JOURNAL OF APPLIED
LINGUISTICS AND
TESOL

EXPLORING MORPHOLOGY IN ACADEMIC WRITING: AN ANALYSIS OF ERRORS BY UNDERGRADUATE STUDENTS OF ENGLISH AT A PUBLIC SECTOR UNIVERSITY IN PAKISTAN

Wazir Ali Tunio
wazir@uolrk.edu.pk
MPhil Scholar
Department of English
Hamdard University, Karachi
Hafiz Imran Nawaz
Senior Lecturer
Imran.nawaz@hamdrad.edu.pk
Department of English
Hamdard University, Karachi
Najma Batool
Kazimhussain0321@gmail.com
Assistant Prof.
Government Degree College, Landhi #3, Karachi

Abstract
This study deals with how undergraduate students of English department at a public sector university in Sindh Pakistan, use English morphemes in the context of their academic writing with a description of the common mistakes they tend to make and why such errors occur. The researcher has studied both building blocks of English words, inflectional and derivational morphemes. This research study makes it clear that, even with respect to grammar rules as well as word formation and compounding issues, students often seem to run into a wall. The researcher used a qualitative approach and collected 20 students' essays, analyzed them for patterns of morphological errors. This finding show that students often misuse plural forms, verb agrees and suffixes or prefixes as they often don't know how the English word structure is supposed to be, i.e. mismanagements, underqualify and plural verb plays with singular subjects. These problems entail that much more emphasis should be placed on teaching English morphology in the classroom. Teachers should teach their students exactly how to use morphemes properly, improve their grammar and vocabulary. The point of this research is that in our classrooms, students should be better instructed in English word formation so that they can write more accurately and more confidently.

Keywords: Academic Writing; Morphological Errors; Inflectional; Derivational Morphology

Introduction

This research study analyzes morphological patterns exhibited in the English compositions created by undergraduate students at a public sector university of, Sindh, Pakistan. The research assesses both prevalent morphological mistakes and identifies their origin factors along with studying the rules students use when forming morphological structures in their academic writing. The research collects student data which lets researcher detect patterns of errors while evaluating their influence on language proficiency. These research findings may guide teaching improvements which can boost student English morphology understanding abilities.

The scientific field of morphology studies grammatical morphemes as the smallest meaningful units through research (Todd, 1987). Grammatical units exist in two categories which are bound and free. A bound morpheme has no meaningful value when standing alone yet free morphemes maintain their meaningful value when uttered independently. The construction of words depends on their supine position to at least one or more morphemes (Stageberg, 1981). The two types of bound morphemes consist of derivational morphemes

and inflectional morphemes. Throughout the finish of words inflectional morphemes remain suffixes that do not modify word classification. The derivational morphemes consist of prefixes and suffixes which modify word classifications but do not bring words to completion. Each prefix possesses the ability to change base meanings in ways that make it qualify as a derivational morpheme regardless of its impact on word category.

Most university students encounter major difficulties when they attempt to construct proper word structures. The students demonstrate frequent word structure confusion because they do not understand morpheme meanings and functions together with the rules that govern their application. Morphology exists only as an optional curriculum in universities which leads to insufficient attention being given to this subject. Students require strong morphological awareness in order to decrease errors when they compose English compositions. Strong morphological awareness could be developed by students through committed study in combination with teaching techniques that prove effective.

The study field of morphology links directly to phonology alongside syntax and semantics and sociolinguistics alongside additional areas within linguistics. This area of linguistics studies word internal structure, and new word generation through morphological processes including affixation and compounding, as well as conversion blending clipping reduplication,, and other such methods (O' Gradly and Guzman, 1996; Quirk and Greenbaum, 1973). The progressive pattern of language enables users to increase their vocabulary through word absorption. The worldwide population uses English as their second language with constantly emerging new vocabulary terms entering the linguistic framework. New terms mostly originate in the language but many notions come from different languages. Complete command of English morphological rules together with their exceptional cases enables speakers to construct new words. Mainly it becomes difficult to build proper word combinations for syntax analysis when words do not meet proper structure requirements although the meaning of words remains affected. Both the importance and simplicity of learning English syntax are connected to morphology. The instruction of morphology with reference to linguistics areas needs to be fundamental for teachers who teach English as a second language or instruct in ESL classrooms.

Research Objectives
- To explore what morphological errors undergraduate students of English in Pakistan make in their essay writing.
- To understand the factors behind morphological errors in essay writing of students of English in Pakistan.

Research Questions
- What morphological errors undergraduate students of English in Pakistan make in their essay writing?
- What are the factors behind morphological errors undergraduate students of English in Pakistan make in their essay writing?

Literature Review

Morphological Awareness for Teachers

Sukarton and Dewanti's (2025) investigation of word structure comprises Morphology by examining morpheme connections within words. The research investigates both teacher awareness of word structure along with their instructional mistakes in the teaching of English. A qualitative content analysis method was employed for this research and an English teacher teaching through YouTube videos became the selected participant because of their extensive teaching experience. The researchers used observation sheets together with criterion-referenced assessment (CRA) during data collection. The test revealed that the teacher scored 71.42% on morphological awareness thus demonstrating average understanding of

morphemes. The teacher made 24 morphological errors in their videos where misinformation errors occurred most frequently (79.16%) and disordering errors followed (12.5%) alongside omission errors at (8.33%). Teaching morphological concepts requires improvement because the teacher demonstrates partial morphological awareness yet frequently makes misinformation mistakes.

Oz's (2014) research study about morphological awareness (MA) as the ability to understand word structures has increased significantly throughout the previous decade. This review traces the linguistic definition of MA and derives implications from latest empirical research for teaching English. Students learn better after receiving instruction on word meaning understanding and recognizing word morphemes in reading texts than those who lack these strategies according to research. The understanding of vocabulary along with comprehension depends heavily on Ma according to scientific investigations. The teaching of vocabulary achieves better results when educators prioritize the study of prefixes and suffixes and word roots according to the beliefs of numerous instructors. Language instructors are now expected to teach morphemic awareness to their students through adaptable instructional techniques for various age groups.

Newton (2018) argues that reading comprehension together with academic achievement relies heavily on the understanding of academic vocabulary. Academic language comes mainly from Latin and Greek origins presenting morphemic features. Most teachers avoid attending to this subject area because they lack morphological understanding and effective teaching methods. The three-year research delivered results from investigating three elementary teachers who participated in professional development to develop expertise in academic vocabulary morphemic foundations and instructional delivery. The research investigates how teachers modify their classroom activities after mastering Latin and Greek morphological knowledge and educational practices. The researchers gathered data through interactive interviews as well as observational notes from lessons and by analyzing educational resources. After professional development teachers transformed their teaching methods from teacher-directed traditional instruction to student-oriented activities that developed language consciousness in their students. The teachers implemented new instructional methods to understand vocabulary acquisition principles such as problem-based learning and collaborative conversation and Spanish-English cognate teaching which typically receives insufficient attention.

Previous Studies from Global Aspect

Ramadan (2015) has studied fourth-year English major students at a Jordanian university to identify and classify their morphological mistakes and describe their underlying causes. The examination of student mistakes demonstrated insufficient understanding of English morphology among the student group. The research identified multiple errors produced by English major students at their fourth year because of inconsistent English usage and faulty morphological rule application and language interference as well as overgeneralization patterns. The morphological course in the university curriculum maintains an optional status that escalates the problem according to this study. The researcher offers various solutions to assist students in reducing their errors.

Babalola and Aknade (2002) performed research to examine phonological as well as morphological and syntactic and spelling linguistic difficulties in English. The researchers focused particularly on morphological issues to determine and analyze what difficulties students encounter in correctly understanding and implementing morphological rules, they attempted to claim that "English is not free of inconsistency in the area of Morphology." (2002, p. 250). Aremo (2005) researched English conversion processes to understand how adjectives evolve into nouns within natural speech communication. He obtained his examples

through a review of Hornby's Oxford Advanced Learners' Dictionary (2000, edited by Wehmeier) and Collins' English Language Dictionary (1987, edited by Sinclair). The author examined conversion cases involving adjectives becoming nouns and grouped them into semantic classes according to his interpretation of their meanings. He illustrated his point through the examples of illiterate, imbecile, African, Nigerian, adolescent, and fugitive in the context of morphology.

Jiang's, et al. (2011) research explores how L1 and L2 morpheme similarities enhance L2 morphology acquisition. English sentences underwent a self-paced reading task by advanced speakers of English who knew Russian or Japanese language. Russian participants demonstrated better awareness when detecting plural morphological errors than Japanese participants did thus confirming that similar morphemes across languages make L2 morphology learning easier. Conclusions from this research analyze the relationship between touching L1 and L2 morphemes and its effect on adult L2 learning they suggest. The study demonstrates how morpheme similarities between L1 and L2 matter for bilingual learning while recommending enhanced teaching methods based on this understanding.

Larsen-Freeman's (2010) review suggests that students who learn language morphology as a second language struggle similarly to how native children learn their first language. Both young children and older L2 learners show different abilities to distinguish between regular and irregular forms although children overcome this challenge but L2 learners maintain difficulties with grammar inflections even at advanced proficiency levels. Learners at intermediate levels often create mistakes through improper uses of allomorphs and by omitting or adding them irregularly. The performance of learners displays marked inconsistency when it comes to the use of morphemes which appear sporadically in their speech. Academic research has focused on uncovering the multiple variables causing difficulty in learning morphology due to complex rules that students find challenging to acquire.

Akande's (2003) focus was aimed at how Yoruba speaking students in Nigeria inflect their English writing. Researchers worked with sixty students from senior secondary school and collected the data from student's essays and grammars exercises. The study wanted to know how frequently students used inflectional morphemes and how frequently they used them incorrectly by analyzing these written tasks. The results in fact showed that many students could not use these morphemes correctly quite well, which demonstrates real gap on their understanding of English grammar rules. The study is important because it focuses on the problems second language learners have with grammar in general, and particularly in the case of a large difference between his first and English language. It also presents practical ways for enhancing students' mastering of inflectional morphemes. This is good support for the argument that the instruction of language should be more deliberate about the mundane grammar elements students tend to miss, and can prove useful for your work as an educator to help students correct morphological errors.

The previous studies reflect that there is a much literature on morphology. This literature deals with morphological contexts and it is contextualized in college/school education, university paradigm from local and global aspect. It entails studies regarding teachers' awareness. However, this research study focuses on what morphological errors students of English literature make in their academic writing. The study is contextualized at a public sector university in Sindh, Pakistan. This study fills the gap of understanding students' academic writing with respect to their morphological approach.

Previous Studies from Local Aspect

Mahmood, Aolakh, & Mujtaba's (2020) study investigates morphological mistakes along with their origins in the written assignments of Pakistani ESL students studying in intermediate education. Through a qualitative interpretive research method, researchers studied descriptive texts from 100 ESL students to establish these students' most prevalent errors. The analysis of data followed Corder's (1974) framework for Error Analysis. Research shows that learners tend to commit inflectional morphology mistakes mostly in noun uses along with verbs and prepositions. The researched text revealed four main categories of mistake: morpheme additions along with omissions and substitutions together with morpheme permutation. The study investigates mistake causes through its analysis and discovers that intralinguas along with interlinguas transfers function as key factors in student errors.

Bashir, Aleem & Anjum (2021) have analyzed morph syntactic mistakes which Pakistani O' Level students make while writing narratives. A research project examined writing mistakes of Pakistani students at five major educational centers in Lahore. The tested errors consisted of tense mistakes combined with problems in subject-verb relations and problems with spelling alongside punctuation issues and both articles and prepositions. The research team organized the errors into distinct groups that represented their statistical numbers across the student writings. A total of 200 students participated in the research by producing narratives that demonstrated their thoughts about English writing. The research data indicated that students experienced most of their problems because of intralingua transfer apart from inter-language errors. The research shows Pakistani O' Level students require additional practice of English writing before they can achieve international examination levels.

Naz's (2022) research study aimed to detect and evaluate writing mistakes found in undergraduate students from the English departments. The research employed a quantitative method for analyzing thirty-eight papers from the 8th semester of a single educational subject. The data analysis utilized Corder's (1974) analytic structure. Fifty errors in writing were found by the research including punctuation issues and spelling mistakes along with article misuse and tense problems and preposition mistakes. Most participating students made errors in using commas along with capitalization and indefinite articles and the present indefinite tense along with improper preposition usage. The experimental findings demonstrate that students must enhance their knowledge about writing mechanics. Female students displayed superior performance by creating fewer errors than their male counterparts in the examination. The department's current educational program lacks sufficient framework to help learners solve their writing problems. Students should devote more reading time to identify weak points which will help minimize their errors according to the examination.

Ahmad, Farya, & Rauf (2023) argue that English education in Pakistan has many years of history so there exist a need to analyze ESL student errors to develop improved learning approaches. The research examines the writing errors of English learners in their morphological and syntactic structures during language use. This research team seeks to detect regular morphological student mistakes at school and investigate their root causes. The research conducted at Iqra Hoti School in Mardan obtained data through quantitative along with qualitative assessment methods. Analysis of student writing errors followed Dulay, Burt and Krashen's (1983) model of language acquisition. Research findings show ESL students tend to produce omission, addition and malformations and disordering mistakes during writing tasks.

Parvaiz et al. (2010) have discussed that English language erroneous of the science students who were learning Subjects like Physics, Chemistry and Mathematics. This article brings out how these students tend to give more weight on their core subjects and end up neglecting

English. As a result, the child makes plenty of language mistakes. The thirty exam papers of Bachelor of Science students of the University of Sargodha were collected and analyzed by using Pit Corder's model of error analysis. This study is very supported with tables and diagrams that clearly indicate usually made by the students. This research is useful because it doesn't just point to the mistakes, but it also provides the method for the improvement in the English teaching methods for the Science students at university level. Being a great language is important for all the fields of life but this article describes how subject focus can play a role in learning English and why English support is necessary in all academic fields.

The study by Tariq et al. (2020) examines how Pakistani students perceive and employ derivational and inflectional morphemes, which are fundamental, to the study of morphology, the investigation of the smallest units of meaning in a language. This research was conducted in order to examine how intermediate level students who studied English handled morphemes in their everyday language use, and how all of these students functioned using tools in intermediate English language. Within the study, the difference between derivational morphemes, which can change the meaning, or even change the grammatical category of a word, and inflectional morphemes, which are more about grammatical function, is explained. For instance, a derivational morpheme might take a word from one class and give us another class (ie, turning a noun into an adjective), or an inflectional morpheme will do its thing and show tense or plurality, but it does not change the word at all. Since this article is useful for explaining how these morphemes were employed and how they are connected to actual language use of learners in word formation and grammar, it is used to help us understand the challenges that learners encounter in word formation and grammar. It furnishes a more profound comprehension of learners' morphological competence to your literature review.

Research Methodology

The researcher has utilized a qualitative research design as put by (Efron & Ravid, 2019) based on morphological error analysis to analyze forms and reasons of morphological patterns and errors in undergraduate students' academic writing. A thorough understanding of how students produce morphological forms and how they face difficulties in this process are intended in this study. For the data for analysis, in purposive sampling, explained by (Efron & Ravid, 2019) the researcher has chosen 20 students of final-year English literature program studying at The University of Larkano, Pakistan. Participants are both girls and boys. Also, they have different academic level and approach. The data for the study is all written English compositions of the participants. They are essays. The researcher asked the students to submit original and short organized essays on the topic 'Education'. The study as a whole is faithful in maintaining credibility and trustworthiness as suggested by Lincoln & Guba (1986). All participants gave informed consent. It always maintains people's anonymity and confidentiality. Their participation is assured that it will not have any impact on their academic standing to maintain ethical considerations as insisted by Schumacher (2007). The following section presents findings of the study.

Findings

The following sub-sections are presented as the findings of the study.

Inflectional Morpheme Errors

Inflectional morphemes indicate tense, number, aspect, etc., without changing the core meaning or word class (Nandito, 2016).

Table 1.

Incorrect Word	Correct From	Error Type
Educations	Education	Plural -s misuse
Successfulling	Successful	-ing instead of adjective
Thinkings	Thinking	Unnecessary plural -s

Studyings	Studying	Unnecessary plural -s
Schoolings	Schooling	Unnecessary plural -s
Learns	Learn	Incorrect verb agreement (3rd person plural)
Ensures	Ensure	Subject-verb agreement error
Plays	Play	Subject-verb agreement error
Believes	Believe	Subject-verb agreement error

In the data the evidence of the misuse of inflectional morpheme that modifies a word for grammatical purpose (e.g. number, tense, agreement) One of the most common is plural -s misuse: *educations* (should be education); *successfulling* (should be successful), where -s is added where it is not necessary. There are several words that use an incorrect form of -ing like *thinkings, studyings, schoolings*, which is a simple use of a singular form of vocabulary. In addition, there are errors of subject verb agreement when the plural form should be used for words such as learns, ensures, plays, and believes. These mistakes show confusion with either singular or plural forms or a wrong verb ending for subject consistency.

Derivational Morpheme Errors
Derivational morphemes change the meaning or grammatical category of a word (Martini, 2016).

Table 2.

Incorrect Word	**Correct From**	**Error Type**
Importanter	more important	Wrong comparative form
Selfimproveing	self-improvement	Incorrect compound+ derivation
Undevelopful	underdeveloped	Incorrect derivation
educativepolicies	education policies	Wrong derivation/compound
Strengthified	strengthened	Incorrect derivation
healthfuller	healthier	Incorrect comparative
knowledged	knowledgeable	Incorrect derivation
guidings	guidance	Incorrect derivation
developful	developed/ developing	Non-standard derivation
brighterful	brighter / bright future	Invented form

Derivational morphemes change the word's meaning or grammatical category (Martini, 2016). Two such errors involve comparative forms, *importanter* instead of more, and *healthfuller* in place for healthier. Errors in the incorrect compound + derivation words such as *selfimproveing* (self-improvement) and wrong derivation like *undevelopful* (underdeveloped) are also to be observed. Other errors are nonstandard derivations like developful (should be developed / developing), and invented forms such as *brighterful* (should be brighter). The confused word-building process occurs in words such as *knowledged*, *educativepolicies* and words like words, thus showing improper derivation.

Prefix Errors
Prefix errors include the use of incorrect or invented prefixes (Rutledge, 2019).
Table 3.

Incorrect Word	**Correct Form**	**Error Type**
underqualify	unqualified	Prefix misuse
mismanagements	mismanagement	Unnecessary plural

Incorrect or invented prefixes constitute prefix errors. It is clear that misuse of prefixes occurs in the word *underqualify* where a correct form is unqualified. The problem with unnecessary pluralization is also another issue, that is, *mismanagements*, instead of mismanagement. The errors stem from confusion on the rules of pluralization and prefix formation (Rutledge, 2019).

Suffix Errors

Suffix errors include misuse or overuse of suffixes to form nonstandard words (Zhang et al, 2018).

Table 4.

Word	Error Type
ment used in *developation*, *understandment*, *strengthified*	incorrect suffix attachment
ful used in *healthfuller*, *developful*, *brighterful*	overextension of suffix
ness used in *priorityness*, *rightfulness*	unnecessary abstract suffix
ing/-ings overused in *guidings*, *educatings*, *studyings*, *thinkings*	No Error

It appears that suffix errors in the data indicates incorrect or overuse of suffixes. For example, the suffix in *developation*, *understandment*, *strengthified* is not attached correctly to the root word, and actually disagrees with the root. Also, the -ful suffix is over extended, as in *healthfuller, developful* and *brighterful* and should be replaced with the comparative or superlative form. There is, furthermore, the gratuitous extra -ness, in *priorityness* and rightfulness, for instance, producing abstract nouns that are not required in these cases. Another common error that occurs with such words (one that overuses the -ing suffix) is the use of *guidings, educatings, studyings* and *thinkings*, as the base form is enough (Zhang et al, 2018).

Compounding Errors

Compounding errors involve unnatural joining of two words (Murphy and Hayes, 2010).

Table 5. Compounding Errors

Incorrect word	Correct From	Error Type
selfimproveing	self-improvement	Incorrect compound
educativepolicies	education policies	Forced compound
Digitalplatforms	digital platforms	Missing space
schoolbuilds	school buildings	Incorrect compound
villagezones	villages / rural zones	Forced compound
mountainareas	mountain areas	Missing space
internetings	internet use	Nonexistent compound
online classeses	online classes	Redundant plural + compound

The errors that make up the phenomenon called compounding errors occur when we join the wrong words. Words *like selfimproveing* and *educativepolicies* are incorrect compounds whose proper forms should be self-improvement and education policies. Other forced compounds are instances of *villagezones* and *mountainareas* where spacing should not be combined words. *Digitalplatforms* and *schoolbuilds* should be written as *digitalplatforms* and *schoolbuildings* and should also have missing spaces. Furthermore, words *like internetings*

and online *classeses* showcase nonexistent compounds and redundant pluralization, respectively (Murphy and Hayes, 2010).

The following section provides a detailed discussion on the findings.

Discussion

The data gathered from the undergraduate students of English from The University of Larkano in Sindh is analyzed regarding the morphological errors made in the data and shows some common mistakes in the use of English among the students. Such errors occur at many morpheme types as James (2013) argued that morphological error patterns among different types of L2 learners can be understood using the concepts of contrastive analysis and developmental factors, including all categories of inflectional, derivational, prefix, suffix, and compounding morphemes. These findings have such implication for language teaching and learning which can be focused into identifying regions of English morphology and grammar which students have problems to master.

Inflectional Morpheme Errors

Morpheme misuse of the inflectional morpheme is the most observed error category. Inflectional morphemes are those which change a word for grammatical function, example number, tense and agreement (Nandito, 2016). A basic misunderstanding of how English pluralization works is indicated when plural forms, educations as opposed to education, and *thinkings, studyings,* and *schoolings* instead of their singular forms *(thinking, studying, schooling)*, are misused. Additionally, errors of *successfulling* and *learns* indicate confusion about the difference between adjectives and verbs. These are examples of the kinds of cases where the ins and outs of the use of the *ing* suffix in forming present participles or gerunds are not understood. In addition, inflectional morphology confuses subject–verb agreement errors in the form of *ensures, plays, and believes*. These errors indicate that students may have difficulties in recognizing number agreement between the number of the subject and the agreement with the verb. Possible reasons for such mistakes include a lack of practice with subject-verb agreement rules, and a lack of knowledge about the concept of singular and plural as argued by Ellis (1997), that the most common errors related to inflectional morphology have a cause in incomplete acquisition of grammatical rules or lack of exposure to target language input.

Derivational Morpheme Errors

Forming comparative and superlative forms are a common area in which students make errors in terms of derivational morphemes: *importanter* (should be more *important*) and *healthfuller* (should be healthier). The errors above reveal confusion concerning how English makes comparatives and superlatives (Martini, 2016). Comparatives and superlatives are usually made with more and most, not with adding -er or -ful to the base word, in Standard English. Also, other errors such as *undevelopful* and *strengthified* indicate incorrect derivational processes. Such errors reveal a students' poor knowledge of word formation and use of suffixes in English, as according to Aronoff and Fudeman (2022), derivational morphemes are typically difficult for second language learners to acquire because they are irregular and semantically variable. Also, overgeneralization (the use of non-standard forms) is openly shown when students apply derivational rules to wider domains, even outside a word class or the word meaning.

Prefix and Suffix Errors

There are also such prefix errors, which make the sentence uglier: *underqualify*, should be unqualified; *mismanagements*, should be mismanagement. In this case of prefix misuse, the student tries to create an adjective by using the wrong prefix. This *s* in last is an unnecessary pluralization of a noun that is not pluralized. The errors indicate that the students do not

understand how a prefix changes a base word as posited by Rutledge (2019) as well as how pluralization should function, as Katamba (1993), argued that prefix and suffix misapplications usually appear when learners attempt to employ the native language rules of logic in mapping onto English morphological rules. Also worth noting are suffix errors (especially overextension of -ful), including in the realm of electrical technology: *supercomputer, ultracomputer, supercomputable*. Also, words like *healthfuller, developful*, etc., are considered examples of this issue (Zhang et al, 2018).. Forms of comparative adjectives, as in these cases, the suffix -ful are used incorrectly to form adjectives. Also, the aberrant use of -ness in the words *priorityness* and *rightfulness* makes the use even more redundant and unnecessary in these cases.

Compounding Errors

When one error occurs, it normally produces an additional error in response. The problem that compound word formation poses in students' language behavior is reflected in the way they misbehave with the joining of words: *selfimproveing* and *educativepolicies*. For these cases students will merge words that ought to be separate or invent compound structures that are not ordinary in the English language (Murphy and Hayes, 2010). Bauer (2003) mentions that learners tend to invent nonstandard compounds because they are rarely exposed to conventional compound patterns in English. They also exhibit ignorance about when spaces should be used in compound words, e.g. errors such as, *digitalplatforms and schoolbuilds*. *Internetings* serve as indication of another nonexistent compound error, indicating the confusion between Standard English compound words and nonexistent forms.

Suggestions for Improving Morphological Errors

As seen in students' academic writing, English grammar presents significant challenges with inflectional, derivational, and compounded morphemes and generally, morphological errors in the students' academic writing reflect these challenges almost equally. One that cannot proceed without an explicit instruction, practice exercises to integrate the new skills in meaningful context, along with formative feedback to reflect on your accomplishments and reveals areas needing work. Inflectional morphemes such as pluralization, verb agreement, the -ing suffix were being misused at a level that was neither mandatory nor understandable (e.g., errors). For example, an unnecessary plural *s* is added erroneously in forming words like *educations* and *studyings,* and verbs like *ensures* and plays fail to agree with their subjects. With phrases like these suggesting that students have not fully understood the basic grammatical rules (Ellis, 1997) such as when to use plural forms or other rules of subject verb agreement, it is apparent these mistakes are highly indicative of serious struggles for students to carry out simple responsibilities. A bin focus grammar lesson is a way to tackle these problems (Nassaji and fotos, 2011). Subject verb agreement and pluralization rules should be covered in the classroom by teachers with a description of what plural forms typically end with (except for some irregular nouns), with verbs matching the number of subjects. Students also should be taught when the –ing suffix is not necessary and to identify gerunds and present participles. Filling in the blanks and to correct the errors type of exercises could help the students to practice these concepts regularly.

Additionally, there should be writing tasks that focus on subject verb agreement and pluralization, to help one remember how to use these rules right. Peer reviews may also potentially be a good way for students to recognize and correct such errors in an active stance which would also help them to learn better. It was also discovered that frequent errors occur with derivational morphemes. Error samples such as *importanter* instead of more important, *selfimproveing* instead of self-improvement, and *healthfuller* instead can illustrate confusion in making comparatives and superlatives or incorrect use of derivational morphemes. The errors in these indicate that even students are not well acquainted with the rule on the

formation of comparative and superlative adjectives or with some suffixes that change the meaning of a word. The formation of the comparatives and superlatives must be taught explicitly in this regard. For the most part, students should know that comparatives are made by using more or most and not by adding -er or -est (e.g., more important, more beautiful). In particular, explanations should be provided of how derivational suffixes such as -ful, -ness, -er alter the meaning or category of the word. So that they can see it and understand how these morphemes are used, teachers should use word sorting exercises for instance, as students categorize words by suffix (Kieffer & Lesaux, 2017). Error correction exercises which involved derivational errors will also allow the students to be able to rewrite the sentence with the right derivational morphemes (Bitchener & Ferris, 2012).

Secondly, another large problem is that suffixes and prefixes are being used incorrectly. Prefixes like *underqualify* (they should unqualified) and suffixes like -ful and -ness are often misused by students: in words such as *priorityness, healthfuller*, etc. The presence of these mistakes may entail a lack of these students' complete comprehension of the way that prefixes and suffixes function to change base words (Katamba & Katamba, 1993). To fix this, teachers must provide the lists of common prefixes and suffixes, as well as its examples to alter a base word. These rules would be reinforced by making interactive activities that will force students to create new words by adding the right prefixes or suffixes before a base word. At the same time, students would be able to practice the correct use of these morphemes and learn them by a number of error correction exercises. Finally, errors compounded by students such *as selfimproveing* and *educativepolicies* represent students' problem in combining words correctly (Bauer, 2003).

These are errors that reveal a not understanding when words should be used as a combination into a compound word and when to leave them as single words. Explicitly, teachers should teach the rules in forming the compound words in English, and make sure that some combinations should be with a space (such as school buildings instead of *schoolbuilds)*. To help certain students with correct breaking, forming compound words in words, they should be forced into tasks where they have to break apart and form the words correctly. Additionally, to work on correcting errors when compounding exercises would give students work on making the correct compounded forms and on figuring out when to compound. Finally, the errors in students' writing that are morphological in nature should be remediated through an integrative strategy involving explicit instruction, specific practice, and feedback (Richards & Schmidt, 2010). Starting with focused grammar lessons, practicing word formation, as well as experiencing peer review opportunities, students get a more in-depth knowledge of how English morphology works and therefore know how to write better and so on. The following section concludes the whole study.

Conclusion

This study finds that students' academic writing errors are multifold, in that they are associated with concerns with the use of inflectional and derivational morphemes. The errors exhibited are typical of bedrock difficulties in mastering English morphology and grammar rules, namely in the domains of agreement of subjects and verbs, word formation, and compounding. This analysis shows that in order to improve students' performance on these features of morphology, teachers' instruction should stress on the proper use of suffixes, prefixes, and compounds. Giving such instruction may help students avoid over generalization and be able to develop more enhanced understanding of English grammar for their academic writing.

References

Ahmad, M., Faryal, S., & Rauf, S. (2023). Analysis of Morphological Errors in English Written Texts by ESL Learners. *Global Language Review*, VIII, 33-43.

Akande, A. T. (2003). Acquisition of the inflectional morphemes by Nigeria learners of English language. *Nordic Journal of African Studies*, *12*(3), 17-17.

Aremo, B. 2005. "Nouns Illustrating Adjectives– Noun Conversion in English". *Asian EFL Journal,* 7:1.

Aronoff, M., & Fudeman, K. (2022). *What is morphology?*. John Wiley & Sons.

Babalola, E.T and Aknade, A.T. 2002. "Some Linguistic Problems of Yoruba Learners of English in Nigeria". *ES: Revistade Filologia Inglesa*, 24: 245–257.

Bashir, A., Aleem, M., Anjum, M. A. I., & Ali, S. (2021). Pakistani O'Level Students. *Ilkogretim Online*, 20(3), 1952-1966.

Bauer, L. (2003). Introducing linguistic morphology. *In Introducing Linguistic Morphology.* Edinburgh university press.

Bitchener, J., & Ferris, D. R. (2012). *Written corrective feedback in second language acquisition and writing*. Routledge.

Efron, S. E., & Ravid, R. (2019). *Action research in education: A practical guide*. Guilford Publications.

Ellis, R. (2006). *The Study of Second Language Acquisition* (2nd ed.). Oxford University Press.

James, C. (2013). Errors in language learning and use: Exploring error analysis. Routledge.

Jiang, N., Novokshanova, E., Masuda, K., & Wang, X. (2011). Morphological congruency and the acquisition of L2 morphemes. *Language Learning*, 61(3), 940-967.

Katamba, F., & Katamba, F. (1993). Inflectional Morphology. *Morphology*, 205-254.

Kieffer, M. J., & Lesaux, N. K. (2007). *Breaking Down Words to Build Meaning: Morphology, Vocabulary, and Reading Comprehension in the Urban Classroom*. The Reading Teacher, 61(2), 134–144.

Larsen-Freeman, D. (2010). Not so fast: A discussion of L2 morpheme processing and acquisition. *Language Learning*, 60(1), 221-230.

Lincoln, Y. S., & Guba, E. G. (1986). *But is it rigorous? Trustworthiness and authenticity in naturalistic evaluation*. New directions for program evaluation, *1986*(30), 73-84.

Mahmood, S., Aolakh, M. S., & Mujtaba, A. (2020). Morphological errors: A study of the written expressions of Pakistani ESL students. *Pakistan Social Sciences Review*.

Martini, I. D. A. K. (2016). Derivational of bound morpheme. *International Research Journal of Management, IT and Social Sciences*, *3*(1), 15-22.

Murphy, V. A., & Hayes, J. (2010). Processing English compounds in the first and second language: The influence of the middle morpheme. *Language Learning*, *60*(1), 194-220.

Naz, A. ANALYSIS OF MORPHOLOGICAL AND SYNTACTIC ERRORS IN THE WRITINGS OF UNDERGRADUATE STUDENTS OF UNIVERSITY OF MALAKAND.

Nandito, I. K. (2016). Derivational and inflectional morphemes. *International Research Journal of Engineering, IT and Scientific Research*, *2*(1), 22-29.

Nassaji, H., & Fotos, S. S. (2011). *Teaching grammar in second language classrooms: Integrating form-focused instruction in communicative context*. Routledge.

Newton, J. (2018). Teachers as learners: The impact of teachers' morphological awareness on vocabulary instruction. *Education Sciences*, 8(4), 161.

O'Grady, W. and Guzman V.P. 1996. Morphology: The Ananlysis Of Word Structure. O'Grady, W., Dobrovolsky, M. and Katamba, F. (etc.), *Contemporary*

Linguistics: An   Introduction, London: Addison Wesely Longman Limited, 132–180.

Oz, H. (2014). Morphological awareness and some implications for English language teaching. *Procedia-Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 136, 98-103.

Parvaiz, A., & Khan, M. K. (2010). Syntactic Errors Made by Science Students at the Graduate   Level in Pakistan--Causes and Remedies. *Language in India*, *10*(9).

Quirk, R., Greenbaum, S., Leech, G. N and Svartvik, J. (1972). *A Grammar of Contemporary English.* London: Longman.

Ramadan, S. (2015). Morphological errors made By Jordanian university students. *Romanian Journal of English Studies*, 12(1), 40-49.

Richards, J. C., & Schmidt, R. (2010). *Longman Dictionary of Language Teaching and Applied   Linguistics* (4th ed.). Routledge.

Rutledge, K. J., Yong, S. Z., & Ozay, N. (2019). Prefix-based bounded-error estimation with intermittent observations. In 2019 American Control Conference (ACC) (pp. 4320-4325).   IEEE.

Schumacher, K. A. (2007). Action research: Establishing ethics. *College of Education: The Ruth   & Ted Braun awards for writing excellence at Saginaw Valley State University.*   Recuperado de. 28-34.

Stageberg, Noraman. 1981. An Introductory English Grammar (4th Ed.), New York: Holt, Rinerhart and Winston.

Sukarton, & Dewanti, R. (2025). Teacher's morphological awareness and errors in teaching English. *Lililacs Journal* , 5(1).

Todd, L. (1987). *An introduction to linguistics*. London: Longman.

Tariq, T. R., Rana, M. A., Sultan, B., Asif, M., Rafique, N., & Aleem, S. (2020). An analysis of   derivational   and   inflectional   morphemes. *International   Journal   of Linguistics*, *12*(1), 83.

Zhang, S., Liu, Y., Meng, W., Luo, Z., Bu, J., Yang, S., ... & Song, L. (2018). Prefix: Switch failure   prediction   in   datacenter   networks. *Proceedings   of   the   ACM   on Measurement and   Analysis of Computing Systems*, *2*(1), 1-29.

Appendix: (A) Sample from Data

Education

Educations is one of the most powerful tools that shapes the future of individuals and societies. It help people grow intellectully and emotionally allowing them to live better and more meaningful lives. Through educations people learn how to think critically make informed decision, and interact respectfully within a community. from early childhood students learns many skills such as reading writhing and problem solving strong eduction systems plays a vital role in perparing students to face challengs and achieve their goals. God eduction builds brightfal minds that can lead the nation toward success Teahers books and technology all contribute to this learning process. Eduction is also about personal growth It support Self-improving and helps individulls understand their strenth and weaknesess. When students engage in activites outside the classroom. like sports and arts, they develop th leadership and teamwork. These experinees are essentil in the journey of eduction. education Unfortunately in some part of the world the prioritynesess of education is skill lacking. Many children are unable to attend school due to povelly social barriers or lack of facilites. These problems keep some areas undevelopful and stuck.

In cycles of hardsihp. To solve this both goverment and communities must work together to improve the quality access to education. In conclusion. educations is not only about ganing knowledge but also about building character values. and vision. It plays a central role in the progress of a nation. A society that values education and supports if with resources and policil policies will surely be more advanced and perful.