table 4

Participant	Omission	Addition	Misformation	Misordering	Total
P-31	0	1	1	0	2

P-32	0	1	0	0	1
P-33	0	0	1	0	1
P-34	0	0	2	0	2
P-35	0	0	1	0	1
P-36	0	0	1	0	1
P-37	0	0	2	0	2
P-38	0	0	1	1	2
P-39	0	0	1	0	1
P-40	0	0	1	0	1
Sub-Total	58	45	26	17	145

Table 4 highlights the errors made by the students of matriculation level based on surface strategy taxonomy. In this study, the researcher found that the 31st participant had 2 overall errors of 0 omission, 1 addition, 1 misformation and 0 misordering. The 32nd participant had 1 total error in the form of 0 omission, 1 addition, 0 misformation and 0 misordering. The 33rd participant made 1 overall error, 0 omission, 0 addition, 1, misformation and 0 misordering. The 34th participant got 2 total errors in terms of 0 omission, 0 addition, 2 misformations and 0 misordering. The 35th participant got 1 total error in terms of 0 omission, 0 addition, 1 misformation and 0 misordering. The 36th participant got 1 total error in terms of 0 omission, 0 addition, 1 misformation and 0 misordering. The 37th participant got 2 total errors in terms of 0 omission, 0 addition, 2 misformations and 0 misordering. The 38th participant got 2 total errors in terms of 0 omission, 0 addition, 1 misformation and 1 misordering. The 39th participant got 1 total error in terms of 0 omission, 0 addition, 1 misformation and 0 misordering. The 40th participant got 1 total error in terms of 0 omission, 0 addition, 1 misformation and 0 misordering. In conclusions, the participants made 58 omission, 45 addition, 26 misformation and 17 misordering errors. They committed total 145 errors.

Discussion

The explanation stage constitutes the fourth step of Pit Corder's Theory of Error Analysis. This stage seeks to establish the possible factors or sources for the morphological errors classified by the Surface Strategy Taxonomy. The Interlanguage Theory was applied to categorize the factors or sources of each error to identify if the error came from the native language (Interlingual) or the result of misapplication of English rules (Intralingual). Some of the instances of interlingual and intralingual factors from the collected data are as follows:

Data Analysis of Inflectional Morphological Errors

Inflectional Morphology deals with the small changes to a word that adds grammatical meaning without changing the word's fundamental class. The present research found several common inflectional errors in the 40 essays composed by the non-native ESL learners.

Table 5

Inflectional Morphological Errors

Type of Error	Sub-Categories	Occurrences
Noun Inflectional Errors	Plural Morpheme (-s, -es)	91
	Possessive Morpheme (-,s)	10
	Third Person Singular Morpheme (-s)	2

Verb Inflectional Errors	Past Tense Morpheme (-ed)	1
	Present Participle Morpheme (-ing)	6
Other Inflectional Errors	Comparative (-er) /Superlative (-est)	2
Sub Total		112

Table 5 highlights that the 40 non-native ESL learners committed 91 errors related to plural morphemes, 10 possessive, 2 third person singular, 1 past tense, 6 present participle and 2 comparative/superlative morphemes. They committed total 112 inflectional morphological errors.

Data Analysis of Derivational Morphological Errors

Derivational morphology deals with the process where new words are created through the addition of prefixes or suffixes that often change the grammatical category of the base words (e.g., from verb to noun, or adjective to adverb). These errors often highlight the difficulties with word-formation rules.

Table 6

<i>Derivational Morphological Errors</i>		
Kind of Error	Sub-Categories	No. of Occurances
Parts of Speech Confusion	-	2
	Noun formation	8
Suffix Misselection	Adjective Formation	1
	Verb Formation	2
Prefix Misuse	-	2
	Incorrect Spacing	3
Compounding Errors	Incorrect Sequencing	2
Incorrect-Element Selection		3
Sub-Total		23

Table 6 highlights that the 40 non-native ESL learners committed 2 errors related to Parts of Speech Confusion, 8 Noun formation, 1 Adjective Formation, 2 Verb Formation, 2 Prefix Misuse, 3 Incorrect Spacing, 2 Incorrect Sequencing, 3 Incorrect Element Selection. They committed total 23 derivational morphological errors.

Table 7

Total Frequency of Intralingual and Interlingual Factors

Factor	Frequency	Calculation Percentage (%)	
Interlingual	42	$42/112 \times 100$	37.5%
Intralingual	70	$70/112 \times 100$	62.5%
Total	112		

The analysis presented in table 7 highlights that the most common factor behind the morphological incompetency of non-native ESL learners is the intralingual factor.

Conclusion

In conclusion, this thesis demonstrates that non-native ESL learners face significant and frequent difficulties as a result of morphological errors, particularly the systematic omission of the plural morpheme on nouns. Importantly, these errors are primarily intralingual in nature, as shown by the Interlanguage Theory's diagnostic power. In the absence of direct L1 interference, the learners' hypotheses regarding English grammar rules are either incomplete or oversimplified. Because of this systematicity, these particular inflectional rules run the risk of becoming fossilized, transforming random errors into structural gaps in the Interlanguage system. As a result, the most significant conclusion is that activities that specifically target the obligatory nature of nominal and verbal morphology in English as well as contrastive awareness should be included in remedial instruction. Such activities should be more than those of the ordinary. Such a change in pedagogical orientation is needed to allow ELT practitioners in Pakistan to be able to lead the students to higher degrees of morphological accuracy.

References

- Abdullah, A. (2024). Investigating Morphological Errors in Iraqi EFL University Students' Written Performance. *Al-Noor Journal for Humanities*, 2(4), 255-288.
- Adha, A.D., & Dania, R. (2021). Students' Morphological Errors in Using Word Formation in Writing an Essay. *Journal of Physics: Conference Series*.
- Ahmad, A., Maitlo, S. K., & Shaheen, R. (2026). Language: Double Edged Sword. *Journal of Applied Linguistics and TESOL (JALT)*, 9(2), 1-35.
- Ahmad, A., Maitlo, S. K., & Soomro, S. A. (2026). CRITICAL DISCOURSE ANALYSIS OF THE BULLEH SHAH'S POEM KAR KATTAN WAL DHYAN KURRE (کر کتن ول دھیان کڑے). *Liberal Journal of Language & Literature Review*, 4(2), 344-357.
- Ahmad, A., Shahid, S. H., & Farhat, P. A. (2023). Comparative analysis of syntactical errors in the writings of ESL students at secondary level in Pakistan. *Global Language Review*, 8(2), 203-213.
- Ahmad, A., Yousaf, I., & Riaz, M. (2026). A CORPUS BASED ANALYSIS OF MODEL VERBS IN BUSINESS DISCOURSE. *Journal of Applied Linguistics and TESOL (JALT)*, 9(1), 894-907.
- Ahmad, A., Yousaf, I., & Riaz, M. (2026). Modality In Hemingway: A Corpus Analysis Of Hemingway's Novel "The Old Man And The Sea". *Liberal Journal of Language & Literature Review*, 4(1), 751-757.
- Aknouch, L. & Bouthiche, H. (2022). Types and Sources of Moroccan EFL Students' Errors in Writing: A Study of Error Analysis. *Arab World English Journal*, 13(4), 67- 79.
- Ansari, A., Ahmad, A., & Shaheen, R. (2025). Impact of Socio-Economic Status (SES) to Access the Quality English Education. *The Critical Review of Social Sciences Studies*, 3(4), 2768-2776.
- Arshad, Z., Mehmood, M. S., & Ahmad, A. (2025). Exploring the Educational Memes in Recent Indo-Pak War. *Dialogue Social Science Review (DSSR)*, 3(8), 87-102.
- Bakht, M. I., Riaz, M., Ahmad, A., & Khan, A. (2026). Instructional Leadership Practices and Students' Academic Achievement: A Study of Public Secondary Schools. *Contemporary Journal of Social Science Review*, 4(1), 120-135.
- Calubing, A. (2024). Analyzing Morphological Errors and Contextual Influence in Senior High School Students' Written Works: A Qualitative Study. *International Journal of Multidisciplinary Research and Analysis (Vol.7, pp. 4716-4727)*.

- Dinamika, S., & Siregar, E. (2020). A Morphological Error Analysis of Students' Written Reports on Indonesia's 2014 Presidential Election. *Indonesian Journal of English Education*, 7 (1), 87-96.
- Farisi, M.R., & Malihah, N. (2024). Grammatical and Syntactic Errors in L2 English Writing: The Impact of Language Interference. *Journal of Language and Literature Studies*, 4(4), 946-955.
- Fatima, S. N., Farhat, P. A., & Ahmad, A. (2026). INVESTIGATING THETA ROLE IN THE SINDHI LANGUAGE: IMPLICATION FOR CROSS LINGUISTICS STUDENTS. *Journal of Applied Linguistics and TESOL (JALT)*, 9(1), 1852-1868.
- Fitrawati, & Safitri, D. (2021). Students' Grammatical Errors in Essay Writing: A Pedagogical Grammar Reflection. *International Journal of Language Education*, 5(2), 74-88.
- Fitriyeni. (2014). Morphological Analysis of Students' Writing. *Journal of English Teaching & Applied Linguistics*, 5(2), 164-171.
- Gayo, H., & Widodo, P. (2018). An Analysis of Morphological and Syntactical Errors on the English Writing of Junior High School Indonesian Students. *International Journal of Learning, Teaching and Educational Research*, 17(4), 58-70.
- Haris, H. (2023). Morphological Errors in Descriptive Students' Writing. *Journal of English Language and Education*,
- Haris, H., & Sulhan, M. (2022). Morphological and Syntactical Errors in Students' Descriptive Writing. *Journal of English Language Teaching*, 5(2).
- Imtiaz, M., Hassan, K. H. U., & Akmal, F. (2023). Analyzing Spelling Errors Committed By English as a Second Language (ESL) Learners at Secondary School Level. *Journal of Social Sciences Review*, 3(2), 181-189.
- Kafipour, R., & Khojasteh, Laleh. (2011). The Study of Morphological, Syntactic and Semantic Errors Made by Native Speakers of Persian and English Children Learning English. *Studies in Literature and Language*, 3 (3), 109-114.
- Khattar, S. (2019). An Analysis of the Most Common Essay Writing Errors among EFL Saudi Female Learners (Majmaah University). *Arab World English Journal*, 10(3), 364-381.
- Mahmood, S., Aolakh, M., & Mujtaba, A. (2020). Morphological Errors: A Study of the Written Expressions of Pakistani ESL Students. *Pakistan Social Sciences Review*, 4(1), 930-942.
- Maitlo, S. K., Ahmad, A., Ali, S., & Soomro, A. R. (2023). Exploring errors and mistakes in the structure of grammar at university level in Khairpur Mir's Sindh. *International Journal of Contemporary Issues in Social Sciences (IJCISS)*, 2(4), 1-8.
- Malaki, F. (2020). The Impact of Morphological Errors on ESL Engineering Students' Writing: A Descriptive and an Analytical Study. *International Journal of Innovation and Applied Studies*, 29(3), 331-336.
- Mangayarkarasi, P. (2025). A Study on The Role Of Morphology In Language. *International Journal of Multidisciplinary Research*, 11(3), 2455-3662.
- Manik, S., Sagala, P. & Dhuha, F. (2022). Morphological Error Analysis on Word Classes Found in Students' Descriptive Writing of the Fifth Semester English Department at Nommensen HKBP University (NHU) Medan. *Jurnal Mutiara Pendidikan*, 17(1).
- Mehmood, M. S., Shaheen, R., Maitlo, S. K., & Ahmad, A. (2026). A COMPARATIVE STUDY OF BLENDED AND TRADITIONAL LEARNING ON READING COMPREHENSION AT THE SECONDARY LEVEL. *Journal of Applied Linguistics and TESOL (JALT)*, 9(1), 1056-1066.

- Mufidah, P.N., & Islam, S. (2022). An Analysis of Grammatical Error on Students' Writing. *International Journal of English Education and Linguistics*, 4(1).
- Mushtaq, S., Shahida, N., Bakhsh, K., & Khan, M.A. (2024). Analyzing Linguistic Errors in English Essay Writing: A Case Study of ESL Learners at FG Secondary Schools in Okara, Pakistan. *History of Medicine*, 10(2), 1988-2004.
- Muziatun, Bay, I.W., & Maryam, S. (2020). Morphological Interference on Student's Writings. *Indonesian EFL Journal (IEFLJ)*, 6(2), 189-196.
- Pasaribu, A., Pasaribu, Y., Hutauruk, M., & Marbun, L. (2021). Error in Students' Thesis Writing: Syntactical and Morphological Error Analysis. *Budapest International Research and Critics Institute (BIRCI-Journal) Humanities and Social Sciences*, 4(4), 8695-8704.
- Pasaribu, A., Pasaribu, Y., Hutauruk, M., & Marbun, L. (2021). Error in Students' Thesis Writing: Syntactical and Morphological Error Analysis. *Budapest International Research and Critics Institute (BIRCI-Journal) Humanities and Social Sciences*, 4(4), 8695-8704.
- Puspita, & Suswanto. (2023). An Analysis of English Article Errors and Pedagogical Implications in Students, Writing Skill. *Buletin Poltanesa*, 24(1), 60-67.
- Raheem, R. B., & Ghafar, Z. N. (2024). Analysis of Punctuation and Spelling Errors Associated with Academic Writing among Iraqi EFL Learners. *International Journal of Second and Foreign Language Education*, 3(2), 21-30.
- Riaz, M., Abdullah, M., Yousaf, I., & Ahmad, A. (2026). Levelling Up Learning: Assessing Game-Based Instruction In Primary Classrooms. *Liberal Journal of Language & Literature Review*, 4(1), 770-795.
- Sadiyah, S., & Royani, S.A. (2019). An Analysis of Grammatical Errors in Students' Writing Descriptive Text. *Journal of English Education*, 2(6).
- Sajjad, K., Farhat, P. A., & Ahmad, A. (2026). ANALYZING MORPHOLOGICAL ERRORS BY NON-NATIVE ESL LEARNERS IN ESSAY WRITING: IMPLICATIONS FOR ELT IN PAKISTAN. *Liberal Journal of Language & Literature Review*, 4(2), 625-637.
- Sakyi, K. A., Musona, D., & Mweshi, G. (2020). Research Methods and Methodology. *Advances in Social Sciences Research Journal*, 7(3) 296-302.
- Suraprajit, P. (2021). An Analysis of Errors in English Essays Written by Thai Non-English Major Students. *Theory and Practice in Language Studies*, 11(1), 12-19.
- Swarooprani, K. (2022). A Study of Research Methodology. *International Journal of Scientific Research in Science, Engineering and Technology*, 9(3), 537-543.
- Taherdoost, H. (2016). Sampling Methods in Research Methodology; How to Choose a Sampling Technique for Research. *International Journal of Academic Research in Management*, 5(2), 18-27.
- Tahir, M., Rahayu, H., Ali, A., Idris, I., & Suputra, G. (2023). Morphological Error Analysis in Students' Explanatory Text : An Analysis Based on Gender. *Jurnal Kependidikan: Jurnal Hasil Penelitian dan Kajian Kepustakaan di Bidang Pendidikan, Pengajaran dan Pembelajaran*, 9(1), 347-355.
- Yousaf, I., Abro, B. A., & Ahmad, A. (2025). Critical Discourse Analysis of the Symbolic Language in Shakespeare's Selected Dark Lady Sonnets. *Indus Journal of Social Sciences*, 3(3), 2019-230.
- Yousaf, I., Ahmad, A., & Riaz, M. (2026). Language Mixing In Multilingual Societies: A Sociolinguistic Analysis Of Class-Based Variation. *Liberal Journal of Language & Literature Review*, 4(1), 758-769.

- Yousaf, I., Ahmad, A., & Riaz, M. (2026). READING PROFICIENCY AND LEXICAL DEVELOPMENT: A STUDY OF UNDERGRADUATE STUDENTS IN KASHMIR. *Journal of Applied Linguistics and TESOL (JALT)*, 9(1), 908-916.
- Zahra, F. (2020). The Impact of Morphological Errors on ESL Engineering Students' Writing: A Descriptive and an Analytical Study. *International Journal of Innovation and Applied Studies*, 29(3), 331-336.
- Zaid, S. B., Ab.Rashid, R., Azmi, N. J., & Yusri, S. S. (2017). Factors Affecting the Morphological Errors in Young ESL Learners' Writing. *International Journal of Academic Research in Progressive Education and Development*, 6(3), 92–99.