

MORPHOLOGICAL AND SYNTACTIC ERROR ANALYSIS AS A BASIS FOR DEVELOPING INDONESIAN LANGUAGE LEARNING STRATEGIES WITHIN A PEDAGOGY-DRIVEN FRAMEWORK

Nadia Eka Putri Indriani¹⁾, Syahrul Ramadhan²⁾, Yuli Tiarina³⁾

^{1, 2, 3}Universitas Negeri Padang

Jln. Prof. Dr. Hamka, Air Tawar, Padang, Sumatera Barat, 25171, Indonesia

¹E-mail: nadiaekaputri@student.unp.ac.id

²E-mail: syahrul_r@fbs.unp.ac.id

³E-mail: yuli.tiarina@fbs.unp.ac.id

Abstrak

Kesalahan penggunaan bahasa masih sering ditemukan dalam tulisan siswa, terutama pada teks eksplanasi yang menuntut ketepatan kata dan kejelasan kalimat. Masalah ini menunjukkan bahwa siswa tidak hanya perlu memahami isi teks, tetapi juga perlu mampu menggunakan bahasa Indonesia secara formal dan efektif. Penelitian ini bertujuan menganalisis kesalahan morfologis dan sintaksis dalam teks eksplanasi siswa kelas XI MAN 2 Padang serta merumuskan arah strategi pembelajaran yang sesuai dengan kebutuhan siswa. Penelitian ini menggunakan pendekatan kualitatif deskriptif dengan desain analisis kesalahan. Data dikumpulkan melalui tugas menulis teks eksplanasi, kemudian dianalisis melalui tahap identifikasi, klasifikasi, dan interpretasi kesalahan. Hasil penelitian menunjukkan bahwa setiap teks mengandung rata-rata 7–9 kesalahan. Kesalahan yang paling banyak ditemukan meliputi penggunaan kata tidak baku, singkatan informal, kesalahan afiksasi, kalimat tidak efektif, konjungsi ganda, serta pengulangan frasa atau klausa yang tidak perlu. Temuan ini menunjukkan bahwa siswa telah mampu menyusun struktur umum teks eksplanasi, tetapi masih lemah dalam menerapkan kaidah bahasa formal. Oleh karena itu, pembelajaran menulis perlu diarahkan pada latihan memperbaiki kesalahan nyata dalam tulisan siswa melalui tata bahasa pedagogis, pembelajaran berbasis kesalahan, dan revisi terbimbing. Strategi tersebut dapat membantu siswa menulis teks eksplanasi secara lebih jelas, efektif, dan sesuai dengan kaidah bahasa Indonesia.

Kata Kunci: kesalahan morfologis, kesalahan sintaksis, teks eksplanasi, tata bahasa pedagogis, analisis kesalahan

Abstract

Language errors are still frequently found in students' writing, particularly in explanatory texts that require precise word choice and clear sentence construction. This problem shows that students not only need to understand the content of the text, but also need to use Indonesian formally and effectively. This study aims to analyze morphological and syntactic errors in explanatory texts written by eleventh-grade students of MAN 2 Padang and to formulate learning strategy directions that suit students' needs. This study employed a descriptive qualitative approach with an error analysis design. Data were collected through an explanatory text writing task and were analyzed through the stages of error identification, classification, and interpretation. The results showed that each text contained an average of 7–9 errors. The most frequent errors included the use of nonstandard words, informal abbreviations, affixation errors, ineffective sentences, double conjunctions, and unnecessary repetition of phrases or clauses. These findings indicate that students were able to construct the general structure of explanatory texts, but they were still weak in applying formal language rules. Therefore, writing instruction needs to be directed toward exercises that help students correct real errors in their own writing through pedagogical grammar, error-based learning, and guided revision. These strategies can help students write explanatory texts more clearly, effectively, and in accordance with Indonesian language rules.

Keywords: morphological errors, syntactic errors, explanatory texts, pedagogical grammar, error analysis

1. INTRODUCTION

Writing proficiency is an essential skill in senior secondary education because students are expected to communicate ideas clearly, logically, and accurately in academic contexts. At this level, writing is not only a matter of expressing ideas, but also a way of showing students' ability to organize information, use formal language, and construct meaningful arguments. Therefore, students need to master both the content of the text and the linguistic rules that support effective written communication (Karim, 2023; Suwandi, 2019). In academic writing, accuracy in word choice, sentence structure, and logical connection between ideas is necessary to ensure that information can be understood properly by readers (Deane, 2020; Fang et al., 2020; Naini & Ulya, 2025; Taye & Mengesha, 2024).

One genre that requires these abilities is the explanatory text. This text aims to explain a process or phenomenon in a sequential, rational, and objective manner. Because explanatory texts present factual information, students are required to use precise word forms, effective sentences, and clear relationships between clauses. However, in classroom writing practices, many senior secondary students still experience difficulties in producing explanatory texts that meet formal language standards. Their problems are not only found in the organization of ideas, but also in micro-linguistic aspects, especially morphology and syntax (Alawiyah et al., 2025; Fakhruddin & Hassan, 2015; Gardner, 2017).

Empirical evidence from students' explanatory texts shows that errors frequently appear in the form of nonstandard words, informal abbreviations, inaccurate affixation, ineffective sentences, double conjunctions, and redundant expressions. For example, students still use forms such as *yg*, *utk*, and *dpt* in formal writing, and they also produce expressions such as "kejadian yang terjadi" and "karena itu yang menyebabkan." These errors indicate that students have not fully understood how

grammatical forms function to build clear and effective meaning in academic texts. If such errors are not addressed, students' writing may become less precise, less coherent, and less convincing as a form of scientific communication.

Morphology and syntax are important linguistic components in constructing formal written discourse. Ramlan (2005) explains that sentence meaning is built through the proper arrangement of words, phrases, clauses, and sentences. Kridalaksana (2022) also emphasizes that errors in word formation and sentence structure can disrupt the clarity and accuracy of meaning. Thus, morphological and syntactic errors should not be viewed merely as technical mistakes, but as signs of students' limited control over formal language use. In this context, error analysis becomes important because it can help teachers identify the specific forms of linguistic problems that appear in students' writing.

Writing instruction in the 21st century should not only train students to produce texts, but also guide them to revise and improve their language use based on actual errors found in their own writing. Students need learning activities that connect grammar with writing practice, so grammar is not taught as isolated rules but as a tool for improving clarity, accuracy, and coherence. This view is in line with the idea of pedagogical grammar, which places students' real language use as the basis for grammar instruction (Li & Hebert, 2024; Saptadi et al., 2025). Through this approach, students can develop greater awareness of how language works in academic texts.

Although previous studies have discussed language errors in students' writing, many of them still focus mainly on describing the types and frequency of errors. These studies have not sufficiently explained how the results of error analysis can be used as a basis for developing classroom learning strategies. This condition creates a research gap: morphological and

syntactic errors have been identified in various writing contexts, but their connection to pedagogy-based Indonesian language learning strategies remains limited. Therefore, a study that links micro-linguistic error findings with instructional strategy development is needed.

The novelty of this study lies in its attempt to use morphological and syntactic error analysis not only as a descriptive tool, but also as a foundation for designing more responsive Indonesian language learning strategies. By examining students' authentic explanatory texts, this study seeks to show how linguistic errors can become useful data for teachers in planning grammar instruction, revision activities, and error-based learning. In this way, students' mistakes are treated not only as weaknesses, but also as learning resources that can guide more contextual classroom practices.

Based on these considerations, this study aims to analyze morphological and syntactic errors found in explanatory texts written by eleventh-grade students of MAN 2 Padang and to use the findings as a basis for developing pedagogy-based Indonesian language learning strategies. The results of this study are expected to contribute to Indonesian language teaching by providing a clearer map of students' grammatical problems and offering practical directions for improving writing instruction at the senior secondary level.

LITERATURE REVIEW

Theoretical Foundation of Micro-Linguistic Errors

Writing quality is strongly influenced by students' ability to use language accurately at the word and sentence levels. In linguistic studies, these aspects are mainly related to morphology and syntax. Morphology deals with word formation, including the use of affixes, standard word forms, and derivational patterns. Syntax deals with the arrangement of words, phrases, clauses, and sentences to produce clear and

logical meaning. Ramlan (2005) explains that sentence meaning is built through the proper relationship among linguistic units, while Kridalaksana (2022) emphasizes that errors in word formation and sentence structure may reduce the clarity and accuracy of written communication. Thus, morphology and syntax provide the basic theoretical foundation for analyzing students' errors in academic writing.

In the context of explanatory texts, mastery of morphology and syntax is important because students are required to explain processes or phenomena in a clear, sequential, and objective manner. An explanatory text does not only require correct content, but also precise language forms that can support logical explanation. When students use nonstandard words, incorrect affixes, unclear phrases, or ineffective sentences, the message of the text becomes less accurate and less convincing. Therefore, micro-linguistic accuracy becomes an essential part of students' academic literacy. This view is supported by Goldman et al. (2016); Hyland & Jiang (2017); Uccelli et al. (2015) who state that academic literacy requires students to connect conceptual understanding with formal language use.

Empirical Findings on Morphological and Syntactic Errors

Previous studies have shown that morphological errors are still commonly found in students' writing. These errors include the use of nonstandard words, informal abbreviations, spelling deviations, and inaccurate affixation. Alawiyah et al. (2025) report that students often experience difficulty in using effective and standard Indonesian in written texts. Similar findings are also shown in studies on students' academic writing, where informal language habits influence the quality of formal writing. This condition indicates that students often bring daily communication habits, especially digital writing habits, into academic writing. As a result, forms such as informal abbreviations and

incorrect word formations appear in texts that should follow formal language conventions.

Syntactic errors also become a major problem in students' writing. Ahamed & Othman (2019) found that students frequently produce ineffective sentences, inappropriate conjunctions, structural imbalance, and sentences with incomplete elements. Corder (1974) views such errors as part of learners' language development, showing that students' intuitive language use has not fully matched formal grammatical rules. In Indonesian academic writing, this problem can appear in the form of double conjunctions, unclear subjects, redundant clauses, and long sentences that weaken coherence. These errors show that students may understand the topic of writing, but still have difficulty arranging ideas into effective and grammatically acceptable sentences.

The empirical studies above are important, but they need to be read together with basic linguistic theory. Recent studies help explain the current forms of students' errors, while foundational theories help explain why these errors occur at the level of word formation and sentence structure. In this study, the concepts of morphology and syntax from Ramlan (2005) and Kridalaksana (2017) are used as the theoretical basis, while recent studies are used to strengthen the empirical context of students' writing problems. This combination is necessary so that the analysis does not only describe error patterns, but also explains their linguistic and pedagogical meaning.

Pedagogical Grammar and Error-Based Instruction

The analysis of students' errors should not stop at identifying and classifying mistakes. In language learning, errors can be used as learning resources to help students understand how language works in real writing practices. This view is closely related to pedagogical grammar, which emphasizes that grammar instruction

should be connected to students' actual language use. Klingelhofer and Klingelhofer & Schleppegrell (2018) argue that grammar learning becomes more meaningful when it is linked to the analysis of students' own texts. In this way, grammar is not taught as a set of isolated rules, but as a practical tool for improving clarity, accuracy, and coherence in writing. Atar (2018) and Sifakis (2023) explain that students' errors can encourage metalinguistic awareness because students are guided to recognize, discuss, and revise their own language use. Revision activities, peer review, and teacher feedback can help students identify errors more consciously and improve their writing gradually. Li & Hebert (2024) also emphasize that reflective revision can strengthen students' ability to evaluate and improve written texts. Therefore, the connection between error analysis and pedagogical grammar is important for designing writing instruction that is more responsive to students' real needs.

Although previous studies have discussed morphological and syntactic errors in students' writing, many of them remain descriptive. They generally identify the types and frequency of errors, but do not sufficiently explain how these findings can be used to develop Indonesian language learning strategies. In addition, previous studies often separate linguistic analysis from classroom pedagogy, so the results are not always directly useful for teachers in designing writing instruction. This creates a research gap: there is still limited research that connects micro-linguistic error analysis with pedagogy-based strategies for teaching explanatory texts at the senior secondary level.

Based on this gap, the present study positions morphological and syntactic errors not only as indicators of students' weaknesses, but also as data for designing more contextual learning strategies. The main contribution of this study lies in linking error analysis with pedagogical grammar, error-based instruction, and guided revision activities. Through this

approach, students' authentic writing errors can be used as a basis for developing Indonesian language instruction that is more practical, data-driven, and relevant to classroom needs.

2. METHOD

This study employed a descriptive qualitative approach to analyze morphological and syntactic errors in students' explanatory texts. This approach was chosen because the study focused on describing, classifying, and interpreting linguistic errors found in students' authentic writing without manipulating research variables. Through this approach, the researcher was able to examine how students used word forms and sentence structures in academic writing contexts (Arikunto et al., 2017; Sugiyono, 2013).

The research design used in this study was error analysis. This design was considered appropriate because it allowed the researcher to identify the forms of errors, classify them into linguistic categories, interpret their possible causes, and relate the findings to Indonesian language learning strategies. The analysis focused on two main linguistic aspects, namely morphology and syntax, based on the frameworks of (Kridalaksana, 2017; Ramlan, 2005).

The participants of this study were 30 eleventh-grade students of MAN 2 Padang. They were selected through purposive sampling because they had studied explanatory texts in Indonesian language lessons and had relatively similar learning experiences in the same classroom context. From the 30 students' writing products, seven explanatory texts were selected for intensive analysis. The selection was based on text completeness, relevance to the assigned topic, and representation of different error patterns found in the students' writings.

The primary instrument of this study was a writing task sheet. In this task, students were asked to write an explanatory text on natural or social phenomena that were familiar to their daily

lives, such as natural disasters, environmental problems, or scientific phenomena. The text was required to contain the general structure of an explanatory text, including a general statement, a sequence of explanations, and a closing statement. Students were asked to write approximately 300–500 words within a controlled classroom session. This writing task was designed to obtain authentic data on students' ability to organize ideas and use formal Indonesian language in explanatory writing.

Supporting instruments consisted of linguistic analysis guidelines, error classification tables, and coding sheets. The linguistic analysis guidelines were used to determine the categories of morphological and syntactic errors. Morphological errors included nonstandard word forms, informal abbreviations, spelling errors, incorrect affixation, and inaccurate word formation. Syntactic errors included ineffective sentences, double conjunctions, incomplete sentence elements, lack of parallelism, phrase or clause redundancy, and unclear sentence structure.

Data collection was carried out in several stages. First, the teacher assigned students to write an explanatory text during a classroom writing activity. Second, the students' written texts were collected and documented as research data. Third, the researcher read all texts carefully to identify linguistic errors. Fourth, the errors were reduced, coded, and classified according to morphological and syntactic categories. Finally, the classified errors were interpreted to determine their pedagogical implications for Indonesian language learning.

The coding procedure followed a systematic error analysis flow. The first stage was error identification, in which the researcher marked words, phrases, clauses, or sentences that did not follow formal Indonesian language rules. The second stage was error classification, in which each error was grouped into morphological or syntactic categories. The third stage was error

calculation, in which the frequency of each error type was counted to identify dominant patterns. The fourth stage was error interpretation, in which the researcher analyzed the possible causes of the errors based on linguistic theory and classroom writing practices. The final stage was pedagogical formulation, in which the findings were used as a basis for proposing learning strategies through pedagogical grammar, error-based instruction, and guided revision.

To ensure the validity of the analysis, the error categories and coding guidelines were reviewed by experts in Indonesian language education. The researcher also conducted repeated reading and cross-checking of the data to ensure consistency in identifying and classifying errors. Reliability was strengthened through an inter-rater checking process. In this process, another rater with expertise in Indonesian linguistics independently examined selected texts and compared the coding results with the researcher's analysis. Differences in coding were discussed until agreement was reached. This procedure was conducted to reduce subjectivity and improve the credibility of the linguistic analysis.

Data were analyzed qualitatively by interpreting the forms and patterns of errors found in the students' explanatory texts. The results of the analysis were then connected to the theoretical concepts of morphology and syntax and used to formulate pedagogical implications. In this way, the study did not only describe students' linguistic errors, but also used the findings as a basis for developing Indonesian language learning strategies that are more contextual, practical, and responsive to students' writing difficulties.

3. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

This section presents the results of the analysis of morphological and syntactic errors identified in seven explanatory texts written by eleventh-grade students. The analysis focuses on

how errors at the word and sentence levels affect the clarity, coherence, and formality of students' explanatory writing. The findings are presented in five main parts: (1) an overview of the linguistic findings, (2) morphological error analysis, (3) syntactic error analysis, (4) error distribution and anomalous patterns, and (5) pedagogical implications for Indonesian language learning.

Overview of Micro-Linguistic Findings

The analysis reveals that all examined texts contain errors at two major linguistic levels: morphology and syntax. Although students were generally able to construct the macrostructure of an explanatory text, including a general statement, explanatory sequence, and closing section, their ability to use formal language accurately was still limited. This finding shows that students' understanding of text organization does not automatically guarantee their ability to produce grammatically accurate academic writing.

Quantitative findings show that each writing sample contained an average of 7 to 9 linguistic errors, consisting of 3 to 5 morphological errors and 3 to 5 syntactic errors. This pattern indicates that students tended to focus more on developing ideas than on controlling word forms and sentence structure. Their writing was generally understandable at the content level, but many sentences were still not effective, not concise, or not fully aligned with formal Indonesian language rules.

These findings are consistent with the view of Ramlan (2005) that meaning in writing is built through the proper arrangement of words, phrases, clauses, and sentences. They also support Kridalaksana's (2022) argument that errors in word formation and sentence structure can weaken clarity and precision in written communication. Therefore, the errors found in this study should not be treated merely as technical mistakes, but as indicators of students' incomplete control of formal academic language.

Morphological Error Analysis

Morphological analysis was conducted to identify inaccuracies related to word formation and the use of standard word forms in students' explanatory texts. Four recurring types of morphological errors were identified across the seven writing samples: (1) the use of informal abbreviations inappropriate for formal academic writing, (2) spelling and capitalization errors, (3) incorrect affixation or word formation, and (4) inaccurate or semantically inappropriate word forms.

The first and most frequent type of error involved the use of informal abbreviations such as *yg*, *utk*, *pd*, and *dpt*. These forms indicate that students still carried habits from digital communication into academic writing. In formal explanatory texts, such abbreviations reduce the academic quality of writing because they do not follow the norms of standard written Indonesian. In addition, several instances of numeral substitutions, such as *4 org* instead of *empat orang*, were also found. This shows that students still need explicit practice in distinguishing informal written forms from formal academic forms.

The second category consisted of spelling and capitalization errors, as seen in forms such as *longso*, *matiaya*, and *menkjulok*. These errors indicate that students had difficulty maintaining accuracy in basic word forms. From a morphological perspective, these errors show that students' control of standard morphemes is still unstable. This supports Kridalaksana's (2022) view that errors in morphemic forms may interfere with the accuracy of meaning.

The third type of error involved incorrect affixation, as seen in forms such as *terjadiya* and *di karenakan*. These errors show that students had not fully understood the difference between bound morphemes and free morphemes in Indonesian. For example, affixes should be attached according to formal word-formation rules, while prepositions should be written separately based on their grammatical function. When students confuse these forms, the accuracy of their writing is weakened.

The fourth category includes lexical redundancy or semantically inappropriate word formation, such as *longsor-longSORan*. This form creates unnecessary repetition and weakens the efficiency of meaning. In explanatory writing, students are expected to use precise and economical language because the genre requires clarity and logical explanation.

Table 1. Distribution of Morphological Errors in Students' Explanatory Texts

No	Text Code	Dominant Error Type	Error Count	Example	Notes
1	T1	Informal abbreviations	5	<i>yg, pd, dpt</i>	Influence of digital writing
2	T2	Spelling errors	1	<i>menkjulok</i> → <i>menakjubkan</i>	Incorrect standard word form
3	T3	Informal abbreviations	4	<i>yg, utk</i>	Not aligned with formal Indonesian
4	T4	Numerals in sentences	4	<i>4 org</i> → <i>empat orang</i>	Nonstandard written form
5	T5	Redundant word formation	3	<i>longsor-longSORan</i>	Lexical redundancy
6	T6	Incorrect affixation	4	<i>terjadiya</i>	Faulty word formation
7	T7	Inaccurate word choice	4	<i>tampak</i> <i>sebab</i>	Inappropriate grammatical collocation

Based on Table 1, the most frequent morphological error involved the use of informal abbreviations and digital writing forms. This finding suggests that students' writing habits are strongly influenced by everyday digital communication. However, in academic writing, students must be able to shift from informal language to formal language. The persistence of affixation and spelling errors also indicates that students' morphological competence is still intuitive and has not been fully supported by explicit knowledge of Indonesian word-formation rules.

Syntactic Error Analysis

Syntactic analysis was carried out to identify errors in constructing phrases, clauses, and sentences. These errors relate to sentence effectiveness, clarity of meaning, parallel structure, and the appropriate use of conjunctions. Five categories of syntactic errors were identified:

- (1) ineffective sentences,
- (2) phrase or clause redundancy,
- (3) lack of parallelism,

- (4) incorrect or double conjunctions, and
- (5) omission of explicit subjects.

Ineffective sentences appeared in constructions that were too long, unclear, or not logically connected. Redundant phrases and clauses were found in expressions that repeated the same meaning without adding new information. Lack of parallelism occurred when students failed to maintain the same grammatical pattern in a series of ideas. Errors involving double conjunctions or inappropriate conjunctions showed that students had difficulty building logical relationships between clauses. Finally, subject omission occurred when sentences were written without a clear subject, resulting in incomplete sentence structures.

These syntactic errors show that students' main difficulty lies in organizing ideas into clear and complete sentences. This finding is in line with Ramlan's (2005) explanation that sentence effectiveness depends on the presence of clear syntactic functions and logical relationships among sentence elements. Thus, syntactic errors affect not only grammar, but also the clarity of students' reasoning in explanatory texts.

Table 2. Distribution of Syntactic Errors in Students' Explanatory Texts

No	Text Code	Dominant Error Type	Error Count	Example	Notes
1	T1	Double conjunction	4	<i>adalah karena</i>	Predicate overlap
2	T2	Long sentences	4	Overly extended clauses	No clear clausal breaks
3	T3	Faulty parallelism	4	<i>yg menebang...</i>	Lack of structural alignment
4	T4	Implicit subject	4	Sentence without subject	Incomplete sentence structure
5	T5	Ineffective sentences	3	Missing clause markers	Ambiguous meaning
6	T6	Redundant clauses	4	<i>kejadian yang terjadi</i>	Syntactic tautology
7	T7	Incorrect punctuation	4	Two sentences joined	Missing full stop

The table shows that syntactic errors were present in all seven texts, with each text containing between three and four errors. The most frequent problems were double conjunctions, faulty parallelism, missing subjects, and redundant clauses. This indicates that students were not only struggling with word choice, but also with sentence construction and logical connection between ideas.

Overall, the analysis shows that students' sentences tended to be long, narrative, and informal in tone. This sentence pattern is less suitable for explanatory texts because this genre requires concise, precise, and logically ordered explanations. A comparison of total error frequencies shows that syntactic errors, with 28 cases, exceeded morphological errors, with 25 cases. This suggests that students' greatest

difficulty was not only selecting correct words, but arranging those words into effective and grammatically acceptable sentences.

Error Distribution and Anomalous Patterns

Two anomalous patterns were identified in the data. First, Text 2 contained only one morphological error but still displayed four syntactic errors. This shows that a student may be able to use relatively correct word forms but still experience difficulty in constructing effective sentences. In other words, morphological accuracy does not automatically lead to syntactic accuracy. Pedagogically, this finding indicates that vocabulary and word-form instruction should be accompanied by sentence-construction practice.

Second, Text 5 contained fewer syntactic errors but showed semantic redundancy, such as repeated or unnecessary expressions. This finding shows that the quality of writing cannot be measured only from the number of errors. A text with fewer structural errors may still be weak if it contains redundant or inefficient expressions. Therefore, writing assessment should consider not only grammatical correctness, but also clarity, conciseness, and effectiveness of meaning.

These anomalous patterns are important because they show that students' micro-linguistic competence develops unevenly. Some students may be stronger in word formation but weaker in sentence structure, while others may produce grammatically acceptable sentences but still lack precision and economy of expression. This supports the view that writing development is nonlinear and influenced by several factors, including reading habits, exposure to formal language, digital communication practices, and opportunities for revision.

The pedagogical implication of these anomalies is that teachers should not apply the same correction strategy to all students. Students with dominant morphological errors need explicit instruction on standard word forms, affixation,

and formal vocabulary. Students with dominant syntactic errors need practice in sentence restructuring, conjunction use, subject-predicate clarity, and paragraph revision. Meanwhile, students with redundancy problems need training in conciseness and academic style.

Instructional Implications

The findings of this study point to three key instructional implications. First, Indonesian language learning should include an error-based instructional cycle. In this cycle, students' own writing errors are used as learning materials. Teachers can present selected errors from students' texts, guide students to identify the problem, discuss the correct form, and ask students to revise their sentences. This strategy helps students understand grammar through real examples rather than through abstract rules alone.

Second, writing instruction should include systematic self-editing and peer-review activities. Students need to be trained to reread their own writing, identify nonstandard words, check sentence completeness, remove redundant expressions, and revise ineffective sentences. Peer review can also help students compare different sentence forms and develop awareness of formal language use.

Third, teachers need to develop pedagogical grammar materials based on students' authentic error data. Pedagogical grammar in this context means grammar instruction that is directly connected to students' writing problems. For example, lessons on affixation can be linked to errors such as *terjadiya* and *di karenakan*, while lessons on effective sentences can be linked to errors such as *adalah karena* and *kejadian yang terjadi*. This makes grammar learning more contextual, practical, and relevant to students' needs.

Thus, the findings of this study provide not only a description of students' morphological and syntactic errors, but also a basis for designing more adaptive Indonesian language learning

strategies. The unique contribution of this study lies in its attempt to connect error analysis with practical pedagogical strategies, especially through error-based learning, guided revision, and pedagogical grammar.

DISCUSSION

The findings of this study indicate that eleventh-grade students at MAN 2 Padang still face difficulties in applying formal Indonesian language rules in explanatory writing. Although the students were able to arrange the general structure of explanatory texts, their writing still contained errors in word formation and sentence construction. This confirms that students' understanding of text structure does not always develop in line with their grammatical accuracy. This finding is in line with previous studies which show that students often understand the topic they write about but still experience difficulties in applying formal linguistic rules consistently in academic writing (Gildore et al., 2023; Naini & Ulya, 2025).

Morphological errors found in this study include nonstandard forms, informal abbreviations, spelling deviations, inaccurate affixation, and inappropriate word formation. These errors show that students have not fully shifted from informal language habits to formal academic writing. The frequent use of forms such as *yg*, *utk*, and *pd* reflects the influence of digital writing habits on students' school writing. This result supports (Wollscheid et al., 2016), who found that students' writing practices are influenced by the use of digital devices and informal written communication. Similar findings were also reported by Alawiyah et al. (2025), who showed that students still frequently use nonstandard and ineffective language forms in written Indonesian. This finding is consistent with studies showing that informal writing practices may influence students' formal written language. However, this study extends previous findings by showing that digital-language

influence does not only appear in spelling or abbreviation, but also affects students' awareness of academic register.

Syntactic errors were also found in considerable numbers. These included ineffective sentences, double conjunctions, lack of parallelism, sentences without explicit subjects, and redundant clauses. Errors such as *pelangi adalah karena pembiasan cahaya* and *kejadian yang terjadi* indicate that students have not fully mastered the principles of effective sentences, especially clarity, economy, and logical relationship between clauses. These findings strengthen Ramlan's (2005) view that sentence meaning depends on the proper arrangement of syntactic elements. They are also consistent with Ahamed & Othman (2019), who found that students often make syntactic errors in the form of ineffective sentence construction, inappropriate conjunctions, and incomplete sentence elements. Ngangbam (2016) also reported that syntactic errors are common in students' academic writing, especially when students attempt to construct longer and more complex sentences. They also show that syntax plays an important role in shaping students' reasoning in explanatory texts.

The comparison between morphological and syntactic errors shows that syntactic errors appeared slightly more frequently than morphological errors. This means that the main challenge in students' writing lies in sentence construction rather than word formation alone. Students may know the topic they want to explain, but they still struggle to express it in clear, complete, and effective sentences. This condition supports Corder (1974) view that language errors can indicate a developmental process, in which learners' intuitive language use has not fully aligned with formal grammatical rules. Therefore, writing instruction should not only emphasize content development, but also sentence-level revision.

The anomalous patterns found in Text 2 and Text 5 provide a more specific understanding of students' writing problems. Text 2 shows that correct word forms do not always produce effective sentences, while Text 5 shows that fewer syntactic errors do not always result in better discourse quality. These findings are important because they challenge the assumption that students' writing ability can be judged only by counting errors. A deeper analysis is needed to understand the type, function, and effect of each error on the overall quality of writing. This finding adds to previous error analysis studies by showing that the quality of students' writing should be examined not only from error frequency, but also from the function and impact of errors on meaning. In this sense, students' errors need to be understood as linguistic evidence that reveals different levels of writing development.

From a pedagogical perspective, these findings suggest that teachers need to design more differentiated writing instruction. Students should not only be told that their writing is incorrect; they need to be guided to understand why the error occurs, how it affects meaning, and how it can be revised. This can be done through error-based instruction, guided revision, sentence reconstruction, and peer editing. This recommendation is supported by (Klingelhofer & Schleppegrell, 2018), who argue that grammar instruction becomes more meaningful when it is connected to students' actual texts. It is also in line with Atar (2018); Sifakis (2023), who emphasize that students' errors can be used as learning resources to develop metalinguistic awareness. By using students' own texts as learning materials, teachers can make grammar instruction more meaningful and directly connected to classroom writing practice.

Overall, this study shows that morphological and syntactic error analysis can function as a diagnostic tool for identifying students' grammatical weaknesses and as a

practical basis for improving writing instruction. Compared with previous studies that mainly described the types and frequency of language errors, this study offers a more pedagogical direction by linking error patterns with possible classroom strategies. The limitation of this study lies in the number of texts analyzed, which consisted of seven explanatory texts from one class at MAN 2 Padang. Therefore, the findings cannot be generalized to all senior secondary students. Future studies should involve a larger number of texts, different school contexts, and longitudinal analysis to examine how students' errors develop over time. Intervention studies are also needed to test the effectiveness of pedagogical grammar, guided revision, and error-based learning in reducing students' morphological and syntactic errors.

4. CONCLUSION

This study shows that eleventh-grade students at MAN 2 Padang still face difficulties in using formal Indonesian in explanatory writing. Although they were able to organize the general structure of explanatory texts, their writing still contained errors in word formation and sentence construction. The most common morphological errors included nonstandard words, informal abbreviations, spelling errors, inaccurate affixation, and inappropriate word formation. At the syntactic level, students often produced ineffective sentences, double conjunctions, incomplete sentence elements, faulty parallelism, and redundant clauses. These findings indicate that students' ability to organize ideas has developed better than their ability to use accurate and effective language.

The main contribution of this study lies in its use of students' real writing errors as a basis for improving Indonesian language learning. The findings show that error analysis can help teachers identify specific problems in students' writing and design more focused learning activities. Therefore, writing instruction should

not only ask students to produce texts, but also guide them to revise words, phrases, clauses, and sentences that are unclear or incorrect. Error-based learning, guided revision, peer review, and sentence reconstruction can be used as practical strategies to help students write more clearly, accurately, and formally.

This study is limited to seven explanatory texts written by students from one class at MAN 2 Padang. Therefore, the findings cannot be generalized to all senior secondary students. Future studies are recommended to involve more student texts, different school contexts, and longer observation periods. Further research may also test the effectiveness of learning strategies developed from this error analysis, especially strategies that train students to revise morphological and syntactic errors in their own writing.

5. REFERENCES

- Ahamed, D. F., & Othman, D. H. (2019). Analysis and assessment of lexical errors committed by Saudi EFL University students in descriptive essay writing (A Case study of College of Science & Arts-Tanumah, King Khalid University). *International Journal of English Language and Linguistics Research*, 7(6), 1–26.
- Alawiyah, T., Juniarti, R. N., Syuhada, I., Arraziq, M. E., & Mubarak, I. (2025). Optimalisasi Penggunaan Kalimat Efektif dalam Penulisan yang Sesuai Kaidah Bahasa Indonesia. *Bureaucracy Journal: Indonesia Journal of Law and Social-Political Governance*, 5(1), 132–148.
- Arikunto, S., Suhardjono, & Supardi. (2017). *Penelitian Tindakan Kelas*. Bumi Aksara.
- Atar, C. (2018). The effects of learning a second language on the first: The case of increased metalinguistic awareness. *Journal of Language and Linguistic Studies*, 14(1), 242–260.
- Corder, S. (1974). *Error Analysis and Remedial Teaching*.
- Deane, P. (2020). Building and justifying interpretations of texts: A key practice in the English language arts. *ETS Research Report Series*, 2020(1), 1–53.
- Fakhrudin, W. F. W. W., & Hassan, H. (2015). A review of genre approaches within linguistic traditions. *LSP International Journal*, 2(2).
- Fang, Z., Cao, P., & Murray, N. (2020). Language and meaning making: Register choices in seventh- and ninth-grade students' factual writing. *Linguistics and Education*, 56, 100798.
- Gardner, S. (2017). Systemic functional linguistics and genre studies. In *The Routledge handbook of systemic functional linguistics* (pp. 497–512). Routledge.
- Gildore, P. J., Uka, A. H., & Yting, J. (2023). Error analysis of academic essays of senior high school students. *Journal Corner of Education, Linguistics, and Literature*, 3(2), 141–156.
- Goldman, S. R., Britt, M. A., Brown, W., Cribb, G., George, M., Greenleaf, C., Lee, C. D., Shanahan, C., & READi, P. (2016). Disciplinary literacies and learning to read for understanding: A conceptual framework for disciplinary literacy. *Educational Psychologist*, 51(2), 219–246.
- Hyland, K., & Jiang, F. K. (2017). Is academic writing becoming more informal? *English for Specific Purposes*, 45, 40–51.
- Karim, A. R. (2023). Analisis Pentingnya Kemampuan Menulis Karya Ilmiah Pada Siswa Sma. *NUSRA: Jurnal Penelitian Dan Ilmu Pendidikan*, 4(4), 1226–1233.
- Klingelhofer, R. R., & Schleppegrell, M. (2018). Functional grammar analysis in support of dialogic instruction with text: Scaffolding purposeful, cumulative dialogue with English learners. In *Talking to learn* (pp. 70–88). Routledge.
- Kridalaksana, H. (2017). Pembentukan Kata dalam Bahasa Indonesia: Jakarta: Gramedia Pustaka Utama. *Bandung: Alfabeta*.
- Kridalaksana, H. (2022). *Perencanaan Bahasa Indonesia*. Yayasan Pustaka Obor Indonesia.
- Li, A. W., & Hebert, M. (2024). Unpacking an online peer-mediated and self-reflective revision process in second-language persuasive writing. *Reading and Writing*, 37(6), 1545–1573.
- Naini, I., & Ulya, R. H. (2025). Reasoning patterns and sentence construction errors in students' scholarly articles: A content analysis of academic writing in Padang City. *Al-Ishlah: Jurnal Pendidikan*, 17(2), 2786–2796.

- Ngangbam, H. (2016). An analysis of syntactic errors committed by students of English language class in the written composition of Mutah University: A case study. *European Journal of English Language, Linguistics and Literature*, 3(1), 1–13.
- Ramlan, M. (2005). Ilmu Bahasa Indonesia: Sintaksis (Cetakan Ke). Yogyakarta: CV. Karyono Offset Yogyakarta.
- Saptadi, N. T. S., Wardoyo, T. H., Hadikusumo, R. A., Andriani, R., Dewi, N. K., Muliawan, P., Talindong, A., Hazlinda, E., Fizriyani, W., & Nurhayati, N. (2025). *Strategi Pembelajaran Bahasa dan Sastra Indonesia*. Sada Kurnia Pustaka.
- Sifakis, N. (2023). Metacognitive and metalinguistic activities can raise ELF awareness: Why and how. *Journal of English as a Lingua Franca*, 12(1), 43–66.
- Sugiyono, D. (2013). *Metode penelitian kuantitatif, kualitatif, dan R & D*. Alfabeta, CV.
- Suwandi, S. (2019). Mereduksi Benturan Kecerdasan Dalam Pembelajaran Bahasa Indonesia Di Era Revolusi Industri 4.01. *Prosiding Seminar Nasional Fakultas Keguruan Dan Ilmu Pendidikan, 1*.
- Taye, T., & Mengesha, M. (2024). Identifying and analyzing common English writing challenges among regular undergraduate students. *Heliyon*, 10(17).
- Uccelli, P., Galloway, E. P., Barr, C. D., Meneses, A., & Dobbs, C. L. (2015). Beyond vocabulary: Exploring cross-disciplinary academic-language proficiency and its association with reading comprehension. *Reading Research Quarterly*, 50(3), 337–356.
- Wollscheid, S., Sjaastad, J., & Tømte, C. (2016). The impact of digital devices vs. Pen (cil) and paper on primary school students' writing skills—A research review. *Computers & Education*, 95, 19–35.