# Morphological Errors Found in Indonesian Students' English Compositions of Application Letter

## Elwa Junaidi [1], M. Zaim [2]

Student of English Language Education Program[1] (English Language and Literature Department, Faculty of Language and Arts, Universitas Negeri Padang), Jl. Prof. Dr. Hamka Air Tawar, Padang, 25173

Lecturer of English Language Education Program[2] (English Language and Literature Department, Faculty of Language and Arts, Universitas Negeri Padang), Jl. Prof. Dr. Hamka Air Tawar, Padang, 25173

Correspondence Email: elwa.junaidi77@gmail.com

## Abstract

*A number of morphological errrors can be found in students' English compositions of application letter. The errors were possibly caused by a lack of students understanding about the rules in morphology.The purposes of this research were to explain the (1) morphological errors, (2) the frequencies of morphological errors, and (3) the sources of errors in students' English compositions of application letter. The research applied a descriptive method. The data from students' compositions of application were collected by using documentation technique. The research results indicated that there were two categories of morphological error, specifically noun morphological errors (indicated by the problems with noun plural –s) and verb morphological errors indicated by the problems with present third person singular –s). The most common errors were noun morphological errors. Furthermore, there are two sources of errors found in the application letters of students. They were interlingual errors (transfer of morphological elements) and intralingual & development errors. (overgeneralization & ignorance of rule restriction).*

## INTRODUCTION

Analyses of morphological errors in English composition made by foreign language students have been considered as a substantial topic that got much interest among researchers because of their significance. The analyses can help teachers to get teaching strategies information with corrective feedbacks provision as they can become aware of troublesome morphological areas faced by students. In addition, by knowing errors such as morphological errors and getting

corrections of them, students can dramatically improve themselves to convey their ideas and ability to understand composition (Castro, 2017).

According to Yakub and Hussein (2018), morphological error analyses may provide a deep language vision for students' output when they produce a massive quan;ity of errors using English morphemes and their remarkable knowledge deficiency. At least to some extent, the morphological analyses' findings will make the teachers what materials are needed and what they should teach to their students. Thus, the teachers are able to meet the needs of students. Furthermore, morphological error analyses which come up with reliable results help material developers to consider what items are importantly needed to be learned in schools.

In agreement with Groves (2018), analyzing morphological errors in students' writing can accurately provide teachers with more information and assist them in presenting more effective instruction that meets the individual students' literacy needs. For assessment, the interaction between morphology and other skills presents a unique opportunity as it catches information about syntactical knowledge, spelling, and vocabulary. As an illustration, a word "whent" can indicate literacy development for one student. Meanwhile, in another writing sample, it can indicate a deficit in literacy skills. Besides, a combination between morphological errors and morphological attempts for a correct usage measure can offer a larger data set that provides a more comprehensive and detailed morphological development analysis in students' writing.

Analyses on morphological errors have been being focused on various forms of English composition made by Indonesian students, such as legends, news reports, etc. In reliance Imam (2015) who analyzed students' morphological errors in making compositions of legends, such as Roro Jonggrang, Malin Kundang, Lake Toba, and Sangkuriang, it was found out that the students contributed three types of errors: noun morphological errors, adjective morphological errors, and verb morphological errors. The verb morphological errors were indicated by the presence of omission of past tense -ed. The noun morphological errors were indicated by the presents of omission of plural –s, over-inclusion of plural –s, redundancy of plural –s, and misselection. The adjective morphological errors were indicated by the presents of omission and misselection. Mostly, the error's type was verb morphological errors which were only contributed into the omission of past tense –ed. Imam believed that the errors caused by mother tongue sound interferences, confusion in choosing words' part of speech, and overgeneralization on morphological rules.

Mutmainah (2019), who analyzed students' morphological errors in making compositions of recount text which was used for students' weekly scores, found that there were four types of morphological errors. They were verb morphological errors (indicated by the presents of omission of past tense –ed &  misselection), noun morphological errors (indicated by the presents of omission of noun plural –s & misselection), adverb morphological errors (indicated by the present of misselection), and adjective morphological errors (indicated by the present of misselection). The most frequent type of morphological errors were verb morphological errors. They mainly were indicated by the presence of misselection

of verb morphological error because students had limited knowledge about the use of past tense form of the verb in recount text. The sources of the errors were translation ambiguity, carelessness, and first language influences.

Gayo and Widodo (2018), who analyzed students' morphological errors in making compositions of descriptive text about animals, plants, or people, found that the morphological errors included demonstrative determiner, auxiliary verb, personal pronoun, copula be, article, preposition, inflection morpheme, and derivation morpheme. The most dominant type of morphological error was in the use of copula be. The sources of the errors were interlingual and intralingual errors.

Ramadan (2015), who investigated students' morphological errors in many forms of compositions, like news report, analytical or hortatory exposition, descriptive, and explanation, found that students contributed to inflectional and derivational morphemes. Errors contributing inflectional morphemes were noun morphological errors and verb morphological errors. Noun morphological errors were indicated by the presents of omission of noun plural –s, the addition of noun plural –s, omission of the possessive –s, and misuse of possessive –'s. Verb morphological errors were indicated by the presence of the wrong formation of the past form of irregular verbs and and omission of the third person present tense. The morphological errors contributing derivational morphemes were errors arising from the wrong use of prefixes and errors made as a result of analogous use of certain suffixes. There were four causes of these errors the inconsistency inherent in English language, the course of morphology is not compulsory and selective based on the university plan, misapplication & overgeneralization of rules, and negative transfer.

Saputra, Dayu, and Islamiah (2020), who investigated students' writing assignments which their form of text made unmentioned, found that students contributed to inflectional errors, derivational errors, and conversion errors. The morphological errors were dominated by the presence of inflectional errors. There were three causes of the morphological errors were negative transfer of L1 to L2, big gap in remedy of the learned material based on basic competencies of curriculum 2013, and limitation in learning English.

Rahman (2019), who investigated students' morphological errors in making compositions of synopsis, he found that there were four types of morphological errors. They were omission, addition, misformation, and misordering which can steer to unsureness on the meanings of erroneous sentences.

Suryani (2017), who analyzed students' morphological errors in composing short paragraphs, found out that the students contributed four types of errors: noun morphological errors, adjective morphological errors, verb morphological errors, and misformation of derivation. The verb morphological errors were indicated by the presence of omission of verb inflection. The noun morphological errors were indicated by the presence of omission of noun inflection. The adjective morphological errors were indicated by the presence of omission of adjective inflection. The morphological errors were dominated by noun morphological errors. Suryani said that the errors occurred because the students did not

comprehend grammar rules.

Munir (2020), who analyzed students' morphological errors in making compositions of short paragraphs (essay), found out that the morphological errors included omission, addition, misformation, and misordering. The most dominant type of morphological error was omission. The sources of the errors were interlingual and intralingual errors.

Among so many analyses of morphological errors, there is no related analysis focusing on morphological errors in application letter yet up to this present, even though this form of composition is required to learn in school according to twelfth-grade English subject basic competency number 4.2.2 in 2013 curriculum. The basic competency mentioned that students should be able to compose application letters, which provide information related to applicants' identities, educational backgrounds, or work experience, by looking carefully at language features of application letter based on the context (Kemendikbud RI, 2013). The researcher examined to determine whether the competency achievement indicator of English subject basic competency number 4.2.2 was achieved by taking part in checking or finding morphological errors referring to language features produced by students in their application letter compositions. Language features themselves are associated with the use of mechanical aspects of writing, sentence construction, and grammar (Budiharso, 2006:1). In the use of grammar, morphology has a role as one of its framers (Mu'in, 2019:47). Mophology studies morphemes as the smallest meaningful units in language (Zaim, 2019). Combining the units can create a word (Zaim, 2017). Here, the researcher set the analysis on how the rules that govern the structure of word is used as they are in scope of language features. Therefore, it can be seen how far the students have mastered in making application letter compositions.

Regarding an informal interview with an English teacher of SMAN 1 Baso, it was found that students had low writing skills or many difficulties in making proper compositions, mainly the compositions that describe plural noun because of the modification of singular noun to plural noun. Here, the researcher brings up a few of students' grammatical problems found related to plural noun found in their assignments. First, in the sentence," I have many book," the student should add suffix –s to the noun "book," but he forgot to do it. He possibly neglected that since he did not find suffix –s attached to the noun in Minangkabau or Indonesian language. Second, in the sentence, "the grandparents take care of those child well," the student ignored the plural form of "child" which is "children." Here, the student might use the simple or common word due to the limited vocabulary he had.

Referred to the problem, the purposes of this research were to explain the (1) morphological errors, (2) the frequencies of morphological errors, and (3) the sources of errors in students' English compositions of application letter.

## METHOD

In this research, a descriptive method was used to identify morphological errors in found in students' essays. Knuffer and McLellan in 1996, descriptive research is an extensive sense of researching data, question, and design analysis

that is used to tell a particular topic. Moreover, as maintained by Gay (2012), descriptive research is linked to a survey research which uses data collection for answering the recent research subject status in a study. Thus, descriptive research is an extensive method or a survey research includes researching data, question, and design analysis for answering the recent research subject status in a study. It means that described morphological errors, their frequencies, and sources committed by students from and the objects of the research were taken from students' assignments.

Population of this research was all the the twelfth-grade students at SMAN 1 Baso school in the academic year 2020-2021. The sample was be taken by using *total sampling*. The sample of the study shared the same number with the population which consisted of 180 twelfth-grade students in the academic year 2020-2021 at SMAN 1 Baso.

To collect the data, the researcher used documentation technique. Documentation technique, according to Arikunto (2006), is a technique looking for data on variables in the form of transcripts, notes, newspapers, books, magazines, inscriptions, agendas, meeting minutes, and so on. The data was collected using checklist table instruments to obtain data (SMAN 1 Baso students' application letters) in the form of homework written from Google Classroom.

In order to analyze the data, the researcher: 1) identified any sentence containing morphological errors based on James's morphological error theory. Meanwhile, the sources of errors based on Keshavarz's theory were also identified at the same time, including interlingual errors, intralingual and developmental errors, teacher-induced errors, language learning strategies, and communication strategies. 2) calculated each kind of error and came with numerical percentages of total errors. The researcher did the same with the classification of the error source. Meanwhile, the researcher also calculated the sources of errors in the same way in calculating kinds of errors.

**RESULT AND DISCUSSION**
*Research Finding*
The findings are related to morphological errors on the data gotten hold of application letters written by the students of 12th grade of SMAN 1 Baso. Based on previous chapter theories, this part presents and analyzes (1) the types of morphological errors, (2) the frequency of morphological errors and, (3) the sources of morphological errors.

*Types of Morphological Error Found in Students' English Composition of Application Letter*
1. Noun Morphological Errors
Noun morphological errors are errors to obey norms in delivering nouns as lexical words. According to Zaim (2019), there was one type of inflectional morphemes in noun: noun plural –s. There are four indicators of noun plural errors. They are omission of noun plural –s, addition of noun plural –s, misselection of noun plural –s, and misplacement of noun plural –s. Based on the data, omission of noun plural –s, addition of noun plural –s, and misselection of noun plural –s were

noticed in students' composition.

a. Omission of Noun Plural –s

Omission of noun plural occurs when the students recurrently do not use suffixes –s, -es, or sometimes –en once they stated noun in plural form as exemplifications:

(1) "I am hard working, able to work well under pressure, creative, pleasant and convenient in dealing with people and customer.*" [S.161]

(2) "My past work experience*. have shown that I'm able to full the qualification my previous job is staff in one of financial firm* along two years." [S.95]

The researcher detected two cases in the omission of noun plural –s from students' compositions. The right sentences should therefore be:

(3) "I am hard working, able to work well under pressure, creative, pleasant and convenient in dealing with people and **customer**." [S.161]

(4) "My past work **experiences**. have shown that I'm able to full the qualication my previous job is staff in one of financial **firms** along two years." [S.95]

The data above showed that the students might realize that they should make use of the plural form by including suffixes –s in the singular form. Suchlike errors occur straightforwardly as the students paid no consideration to the right use of plural and singular words. They ignored it in view of the fact that they did not identify suffix –s connected to the nouns in their common speech (Indonesian). In English, a plural should be attached with suffix –s to the singular form as the things mentioned above. The word "customer" should become "customers" as it is impossible for the student as the applicant to get one customer during his work experience in that job. It is similar with the word "experience." A morpheme noun plural –s should be attached after it because during his past work, it is unimaginable if he only got one experience. Then, the noun "financial firm" should become "financial firms" because it comes after number "one of" which represents more than one quantity.

b. Addition of noun plural –s

Addition of noun plural is made by attaching plural -s into a word which makes it ungrammatical. It occurs because of the students' ignorance in understanding both native language and target language. Therefore, they produced distortion in their conversion. Some erroneous of the identified addition of noun plural were:

(5) "So, I have a good computer skills* and I can communicate in English and Java." [S.7]

(6) "Based on information from the PT Matosa Indonesia advertisement, there is another job vacancies* at the company where you lead." [S.53]

The students should not add suffixes –s to some nouns in the sentences above. Thus, the correct sentences are:

(7) "So, I have a good computer **skill** and I can communicate

in English and Java." [S.7]

(8)  "Based on information from the PT Matosa Indonesia advertisement, there is another **job vacancy** at the company where you lead." [S.53]

Here, the word "skills" should be "skill" because there is an article "a" that comes before the noun "skills." It is known that nouns after articles are always singular. Then, "job vacancies" should be "job vacancy" since the quantifier "another" is also always paired with singular nouns. These errors happened as the students were careless in selecting the words. Moreover, these errors do not have a relationship either to the native language or the target language.

c.  Misselection of noun plural –s

Misselection of noun plural -s is the wrong form of noun plural –s as a morpheme. In misselection of noun plural –s, the students supplied noun plural –s morphemes to nouns, even though they were not needed. In this study, the researcher showed students' errors refer to misselection of noun plural –s. The students supplied suffixes –s after noun, for example:

(9)  "I am graduate from Programmer Department of Yogyakarta State University on August this years.*" [S.7]

The students selected one member of a class of forms to represent others in the class. They supplied suffixes –s after  the English demostrative adjective "this." Thus, the correct sentences are:

(10)  "I am graduate from Programmer Department of Yogyakarta State University on August this **years**." [S.7]

Here, the words "years" should be "year" since the demonstrative adjective "this" only can represent singular noun. the These errors might happen as the students were during the phases of foreign language acquisition.

2.  Verb Morphological Errors

Verb morphological errors are lexical errors occured in verb. The identification table shows that third person singular –s (omission) was the indicator found in verb morphological errors. Along with present third person singular (he/she/it) in affirmative simple present  tense sentences, morpheme -s or -es is able to be used to verb. Nevertheless, the morpheme -s or -es is not linked to the verb with the other pronouns (I/you). In this study, the researcher discovered that the students often omitted –s or -es as like they expressed third singular pronoun subject (he/she/it) in affirmative or positive simple present tense, for example:

(11)  "I make sure I have qualifications as your company need.*
I've good motivation, I can work together with the team,
my communication skill is really good, and my English is
excellent both in written and spoken form." [S.25]

(12)  "I believe that position fit* with speciality form my
education background as Business Management." [S.25]

The researcher found three cases in the omission of third person singular –s where the students ignored adding -s/-es in their sentences. The correct sentences should therefore be:

(13)  "I make sure I have qualifications as your company
**needs**. I've good motivation, I can work together with the

team, my communication skill is really good, and my
English is excellent both in written and spoken form."
[S.25]

(14) "I believe that position **fits** with speciality form my
education background as Business Management." [S.25]

The students should add morpheme –s  to the verb sit and ask in those
sentences, but they forgot to do it. The students shared a problem in using
morpheme –s to the third person singular considering there is no distinction
between verb 1 for third person or pronoun in Indonesian language. Here, the word
"fit" should be "fits," and "need" should be "needs."

*The Most Dominant of Morphological Errors Found in Students' English
Composition of Application Letter*

Based on the data that the researcher has obtained, there were two main
morphological errors made by students. Noun morphological errors were 66
(97.06% ), and verb morphological errors were 2 (2.94%). This means the most
dominant errors made by students were noun morphological errors, and the least
errors fell on verb morphological errors in general.

1. Noun Morphological Errors

    It was figured out that 97.06% of morphological errors were known as
    noun morphological errors, which means this type was the most problematic
    morphological errors on nouns. There was one noun morphological errors
    indicator found in students' composition: noun plural –s. It was found that 66
    (97.06%) errors in noun morphology were plural -s errors. In fact, there were
    three indicators of noun plural –s errors found. 57 cases for omission (83.82%),
    8 cases for addition (11.76%), and 1 case for misselection (1.47%).   For
    examples: (1) Omission of noun plural –s *(My past work experience\*. have
    shown that I'm able to full the qualification my previous job is staff in one of
    financial firm\* along two years [S.95])*  (2) Addition of noun plural –s *(Based
    on information from the PT Matosa Indonesia advertisement, there is another
    job vacancies\* at the company where you lead. [S.53]),* and (3) Misselection of
    noun plural –s *(I am graduate from Programmer Department of Yogyakarta
    State University on August this years.\* [S.7]).*

2. Verb Morphological Errors

    Morphological errors containing verb morphological errors were 2 or
    2.94%. Identified sentences showed that there was one indicator reported in verb
    morphological errors: present third person singular –s. In present third person
    singular –s errors, the researcher has found 2 cases or 2.94%. It only occured in
    omission of noun plural –s. For examples: *I make sure I have qualifications as
    your company need.\* I've good motivation, I can work together with the team,
    my communication skill is really good, and my English is excellent both in
    written and spoken form. [S.25].*

*Sources of Errors Found in Students' English Composition of Application Letter*

There are five sources of error in second language acquisition according to
Keshavarz (2012: 120-129). They are interlingual errors, intralingual errors &

developmental errors, teacher-induced errors, and language learning strategies. In compliance with the data, the researcher identified that there are only two sources of errors found in students' composition: interlingual errors and intralingual errors & developmental errors.

1. Interlingual Errors

Students made interlingual errors in their effort to express English by depending on their source language system as they are not familiarized to the target language system (Keshavarz, 2012). The types of interlingual errors were divided into transfer of phonological elements, transfer of morphological elements, transfer of grammatical elements, transfer of lexico sematic elements, and transfer of sylistic and cultural elements. Among the other types of interlingual errors, transfer of morphological error is the only type that occurred in interlingual errors.

In this research, the data indicated that the students used transfer of morphological error to omit suffixes after nouns in plural & possesive form, and omitt suffixes after verbs in the present third singular person present participle, & past participle. This occurs because in Indonesian language, noun is not determined with number quantifier, and possession. Moreover, verb is not determined by the number of its pronoun, and its tense. Here are some transfer of morphological errors (interlingual errors):

a. Omission of Noun Plural –s

From the data, the researcher found that students frequently have difficulties in using noun plural –s. They omitted noun plural –s from the nouns that literally needed it due to transfer of morphological error. The followings are the examples:

    (15) "I am hard working, able to work well under pressure, creative, pleasant and convenient in dealing with people and customer.*" [S.161]

    (16) "My past work experience*. have shown that I'm able to full the qualification my previous job is staff in one of financial firm* along two years." [S.95]

Here, the students had no idea to add the suffixes –s after the nouns "customer," experience," and "financial firm." It might happened due to no rule about adding the suffix –s related to the number of noun in Indonesian language.

b. Omission of Present Third Singular Person –s

Students were liable to transfer morphological errors on the use of present third singular person –s without enough attention to changing the present forms of verb in singular and plural form. They used infinitive verbs in the sentences that literally required to use present third singular person –s after the verbs because the subjects were singular. The following sentences are the examples:

    (17) "I make sure I have qualifications as your company need.* I've good motivation, I can work together with the team, my communication skill is really good, and my English is excellent both in written and spoken form." [S.25]

    (18) "I believe that position fit* with speciality form my education background as Business Management." [S.25]

The simple present tense verb "need" was simplified by omitting its suffix

–s as well as the verb "fit." Reversing to Indonesian language, it is important in the grammatical rule of English language when the third person singular subject is present, –s ending is added after verb.

2. Intralingual and Developmental Errors

In this case, the errors of students were descended from conflicting information of the target language itself (Keshavarz, 2012). Not as interlingual errors that resulted from the transfer of source or first language. Grounding on the previous theory, intralingual and developmental errors comprise six subcategories: overgeneralization, ignorance of rule restriction, false analogy, hyperextension, hypercorrection, and faulty categorization. However, there are two subcategories of student errors sources described in the following explanation.

a. Overgeneralization

Students tend to make a nonstandard structure in virtue of their understanding of other structures in English as a target language by generalizing or simplifying all grammatical forms that in fact supposed to be modified or changed, then the errors happened. It commonly included constructing nonstandard structures in place of the first language and the target language structure rules.

At this point, the reseacher found examples of overgeneralizations that have the same characteristics with transfer of morphological elements (interlingual errors) through the following data.

1) Omission of Noun Plural –s

From the data, the researcher found that students frequently have difficulties in using noun plural –s. They omitted noun plural –s from the nouns that literally needed it. The followings are the examples:

(19) "I am hard working, able to work well under pressure, creative, pleasant and convenient in dealing with people and customer.*" [S.161]

(20) "My past work experience*. have shown that I'm able to full the qualication my previous job is staff in one of financial firm* along two years." [S.95]

The use of noun "customer," "experience," and "financial" were overgeneralized by the student in transforming noun in contrary form or pattern. It is occurred on overgeneralization (plural –s) on plural noun where suffixes –s was omitted to it.

2) Omission of Present Third Singular Person –s

Students were liable to overgeneralize the use of present third singular person –s without enough paying attention to the changing of the present forms of verb in singular and plural form. They used infinitive verbs in the sentences that literally required to use present third singular person –s after the verbs because the subjects were singular. The following sentences are the examples:

(21) "I make sure I have qualifications as your company need.* I've good motivation, I can work together with the team, my communication skill is really good, and my English is excellent both in written and spoken form." [S.25]

(22) "I believe that position fit* with speciality form my education background as Business Management." [S.25]

The verbs "need" and "fit" should be changed into "needs" and "fits." The third person singular suffix -s omission after the verbs "need" and "fit" appear to have been affected by all other English endless forms of overgeneralization in English.

b.  Ignorance of Rule Restriction

According to Keshavarz (2012), ignorance of rule rescriction occurs when students fail to acknowledge the restrictions of target language existing structures. The errors created are considered from the disobedience of target language structures themselves. The following examples are found in students' writings. In this research, addition of noun plural –s and addition of present third singular –s were caused by ignorance of rule restriction. The examples are mentioned below:

1)  Addition of Noun Plural –s

In this research, the data shows that the students ignored the rule restriction in adding noun plural –s  in sentences. The data reveals that the  ignorance of rule restriction in using  noun plural –s has resulted in errors, such as in the following:

(23)  "So, I have a good computer skills* and I can communicate in English and Java." [S.7]

(24)  "Based on information from the PT Matosa Indonesia advertisement, there is another job vacancies* at the company where you lead." [S.53]

The nouns "skills" and "vacancies" should be changed into "skill" and "vacancy." The noun plural -s addition after the nouns "skill" and "vacancy" appear to fail to acknowledge the restrictions of target language existing structures.

2) Misselection of Noun Plural –s

From the data, it can be seen that the students ignored the rule restriction in supplying noun plural –s  in a sentence. The data reveals that the  ignorance of rule restriction in using noun plural –s  has resulted in errors as follows:

(25)  "I am graduate from Programmer Department of Yogyakarta State University on August this years.*" [S.7]

Also, as shown in the example, the student seems to ignore the rule of adding suffix -s for the settlement to not supply noun plural –s if nouns are preceded with a demostrative adjective (this, that, these, and those).

After analyzing students' morphological errors, the researcher counted the number of students' errors sources, and then she provided the percentage of each of them. The sources of errors found were devided into interlingual errors, and intralingual & developmental errors (overgeneralization & ignorance of rule restriction). The percentages were figured out in table 1:

**Table 1.** The percentage of Sources of Errors Found in Students' English Composition of Application Letter

| Sources of Errors | Quantity | Percentage |
|---|---|---|
| Interlingual Errors | | |
| Transfer of Phonological Elements | - | |
| Transfer of Morphological Element | 59 | 86.76% |
| Transfer of  Grammatical Elements | - | - |
| Transfer of  Lexico Semantic Elements | - | - |

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| Transfer of Stylistic and Cultural Elements | - | - |
| **Total** | **59/68** | **86.76%** |
| Intralingual and Developmental Errors | | |
| Overgeneralization | 59 | 86.76% |
| Ignorance of Rule Restriction | 9 | 13.24% |
| False Analogy | - | - |
| Hyperextention | - | - |
| Hypercorrection | - | - |
| Faulty Categorization | - | - |
| **Total** | **68/68** | **100%** |
| Teacher-Induced Errors | - | - |
| **Total** | **-** | **-** |
| Language Learning Strategies | - | - |
| **Total** | **-** | **-** |
| Teacher-Induced Errors | - | - |
| **Total** | **-** | **-** |

Based on the table above, it could be seen that the most common source of errors in students' compositions was intralingual and developmental errors (100%) devided into overgeneralization (86.76%) and ignorance of rule restriction (13.24%). Then, they were followed by interlingual errors: transfer of morphological elements (86.76%).

*Discussion*

This part attempts to discuss the position between the current analysis findings and the findings of the previous analyses. Simply, it was intended to place this current within the context of previous analyses.

The researcher's findings revealed that the most significant part of students' morphological errors (which particularly inflectional morphemes errors) in their composition of application letters fell on noun morphological errors that occurred in students' writings were: noun morphological errors counting to noun plural –s (omission, addition, & misselection). On the other side, verb morphological errors created in students' composition were present third person singular –s (omission).

The findings indicate that the students were trying to apply their awareness about grammar in concrete usage by producing errors. In compliance with the data, the researcher identified that there were only two sources of morphological errors found in students' composition. First, intralingual and developmental including overgeneralization and ignorance of rule restriction. Second, interlingual errors only occurred in transfer of morphological elements.

The researcher then compared her findings with the previous findings from Mutmainah (2019), Gayo & Widodo (2018), Imam (2015), and Ramadan (2015). Mutmainah (2019) studied the morphological errors made by students at MtsN 2 Surakarta. In inflectional morphemes errors, she found that students committed omission of past particle –ed mostly. Her finding is different compared to the recent finding related to application letter because the researcher found addition of noun plural –s as a dominant type of error. In Mutmainah's study, the errors occurred because the students did not have enough understanding about the use of past tense verb, which is one of the characteristics of recount text meanwhile, in

the recent research, students did not have enough understanding about the use of present third singular –s in present tense. The equivalence between the recent research with the research of Mutmainah lays on the fact that the students of MtsN 2 Surakarta and SMAN 1 Baso made noun morphological errors indicated by omission of noun plural –s because they were still having problems in understanding the use of noun plural –s. The researcher has faith that the students can improve to not produce any similar errors after being treated well and increase to a higher proficiency level.

In comparison with Gayo's & Widodo's finding in their study in 2018 about an analysis of morphological and syntactical errors on the English writing of Junior High School Indonesian Students at SMPN 9 Yogyakarta in writing descriptive text, the recent research has similarity in the term of overgeneralization occurrence. They found that Junior High School Indonesian students made errors because they had the creativity to make new forms of utterances. The errors were grammatically produced from the intralingual language or first language interference factor in general. In addition, the similar errors found in the current research and their research were noun morphological errors indicated by omission of noun plural –s and addition of noun plural –s.

In comparison with Imam in his study in 2015 entitled Morphological Errors in Narrative Writing of Eleventh Grade Students at Madrasah Aliyah Negeri 2 Palembang, he found that omission of past participle –ed as two of three errors which yield on students' composition. Besides, the recent study identified the similarity, yet the recent study looked at other sides which may become the cause of errors; overgeneralization (as a part of intralingual and developmental errors).

Related to the 2015 study at Al–Zaytoonah Private University of Jordan conducted by Ramadan, who studied the causes of morphological errors on the fourth year English students' essay writing which was not limited to certain types of text. The recent research did not only focus on the causes of morphological error but also focused on analyzing the types of morphological errors. Both of the study variables (the causes and the types of morphological errors) are studied equally. Ramadan conducted a specific study on the causes of morphological errors, although his study still discussed the types of morphological errors in order to identify the causes themselves. The former study showed several causes of the errors in students" essays, such as the inconsistency inherent in English itself, interference from Arabic to English, misapplication of rules, and overgeneralization. Here, overgeneralization was the same cause of errors both in the previous and the recent study.

## CONCLUSION

Based on the purposes of this research, the conclusion is presented to present the summary of research findings. First, it was revealed that there were eventually two types of morphological errors yielded by twelfth-grade students of SMAN 1 Baso in the academic year 2020/2021 in  writing application letters. The two types of morphological errors were: 1) noun morphological errors. All noun morphological errors were noun plural –s errors indicated as omission and addition 2) verb morphological errors. These included present third person singular –s (omission).

Second, this research showed that participants' most dominant type of morphological errors were noun morphological errors, which occurred in omission of noun plural –s and addition of noun plural –s. Noun indicated that participants faced difficulties of noun plural characteristic of the English words which significantly different from the first language of the agents.

Third, the researcher identified two sources of students' morphological errors, such as interlingual errors, and intralingual & developmental errors. In the compositions of students, interlingual errors language rules occured in transfer of morphological elements only. Then, for intralingual & developmental errors occured in overgeneralization and ignorance of rule restriction.

**REFERENCES**

Arikunto, S. (2006). *Prosedur Penelitian Suatu Pendekatan Praktik.* Jakarta: Rineka Cipta.

Castro, A. M. (2017). Errors and Corrective Feedback in Writing: Implications to Our Classroom Practices. *Language and Language Teaching Journal*, 20(2), 158-166.

Gay, L. R., Mills, G. E., & Airasian , P. (2012). *Educational Reseacrh Competencies for Analysis and Applications* (10th Ed.). United States: Pearson Education Inc.

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.

Groves, S. (2018). *Morphological Awareness Analysis in the Writing of Grade 3 and 5 English First and Second Language Learners*. Thesis. Canada: University of Victoria.

Imam, S. (2015).*Morphological Errors in Narrative Writing of Eleventh Grade Students at Madrasah Aliyah Negeri 2 Palembang*. Thesis. Palembang: UIN Raden Fatah.

James, C. (2013). *Errors in Language Learning and Use*. New York: Routledge

Kemendikbud RI. (2013). *Silabus Mata Pelajaran Bahasa Inggris Kelas XII.* Jakarta:Kemendikbud RI.

Keshavarz, M. H. (2012). *Contrastive analysis and error analysis*. Tehran, Iran: Rahnama Press.

Knupfer, N.N. & McLellan, H. (1996). *Research methodologies in educational communications and technology*. Kansas, KS: McLellanWyat Digital.

Munir, U.H. 2020. *An Analysis of Students' Morphological Error in the English Essay (A Study on the Eighth Grade Students of Nahdhatul Ulama Junior High School Suruh in Academic Year 2019-2020).* Thesis. Salatiga: IAIN Salatiga.

Mutmainah, E. (2019). Morphological Errors *Analysis in Writing Skill of Recount text at the Eighth Grade Students of MTs N 2 Surakarta in Academic Year 2018/2019*. Thesis. English Language Education, Cultures and Languages Faculty. IAIN Surakarta.

Rahman, A.I. 2019. Morphological Errors Analysis on Students' Synopsis Writing. *English Language in Focus (ELIF),* 1(2), 81–88.

Ramadan, S. (2015). Morphological Errors Made by Jordanian University Students. *Journal of Literature, Languages and Linguistics*, 14: 25-31.

Saputra, H.R., Dayu, T.A., & Islamiah, N. (2020). Analysis on Morphological Errors Based on Students' Writing Assignment of English Subject in the Implementation of Curriculum 2013. *Jurnal Uniska.*

Suryani, I.A. (2017). *Morphological Errors Made by the Sixth Semester Students of English and Literature Department of Adab and Humanities Faculty in Writing Short Paragraph.* Thesis. Romang Polong: Universitas Islam Negeri Allaudin Makassar.

Yakub, F., & Hossain, F.M. (2018). Morphological Error Analysis of English Written Texts Produced by The Tertiary Level Students of Bangladesh. *Research Journal of English Language and Literature (RJELAL)*, Vol. 6. No. 4, ISSN: 2395-2636.

Zaim, M. (2017). Shifting the system of Indonesian word formation; the study on morphology and sociolinguistics of acronyms, blending, and clipping. *Humanus*, 16(2), 248-262.

Zaim, M. (2019). *Morphology and Syntax.* Padang: Sukabina Press.