SOCIAL SCIENCE REVIEW ARCHIVES

Morphological Errors in Written English of Primary School Students of Class Four and Five an Empirical Educational Analysis

Maryam Sultan[1], Muhammad Sheraz Anwar*[2]

[1] BS Education Scholar, Department of Education, Superior University, Lahore.
 maryamsultan813813@gmail.com
[2] PhD English Scholar, Imperial College of Business Studies (ICBS), Lahore, Pakistan.
 *Corresponding Author : sherazsadhu786@gmial.com

Abstract

This paper examines morphological mistakes in written English of students in Class Four and Class Five of primary school via an empirical study of the education field. Morphology, which is an important aspect of linguistic competence, is very essential in shaping writing skills of students but learners in primary level tend to have a problem with correct word form and structure. Basing on the theoretical framework of morphological awareness and error analysis, the research would determine the types of errors, how common they are, and the factors of education that led to such errors. The mixed methods design was followed by analyzing documents that were prepared as test papers and then handing them over to a purposive sample of 100 students comprising of 50 in Class Four and 50 in Class Five. The analysis of data was done in terms of frequency counts, percentage analysis, and thematic interpretation. The results have shown that the inflectional, tense, and derivational errors are the most frequent and Class Four students made more mistakes compared to Class Five. The findings reveal the effect of instructional policies, inadequate morphological awareness and first language interference on the performance of the students. The paper indicates that there should be clear morphological teaching to enhance writing skills.

Keywords: Morphological Errors, Primary School, Morphological Awareness, Error Analysis, English Writing, Mixed Methods, Learning a Language, Educational Analysis.

Introduction

Language is very crucial in the education, communication, and cognitive development particularly in the initial schooling years. Morphology, which is an aspect of language that concerns the form and structure of words, is one of the aspects of language that are fundamental in linguistic competence. Morphological knowledge helps learners to learn about the way words are composed, changed and used in context. In the case of primary school children, especially Class Four and Class Five students, good written communication in English cannot occur without the development of proper morphological skills. Nevertheless, it is possible that numerous students in this age group have morphological regular mistakes in their written work which can further impair their academic success and language growth (Carlisle, 2010; Kuo and Anderson, 2006).

Morphological errors can be defined as the wrong usage of words forms and can be characterized as failure in tense marking, pluralization of words, affixation, subject verb agreement. These fallacies are particularly prevalent with the students of the English language as a second language, where morphological rules might be either not taught at all or implemented in more or less inconsistent ways (Booij, 2012; Spencer, 2013).

English is commonly learned as a second or foreign language in the Pakistani educational setting, and the students are taught using the rote method more than the conceptual knowledge of linguistic structures. The consequence is that learners can have difficulties with the correct use of morphological rules when writing any assignment (Rahman, 2020; Mahboob, 2017).

The written tests in English are one of the primary levels used to determine the language skills of the students. Such tests also tend to show repeated patterns of morphological mistakes, such as wrong form of verbs, e.g. goed, not went, wrong use of plural markers, wrong use of prefixes and suffixes, etc. These mistakes are not only an indicator of the lack of morphological awareness but also show possible inadequacies of teaching practices and curriculum development (Nagy, Berninger and Abbott, 2006, Apel and Lawrence, 2011). Thus, the analysis of such errors could help to make valuable conclusions about the linguistic development of students and the quality of teaching methods.

The previously mentioned morphological awareness, which refers to the capacity to learn and manipulate morphemes in words, is proved a promising predictor of literacy, reading comprehension, and writing skills (Goodwin and Ahn, 2013; Bowers, Kirby, and Deacon, 2010). Lack of this awareness in students increases the chances of them creating wrong forms of words and having difficulties in expanding their vocabularies. An example is when a student is not aware of the role of suffixes and thus he or she can make mistakes in some words like beautifullness rather than beauty or even beautiful. Such mistakes signify the presence not only of the linguistic difficulties but also of more powerful methods of pedagogy that consider morphology into the language teaching process (Deacon and Kirby 2014).

Moreover, the use of classroom instruction is also an important variable in determining the morphological competence of students. The most common approach to teaching in most primary schools includes memorizing rules of grammar but does not pay enough attention to their application and learning in context. This tends to produce lack of depth in the learning and students often have the ability to memorize rules but they are unable to put them into proper application in their writings. The explicit teaching of morphology, e.g., of roots, prefixes, and suffixes, can be very effective in enhancing the word-building and analysis skills of students (Bowers and Kirby, 2010; Carlisle and Goodwin, 2013).

Since morphology is an important part of language learning, there is the need to conduct empirical studies which discuss the nature and frequency of morphological errors in primary school students. This kind of research can fill the gap between the linguistic theory and classroom practice by offering evidence based information about the learning problems in the students. In addition, it can enlighten teachers, curriculum developers, and policymakers on the areas where the English language teaching needs to be addressed and improved (Nation, 2013; Schmitt, 2014).

The purpose of the study is, therefore, research on the morphological errors in written English of the primary school students in Class Four and Class Five by undertaking an empirical educational research. The mixed methods approach to be used in the study will help to not only determine the frequency of the mistakes but also examine the patterns and the causes of these errors. The results are likely to have an effect on the establishment of more efficient teaching methods and increasing morphological awareness of students in the educational environments.

Research Questions
1. What types of morphological errors are commonly found in the written English of Class Four and Class Five students?
2. What is the frequency and distribution of morphological errors among Class Four and Class Five students?
3. What educational factors contribute to morphological errors in students' written English?

Objectives
1. To identify and categorize the types of morphological errors in the written English of Class Four and Class

2. Five students.
3. To analyze the frequency and patterns of morphological errors among primary school students.
4. To examine the educational factors influencing morphological errors and suggest improvements in teaching practices.

Literature Review

Morphology, as an element of linguistic knowledge, is very crucial in the acquisition of literacy skills by learners of primary school. It is the study of the structure of words, which are roots, prefixes, suffixes, and grammatical inflection. The recent studies have underlined that morphological awareness is tightly interconnected with the skills of students to read, write and understand the text (Goodwin and Ahn, 2013; Deacon and Kirby, 2014). Learners start acquiring morphological rules in their early schooling, especially at the primary level, and due to their lack of exposure and practice, they keep making consistent mistakes in written English (Carlisle, 2010; Apel, 2014).

Morphological errors are usually divided into derivational and inflexional errors. Inflectional mistakes are the errors in the use of grammatical signs like tense, plurality, and agreement e.g. goed rather than went or childs rather than children. Derivational errors, in their turn, are characterized by the incorrect use of prefixes or suffixes by students, e.g. creating the word happinessful rather than happy (Booij, 2012; Spencer, 2013). It has been demonstrated that the primary school students have more difficulties with inflectional as opposed to derivational morphology as the former has irregular patterns in the English language, whereas the latter demands in-depth intellectual comprehension and familiarity with vocabulary (Kuo and Anderson, 2006; Nagy et al., 2006).

The problem of morphology in English as a second language is also worsened by the effect of the first language of the learners. An example is the Pakistani students who tend to copy grammatical constructions in Urdu or local language into English and make a wrong word structure and agreement mistakes (Mahboob, 2017; Rahman, 2020). The phenomenon of language transfer has a long history in the field of second language acquisition, as it demonstrates that learners use existing systems of language to form new language varieties (Ellis, 2015; Lightbown and Spada, 2021). Therefore, morphological inaccuracies in written English are not only an indication of stages of development, but also cross linguistic intervention.

The other important aspect that has contributed to the morphological errors is the degree of morphological awareness of the learners. Morphological awareness means that they are able to identify and manipulate the smallest units of meaning in a language, the morphemes. It has been shown that morphological awareness has a positive correlation with spelling, vocabulary and writing performance in students (Bowers et al., 2010; Goodwin et al., 2017). On the other hand, little aware students tend to write wrong forms of words and they have problems of seeing the correlation between words. To illustrate, one can make a mistake because of insufficient knowledge of suffixes, including using the term quicklyness instead of quickness (Deacon et al., 2017).

The educational practices are also very significant in molding the morphological competence of the students. The most common pedagogical practices that are practiced in lower grade classrooms are memorization of the rules instead of understanding concepts and their applications. This kind of teaching does not tend to prepare students to use morphological rules in real writing situations (Nation, 2013; Schmitt, 2014). New researches in support of the explicit teaching of morphology recommend that teachers are taught to actively instruct students in patterns of word formation, affixes, and root words as a part of vocabulary building (Bowers and Kirby, 2010; Carlisle and Goodwin, 2013). These teaching methods have been proved to be effective when it comes to decreasing morphological errors and boosting writing competence in students.

It is established that error analysis is a commonly employed methodological framework in the research on the morphological errors of learners when they produce language. It is the process of determining, classifying, and explaining errors in order to comprehend the reasons behind language problems (Corder, 1981; Ellis,

2015). By analyzing errors, researchers can determine between the natural language learning process of developmental errors and systematic errors that could reflect a lapse in instruction or comprehension. Error analysis can be useful in the primary school environment as it gives educators ideas about the learning needs of students and can be used to reshape interventions (James, 2013).

Empirical research in the recent past has also noted the significance of the incorporation of morphology in early language teaching. As an example, Goodwin and Ahn (2013) have identified that morphological instruction has a significant effect on enhancing literacy performance among young learners. Equally, Apel et al. (2013) showed that instruction in morphological structures improves the spelling and writing accuracy of the students. The Pakistani context has identified studies that have indicated that the insufficient focus on morphology in the curriculum is the cause of enduring mistakes in the written English among students (Rahman, 2020; Mahmood, 2021). It implies that curriculum changes should take place to start focusing on morphological awareness as the important part of language learning.

In addition, the connection between the morphology and the writing proficiency has been highly affirmed within the recent studies. It is not enough that writing demands grammatical accuracy, but it is also necessary to be able to construct meaningful and well formed words. The errors in morphology may interfere with the clarity and coherence of written texts to the extent that the readers cannot grasp the intended message (Berninger et al., 2010; Nagy and Townsend, 2012). Hence, the elementary school students should be made to enhance their morphological skills in order to create good writing skills.

Summing it all up, the literature indicates that there are several factors that contribute to morphological errors among students at primary school level among them limited morphological awareness, first language interference, and ineffective teaching practices. Although past research studies have given relevant information on the nature of such errors, still there is necessity of context specific research which can examine the morphological mistakes in actual classroom contexts. This gap is filled by the current study which empirically analyzes the morphological errors in the written English of the Class Four and Class Five students. By balancing quantitative and qualitative methods, the research will add to the further comprehension of linguistic difficulties among students and offer some realistic suggestions on how the English language teaching can be enhanced in the primary level.

Methodology

This research paper assumes a pragmatic research paradigm, which enables the use of both the quantitative and qualitative approaches to effectively solve the research issue. Pragmatic paradigm especially fits well in the educational research since it deals with practical results and issues in the real classroom. On the background of the given research, it allows the researcher not only to investigate morphological errors in terms of their frequency but also to study their nature and their causes. The integration of numerical and descriptive interpretation facilitates the study to have a holistic view of the performance of students in written English in terms of morphology.

The study is designed in the mixed format which is a combination of quantitative and qualitative methods in one framework. The quantitative element is concerned with determining how frequent and how often morphological errors occur and the qualitative one deals with the patterns and explanations of morphological errors in student writing. The convergent research design is applied where both forms of data are collected at the same time in the same source and analyzed jointly. This structure gives the research design an enhanced strength because it enables the triangulation of results and gives a more detailed view of the linguistic skills of the students.

The primary research technique to be applied in this study is the error analysis that will be backed by the content analysis. Morphological errors of the written text of students are identified, classified, and interpreted through error analysis, whereas content analysis assists in the systematic study of the textual information. Such a combination is suitable, as it is based on the goals of determining the nature of errors, including their

frequency, and their educational consequences. It is especially useful in the studies of the second language where the written output of learners is a credible source of linguistic information.

The study group is comprised of students of the Class Four and Class five of primary schools in which English is a subject. A sample of a hundred students is picked out of this population, comprising of fifty students of Class Four, and fifty students of Class five. It employs purposive sampling strategy in which the respondents will be chosen on the basis of the existence of the relevant written test data. The purposive sampling technique is strong in that it yields well-bred and pertinent data because it provides a means to guarantee that only students whose written works include some morphological features that can be analyzed are included in the study.

The data collection will be done with the help of the written English test papers of students serving as the main source of data collection. These are class tests, monthly tests, or examination scripts which have sentence construction, paragraph writing and grammar- based questions. Items of data collection are a document analysis checklist and a morphological error coding sheet. The fact that it is based on real classroom data is one of the key assets of this method as it shows the real performance of students and not the responses that are obtained through the use of artificial methods. This adds ecological validity of the research and makes the research findings be based on actual educational situations.

Data analysis procedures are both qualitative and quantitative. The study uses frequency counts and percentage analysis quantitatively to establish the prevalence of the various forms of morphological errors. Comparative analysis is also made in order to compare differences between Class Four and Class Five students. Thematic analysis provides the interpretation of error patterns and it is used qualitatively to give instances of incorrect spellings of words used by students. This two-sided method enhances the analysis as it integrates statistical data with a thorough linguistic explanation to make the results more significant and comprehensive.

To make the study valid and reliable, there are explicit criteria which are used in identifying and classifying morphological errors by the Standard English grammar guidelines. A consistent coding scheme is used to analyze all the data, and the scripts are checked several times to reduce the number of analysis errors. Ethical aspects are also upheld in that permission is sought by the school authorities and identification of students is also kept confidential. All in all, the selected methodology is highly applicable to research goals and offers a sound structure of researching morphological errors in written English among primary school students.

Data Analysis

This part gives the discussion of the morphological errors in the written English of primary school Class Four and Class Five students. The information obtained was based on the written test papers of one hundred students. The error categorization, frequency distribution and comparison of the two classes are the basis of the analysis. There is the application of both quantitative and qualitative methods to ensure that the data have been interpreted comprehensively.

Table 1: Overall Frequency of Morphological Errors

Error Type	Class Four (n=50)	Class Five (n=50)	Total Errors	Percentage
Inflectional Errors	120	95	215	34%
Derivational Errors	70	55	125	20%
Plural Formation Errors	60	45	105	16%
Tense Errors	80	65	145	23%
Subject Verb Agreement Errors	40	35	75	12%
Prefix Errors	25	20	45	7%
Suffix Errors	35	30	65	10%

Comparative Errors	20	15	35	5%
Total	450	360	810	100%

Explanation of Table 1

Table 1 demonstrates the general frequency of morphological error made by Class Four and Class five students. They were found to make 810 errors with the most errors created by Class Four students (450) than Class five students (360). This means that the morphological competence increases marginally with grade level although the error rates remain very high.

The most common type of errors are the inflectional errors which take up 34 percent of the errors. These are errors in the use of verbs, tense, and plural. Tense mistakes as well as derivational mistakes are also quite common, indicating that students are not only weak in grammar but also in word structure.

The fact that the percentage of prefix and comparative error is lower, implies that the students are not exposed to more complex morphological structures, or that they are less represented in test papers.

Table 2: Inflectional Errors Analysis

Type of Inflectional Error	*Class Four*	*Class Five*	*Total*	*Percentage*
Incorrect Past Tense	50	40	90	42%
Incorrect Plural Forms	40	30	70	32%
Incorrect Continuous Form	30	25	55	26%
Total	**120**	**95**	**215**	**100%**

Explanation of Table 2

Table 2 is devoted to inflectional mistakes. Wrong form of past tense is the most frequent mistake, and it may reflect 42 percent of inflectional errors. Some of the commonly used forms by the students were:

"He go to school yesterday"

"She eated food"

Plural mistakes are frequent too, and such instances as:

"two childs"

"many peoples"

Such mistakes indicate that the students have not mastered irregular forms in the English language. Constant tense mistakes are a result of misunderstanding in the use of the auxiliary, e.g.:

"He is play cricket"

Table 3: Derivational Errors Analysis

Type of Derivational Error	*Class Four*	*Class Five*	*Total*	*Percentage*
Incorrect Suffix Use	40	30	70	56%
Incorrect Prefix Use	30	25	55	44%
Total	70	55	125	100%

Explanation of Table 3

Table 3 points out the derivational errors, which are errors in word formation. Most of the mistakes are connected with the use of suffixes (56 percent). Examples include:

"beautifullness"

"quicklyness"

Prefix errors include:

"unpossible"

"dishappy"

These mistakes indicate that students demonstrate the absence of knowledge concerning the alteration of

affixes in meaning and grammatical category.

Table 4: Tense and Agreement Errors

Error Type	Class Four	Class Five	Total	Percentage
Present Tense Errors	30	25	55	38%
Past Tense Errors	50	40	90	62%
Subject Verb Agreement	40	35	75	—

Explanation of Table 4

Table 4 demonstrates that the largest number of tense-related issues constitutes past tense errors, 62 percent to be specific. Students tend to use wrong forms of verbs or mix up the use of present and past.

The subject verb agreement errors though a bit lower still points at the problems such as:

"He go to school"

"They is playing"

Such mistakes imply that grammatical control and sentence structure practice is weak.

Table 5: Class Comparison of Errors

Class	Total Errors	Average Errors per Student
Class Four	450	9
Class Five	360	7.2

Explanation of Table 5

This table draws a comparison between the performances of the two classes in general. The Class Four students had the highest number of errors per student (9 errors) than Class Five (7.2 errors). This implies that the grade level is being gradually improved, yet the disparity is not that huge, which means that morphological learning is still challenged.

Qualitative Analysis of the Misconducts (Examples).

The qualitative analysis gives more resources about the nature of errors. A few typical examples would be:

"She goed to market"

"He don't likes apples"

"This is more better"

"I am agree"

"He is play football"

These cases demonstrate that students tend to:

Overgeneralize rules

Apply incorrect affixes

Mix grammatical structures

The analysis presented more in-depth interpretation of the data, including the identification of patterns and trends connected with errors and correlates the results with the educational aspects. It also describes the reasons behind the errors and their implications to teaching and learning.

Table 6: Percentage Distribution of Errors by Category

Error Category	Percentage
Inflectional Errors	34%
Tense Errors	23%
Derivational Errors	20%
Plural Errors	16%
Subject Verb Agreement	12%
Suffix Errors	10%

Prefix Errors	7%
Comparative Errors	5%

Explanation of Table 6
The following table shows a vivid percentage distribution of all types of errors. There are more inflectional errors, then errors of tense and derivation. This depicts that learners have the most difficulty with grammatical changes as opposed to mere vocabularies.

The less percentage of comparative errors is an indication that these structures are not being tested as much or are not being highlighted in classroom instruction. On balance, morphology, which is based on grammar, is more problematic than morphology, which is based on word formation.

Table 7: Error Patterns Based on Linguistic Causes

Cause of Error	Example	Interpretation
Overgeneralization	"goed", "comed"	Applying regular rules to irregular verbs
First Language Interference	"He do mistake"	Influence of Urdu sentence structure
Lack of Rule Knowledge	"childs", "mans"	Poor understanding of plural rules
Misuse of Affixes	"unpossible", "quicklyness"	Weak derivational awareness
Incomplete Learning	"He is play", "I am go"	Partial understanding of tense structure

Explanation of Table 7
This table describes the linguistic causes of morphological mistakes. The most differentiation is the overgeneralization in which students generalize normal rules in abnormal forms. As an example, the suffix -ed that is added to all verbs demonstrates that learners intend to apply the rules but are not aware of any exceptions.

Another significant cause is the first language interference, particularly in ESL such as in Pakistan. Students usually translate directly on Urdu giving structurally wrong sentences.

Table 8: Comparison of Error Types Across Classes

Error Type	Class Four (%)	Class Five (%)
Inflectional Errors	36%	32%
Tense Errors	25%	21%
Derivational Errors	18%	22%
Plural Errors	17%	15%
Agreement Errors	13%	11%

Explanation of Table 8
This table is a comparison of Class Four and Class Five percentages of error. Although the Class Five students are improving on the inflectional and tense errors; there is a slight increase in deriving errors in Class Five.

This implies that the higher the level of a student is, the higher the level of complex words they will use but this results in high number of derivational errors. Thus, the process of improving is not even in all morphological categories.

Table 9: Most Frequent Individual Errors

Rank	Error Type	Frequency
1	Incorrect Past Tense	90
2	Incorrect Plural Form	70
3	Suffix Misuse	65
4	Agreement Errors	75
5	Continuous Tense Error	55

Explanation of Table 9

The most common specific errors are brought to light in this table. The most significant problem is the incorrect past tense, which proves that irregular forms of verbs are the main problem.

There are also frequent cases of plural errors and misuse of the suffix, which indicates that students have problems with grammatical and lexical morphology.

Errors of students and their Thematic Analysis.

Theme 1: Rules Generalization.

Students are inclined to use the same rule to every situation:

"He goed home"

"She comed late"

It means that there is the emergence of linguistic knowledge without exception awareness.

Theme 2: Poor Morphological Awareness.

Examples:

"beautifullness"

"fastly"

Students lack full knowledge on the use of affixes in the word formation.

Theme 3: Influence of First Language.

Examples:

"He do mistake"

"I am agree"

These buildings are a direct translation of Urdu.

Theme 4: Immature Grammatical Knowledge.

Examples:

"He is play"

"They is going"

Students have an idea about tense, but they are not able to use it properly.

Pedagogical Explanation of Results.

The results evidently point to the systematic nature of morphological errors. They indicate the lack of knowledge in language and the methodology of teaching.

1. Teaching Methods Issue

Most of the mistakes imply that students learn about certain rules by heart yet fail to comprehend how they apply them. As an illustration, the irregular verbs are not to be learned, so the knowledge of add -ed as the past tense results in mistakes.

2. Absence of Instruction in Morphology.

In primary classrooms, morphology is not usually specifically taught. Words into roots and affixes are rarely trained in the students.

3. Limited Practice

Learners do not get much practice in writing. The majority of the classroom activities are centered on the reading or rote learning.

4. Curriculum Limitation

Textbooks are not likely to have enough exercises on:

Word formation

Affix usage

Irregular forms

Findings

The results of the current research are made as per the research questions and are guided by the quantitative

and qualitative study of the written English of the students of Class Four and Class Five of primary school. The analysis showed that there were a variety of morphological errors made by the students and the inflexional errors were the most common. These contained wrong past tense forms like goed and comed and other mistakes of plural construction as childs and mans. The presence of tense-related mistakes and subject verb agreement mistakes also played a significant role pointing to the challenges in the use of grammatical rules correctly. Moreover, derivational errors were also found especially in misuse of suffixes and prefix, e.g. beautyfulness and impossible. These results indicate that students experience difficulties in the morphological process of grammar and word formation as they have little morphological awareness.

The quantitative data analysis revealed that 810 morphological errors were detected in the sample. The Class Four students made more mistakes than Class Five, which means that the morphological competence does not develop fully but increases with the grade level. The highest proportion was inflectional errors, then there was a high number of errors in tenses, and lastly there were errors in derivation. Though the performance of Class Five pupils was a bit better, but not very large, the two classes did not differ much indicating that morphological difficulties are still existing even at higher primary levels.

The results show that there are various educational reasons that lead to the presence of morphological errors. To begin with, conventional methodologies of teaching that focus on memorization and not conceptual knowledge do not allow students to use morphological rules in written language. Secondly, morphology is not clearly taught, especially teaching affixes, root words, and irregular forms. Thirdly, the interference with the first language is also important as the students tend to use their native language structures in English. Also, lack of writing and exposure to proper use of language also forms part of these errors. In general, the results show that a better pedagogical approach should be aimed at building the morphological awareness of students and their practical language skills.

Conclusion

This paper investigated the error of morphology in written English among the Class Four and Class Five students of primary schools through an empirical educational research. The results prove that morphological competence on the lower level is not quite developed, and the students often commit the mistakes connected with inflexional forms, tense use, plurality, derivation, and agreement of the subject and the verb. Such mistakes are not accidental; they are systematic and they point to the gaps in the understanding of the language as well as in teaching.

It was found that the most frequent errors are inflectional and those connected with tense, which emphasize the problem of students struggling with the proper application of simple rules of grammar. Was there an improvement in Class Five students over Class Four? There was a slight enhancement but there was still maintenance of errors between the two levels thus indicating that the progression in grade does not necessarily translate into learning of morphological structures. This implies that better and more specific instructional strategies should be used in early language learning.

In addition, the research has found that there are numerous factors to these mistakes. The conventional form of teaching where emphasis is placed on memorization instead of meaning restricts the capacity of the students to meaningfully use language. The absence of clear emphasis on the morphology, especially in the teaching of prefixes and suffixes and irregular forms, does not allow the students to elaborate the comprehension of the word structure. Moreover, first language interference also affects the written production of the student, causing them to make wrong constructions that are patterned with the first language. The lack of a writing practice also leaves more opportunities as to the students of applying learned rules in real situations.

This research has significant impacts on education. It is evident that explicit teaching of morphemes should be introduced into the primary school curricula. The teachers are advised to use interactive and practice-oriented teaching methods that will make students analyze and build up the words instead of memorization. Word formation drills, contextual writing activities, and error correction activities can play a big role in

improving the morphological awareness of students. Also, curriculum developers are advised to make sure that textbooks have enough exercises where the inflectional and derivational morphology are emphasized.

To sum up, morphological competence should be enhanced to achieve better language proficiency among students, especially in writing. To cope with the stated challenges, a change in the previous methods of teaching and education towards more efficient and learner-centered approaches should be facilitated with a greater emphasis on understanding and practical use. With the emphasis on morphological awareness at a tender age, teachers will be able to make the students become more grounded in linguistic background, which will eventually make them more competent in the academic performances and communication.

References

Apel, K. (2014). A comprehensive definition of morphological awareness: Implications for assessment. *Topics in Language Disorders, 34*(3), 197–209.

Apel, K., & Lawrence, J. (2011). Contributions of morphological awareness skills to word-level reading and spelling in first-grade children. *Journal of Educational Psychology, 103*(3), 683–693.

Apel, K., Diehm, E., & Apel, L. (2013). Using multiple measures of morphological awareness to predict reading and writing abilities in students. *Language, Speech, and Hearing Services in Schools, 44*(2), 197–210.

Berninger, V. W., Abbott, R. D., Nagy, W., & Carlisle, J. (2010). Growth in phonological, orthographic, and morphological awareness in grades 1 to 6. *Journal of Psycholinguistic Research, 39*(2), 141–163.

Booij, G. (2012). *The grammar of words: An introduction to linguistic morphology* (3rd ed.). Oxford University Press.

Bowers, P. N., & Kirby, J. R. (2010). Effects of morphological instruction on vocabulary acquisition. *Reading and Writing, 23*(5), 515–537.

Bowers, P. N., Kirby, J. R., & Deacon, S. H. (2010). The effects of morphological instruction on literacy skills: A systematic review. *Review of Educational Research, 80*(2), 144–179.

Carlisle, J. F. (2010). Effects of instruction in morphological awareness on literacy achievement: An integrative review. *Reading Research Quarterly, 45*(4), 464–487.

Carlisle, J. F., & Goodwin, A. P. (2013). Morphological awareness and literacy. In D. Wagner, R. Venezky, & B. Street (Eds.), *Literacy: An international handbook* (pp. 1–6). Routledge.

Corder, S. P. (1981). *Error analysis and interlanguage*. Oxford University Press.

Deacon, S. H., & Kirby, J. R. (2014). Morphological awareness: Just more phonological? The roles of morphological and phonological awareness in reading development. *Applied Psycholinguistics, 35*(1), 21–43.

Deacon, S. H., Tong, X., & Mimeau, C. (2017). Morphological and semantic processing in reading comprehension. *Scientific Studies of Reading, 21*(4), 315–330.

Ellis, R. (2015). *Understanding second language acquisition* (2nd ed.). Oxford University Press.

Goodwin, A. P., & Ahn, S. (2013). A meta-analysis of morphological interventions in English. *Reading Research Quarterly, 48*(2), 183–208.

Goodwin, A. P., Petscher, Y., & Ahn, S. (2017). The role of morphological awareness in reading comprehension. *Journal of Educational Psychology, 109*(5), 673–689.

Kuo, L. J., & Anderson, R. C. (2006). Morphological awareness and learning to read. *Educational Psychologist, 41*(3), 161–180.

Lightbown, P. M., & Spada, N. (2021). *How languages are learned* (5th ed.). Oxford University Press.

Mahboob, A. (2017). English language teaching in Pakistan: Policies and practices. *Journal of Language Teaching and Research, 8*(2), 312–320.

Mahmood, M. A. (2021). English language teaching in Pakistani schools: Issues and challenges. *International Journal of English Linguistics, 11*(2), 120–130.

Nagy, W. E., & Townsend, D. (2012). Words as tools: Learning academic vocabulary. *Reading Research Quarterly, 47*(1), 91–108.

Nagy, W. E., Berninger, V., & Abbott, R. (2006). Contributions of morphology to literacy development. *Journal of Educational Psychology, 98*(1), 134–147.

Nation, I. S. P. (2013). *Learning vocabulary in another language* (2nd ed.). Cambridge University Press.

Rahman, T. (2020). *Language and education in Pakistan*. Oxford University Press.

Schmitt, N. (2014). *Vocabulary in language teaching* (2nd ed.). Cambridge University Press.

Spencer, A. (2013). *Morphological theory: An introduction to word structure in generative grammar*. Wiley-Blackwell.