

An Analysis of the Written Errors of Thai EFL Students' Essay Writing in English

Bordin Waelateh¹, Yusop Boonsuk²,
Eric A. Ambele³ and Fatimah Jeharsae⁴

¹Ph.D. (Applied Educational Studies), Lecturer,

²Ph.D. (Applied Linguistics: English Language Teaching), Lecturer,

E-mail: yusop.b@psu.ac.th

³Ph.D. Candidate (Applied Linguistics), Lecturer,

⁴M.A. (English), Lecturer,

Faculty of Humanities and Social Sciences,

Prince of Songkla University

55

ปีที่ 25

ฉบับที่ 3

ก.ย.

-

ศ.ค.

2562

Abstract

A major skill in English language that Thai students underperform at, comparing to the students from neighboring countries, such as Malaysia, Indonesia, Vietnam, and Singapore is English writing. Against this background, the aim of this study is to examine the English writing errors that Thai learners commit in essay writing, as well as a discussion of their written errors taxonomy. 15 Thai undergraduate students in a university in Southern Thailand with Arabic as their first language (L1), Thai as their second language (L2), and English as their foreign language (EFL), participated in the study. Convenience

sampling was employed in participant selection. 45 essays written in English (of different genres) were collected from the students (total of 3 essays per student) throughout one semester and analyzed. The researchers identified anomalous structures of the student's essays and compared the errors with their L1 characteristics in order to identify cross-linguistic influences. An analysis of the errors was based on the morphological, lexical, syntactic and discourse categories. The findings show 33 types of written errors associated with the different analytical levels: 1) syntactic (25 categories – the most frequent); 2) lexical (4 categories); 3) morphological (2 categories); and 4) discourse (2 categories). The findings of the study are essential to English teaching practitioners in Thailand for their pedagogical implications when teaching writing to Thai EFL learners.

Keywords: English language teaching, English writing, written errors

การวิเคราะห์ข้อผิดพลาดในการเขียนเรียงความ ภาษาอังกฤษของนักศึกษาไทยที่เรียน ภาษาอังกฤษในฐานะภาษาต่างประเทศ

บดินทร์ เวลาตะ¹, ยูโสภ บัญสุข²,
Eric A. Ambele³, ฟาตีเมาะห์ เจ๊ะอาแซ⁴

¹Ph.D. (Applied Educational Studies), อาจารย์

²Ph.D. (Applied Linguistics: English Language Teaching), อาจารย์

E-mail: yusop.b@psu.ac.th

³นักศึกษาระดับปริญญาเอก (ภาษาศาสตร์ประยุกต์), อาจารย์

⁴M.A. (ภาษาอังกฤษ), อาจารย์

คณะมนุษยศาสตร์และสังคมศาสตร์ มหาวิทยาลัยสงขลานครินทร์

57

ปีที่ 25

ฉบับที่ 3

ก.ย.

-

ศ.ค.

2562

บทคัดย่อ

การเขียนภาษาอังกฤษเป็นหนึ่งในทักษะภาษาอังกฤษจากสี่ทักษะที่นักศึกษาไทยมีศักยภาพระดับค่อนข้างต่ำเมื่อเปรียบเทียบกับประเทศเพื่อนบ้าน เช่น มาเลเซีย อินโดนีเซีย เวียดนาม และสิงคโปร์ ดังนั้นงานวิจัยนี้จึงมีวัตถุประสงค์เพื่อศึกษาข้อผิดพลาดที่เกิดขึ้นจากการเขียนภาษาอังกฤษของนักศึกษาไทยและพิจารณาอนุกรมวิธานของข้อผิดพลาดเหล่านั้น กลุ่มตัวอย่างเป็นนักศึกษาไทยระดับชั้นปริญญาตรีที่กำลังศึกษาในภาคใต้จำนวน 15 คน ซึ่งใช้ภาษาอาหรับเป็นภาษาแม่ (L1) ภาษาไทยเป็นภาษาที่สอง (L2) และภาษาอังกฤษเป็นภาษาต่างประเทศ งานวิจัยนี้ใช้การ

สุ่มตัวอย่างตามความสะดวก (Convenience Sampling) โดยรวบรวมเรียงความภาษาอังกฤษของกลุ่มตัวอย่างจำนวน 45 ชิ้นงาน (กลุ่มตัวอย่างละ 3 ชิ้นงาน) ตลอดระยะเวลา 1 ภาคการศึกษา นักวิจัยได้ทำการตรวจสอบโครงสร้างที่ไม่ถูกต้องในการเขียนเรียงความภาษาอังกฤษของนักศึกษา และเพื่อที่จะระบุผลกระทบของการใช้ข้ามภาษา (Cross Linguistic Influences) ข้อผิดพลาดเหล่านั้นถูกนำมาเปรียบเทียบกับคุณลักษณะของภาษาแม่ (L1) ของกลุ่มตัวอย่างโดยผ่านการวิเคราะห์ในระดับสัณฐานวิทยา คำศัพท์ การสร้างประโยค และวาทกรรม ผลการศึกษาพบว่า นักศึกษามีข้อผิดพลาดในการเขียนเรียงความภาษาอังกฤษทั้งหมด 33 ประเภทในระดับที่ต่างกัน โดยระดับที่พบข้อผิดพลาดมากที่สุดคือระดับการสร้างประโยค โดยพบข้อผิดพลาดทั้งหมด 25 ประเภท รองลงมาได้แก่ ระดับคำศัพท์ (4 ประเภท) ระดับสัณฐานวิทยา (2 ประเภท) และระดับวาทกรรม (2 ประเภท) ผลการศึกษาดังกล่าวมีประโยชน์ต่อผู้สอนภาษาอังกฤษในประเทศไทยในการนำไปเป็นแนวทางในการพัฒนาการสอนด้านการเขียนภาษาอังกฤษให้กับนักศึกษาไทยที่เรียนภาษาอังกฤษในฐานะภาษาต่างประเทศ

คำสำคัญ: การเขียนภาษาอังกฤษ การสอนภาษาอังกฤษ ข้อผิดพลาดในการเขียน

Introduction

Writing as one of the core English language skills is a (nuanced) process that requires learners to pen down their ideas, as a tool for learning. Therefore, an appraisal on writing mistakes in English is seen as one way of improving the written skills of learners as a measure of language learning success and teachers can be given the opportunity to establish effective instructional strategies to enhance the writing skills of students. The outcome of such an objective is a growing interest in researching written errors with learners. A knowledge of grammatical structures, idioms and vocabulary is important in the composition of writing, including an attempt to express ideas and the continuous use of eyes, hands and brain (Sattayatham & Ratanapinyowong, 2008) pointed out that competence was needed in several domains, namely grammar skills in order to produce successful written tasks: grammar, lexicon and knowledge of the language system; discourse skills: competence of the genre and the rhetorical pattern; socio-linguistics competence: competence to use vocabulary in various contexts. Bennui (2016) and Fitriani & Suyitno (2019) recognized the development of the writing skill. Yet practice does not only allow learners to create successful writing pieces, but also includes skills and communication methods. It is therefore difficult for EFL learners, in particular, to produce English writing, as the learners need skills in the intended language, and must be able to communicate their thoughts on correct language use and communication techniques (Richards & Renandya, 2002). Many studies (Phoocharoensil et al., 2016; Roongsitthichai et al., 2019; Sermsook et al., 2017) have argued that writing is considered to be the most challenging skill for learners in EFL context due to their limited language

skills or linguistic awareness to the content, structure and language needed for composition writing (Weigle, 2002). Nevertheless, learners should not just learn how to write, but should also be conscious of their weakness in order to write a successful piece in English, thus the study of learners written errors is important.

The study of errors in writing becomes very important when it comes to the learning of languages since it is a study of the language process (Ellis, 2002; Katip & Gampper, 2016; Khumpee & Yodkamlue, 2017; Phettongkam, 2017). The relevance of the identification of second language learners' or foreign language learner errors is reiterated by Corder (1974) who notes that "error analysis is part of the study of language learning. It gives us an idea of learner's language development and may provide us with feedback as to how they are learning "(Corder, 1974: 125). Such research usefulness is not only beneficial to teachers and curriculum designers but also for researchers to show them the techniques used by learners to learn a target language skill. Moreover, error analysis determines the types of errors committed by the learners and explains why these errors are made (Nation & Newton, 2001). In addition, error analysis in writing helps to encourage second-language and foreign language learners to recognize, categorize and use correct techniques for their writing (Kwok 1998). This includes information about the methods used by the learner to acquire the language so that the language output of the learners can be assessed using errors. This study aims (1) to identify the written errors committed by Thai university students in their writing; and (2) to investigate the teaching implications for English teachers in Thailand and related contexts. The study therefore seeks to answer

the following research question: What are the errors made by Thai EFL learners in their English essay writing?

Literature review

Writing and Error Analysis in Writing

Previous research show that several attempts have been made at defining 'writing'. Byrne (1996), by defining writing as the encoding of a certain message or idea, says writing is a sequence of phrases in a systematic manner. There must be an intentional mental effort to order written sentences such as note taking, writing and revising (Byrne, 1996). In addition, White and Arndt (1991: 3) describe 'writing' as a method of problem solving involving processes such as ideas generation, the discovery of a voice with which to write, schedule, set goals, track and evaluate things, and a quest for language that communicates exact significances.' The current study defines writing in light of the above concepts.

With respect to error analysis (EA), some prior studies had specific 'error analysis' concepts. Brown (1980) described error analysis as the evaluation, review and classification phase of deviations from the second language rules and then the disclosure of teacher systems. It would seem that this idea is the same one proposed by Crystal (1999: 108) who defines EA as "a study of unacceptable forms of learning a language, particularly a foreign language," in terms of language education and learning. It is also a technique to identify, classify and systematically interpret, using the principles and procedures provided by linguistics, the unacceptable form of a foreign language learner. Ridha (2012: 26) sees EA in the same vein as "the process

for observing, analyzing and classifying the differences between the second language rules and then revealing the learner-managed systems." Such meanings may be inferred by the fact that EA is an operation in which the errors made by someone in speech or in writing are detected, recorded and interpreted and information on the specific difficulties that someone has in speech or writing English sentences. The error analysis procedure is another thing that must be considered. Further, Hasyim (2002, 43) proposed that EA: (a) ascertain to what extent someone knew a language, (b) ascertain how a person learns language, and (c) as an assistant to teaching and the preparation of teaching material information on common challenges to learning languages. However, according to language errors, interlingual and intralingual mistakes can be categorized as translation mistakes caused by learner's mother tongue, including lexicon errors, grammar mistakes, or pragmatics in the interlanguage and intralingual errors (Richard & Schmidt, 2002). The misunderstanding of rules and flawed rules and incorrect definitions, all of which contribute to over generalization, can be due to intralingual errors (Richard & Schmidt, 2002). Ellis (1996) notes that over-generalization errors occur when students create unusual structures, as opposed to the language structures of target languages, while ignorance of rule limitations in inappropriate environments is linked to rule enforcement. Ellis (1996) also noted that when learners don't establish a complete framework, the incomplete application of the rules happens while the confusion of learning differences in the target language leads to false concepts.

Previous Studies on Writing Errors

As already mentioned, EA has an important part to play in the learning as language learning makes it difficult for EFL learners to write in English. Chan (2010) is one of the important studies that has been used in this current study as the key context. Chan's research aimed to review and analyze a written article, aimed at providing a taxonomy of Hong Kong Cantonese ESL students' written errors. The researcher tried to identify anomalous structures with the assistance of two other assistants and made a comparison between student errors and their first language (L1) characteristics, in order to identify cross-linguistic influences. Further analyzes were done to identify other influencing factors, in addition to L1 interference. She attributed these mistakes to various factors. Firstly, L1 is the principal source of errors for students because many students frequently think in their first language before they translate the text into the target language. Secondly, lack of matching or facilitation in the native language of students which made it more difficult for the student to learn English. The writer, however, did not participate. She argues that the establishment of empirically based error taxonomy will lead to: a) an understanding of cognitive and psychological mechanisms involved in the learning process; b) the information to be provided by the teaching stakeholders concerning learner error which is very important for the design of remedial materials; c) helping instructors, curriculum-designers and selecting the best error correction strategies; and d) giving comprehensive data on the interlanguage and cross-language impact of Hong Kong Cantonese ESL students.

In addition, several studies have also been conducted to investigate learners' written errors (Alcoy & Biel, 2018; Bennui, 2019; Foosuwan, Chumpavan, & Suksaeresup, 2019; Garza, 2014; Kongkaew & Cedar, 2018; Llach, 2015; Moqimipour & Shahrokhi, 2015; Sor, Intanoo, & Prachanant, 2017). The studies attempt to identify the written errors of the student, their causes and pedagogical implications. In a similar vein, Wu and Garza (2014) examine the forms and features of errors in the English language writing of grade six students. They studied samples of grammar, lexicon, semantic, mechanic and word order errors by e-mail. The findings were categorized into 22 error subcategories. Grammar errors were most commonly observed as students had most errors in (a) subject and verb agreement, (b) sentence fragment and sentence structure and (c) singular / plural and verb failure. Although the sample in this analysis is similar to Chan's, the findings were different based on the error frequency with regard to the country and mother tongue. Such differences could be linked to the different student levels, with the youngest students in Chan at grade 9, and the sixth grade in Wu and Garza. Wu and Garza find that the student (a) makes grammatical, (b) lexical and (c) semantical errors because of the first language transmission. As a result of intralingual transfer only mechanical errors were found. This is due to the English language practice in the classroom and the late exposure to English. The paragraphs were written as narratives, descriptions and comparison of different kinds. Errors that were focused on interference with the first language were classified in 12 groups. Singular / plural form, mode of help, subject-verb agreement, verb tense and infinitive gerund, respectively,

were the most frequent errors in the writing of the narrative while the most common errors in the description were article, sub-verb agreement, mode / auxiliary, verb tense and prepositions. The comparison errors writings were verb-tense, singular / plural form, preposition and subject-verb agreement. The results show that in each writing task the mean number of errors tended to be different depending on the genre. This finding is in line with the studies of errors in English writing in many EFL students (Moqimipour & Shahrokhi, 2015; Watcharapunyawong & Usaha, 2013). Orozco (2002) has found for instance, that EFL students' writings are mistaken for grammar, spelling, lexis and punctuation. EFL errors are common errors of verbs, punctuations, articles, singular / plural substances, present / last simple translations, prepositions, the agreement of subject-verb, improprietary times, order of words and sentence, etc (Al-Sobhi et al., 2017; AlKadi & Madini, 2019; AlTameemy & Daradkeh, 2019; Hassan et al., 2019; Muftah & Rafik-Galea, 2013; Sabtan et al., 2019). Therefore, most researchers agree that the main causes of language errors are the limited knowledge of the second language and variations in vocabulary, mother and target tongue structures (Ababneh, 2017; Chaleila & Garra-Alloush, 2019; Grami & Alzughaibi, 2012; Khatter, 2019; Saleem, 2019; Zawahreh, 2013). Inadequate knowledge of lexicon, grammatical laws, ignorance of legislation, imperfect implementation of rules and owns assumptions are the source of English writing errors of Thai students who studied in Thailand and who were unable to write in new language (Bennui, 2016; Bennui, 2019; Fitriani & Suyitno, 2019; Foosuwan et al., 2019; Katip & Gampper, 2016; Khumphee & Yodkamlue, 2017; Phetongkam, 2017; Roongsitthichai et al., 2019; Sermsook et al., 2017; Sor et al.,

2017). In this regard, the scientists argue that the various structural features of each genre affect the existence of errors in that particular genre. In addition, certain errors relate to the target language itself, since inappropriate language acquisition could lead to errors in the productive skill-which it called intralingual errors. Such errors occur where students do not have adequate feedback or practice.

Watcharapunyawong and Usaha (2013), in a related study to the objective in this paper, studied the writing errors of Thai EFL students in different types of texts. In 3 separate genre narratives, descriptions and comparisons they gathered 120 English paragraphs written by 40 students in a Thai university and examined them to identify the written errors in their writing. They found that the five most common errors in the writing of narratives were verb-tense, word-choice, phrase structure and preposition and modal / audible, and the five most common errors in the writing of comparison and descriptive texts are article, phrase structure, word choices, plural form and subject-verb agreement. It is noteworthy that the comparison structure is the least common flawed, as opposed to the errors in the narrative and description writing.

Research Methodology

The interest of the researchers in the present study stems from their familiarity with similar students as in Chan's (2010) research. While Chan's students were 9 years old, the issue could however be considered the same, regardless of educational level (as in other previous research). This current small-scale research consists of 15 Thai university students, with Arabic as L1, Thai as L2, and English as a foreign language in a university in the South of Thailand. The

choice of this group of participants is because their writings have been observed to have certain errors which maars the comprehension of their work. The 15 students were randomly selected out of the group of students whose essays were highly flawed. In the EFL learners writing process, the interference of the mother tongue-Arabic-is contrasted. Although the learners are from various levels of education, if the errors reported by the students from Hong Kong are found in that of Thai Arabic learners, then, together with a further analysis of error reasons, we may consider it as empirical evidence that undermines the hypotheses of interference with the mother tongue.

Also, because the researchers work in this context it was convenient for them to conduct this kind of research. The data that was used in this study were essays written by students within a semester. The written essays were collected and analyzed based on the EA taxonomy. Privacy practices in compliance with the ethical rules of the university were observed. The essays are different in genres and this genre difference was not considered as a variable in this study. The researchers analyzed 45 essays by the identification of anomalous structures with the help of two other research assistants who served as inter-raters in order to strengthen the reliability and validity of the findings. The identified errors were statistically analyzed at a descriptive level using frequency percentages. The errors were evaluated in the fields of morphology, lexis, syntax and discourse. Further analysis was done in addition to L1 intervention to find potential affective variables.

Results and discussion

The findings and discussion in this section are from the data

collected from the analysis of the Thai learners writing in English. Four key tables in relation to four types of written errors were established under morphology, lexis, syntax and discourse. The analyzed data collected show 467 tokens that were classified into 32 groups. Nevertheless, since the students supplied hand-written text, some spellings errors were found and so were added to the findings to make up a total of 33 types (see Table 1).

Table 1: English Written Errors for Syntax

Syntactic Level	Numbers of Errors Made
Incorrect Spelling issues	51
Incorrect Punctuation issues	47
Issues with Loanwords	34
Issues with Independent Clauses either being used as subjects or objects	27
Incorrect Verb form issues	27
Issues with Inappropriate case selection with mismatched contexts	22
Issues with incorrect utilization of Word types, Classes, and Functions	18
Issues with missing Copulas in sentences	17
Incorrect Conjunction issues	15
Incorrect Preposition issues	14

Table 1: English Written Errors for Syntax

Syntactic Level	Numbers of Errors Made
Incorrect Subject issues	13
Incorrect Prepositional Phase issues	11
Incorrect Concord issues	11
Incorrect Transitivity issues	10
Incorrect Existential Structures	9
Incorrect Serial Verb issues	9
Incorrect Adverbials or Adverbs issues	8
Issues with the use of Be followed by -ed	7
Issues with the use of Be followed by base-form verbs	6
Incorrect Relative Clause issues	5
Incorrect Pseudo issues	3
Issues with incorrect word 'Until' being used	0
Incorrect Comparative Adjective issues	0
Issues with incorrect Indirect Questions being asked	0
Issues with incorrect Passive Sentences being used	0

For the syntactic level, 364 token errors were found, revealing spelling as the error with the highest token count (51 tokens). This high token count was as a result of the fact that the students provided hand written texts without any help of auto correction software. Consequently, the result of the many spelling errors, which can, in turn, be linked to the learner's lack of the target language knowledge. On the other hand, misuse of 'until', pseudo passives and under generation of passives, disordering of constituents in indirect questions, and duplicated comparatives or superlatives were all found to have zero token ratio. This does not imply that the learners struggled to use the language correctly but that the learners had a poor mastery of the language. Overall, as seen in Table 1 above, the variations in the token counts for the different categories for this syntactic level is largely due to: (a) the learners L1 Arabic influence, and (b) the learners lack of adequate knowledge in the English language.

Table 2: English Written Errors for Lexis

Lexical Level	Numbers of Errors Made
Issues with incorrect Synforms	17
Issues with incorrect Synonyms	15
Issues with the use of Terms with mismatched contexts	13
Issues with incorrect Vocabulary Compensation	8

53 token errors were found for this level. The issues in relation to Synforms had the highest token errors (17), followed by the Issues with incorrect Synonyms (15 tokens) and the use of Terms with mismatched contexts (13 tokens), accordingly. This result was found to be so as a result of L1 influence. The least of the token count in this category was vocabulary compensation being used by the participants in this current study (8 tokens) which is a small number in comparison with Chan's main research. They were identified as the effect of L1 in Chan's analysis. However, L1 influence in the current study appeared to be less common with regards to vocabulary compensation.

Table 3: English Written Errors for Morphology

Morphological Level	Numbers of Errors Made
Issues with inappropriate Affixes	15
Issues with Affixes being excessively used	7

For the morphological category, 22 identifiable errors were found and classified as: 1) Issues with inappropriate Affixes (15 tokens), and 2) Issues with Affixes being excessively used (7 tokens). Regarding Issues with inappropriate Affixes, this finding can be linked to the lack of knowledge of the learners about the use of affixes, particularly since the learners indicated that affixes were not being given much attention. The learner's Arabic mother tongue does not make use of affixes, but this is not meant to be the explanation for this error. Unlike Chan's main research, the students made the least mistakes in the overuse of affixes because their language and vocabulary, most of which rely on the word stems that are very basic and simple. The learner's lack of knowledge rather than the L1 interference was the basis for this usage.

Table 4: English Written Errors for Discourse

Discourse Level	Numbers of Errors Made
Issues with unsuitable Periphrastic topics	18
Issues with “it” being Inappropriately used as discourse deixis	10

A total of 28 token errors were found for discourse level. The tokens were grouped according to the Issues with unsuitable Periphrastic topics (18 tokens) and the Issues with “it” being Inappropriately used as discourse deixis (10 tokens). The errors were identified as related to students’ lack of knowledge as well as mother tongue interference.

The results highlight English writing errors of the students. They show errors at various levels such as morphology, lexicon, syntax and discourse. This indicates that the learners do not have an adequate knowledge of the language at these levels. It is also evident that the learners tend to think (in their first language) before translating into the target language which can be seen in the learner's mistakes. Additional studies have confirmed the results behind the learners' errors. Tahaineh (2009) noted that interference with the mother tongue is the main source of written preposition errors for EFL students with a ratio of 58%. Muffah and Rafik-Galea (2013) found that Arab students made errors using a single, third-party tense agreement (s) because of conflict with the L1.

This result can be confirmed in research in Thailand as well. With 28 third year students at Thaksin University, Bennui (2008) has identified the effect of interference in the first language on student’s

paragraph writing. Three L1 interference levels were examined, which are word, sentence and discourse. The findings showed that (1) lexical interference has been established from the translation into English of Thai words and the use of Thai terms; (2) Syntactic interference was found through structural borrowing from Thai language, such as the word order, tense subject-verb-agreement, infinitive, verb 'have,' prepositions and noun determinants; and (3) L1 discourse interference was manifested in the light of linguistic and cultural awareness. Similarly, Bootchuy (2008) also investigated poorly formed sentences from Thai into academic English writing. The data was gathered from a written assignment and the final papers of 41 first year students in an English Master's Program at a Bangkok University were collected. Three types of poorly formed sentences that were most frequently identified included: (1) omission and complement of subjects, verbs, objects; (2) wrong formation of compound and complex sentence structures; and (3) error of word order. Similarly, in the narration, description and comparison / contrast writing of English major students, Watcharapunyawong and Usaha (2013) researched first-language interference of the Thai language. The results showed that the errors of the first language interference belong to sixteen categories: verb tense, word choice, sentence structure, article, preposition, modal / auxiliary, singular / plural, fragment, verb form, pronoun, run-on sentence, infinitive / gerund, transition subject-verb agreement, parallel structure and comparison. The use of Thai sentences, and Thai structures such as tenses, subject-verb agreements, fragments, run-on sentences, articles and prepositions were evident when Thai students write in English. Furthermore, language style and L1 cultural knowledge are

clearly shown to interfere with the compositions of students writing.

Moreover, the Arabic student according to Zawahreh (2013) study were faced with difficulties in using correct English adjectives, and he also noticed that there is a difference in parts of speech, context and collocation between the two languages as the students thought in L1 and write in English. However, the majority of written errors were in the preposition category in Abushihab, El Omari and Tobat (2011) research, meanwhile, in the present study most of the students made errors in the spelling category. Errors exist because of the lack of first language support. Different studies (Ababneh, 2019; Al-Adawi, 2019; Hussain & Abdullah, 2019; Saeed and Fatih; 2011; Yaseen et al., 2019) have contrasted and established these variations in Arabic and English. Saeed and Fatih (2011) discovered (14) variations in the inflection affix between English and Arabic. In terms of verb, aspect and structure, Al Aswad (1983) found many language-similarities and differences between English and learners L1.

Conclusion and recommendation

This study has been an analysis of the errors in the essays of 15 Thai undergraduate students from a Thai university in southern Thailand, with results of the errors types used quite similar to Chan's (2010) study. In both studies, however, the difference in the number of errors is due to: a) different mother tongues investigated; b) different numbers of students; and c) different levels of the students. The result is this study are therefore not generalizable to other contexts as the current study is limited to only 15 university students. However, there are still a couple of recommendations for the writing of students based

on previous studies (Fareh, 2010). Fareh (2010) explored why the quality of education standards were falling in the English education programs in the Arabian world. He conducted the study with hundreds of teachers from about eight Arab countries and provided the following recommendations: (a) lack of proper training of service teachers; (b) supremacy of teacher-centered teaching style in school; (c) low motivation of the students towards English language learning; (d) misconceptions of teachers about learning techniques; and (e) the continuous utilization of traditional exam templates with washback effects. In order to implement a careful strategic approach to addressing this issue, we suggest consideration of such studies. In support to these recommendations, we also concur with the careful and strategic implementation of these recommendations in order to overcome this problem. Furthermore, error-based taxonomy is important for teachers and educational developers to create remedial material which would contribute to the achievement of quality education. The researchers believe that every educational player, and particularly teachers, can help improve the teaching and learning of English writing, according to the Error analysis of the English writing found in this study since teachers can understand why students make certain errors and then, prepare remedial lessons. The plan and design of proper curricula is also beneficial because it requires adequate teaching approaches, materials and curricula based on error types committed by students, in order to improve Thai university students ' writing skills.

References

- Ababneh, I. (2017). Analysis of written English: The case of female university students in Saudi Arabia. *Int'l J. Soc. Sci. Stud.*, 5, 1.
- Ababneh, I. (2019). Errors in Arabic-English Translation among Saudi Students: Comparative Study Between Two Groups of Students. *AWEJ for Translation & Literary Studies, Volume3, Number4*.
- Abushihab, I., El-Omari, A., & Tobat, M. (2011). An analysis of written grammatical errors of Arab learners of English as a foreign language at Alzaytoonah private university of Jordan. *European Journal of Social Sciences*, 20(4), 543-552.
- Al-Aswad, M. K. (1983). *Contrastive Analysis of Arabic and English Verbs in Tense, Aspect, and Structure*. Ph.D Dissertation, University of Michigan, Ann Arbor.
- Alcoy, J. C. O., & Biel, L. A. (2018). Error analysis in written narratives by Thai university students of elementary Spanish as foreign language. *Ogigia. Revista Electrónica de Estudios Hispánicos*, (24), 19-42.
- Al-Adawi, S. (2019). Omani EFL Written Errors at a College Level. In *English Language Teaching Research in the Middle East and North Africa* (pp. 455-478). Palgrave Macmillan, Cham.
- AlKadi, S. Z., & Madini, A. A. (2019). EFL Learners' Lexico-grammatical Competence in Paper-based Vs. Computer-based in Genre Writing.
- AlTameemy, F., & Daradkeh, A. (2019). Common Paragraph Writing Errors Made by Saudi EFL Students: Error Analysis. *Theory and Practice in Language Studies*, 9(2), 178-187.

- Al-Sobhi, B. M. S., Rashid, S. M., Abdullah, A. N., & Darmi, R. (2017). Arab ESL secondary school students' spelling errors. *International Journal of Education and Literacy Studies*, 5(3), 16-23.
- Bennui, P. (2008). A study of L1 interference in the writing of Thai EFL students. *Malaysian Journal of ELT Research*, (4), 72-102.
- Bennui, P. (2016). A study of L1 interference in the writing of Thai EFL students. *Malaysian Journal of ELT Research*, 4(1), 31.
- Bennui, P. (2019). Lexical Borrowing in English Language Tourism Magazines in Southern Thailand. *Humanities, Arts and Social Sciences Studies (FORMER NAME SILPAKORN UNIVERSITY JOURNAL OF SOCIAL SCIENCES, HUMANITIES, AND ARTS)*, 452-502.
- Bootchuy, T. (2008). *An analysis of errors in academic English writing by a group of first-year Thai graduate major in gin English*. Unpublished Master of Art Thesis, Kasetsart University, Thailand.
- Byrne, D. (1996). *Teaching writing skills*. UK: Longman Group.
- Chaleila, W., & Garra-Alloush, I. (2019). The Most Frequent Errors in Academic Writing: A Case of EFL Undergraduate Arab Students in Israel. *English Language Teaching*, 12(7).
- Chan, A. (2010). Toward a Taxonomy of Written Errors: Investigation Into the Written Errors of Hong Kong Cantonese ESL Learners. *TESOL Quarterly* [serial online]. 2010: 295. Available from: JSTOR Journals, Ipswich, MA. Accessed December 25, 2019.
- Corder, S. P. (1974). *Error Analysis*. In J. P. B. Allen and S. P. Corder (eds.) *Techniques in Applied Linguistics (The Edinburgh Course in Applied Linguistics: 3)*. London: Oxford University Press (Language and Language Learning), pp 122-154.

- Crystal, D. (1999). *The penguin dictionary of language* (2nd ed.). Penguin.
- Ellis, R. (1996). *The study of second language acquisition*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Ellis, R. (2002). *Second language acquisition*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Fareh, S. (2010). WCES-2010: Challenges of teaching English in the Arab world: Why can't EFL programs deliver as expected? *Procedia - Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 2 (Innovation and Creativity in Education), 3600-3604.
- Fitriani, M. M., & Suyitno, I. (2019). Indonesian words writing error by students in Krabi Santivitty School, Thailand. *ISCE: Journal of Innovative Studies on Character and Education*, 3(1), 41-49.
- Foosuwan, S., Chumpavan, S., & Suksaeresup, N. (2019). English Writing Errors in the Written Tasks of Thai Employees Working in a Thai Bank and the Impact of Errors on the Bank's Business. *วารสารมนุษยศาสตร์ปริทรรศน์ (MANUTSAT PARITAT: Journal of Humanities)*, 39(2).
- Grami, G., & Alzughabi, M. (2012). L1 transfer among Arab ESL learners: Theoretical framework and practical implications for ESL teaching. *Theory and Practice in Language Studies*, 2(8), 1552-1560.
- Hassan, H. M. A., Uddin, M. K., & Akhtar, R. M. N. (2019). Investigating the Role of Classroom Interactional Activities in Developing University Students' Writing Skills at Arab Countries. *Online Submission*, 2(1), 58-64.
- Hasyim, S. (2002). Error analysis in the teaching of English. *Jurusan Sastra, Fakultas Sastra, Universitas Kristen Petra*, 4, 42-50.

- Hussain, M., & Abdullah, R. (2019). An Analysis of Undergraduate Saudi EFL Female Students' Errors in Written English Essays. *Arab World English Journal*.
- Katip, P., & Gampper, C. (2016). English as a Foreign Language Student Productive Conditional Verb Form Errors in Thailand. *LEARN Journal: Language Education and Acquisition Research Network*, 9(2), 1-13.
- Khatter, S. (2019). An Analysis of the Most Common Essay Writing Errors among EFL Saudi Female Learners (Majmaah University). *Arab World English Journal (AWEJ) Volume*, 10.
- Khumphee, S., & Yodkamlue, B. (2017). Grammatical Errors in English Essays Written by Thai EFL Undergraduate Students. *Journal of Education*.
- Kongkaew, S., & Cedar, P. (2018). An Analysis of Errors in Online English Writing made by Thai EFL Authors. *International Journal of Applied Linguistics and English Literature*, 7(6), 86-96.
- Kwok, H. L. (1998). *Why and when do we correct learner errors? An error correction project for an English composition class*. Accessed December 25, 2019 from: <http://sunzi1.lib.hku.hk/hkjo/view/45/4500101.pdf>
- Llach, M. (2015). Lexical errors in writing at the end of primary and secondary education: Description and pedagogical implications. *Porta Linguarum*, (23), 109-124.
- Moqimipour, K., & Shahrokhi, M. (2015). The impact of text genre on Iranian intermediate EFL students' writing errors: An error analysis perspective. *International Education Studies*, 8(3), 122-137.

- Mourtaga, K.R. (2004). *Investigating writing problems among Palestinian students studying English as a foreign language*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Mississippi. Mississippi, United States.
- Muftah, M., & Rafic-Galea, S. (2013). Error analysis of present simple tense in the interlanguage of adult Arab English language learners. *English Language Teaching*, 6(2), 146-154. doi:10.5539/elt.v6n2p146.
- Nation, I. S. P. & Newton J. (2001). *Teaching EFL listening and speaking*. New York: Routledge/Taylor and Francis Group.
- Orozco, R. (2002). *An analysis of the language assessment scales test results for determining the writing problems of English learners*. Doctoral dissertation, Alliant International University, San Diego, California, United States.
- Peña, D, S. (2009). Analysis of errors in the essays written by Math, Science and Engineering Faculty. *Lieco Journal of Higher Education Research*, 6(1), 76-85.
- Phetongkam, H. (2017). Grammatical Errors in Spoken English of Undergraduate Thai Learners in a Communicative Business English Course. *LEARN Journal: Language Education and Acquisition Research Network*, 10(1), 95-118.
- Phoocharoensil, S., Moore, B., Gampfer, C., Geerson, E., Chaturongakul, P., Sutharaj, S., & Carlon, W. (2016). Grammatical and Lexical Errors in Low-Proficiency Thai Graduate Students' Writing. *LEARN Journal: Language Education and Acquisition Research Network*, 9(1), 11-24.

- Richards, J. C., & Renandya W.A. (2002). *Methodology in language teaching; an anthology of current practice*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Richards, J. C. & Schmidt, R. (2002). *Dictionary of Language Teaching & Applied Linguistics*. Pearson Education Limited. London: Longman.
- Ridha, N. (2012). The Effect of EFL Learners' Mother Tongue on their Writings in English: An Error Analysis Study. *Journal of the College of Arts*. University of Basrah, 60, 22-45.
- Roongsitthichai, A., Sriboonruang, D., & Prasongsook, S. (2019). Error Analysis in English Abstracts Written by Veterinary Students in Northeast Thailand. *Chophayom Journal*, 30(3), 21-30.
- Sabtan, Y. M. N., Elsayed, A., & Mohamed, A. (2019). Common Writing Errors Among EFL Students at Dhofar University in Oman: An Analytical Study. *International Journal of English Linguistics*, 9(2), 402-4011.
- Saeed, G. M., & Fatihi, A. R. (2011). A Contrastive Analysis of Inflectional Affixes in English and Arabic. *Language in India*, 11(5), 76.
- Saleem, H. (2019). *An analysis of Common Grammatical Error in English Essay Writing by the Students of Business Administration in Bahauddin Zakariya University Multan* (Doctoral dissertation).
- Sattayatham, A. & Rattanapinyowong, P. (2008). Analysis of errors in paragraph writing in English by first year medical students from the four medical schools at Mahidol University. *Silpakorn University International Journal*, (8), 17-38.

- Sermsook, K., Liamnimit, J., & Pochakorn, R. (2017). An Analysis of Errors in Written English Sentences: A Case Study of Thai EFL Students. *English Language Teaching*, 10(3), 101-110.
- Sor, T., Intanoo, K., & Prachanant, N. (2017). An Error Analysis of English Composition Written by Cambodia and Thai Grade twelve Students.
- Tahaine, Y. (2009). *A Cross-Sectional Investigation of Interlingual & Intralingual Errors Made By EFL Arab Jordanian University Students in the Use of Prepositions in Their Writing* [P1-1091].
- Watcharapunyawong, S. & Usaha, S. (2013). Thai EFL students' writing errors in different text types: The interference of the first language. *English Language Teaching*, 6(1), 67-78.
- Weigle, S.C. (2002). *Assessing writing*. Cambridge: The United Kingdom at the University Press.
- White, R. & Arndt, V. (1991). *Process writing*. London, UK: Longman.
- Wu, H. & Garza, E. (2014). Types and attributes of English writing errors in the EFL contexts-A study of error analysis. *Journal of Language Teaching and Research*, 5(6), 1256-1262.
- Yaseen, A. A., Ismail, K., & Yasin, M. S. M. (2019). Syntactic Errors in an Arab EFL Postgraduate Student's Spoken English during a Thesis Supervision Session.
- Zawahreh, F. A. S. (2013). A linguistic contrastive analysis case study: Out of context translation of Arabic adjective into English in EFL classroom. *International Journal of Academic Research in Business and Social Sciences*, 3(2), 427-436.