

Morphosyntactic analysis of PSAU BS agriculture first year students' written compositions

Rodolfo P. Dizon Jr¹, Jamayma M. Gatchalian²

Pampanga State Agricultural University, PHILIPPINES^{1,2}

¹Email: rodolfojr_dizon@psau.edu.ph

²Email: jamayma_gatchalian@psau.edu.ph

Abstract - The ability to write grammatically correct sentences in Standard American English remains a persistent concern in many academic institutions. This study aimed to analyse the morphosyntactic features of written compositions produced by randomly selected First Year BS Agriculture students enrolled in a Purposive Communication course. Using a qualitative approach grounded in corpus linguistics, the study employed morphological and syntactic analysis frameworks to evaluate students' writing. Data were collected from existing written outputs, focusing on common grammatical deviations. The syntactic analysis revealed frequent issues in the use of verb tenses, subject-verb agreement, and prepositions. These syntactic elements were found to consistently deviate from Standard American English norms. In terms of morphological features, students demonstrated recurring errors in the use of singular and plural nouns, pronouns, articles, conjunctions, and other parts of speech. Additionally, students showed difficulty distinguishing between noun phrases and adjective phrases, contributing to further confusion in sentence construction. Based on the results, the study suggests that grammar and writing support must be strengthened, especially in early college instruction. A targeted extension activity or writing workshop is recommended to address the specific syntactic and morphological issues observed. Moreover, as students in the research locale only take one English subject, the inclusion of a dedicated writing course in the General Education curriculum is proposed to enhance academic writing skills and support language development.

Keywords: morphosyntactic analysis, corpus linguistics, student writing, syntactic deviation, academic English

1. Introduction

In the 21st century, educational institutions play a pivotal role in preparing students not only for academic success but also for the demands of real-world environments. As societies become more knowledge-driven and interconnected, the traditional focus on rote memorization and passive learning is increasingly seen as inadequate. Modern education systems must evolve to develop critical 21st-century competencies such as critical thinking, communication, collaboration, creativity, and digital literacy (Trilling & Fadel, 2009). This evolution calls for the integration of teaching strategies and assessment tasks that are relevant, standards-based, localized, contextualized, and authentic. Such strategies help learners understand the practical applications of their knowledge and skills, thereby increasing their confidence and readiness to engage with complex, real-life challenges.

To meet these needs, many education systems globally have embraced curriculum reforms that focus on holistic learning outcomes. In the Philippines, the Department of Education (DepEd) implemented a significant educational reform in 2012 through the K to 12 Basic Education Program. This reform was institutionalized under Republic Act No. 10533, also known as the Enhanced Basic Education Act of 2013. It extended the basic education cycle from ten to twelve years, aiming to better equip Filipino learners with the necessary skills and knowledge to be globally competitive (Congress of the Philippines, 2013). The K



to 12 program emphasizes the development of 21st-century skills, values formation, and the integration of contextualized content, particularly in the Senior High School (SHS) level, where students can choose academic or technical-vocational-livelihood tracks based on their interests and career goals.

While the intention behind this reform is laudable, the reality on the ground presents significant challenges. According to the World Bank (2022), approximately 70% of 10-year-old children in low- and middle-income countries—including the Philippines—cannot read and understand a simple written text. This alarming statistic, which indicates a condition known as "learning poverty," reflects a deep-rooted issue within educational systems: the inability to translate curriculum content and policy reforms into meaningful learning outcomes for all learners. In the Philippine context, this is compounded by factors such as overcrowded classrooms, lack of instructional materials, undertrained teachers, and language barriers in instruction, particularly in regions with high ethnolinguistic diversity (UNESCO, 2016).

Language plays a critical role in facilitating learning, yet it also presents barriers when not aligned with learners' mother tongues or cultural identities. The Philippines is a linguistically diverse country, with over 180 languages spoken across its islands (Eberhard et al., 2021). Although the Mother Tongue-Based Multilingual Education (MTB-MLE) policy was implemented to support early-grade learners through the use of their native language as the medium of instruction, challenges in implementation have resulted in inconsistencies in its effectiveness (Dekker & Young, 2005). Students from minority language groups, in particular, continue to face difficulties in acquiring literacy skills due to limited resources and teacher training in their specific mother tongues. This exacerbates educational inequalities and negatively impacts reading comprehension and other foundational literacy skills.

Moreover, the COVID-19 pandemic further highlighted existing vulnerabilities in the Philippine education system. With school closures and the shift to remote learning modalities, students from marginalized communities suffered the most due to limited access to technology and internet connectivity (UNICEF Philippines, 2021). These issues have widened the learning gap, especially among learners with lower socio-economic backgrounds and those residing in remote areas. As education systems recover from the pandemic, there is an urgent need to implement effective, inclusive, and adaptable teaching and assessment strategies that can bridge these gaps.

One promising approach to address these varied learning needs is differentiated instruction. This method involves tailoring instruction based on students' readiness levels, learning profiles, and interests, ensuring that all students have access to meaningful learning experiences (Tomlinson, 2014). Differentiated instruction emphasizes flexibility in teaching content, process, product, and learning environment. It allows teachers to be responsive to student diversity, which is particularly critical in multilingual and multicultural classrooms in the Philippines. Research has shown that when educators implement differentiated instruction effectively, students show improved academic performance, increased motivation, and better classroom engagement (Smale-Jacobse et al., 2019).

However, for differentiated instruction to be successful, it must be informed by accurate and consistent assessments of students' current skills and learning needs. This underscores the importance of analysing students' written and oral language output—not merely for grading purposes, but as a diagnostic tool to guide instructional planning. Morphosyntactic analysis of student writing, for instance, provides valuable insights into their linguistic development and can reveal patterns influenced by factors such as mother tongue, gender, and prior exposure to formal education. These insights are especially useful in developing appropriate instructional strategies for linguistically and culturally diverse learners.

While the Philippines has made significant strides in educational reform through the K to 12 program, there remain critical challenges in achieving equitable learning outcomes. The persistent issue of learning poverty, coupled with linguistic diversity and unequal access to resources, necessitates a renewed focus on inclusive and differentiated approaches to teaching and assessment. By grounding instruction in a clear understanding of learners' morphosyntactic and linguistic profiles, educators can create more responsive and effective learning environments that cater to the diverse needs of Filipino students.

Differentiated instruction emerges as a pivotal approach in addressing diverse student needs in the classroom. This pedagogical strategy involves modifying content, process, product, or learning environment based on students' readiness levels, interests, and learning profiles (Tomlinson, 2014). By doing so, educators create inclusive learning experiences that promote engagement, equity, and academic growth. Research indicates that differentiated instruction leads to improved student motivation, deeper understanding, and better learning outcomes, especially in linguistically and culturally diverse settings (Smale-Jacobse et al., 2019). As highlighted in studies from Lund University, differentiation is essential in bridging achievement gaps and supporting varied learning trajectories (Skog, 2020).

Research indicates that linguistic diversity within classrooms can influence students' learning outcomes. A study by Dotzel et al (2021) examined the impact of linguistic diversity on students' reading comprehension, revealing that such diversity can have varying effects depending on students' backgrounds.

In the Philippine context, Leba et al. (2021) investigated students' syntactic abilities, finding that many students struggle with differentiating between noun phrases and adjective phrases, indicating a need for targeted linguistic instruction.

A growing body of research explores the morphosyntactic challenges faced by English language learners in academic writing across diverse linguistic and cultural contexts. Several studies identify recurring patterns of grammatical errors, including misuse of determiners, subject-verb agreement, and tense consistency. These issues often stem from negative language transfer, insufficient grammatical instruction, and learners' overgeneralization of rules (Hijjo, 2013; Shahid et al., 2023).

Researchers have adopted both qualitative and quantitative approaches, such as error analysis, contrastive analysis, and corpus-based methods, to assess learner compositions. While some studies focus on secondary school contexts and examine L1 influence on English writing (Hijjo, 2013; Silalahi & Rakasiwi, 2022), others emphasize tertiary-level or advanced learners, highlighting that even students with higher proficiency levels struggle with morphosyntactic precision (Mogilevski & Burston, 1999; Mercado, 2025).

Cross-linguistic studies further reveal the impact of native language structures on the acquisition of English morphology and syntax. This is particularly evident in comparative analyses involving learners from Urdu, Malay, and French language backgrounds, where grammatical structures in the L1 either facilitate or hinder the development of accurate written English (Shahid et al., 2023; Kusumawardhani, 2015; Mogilevski & Burston, 1999).

The article offers a compelling examination of morphological transformation within the Javanese language, specifically focusing on how numerical phrases are converted into verbs (Somawati et al., 2024). The study utilizes qualitative methods grounded in descriptive linguistics, which provide a foundational understanding of this relatively underexplored phenomenon. However, while the research identifies and classifies verb formations derived from numerical phrases using the prefix *N-*, it tends to overlook the sociolinguistic implications of such transformations in everyday communication. Furthermore, the article could benefit from a comparative analysis with other Austronesian languages to highlight whether this morphological pattern is unique to Javanese or part of a broader typological trend. The data sources, largely derived from oral and written texts, lack detailed contextualization, which limits the ability to assess pragmatic usage and frequency. Although the study is methodologically sound in presenting morphological patterns, a deeper theoretical engagement with morphological typology or cognitive linguistics might have enriched the analysis. Overall, the article makes a significant contribution to Javanese linguistics, yet future research should aim to expand the scope by incorporating cross-linguistic perspectives and sociocultural variables to provide a more comprehensive understanding of the phenomenon (Somawati et al., 2024).

Despite their varied contexts, these studies converge on the conclusion that morphosyntactic competence remains a persistent hurdle in L2 writing. Many emphasize the need for more explicit grammar instruction and integration of error-based feedback in writing pedagogy (Padilla & Padilla, 2021; Jawad, 2019). Moreover, research increasingly points to the pedagogical value of using learner corpora and targeted interventions to improve grammatical accuracy (Cusangua García et al., 2025).

In sum, these works collectively underline the importance of context-sensitive instruction, informed error analysis, and continual assessment to address learners' morphosyntactic challenges in writing (Hijjo, 2013; Mogilevski & Burston, 1999; Padilla & Padilla, 2021; Silalahi & Rakasiwi, 2022; Shahid et al., 2023; Kusumawardhani, 2015; Cusangua García et al., 2025; Jawad, 2019; Mercado, 2025).

Building upon these insights, the current study aims to analyze the morphosyntactic features of students' written compositions, focusing on how ethnolinguistic and gender identities may influence these features. The study seeks to answer the following research questions: (1) What are the common morphosyntactic features observed in the students' written compositions? (2) How do ethnolinguistic and gender identities influence these morphosyntactic features? (3) What differentiated instructional strategies can be developed to address the identified linguistic needs?

2. Method

2.1 Participants/Corpus

English written compositions of the PSAU BSA first year students were analyzed. The already available corpora were collected from the College of Arts and Sciences English faculty handling BSA first year students taking GE Purposive Communication. Currently, the school has seven sections with an average of 30 students per class. With that, 5 students' written compositions per section were randomly



selected having a total of 40. According to Creswell (2007), a qualitative research may have five to 25 participants. Moreover, the researchers considered data saturation in the analysis in order to determine when to stop the process.

2.2 Ethical Consideration

After the selection of corpus, a written consent was provided to ensure utmost confidentiality of the data gathering and analysis. The study ensured that no potential conflict of interest that may occur in the collection of corpora as these are GE PC course requirements.

In the collection of corpora and in all the course of the research, the participants' dignity, rights, and safety were given utmost importance. In the event that there is a feeling of discomfort and discrimination, they may pull out their written compositions as subjects for the morphosyntactic analysis.

Moreover, a statement was provided in the consent form stating that participants' dignity, rights, safety, and wellbeing will not be affected by the specific activity. The data analysis shows compliance with the Gender and Development parameter and/or policy as gender biases in any forms (language, selection of participants, etc.) are fully eliminated. Everyone, regardless of gender, is given an equal opportunity to participate.

2.3 Data Analysis

In the morphological analysis, the word formation processes of Yule (2010) as cited by Indrian (2022) was utilized. By following this framework, the researchers investigated the utilization of the following processes: borrowing, coinage, compounding, blending, clipping, back formation, conversion, acronym, derivation, and multiple processes. Moreover, the researchers will look at the addition, omission, misinformation of morphemes.

In conducting syntactic analysis, researchers often follow a systematic framework to ensure clarity and consistency in their examination of sentence structures. Based on Morley (2006), this process begins with Segmentation I, where clause and word boundaries are identified, followed by Classification I, which involves determining the parts of speech for each word. Next, Segmentation II focuses on identifying the syntactic constituents, while Classification II assigns syntactic categories to these constituents. Researchers then determine each constituent's grammatical function (subject, object, etc.), and finally, they draw the overall syntactic structure. Such methodologies are crucial in syntactic research and language learning contexts (Radford, 2009; Carnie, 2013).

3. Results and Discussion

3.1 Results Data analysis and results

For the data gathering, the participants were asked to write a paragraph about the Principles of Ethical Communication and expound one by giving an example. These data were analysed morphologically and syntactically. Through the analysis, the following types of errors were identified.

The analysis of syntactic deviations in the compositions of 40 students reveals significant patterns that underscore challenges in mastering Standard American English grammar. These patterns, predominantly involving run-on sentences, subject-verb agreement errors, and verb tense inconsistencies, highlight areas requiring targeted instructional interventions.

Run-on sentences emerge as the most frequent syntactic error, identified in the writings of 26 out of 40 students (65%). This issue involves the improper joining of two or more independent clauses without appropriate punctuation or conjunctions, leading to sentences that are grammatically incorrect and often confusing. For instance, a student might write, "I love to read I often go to the library," which lacks the necessary punctuation to separate the two independent clauses.

The high occurrence of run-on sentences suggests a need for explicit instruction on sentence boundaries and the use of coordinating conjunctions and punctuation marks. Educators should emphasize the importance of recognizing independent clauses and the methods to correctly join them, such as using semicolons, periods, or conjunctions.

Subject-verb agreement errors are present in the writings of 15 students (37.5%). These errors occur when the verb form does not correspond correctly with the subject in number and person. For example, a student might write, "The group of students are late," instead of the correct form, "The group of students is late".

Such errors indicate a misunderstanding of grammatical rules governing subject-verb agreement, particularly in complex sentences with collective nouns or intervening phrases. Instruction should focus on reinforcing these rules through practice exercises that highlight common pitfalls and exceptions.

Verb tense inconsistencies are noted in the writings of 5 students (12.5%). These errors involve the improper shifting of verb tenses within a sentence or paragraph, disrupting the temporal coherence of

the text. An example includes, "He studies hard and passed the exam," which incorrectly combines present and past tenses .

To address this issue, educators should provide lessons on maintaining consistent verb tenses, using timelines and context-based activities to help students understand the appropriate use of tenses in conveying time relationships.

Comma splices and sentence fragments are also prevalent, with comma splices identified in 5 students' writings and sentence fragments in 3. A comma splice occurs when two independent clauses are joined solely by a comma without a coordinating conjunction, such as, "The death rate decreased, the health care system improved," which should be corrected to include a conjunction or appropriate punctuation . Sentence fragments, on the other hand, are incomplete sentences that lack a subject or verb, leading to unclear expressions. For example, "When the report was delivered," is a fragment that requires completion to form a complete thought .

These errors highlight the necessity for instruction on sentence structure, emphasizing the components of complete sentences and the correct use of punctuation to join clauses.

Additional syntactic issues include pronoun-antecedent agreement errors, noted in 2 students, and problems with parallelism and wordiness, each identified in 1 student. Pronoun-antecedent agreement errors involve mismatches in number or gender between pronouns and their antecedents, leading to confusion. For instance, using "they" to refer to a singular noun like "student" is incorrect.

Parallelism errors disrupt the balance of sentence structures, as in, "She likes reading, to swim, and biking," which should maintain consistent grammatical forms. Wordiness involves the use of unnecessary words that obscure the intended message, requiring instruction on concise writing.

The prevalence of these syntactic errors underscores the need for comprehensive grammar instruction that addresses the specific challenges faced by students. Educators should implement targeted teaching strategies, including:

- Focused Grammar Lessons: Providing explicit instruction on sentence structure, subject-verb agreement, verb tenses, and punctuation.
- Writing Workshops: Engaging students in peer review and editing sessions to identify and correct syntactic errors collaboratively.
- Practice Exercises: Utilizing exercises that reinforce grammar rules and encourage the application of correct structures in writing.
- Use of Writing Tools: Incorporating grammar-checking software to provide immediate feedback and reinforce learning.

The analysis of student writings reveals a pattern of syntactic errors that impede effective communication. Addressing these issues through targeted instruction and practice is essential for improving students' writing proficiency. By focusing on the identified areas of difficulty, educators can enhance students' understanding and application of Standard American English grammar, leading to clearer and more effective written communication.

The table below shows the summary of the morphosyntactic features present in the written compositions:

Table 1. Common Grammatical Deviations from Standard American English in Student Writing

	Features that Deviate from the Standard American English
Student 1	run-on sentences, subject-verb agreement
Student 2	run-on sentences, verb tenses
Student 3	run-on sentences, subject-verb agreement, sentence fragment
Student 4	comma splice, run-on sentences
Student 5	Wordiness
Student 6	run-on sentence
Student 7	pronoun antecedent agreement
Student 8	subject-verb agreement



Student 9	run-on sentence
Student 10	subject-verb agreement
Student 11	verb tense, misuse of coordinating conjunctions
Student 12	subject-verb agreement
Student 13	None
Student 14	run-on sentence subject-verb agreement
Student 15	run-on sentence, comma splice
Student 16	run-on sentence
Student 17	None
Student 18	subject- verb agreement
Student 19	comma splice, run-on sentence
Student 20	run-on sentence
Student 21	sentence-fragment
Student 22	run-on sentence
Student 23	sentence fragment, run-on sentence
Student 24	run-on sentence
Student 25	None
Student 26	run-on sentence
Student 27	run-on sentence
Student 28	None
Student 29	verb tense, subject-verb agreement, run-on sentence
Student 30	subject-verb agreement
Student 31	Parallelism, run-on sentence, subject-verb agreement
Student 32	unity of verb tenses, pronoun antecedent agreement, subject-verb agreement
Student 33	subject-verb agreement, run-on sentence, unity of verb tenses
Student 34	subject-verb agreement, run-on sentence, unity of verb tenses
Student 35	run-on sentence, unity of verb tenses
Student 36	run-on sentence, number of nouns
Student 37	run-on sentence
Student 38	subject-verb agreement, comma splice

Student 39	None
Student 40	None

As presented in Table 1, no major morphological errors were identified in the students' written compositions, indicating a general understanding of English word formation and basic lexical structure. Morphological competence, which involves the ability to manipulate word parts such as prefixes, suffixes, and root words, appears to be relatively well-developed among the cohort. This suggests that students have internalized the morphological rules governing the construction of nouns, verbs, adjectives, and adverbs, allowing them to form coherent and contextually appropriate words. Morphological accuracy is often the result of early instruction in vocabulary and spelling, and its relative absence in the error profile may reflect the effectiveness of foundational language instruction at earlier educational stages (Bauer et al., 2013).

In contrast, syntactic deviations were widespread and significantly more problematic. The most frequently recurring syntactic issues included **subject-verb agreement errors**, **run-on sentences**, and **verb tense inconsistencies**. These findings align closely with those of Somathasan (2024), who concluded that run-on sentences are among the most frequent and disruptive grammatical mistakes in ESL and EFL student writing. A run-on sentence, also known as a fused sentence, occurs when two or more independent clauses are joined without appropriate punctuation or conjunctions. This error undermines the clarity of the message, leading to confusion and cognitive overload for readers. For instance, a sentence such as "*She studied hard she passed the exam*" fails to signal the relationship between the two clauses, requiring readers to infer meaning where structure should provide guidance.

Subject-verb agreement errors also featured prominently in the dataset. These occur when the verb does not match the subject in number or person, such as "*He go to school every day*" instead of the grammatically correct "*He goes to school every day.*" This type of syntactic deviation is particularly challenging for learners whose first languages do not mark verb agreement morphologically (Celce-Murcia & Larsen-Freeman, 1999). Such errors can reduce the perceived fluency and proficiency of student writing, making even well-organized ideas appear linguistically immature.

Verb tense inconsistency was another recurrent issue. Students often shifted tenses unnecessarily within sentences or paragraphs, disrupting temporal coherence. For example, a student might write, "*Yesterday I go to the library and studied for the exam.*" improperly mixing present and past tenses. Tense shifting confuses the timeline of events and suggests a weak grasp of how grammatical tense functions to represent time in discourse. In academic writing, maintaining consistent verb tense is essential for establishing clarity, logic, and cohesion (Ferris et al., 2005).

These syntactic errors collectively impede not only the grammatical correctness of writing but also its rhetorical effectiveness. Poor sentence structure and inconsistent tense usage obscure meaning and weaken arguments, thereby undermining academic writing performance. As Hyland (2019) emphasizes, writing is not merely a matter of language accuracy but also a tool for constructing meaning, engaging audiences, and building disciplinary identity.

Addressing these persistent syntactic problems requires more than rote memorization or traditional grammar drills, which tend to isolate language forms from real-world contexts. Instead, educators are encouraged to adopt **contextualized grammar instruction**, where grammatical features are taught within the framework of meaningful texts and tasks. Contextualized instruction enables students to see the functional purposes of grammar and how it serves rhetorical and communicative goals (Ellis, 2006). For example, teaching subject-verb agreement through reading and writing tasks related to descriptive or argumentative essays can enhance learners' understanding of how agreement contributes to clarity and formality in academic prose.

Another effective pedagogical approach is the use of **sentence-combining exercises**, in which students learn to integrate shorter sentences into more complex, grammatically accurate constructions. Research shows that this method helps learners internalize syntactic patterns and fosters the development of writing fluency (Saddler & Graham, 2005). Sentence combining activities promote a deeper awareness of syntactic relationships, encourage experimentation with different sentence structures, and help mitigate issues such as run-ons and fragments.

Additionally, **digital writing tools** like Grammarly, ProWritingAid, or Microsoft Editor can play a supportive role in real-time error correction. These tools provide immediate feedback on grammar, punctuation, and style, allowing students to identify and correct their errors autonomously. While such tools are not substitutes for instruction, they offer valuable scaffolding for students during the revision process and support the development of metalinguistic awareness (Li et al., 2015).



Moreover, **peer review sessions** can be integrated into writing classrooms to create opportunities for collaborative grammar correction. When students review one another's work, they not only learn to spot errors but also reinforce their own understanding of syntactic rules through application and discussion (Rollinson, 2005). This process also cultivates a sense of ownership and responsibility for accuracy in writing.

In conclusion, the syntactic errors identified in the students' writing—especially run-on sentences, subject-verb agreement issues, and verb tense inconsistencies—pose significant challenges to achieving academic writing competence. While morphological awareness appears adequate, syntactic competence requires continued support and instruction. Employing innovative pedagogical strategies such as contextualized grammar teaching, sentence-combining tasks, digital feedback tools, and peer collaboration can help learners internalize grammatical structures in meaningful ways. By integrating these approaches, educators can foster not only grammatical accuracy but also greater fluency, coherence, and sophistication in student writing.

4. Conclusion

Based on the findings and thorough analysis of the students' written compositions, several significant conclusions were drawn. First, the presence of **syntactical errors** was found to be consistent across the writings of most participants. These syntactical deviations included issues such as improper **use of punctuation, errors in subject-verb agreement, inconsistent use of tenses**, and challenges related to the **number and agreement of nouns and verbs**. Additionally, **sentence structure errors**, particularly **run-on sentences**, were among the most common, with students often combining multiple independent clauses without appropriate punctuation or conjunctions. This resulted in unclear and ambiguous statements that disrupted the intended meaning of the compositions. It became apparent that many of the participants lacked a firm grasp of essential grammar rules, which significantly influenced the overall clarity, cohesion, and coherence of their writing.

Secondly, the **morphosyntactic deviations** present in the students' written outputs suggest broader systemic issues within the language curriculum currently implemented in their academic institution. While students are expected to gain proficiency in English, the focus of their current curriculum appears to be centred more on **oral communication** rather than written composition. As a result, foundational skills in grammar and writing receive less instructional time and pedagogical emphasis. This imbalance may contribute to the students' inadequate mastery of syntactic and morphological rules, as evidenced in their writing tasks. Given the critical role of grammar in language development—particularly in academic writing and standardized assessments—there is an urgent need to **revisit and revise the existing curriculum**. Grammar instruction, along with structured writing activities, should be prioritized to develop students' linguistic competence more effectively.

In light of the study's findings and its acknowledged limitations, several practical and research-based **recommendations** are proposed to improve both instruction and future investigations in this area. Firstly, it is strongly recommended that **future studies target participants from Grades 7 to 10**. This age group is crucial in shaping language skills, and monitoring their performance in English subjects—specifically grammar—can yield long-term benefits. Designing and implementing a **well-structured work plan for extension activities** would support these students outside the standard classroom setup. Such activities could include writing workshops, grammar review sessions, and collaborative peer-editing programs. These initiatives should be tailored to the specific syntactical and morphological challenges identified in this study, thereby ensuring relevance and immediate applicability.

Moreover, in the locale of the current study, students are only enrolled in **one English subject**, making it difficult for teachers and researchers alike to monitor their **language learning progression** effectively. The limited exposure to grammar and writing instruction may explain the widespread occurrence of syntactic and morphosyntactic errors. To overcome this challenge, schools may consider introducing **supplementary grammar modules or electives** that cater to students struggling with language use. Additionally, the administration should advocate for a **more integrated approach to language instruction**, where grammar and writing are not treated as separate or secondary to communication skills, but rather as essential components of communicative competence.

Another recommendation concerns the **nature and scope of data collection**. In this study, the corpus of written texts was gathered from a **single writing activity**, limiting the depth and breadth of analysis. To generate more reliable, valid, and generalizable data, it is essential that future studies **collect compositions from a series of writing activities** administered over a longer period. This longitudinal approach would allow researchers to observe patterns in error types, the progression of grammatical

understanding, and the effects of any interventions that may be introduced. It would also enable educators to track the efficacy of different teaching strategies over time.

Furthermore, it is recommended that this line of research be **expanded and replicated across various academic levels and institutions**, including **colleges and universities**. By widening the scope, researchers can investigate whether morphosyntactic errors persist as students advance in their academic careers or if these errors are mitigated through further education and exposure. Comparative studies between secondary and tertiary level students may reveal trends in grammar instruction effectiveness and provide insights into how early interventions can influence long-term academic writing development.

In conclusion, this study has shed light on the **prevalence of syntactic and morphosyntactic errors** in student compositions and underscored the need for curriculum reforms, more robust writing instruction, and continued research. While the students demonstrated some ability to compose written texts, their lack of grammatical precision highlights significant instructional gaps. Addressing these concerns through targeted interventions, improved curriculum design, and expanded research efforts will be essential in enhancing students' English writing skills and overall academic performance.

References

- Bauer, L., Lieber, R., & Plag, I. (2013). *The Oxford reference guide to English morphology*. Oxford University Press.
- Carnie, A. (2013). *Syntax: A Generative Introduction* (3rd ed.). Wiley-Blackwell.
- Celce-Murcia, M., & Larsen-Freeman, D. (1999). *The grammar book: An ESL/EFL teacher's course* (2nd ed.). Heinle & Heinle.
- Congress of the Philippines. (2013). *Republic Act No. 10533: Enhanced Basic Education Act of 2013*. <https://pqf.gov.ph/Uploads/Legal%20Basis/RA%2010533%20Enhanced%20Basic%20Education.pdf>
- Creswell, John W. (2007). Qualitative Inquiry and Research Design: Choosing Among Five Approaches. Sage Publications, Inc. <https://revistapsicologia.org/public/formato/cuali2.pdf>
- Cusangua García, G., Sangucho Lugmaña, X., & Tovar Viera, V. (2025). Morphosyntactic Interference in EFL Written Compositions. *Knowledge Pole*, 10 (2), 383-406. doi: <https://doi.org/10.23857/pc.v10i2.8880>.
- Dekker, D., & Young, C. (2005). Bridging the gap: The development of appropriate educational strategies for minority language communities in the Philippines. *Current Issues in Language Planning*, 6(2), 182-199. <https://doi.org/10.1080/14664200508668280>
- Dotzel, S., Bonefeld, M., & Karst, K. (2021). The impact of linguistic diversity on students' reading comprehension using different diversity measures and its differential effects depending on students' migration background. *International Journal of Educational Research*, 109, 101796.
- Eberhard, D. M., Simons, G. F., & Fennig, C. D. (Eds.). (2021). *Ethnologue: Languages of the world* (24th ed.). SIL International. <https://www.ethnologue.com>
- Ellis, Matt. (2022). What is Syntax? Learn the Meaning and Rules, With Examples. <https://www.grammarly.com/blog/syntax/>
- Ellis, R. (2006). Current issues in the teaching of grammar: An SLA perspective. *TESOL Quarterly*, 40(1), 83-107. <https://doi.org/10.2307/40264512>
- Ferris, G. R., Treadway, D. C., Kolodinsky, R. W., Hochwarter, W. A., Kacmar, C. J., Douglas, C., & Frink, D. D. (2005). Development and Validation of the Political Skill Inventory. *Journal of Management*, 31(1), 126-152. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0149206304271386> (Original work published 2005)
- Hijjo, Nael. (2013). A Morphosyntactic Analysis on Malaysian Secondary School Students' Essay Writing in English Class. *International Journal of Humanities and Social Science*, 3.
- Hyland, K. (2019). *Second language writing* (2nd ed.). Cambridge University Press.
- Indriani, RD. (2022). A Morphological Analysis of Word Formation Process Used in Mobile Application Names. *Indonesian Journal of English Language Studies*. <https://doi.org/10.24071/ijels.v8i2.3692>
- Jawad, MR. (2019). A Morphosyntactic study of Iraqi EFL college students' written essays: A corpus based analysis. *Int J Appl Res*;5(12S):145-151.
- Kusumawardhani, Paramita. (2015). "The Analysis of Morphology in Writing an English Narrative Composition." *Jurnal Khatulistiwa Informatika*, vol. 7, no. 1, Mar. 2015, pp. 32-40, doi:[10.31294/w.v7i1.765](https://doi.org/10.31294/w.v7i1.765).
- Shahid, M. A., Syed, T. H., Syed, A. F., Shahbaz, K., & Ahmad, F. (2023). Morphosyntactic analysis: A study of English and Urdu determinatives. *American Journal of Humanities and Social Sciences Research (AJHSSR)*, 5(9), 78-85. Retrieved from <http://www.ajhssr.com>
- Leba, S. M. R., Uspayanti, R., Butarbutar, R., & Bawawa, M. (2021). Syntactical analysis of students' writing paper. *Proceedings of the 4th International Conference on Language, Literature, Culture, and Education (ICOLLITE 2021)*, 630, 370-374. <https://doi.org/10.2991/assehr.k.211130.077>
- Li, Z., Link, S., & Hegelheimer, V. (2015). Rethinking the use of automated writing evaluation in L2 writing classrooms: A longitudinal study. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 28, 45-57. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jslw.2015.02.005>



- Mercado J.G. (2025) Morphological Analysis on the Level of Vocabulary Production of L2 Learners in Their Composition Writing, *International Journal of English Language and Linguistics Research*, 13 (1), 12-24
- Mogilevski, Eugene & Burston, Jack. (1999). Morphosyntactic Accuracy in the written compositions of advanced university level students of French. *Australian Review of Applied Linguistics*. 22. 61-80. 10.1075/aral.22.1.03mog.
- Morley, G. D. (2006). *Syntax in Functional Grammar: An Introduction to Lexicogrammar in Systemic Linguistics*. Continuum.
- Morley, L. (2006). Hidden transcripts: The micropolitics of gender in Commonwealth universities. *Women's Studies International Forum*, 29, 543-551. doi:10.1016/j.wsif.2006.10.007.
- Pablo and Lasaten. (2018). Writing Difficulties and Quality of Academic Essays of Senior High School Students. *Asia Pacific Journal of Multidisciplinary Research*. <https://www.apjmr.com/wp-content/uploads/2018/08/APJMR-2018-6-4.06.pdf>
- Padilla, J. E., & Padilla, C. A. (2021). Morpho-syntactic error analysis in written compositions of MTB-MLE policy students. *International Journal of Social Sciences & Educational Studies*, 8(2), 39-52. DOI:10.23918/ijsses.v8i2p39
- Radford, A. (2009). *Analyzing English Sentences: A Minimalist Approach*. Cambridge University Press.
- Republic Act No. 10533. (2013). Enhanced Basic Education Act of 2013. <https://pqf.gov.ph/Uploads/Legal%20Basis/RA%2010533%20Enhanced%20Basic%20Education.pdf>
- Rollinson, P. (2005). Using peer feedback in the ESL writing class. *ELT Journal*, 59(1), 23–30. <https://doi.org/10.1093/elt/cci003>
- Saddler, B., & Graham, S. (2005). The effects of peer-assisted sentence-combining instruction on the writing performance of more and less skilled young writers. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, 97(1), 43–54. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-0663.97.1.43>
- Schmid, Hans-Jorg. (2015). An introduction and survey of (mainly English) morphology addressing students in early stages. https://www.academia.edu/15970077/Morphology?fbclid=IwAR0KppItC6Jyfu6he_hpsO4bsEIVYvviY0vpY4vbx9zJq1gdzXM1HhpKnzo
- Silalahi, M. M. R., & Rakasiwi, S. (2022). A Morphosyntactic Analysis on Narrative Writing of the Fresh Year Students's of Management Informatics AMIK MEDICOM: Morphosyntactic Analysis. *Journal of Classroom Action Research*, 1(2), 29–42. <https://doi.org/10.52622/jcar.v1i2.90>
- Skog, M. (2020). *Differentiated instruction in practice: Teachers' perspectives on meeting diverse learners' needs*. Lund University Publications. <https://lup.lub.lu.se>
- Smale-Jacobse, A. E., Meijer, A., Helms-Lorenz, M., & Maulana, R. (2019). Differentiated instruction in secondary education: A systematic review of research evidence. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 10, 2366. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2019.02366>
- Somawati, N. P., Wajdi, M., Susanto, B., Claridad, N., Mohammed, L., & Udoudom, U. I. (2024). Morphological transformation of numerical phrases into verbs in the Javanese language. *Journal of Language, Literature, Social and Cultural Studies*, 2(3), 186–196. <https://doi.org/10.58881/jllscs.v2i3.125>
- Somathasan, L. (2024). Common syntactic errors in the writing of ESL learners: A Sri Lankan case study. *International Journal of Language and Education Studies*, 12(1), 33–47.
- Somathasan, M. (2024). An innovative remedy for healing run-on sentences in English https://www.researchgate.net/publication/384449351_AN_INNOVATIVE_REMEDY_FOR_HEALING_RUN-ON_SENTENCES_IN_ENGLISH
- Sy, E. N. S., & Reztia, D. A. (2019). A syntactical analysis of simple sentences in *Kembang Babur*. *Journal of English Education and Applied Linguistics*, 8(2), 123–134. <http://dx.doi.org/10.24127/pj.v8i2.2112>
- Tomlinson, C. A. (2014). *The differentiated classroom: Responding to the needs of all learners* (2nd ed.). ASCD.
- Trilling, B., & Fadel, C. (2009). *21st century skills: Learning for life in our times*. Jossey-Bass.
- UNESCO. (2016). *If you don't understand, how can you learn?* Global Education Monitoring Report. <https://unesdoc.unesco.org/ark:/48223/pf0000243713>
- UNICEF Philippines. (2021). *Reimagining education in the Philippines: A crisis and an opportunity*. <https://www.unicef.org/philippines/reports/education-covid19>
- World Bank. (2022, June 23). 70% of 10-year-olds now in learning poverty, unable to read and understand a simple text. <https://www.worldbank.org/en/news/press-release/2022/06/23/70-of-10-year-olds-now-in-learning-poverty-unable-to-read-and-understand-a-simple-text>