Grammatical Errors in English Essays Written by Thai EFL Undergraduate Students

Sirilak Khumphee[1], Butsakorn Yodkamlue[2]

Abstract

This study was conducted according to three research objectives: 1) to investigate common types of grammatical errors based on their frequency of occurrence in English essay writing of Thai EFL undergraduate students, 2) to examine the effects of L1 interference on discovered grammatical errors, in particular, to find out whether there were any of the errors influenced by the students' mother tongue (Thai language), and 3) to provide some essential pedagogical implications for second language learning and teaching. The subjects of this study were 83 second-year students majoring in English at Nakhon Ratchasima Rajabhat University, and they were drawn by using purposive sampling method. The study procedures consisted of 2 steps: 1) the students were asked to write an English essay, and 2) the researcher of this study analyzed the students' essays by employing the study analysis framework which was adapted from Na-ngam's (2005) error taxonomy and Richards' (1971) error categories. The findings indicated that ; 1) there were 26 types of grammatical errors, with the total number of 4,909 errors, occurred in the students' written work, and the five most common types of all were punctuation, nouns, prepositions, verbs, and articles

[1] Master Student Candidate in English Studies, Institute of Social Technology, Suranaree University of Technology, Thailand

[2] Institute of Social Technology, Suranaree University of Technology, Thailand

respectively ; and 2) there were 1,560 out of 4,909 errors, which were categorized into 14 types, caused by the students' L1 interference, Thai language. The five most frequent numbers of these types of errors fell into the use of plural form of nouns, omission of punctuation, wrong structures of complex sentences, omission of some parts of a sentence, and fragments respectively.

Keywords: Grammatical errors, l1 interference errors, error analysis, second language writing

Introduction

Research in the field of English as a second language writing (SLW) during the past decade has sought to identify various aspects of EFL/ESL writing problems. Particularly in Thai context, much of the research in this field has indicated that grammatical error is the major problem of Thai students' writing (Pongpairaj, 2002 ; Tawilapakul, 2002 ; Na-ngam, 2005). Likewise, the researcher, as a former part-time English lecturer with over 5-year experience at Nakhon Ratchasima Rajabhat University (NRRU) had noticed and found that most of NRRU students usually had problems in learning English especially when they wrote in English ; they always made errors on grammatical structures. For example, they used present simple tense instead of past tense when describing their past experience. In addition, some of the SLW research showed that errors on English writing of Thai students are caused by L1 interference or the effects of students' first language (Pengpanich, 2002 ; Junpui, 2007).

Accordingly, it can be proposed that grammatical errors are inevitable features in second language learning. Thus, research on errors in L2 writing should play an important role in order to enable L2 learners to better understand their problems and produce better written texts (Darus, 2009). Namely, learners' errors should be identified, categorized, and analyzed for investigating the causes of errors and to find out the ways to reduce errors (Pongsiriwet, 2001). Moreover, as L1 interference is one of the biggest influences which cause L2 writers to produce errors, the examination of the effects of L1 interference on SLW can provide some pedagogical implications on second language learning and teaching in EFL/ESL context (Corder, 1967). Therefore, it is worth investigating errors in L2 writing with a focus on the interplay of grammatical errors and L1 interference.

Objectives

This study was conducted regarding to the following purposes:

1. To investigate the types of grammatical errors based on their frequency of occurrence in English essay writing produced by second-year English-major students of Nakhon Ratchasima Rajabhat University (NRRU), in order that the problems of their writing could be identified.

2. To examine whether there are any errors influenced by their L1 interference.

3. To provide some essential pedagogical implications for second language learning and teaching.

Methodology

Participants

The population of this study was second-year Thai undergraduate students majoring in English at Nakhon Ratchasima Rajabhat University. The total number of research population was approximately 200 students. Among this number, 83 students were drawn purposively as the research participants. Of these 83 participants, 71 were female and 12 were male. All of the participants were between 19 and 21 years of age. Their average number of year studying English was 14 years, and their average grade of the English subjects was 3.18. However, none of them had been exposed to a native English-speaking context. Moreover, these participants were chosen purposively as the sample group because they were enrolling in a writing course, Academic Writing, and they had taken all 5 required English courses: English for Communication (EC) 1 and 2, English Structures and Usage (ESU) 1 and 2, and Paragraph Writing (PW). Therefore, it could be verified that they probably had similar background knowledge in L2 grammar and L2 writing.

Instruments

There were three research instruments in this study, a descriptive essay, a T-unit analysis, and a study analysis framework adapted from both Na-ngam's (2005) error taxonomy and Richard's (1971) error categories.

1. The descriptive essay on the topic: "How can Thai students be successful in Learning English?" was chosen as a data collection instrument because it related to the participants' interest and background, so it could motivate and enable them to write comfortably.

2. The T-unit was used as a data analysis instrument to analyze sentences in students' written essays ; its usage was to determine the sentences whether they consisted of a single unit of the sentence or more, and to identify those units whether they were a dependent clause or an independent clause.

3. The study analysis framework was formulated by combining and adapting from both Na-ngam's (2005) error taxonomy and Richards' (1971) error categories. Na-ngam's (2005) error taxonomy was employed to identify grammatical errors into types. It consisted of 23 types of grammatical errors: incomplete sentences (fragments and omissions), run-on sentences, comparison, word order, there-be, tenses, voices, agreements, infinitives and gerunds, nouns, verbs, adverbs, adjectives, pronouns, modals and auxiliaries, possessive's, conjunctions, prepositions, articles, punctuations, capitalization and spelling.

Richards' (1971) error categories were manipulated to identify L1 interference errors. It originally consisted of 10 types: omission of subject/ verb/ object/ complement, incorrect verb construction (serial verb construction), plural form of nouns, compound/ complex sentence structure, word order, "there" structure, fragment, run-on sentence, and word-by-word translation.

Since this study aimed at investigating grammatical errors and L1 interference errors, the above two frameworks were then combined. However, there were 6 types of L1 interference errors in Richards' errors categories that overlapped with some of error types in Na-ngam's error taxonomy. According to T-unit analysis, moreover, there were two types of errors in the merged framework that could not be considered as grammatical errors, and they needed to be eliminated from the framework ; they were capitalization errors and spelling errors. Therefore, the study analysis framework, then, consisted of 26 types of errors ; they were incomplete sentences (fragments and omissions), run-on sentences, comparison, word order, there-be, tenses, voices, agreements, infinitives, gerunds, nouns, verbs, adverbs, adjectives, pronouns, modals, auxiliaries, possessive's, conjunctions, prepositions, articles, punctuations, incorrect verb construction (serial verb construction), compound/ complex sentence, word by word translation and others (errors that was too complicated to be grouped).

In summary, among the 26 types of grammatical errors, there were 10 types of them were also considered as L1 interference errors. However, after this framework was tried out, four more types of L1 interference errors were added to the researcher's framework as they could be found in Thai students' written work. These four extra types of L1 interference errors were sub-types under some of the 26 types of grammatical errors. For more understandable, the four extra types of L1 interference errors were: 1) misuse of simple present tense for

simple past tense (a sub-type of tenses), 2) subject-verb agreement (a sub-type of agreement), 3) omission of auxiliary in negative sentences (a sub-type of verbs), and 4) omission of some punctuation marks (comma/ period/ question mark) (a sub-type of punctuations). Therefore, the adapted framework was then carrying 14 types of L1 interference errors.

Data Collection

Data were obtained from students' descriptive essay of 250-300 words on a topic: "How can Thai students be successful in learning English?" The students performed the task as a classroom assignment in order to gain the most reliable and authentic results. They were asked to write under the time limit of 60 minutes. The total number of essay writing was 83 samples. All of them were collected and copied. The copies of the 83 writing samples were then compiled and analyzed by 3 analysts: the researcher of this study, the Academic Writing course teacher, and a native English-speaker.

Data Analysis

The analysis of T-unit and the study analysis framework were employed as guides for analysis procedures. The T-unit, or terminable unit, was introduced by Hunt (1965) to measure development of sentences in the writing of grade school children (Bofman, 1988). It consisted of one independent clause and its dependent clauses (Polio, 1997). Therefore, the T-unit was used to analyze sentences into clauses. After analyzing sentences by using T-unit, the analyzed sentences were then re-analyzed to find errors by using the study analysis framework.

Analysis Procedures

The analysis procedures were divided into two phases. The first phase aimed to identify grammatical errors, and it consisted of four steps: (1) identifying sentences, (2) identifying errors, (3) categorizing errors, and (4) calculating. Next, the overall errors gained from the first analysis phase were re-analyzed whether there were any errors caused by the students' L1 interference in the second phase. In this stage, the errors analyzed as L1 interference errors were identified and classified into types, and then calculated into numbers.

Results

Types and frequency of overall grammatical errors

The total number of sentences in students' writing was counted and categorized into types. The frequency and percentage of each type were identified. The overall sentences were then marked as sentences with or without errors and were calculated for their total numbers and percentages as shown in Table 1.

Table 1:   Types of sentences and the number of errors

Types of Sentences	# of Clauses	%	# of Errors	%	Mean of Error Occurrence / Error-Carrying Clause
1. No-error sentences	200	11.09*	0	0.00	0.00
1.1 Independent Clauses	148	8.20*	0	0.00	0.00
1.2 Dependent Clauses	52	2.88*	0	0.00	0.00
2. Error-carrying Sentences	1,604	88.91*	4,909	100.00	3.06***
2.1 Complete sentences	1,385	76.77*	4,909	4,909	3.06***
- Independent Clauses	1,146	63.53*			
- Dependent clauses	239	13.25*			
2.2 Incomplete Sentences	219	12.14*			
Total	**1,804**	**100.00**	**4,909**	**100.00**	**3.06***

Note   1. * Percentage calculated based on the total number of sentences
2. ** Percentage calculated based on the total number of errors
3. *** Mean calculated based on the total number of overall errors divided by the total number of clauses with errors

Table 1 showed that there were 1,804 sentences that occurred in students' written work. Among this number, 200 sentences (11.09%) were found as error-free sentences while 1,604 sentences (88.91%) were carrying 4,909 errors. The average number of error occurrence per clause was at 3.06. In addition, out of

1,604 sentences with errors, 1,385 sentences were classified as complete sentences (67.77%), and 219 sentences fell into incomplete sentence type (12.14%).

For more obvious results, thus, 4,909 errors were categorized into 26 types of errors. Among these 26 types of errors, there were five most common types of them that were frequently produced in the students' papers. The summary of frequency and percentages of these five most frequent types including an example of errors found in each type were shown in Table 2.

Table 2: Types and frequency of common grammatical errors

No.	Types of Errors	Example of Errors	# of Errors	Percentages* (%)
1	Punctuation	If you don't know <u>vocabulary you</u> can't speak English. **Correction**: If you don't know <u>vocabulary, you</u> can't speak English.	842	17.15
2	Nouns	Learning falls to <u>the deep</u>. Correction: Learning falls to <u>the depth</u>.	776	15.81
3	Prepositions	You can watch the shows <u>in television</u>. **Correction**: You can watch the shows <u>on television</u>.	577	11.75
4	Verbs	<u>Thai students lazy</u> to study. Correction: <u>Thai students are lazy</u> to study.	404	8.23
5	Articles	English is <u>the international language</u>. **Correction**: English is <u>an international language</u>.	292	5.95
6	Incomplete Sentences	<u>When you speak English.</u> Correction: When you speak English, you should focus on your pronunciation.	219	4.46
7	Pronouns	When you thin <u>anywhere anytime</u> or speak to yourself, you must think for English only. **Correction**: <u>Whenever or wherever</u> you think or speak to yourself, you must think for English only.	201	4.09
8	Gerunds	They must do many ways <u>for help</u> them learning and useful from that well. **Correction**: They must do many ways <u>for helping</u> them learning and useful from that well.	197	4.01
9	Infinitives	They said English is very difficult, and hard <u>to learning</u>. **Correction**: They said English is very difficult, and hard <u>to learn</u>.	183	3.73
10	Agreement	<u>It make</u> you have knowledge. **Correction**: <u>It makes</u> you have knowledge.	182	3.71

No.	Types of Errors	Example of Errors	# of Errors	Percentages* (%)
11	Conjunctions	It is very <u>important,</u> you have to use it for work and communication. **Correction**: It is very <u>important because</u> you have to use it for work and communication.	164	3.34
12	Adjectives	Their English skills are <u>not bad not well.</u> **Correction**: Their English skills are <u>not bad not good.</u>	148	3.01
13	Complex Sentences	First, <u>If you want be successful in learning English. You</u> should read many English books. **Correction**: First, <u>If you want be successful in learning English, you</u> should read many English books.	145	2.95
14	Modals/ Auxiliaries	You <u>will can</u> remember English grammar or English sentence. **Correction**: You <u>will be able to</u> remember English grammar or English sentence.	121	2.46
15	Adverbs	If I <u>know vocabulary so much,</u> I can speak. **Correction**: If I <u>know a lot of vocabulary,</u> I can speak.	86	1.75
16	Run-on Sentences	Structure of English is important too because it help we know how to speak or write what is before and after for help the listener or the reader can understand the meaning about the data of the speaker and the writer send to.	81	1.65
17	Compound Sentences	Students will need practice English from listening, speaking, reading and <u>writing so students</u> will be successful of course. **Correction**: Students will need practice English from listening, speaking, reading and <u>writing, so students</u> will be successful of course.	62	1.26
18	Word Order	Thai students must read <u>book English,</u> watch <u>movies English</u> and listen to <u>song English.</u> **Correction**: Thai students must read <u>English books,</u> watch <u>English movies,</u> and listen to <u>English songs.</u>	45	0.92
19	Tenses	<u>I tried</u> to read many books and train to speak <u>every day</u>. **Correction**: <u>I try</u> to read many books and train to speak <u>every day</u>.	44	0.90
20	Word by Word Translation	<u>I'm shy in time speak with other people.</u> **Correction**: I'm shy <u>when</u> speak with other people.	33	0.67
21	Serial Verb Construction	They will <u>need practice</u> and use it in their life. **Correction**: They will <u>need to practice</u> and it in their life.	32	0.65

No.	Types of Errors	Example of Errors	# of Errors	Percentages* (%)
22	Voices	Although <u>I may speak</u> a litter bit. **Correction**: Although <u>I may speak</u> a litter bit.	19	0.39
23	Comparison	You have <u>vocabulary more than</u> in the past. **Correction**: You have <u>more vocabulary than</u> in the past.	18	0.37
24	Others	<u>essay</u> will <u>desclipe</u> about "How can Thai students be successful in learning English?" **Correction**: <u>This essay</u> will <u>describe</u> about "How can Thai students be successful in learning English?"	17	0.35
25	Possessive ('s)	Activity in English major can make me fun and get knowledge in English such as Halloween and <u>Valentine day</u>. **Correction**: Activity in English major can make me fun and get knowledge in English such as Halloween and <u>Valentine's day</u>.	12	0.24
26	There-be	<u>There are have</u> data and method not same. **Correction**: <u>There are</u> data and method not same.	9	0.18
	Total		**4,909**	**100.00**

Note: *Percentages calculated based on the total number of overall grammatical errors (4,909 errors).

As shown in Table 2, the total number of grammatical errors was 4,909 errors. However, the total number of five most common types was 2,891 errors or 58.89%. To present the results in particular orders, the use of punctuation was found as the most frequently committed type of errors: 842 errors or 17.15%. The second most frequent one was errors in nouns: 776 errors or 15.81%. The use of prepositions came at the third place of all the five most frequent types: 577 errors or 11.75%. Then, it was followed by 404 errors in verbs (8.23%), and 292 errors in articles (5.95%) respectively.

Types and frequency of L1 interference errors

The overall grammatical errors were re-analyzed by employing the adapted framework of Richards' (1971) error categories. The results showed that among the 14 types of this framework, there were 13 types that carried errors with the total number of 1,560 or 31.78%, compared to the total number of overall grammatical errors: 4,909 errors. Among these 13 types, however, five most frequent types of L1 interference errors carried over a hundred of errors in each type. The results of these five types were shown in Table 3.

Table 3: Types and frequency of five most frequent types of L1 interference errors

Types of L1 Interference Errors	Sample Sentences with Error	# of Errors	Percentage (#)
1. Plural forms of nouns	I can learn about vocabulary from <u>movie</u>. **Correction**: I can learn about vocabulary from <u>movies</u>.	583	37.37**
2. Punctuation (Omission of comma / period / question mark)***	If you want to <u>speak you</u> must try to listen. **Correction**: If you want to <u>speak, you</u> must try to listen.	201	12.88**
3. Subject-verb agreement***	<u>It have</u> many skills in learning English. **Correction**: <u>It has</u> many skills in learning English.	148	9.49**
4. Complex sentences	<u>Although I can speak English a little, but</u> I should speak English every day. **Correction**: <u>Although I can speak English a little,</u> I should speak English every day.	145	9.29**
5. Omission of subject/ verb/ object complement	<u>I happy</u> with it. **Correction**: <u>I am happy</u> with it.	122	7.82**
6. Fragments	But I don't understand English language.	97	6.22**
7. Run-on Sentences	<u>It's very important if I can remember many words it's not difficult to learn English because I can translate words.</u> **Correction**: <u>It's very important if I can remember many words. It's not difficult to learn English because I can translate words.</u>	81	5.19**
8. Compound Sentences	<u>They can help to improve not only your English using</u> but you can learn new vocabularies from books or newspaper. **Correction**: <u>They can help to improve not only your English using, but</u> you can also learn new vocabularies from books or newspaper.	62	3.97**
9. Word by Word Translation	If you don't know about rule structure and <u>using structure</u> You can't speaking and writing because people listening don't understand you say. **Correction**: If you don't know about rule structure and <u>structure usage</u> You can't speaking and writing because people listening don't understand you say.	33	2.12**
10. Serial Verb construction	You should <u>attend study</u> English subject. **Correction**: You should <u>attend to study</u> English subject.	32	2.05**

Types of L1 Interference Errors	Sample Sentences with Error	# of Errors	Percentage (#)
11.Word Order	You must read <u>book English</u> and watch <u>movies English</u>. **Correction**: You must read <u>English books</u> and watch <u>English movies</u>.	31	1.99**
12. Omission of auxiliaries in negative Sentences***	<u>It have</u> many skills in learning English. **Correction**: <u>It has</u> many skills in learning English.	21	1.35**
13. There-be	The skills for learning English language to be successful <u>it have four skills</u>. **Correction**: <u>There are four skills</u> in learning English to be successful.	4	0.26**
	Total	**1,560**	**31.78***

Note:
1. * Percentage calculated based on the total number of overall grammatical errors
2. ** Percentage calculated based on the total number of L1 interference errors
3. *** Type of L1 interference errors adapted from Richards' (1971) framework

As the results presented in Table 3, it showed that the most frequent number of L1 interference errors fell into the use of plural forms of nouns (583 errors or 37.37%). The second most frequent one was errors in the omission of punctuation (201 errors or 12.88%). Then, it was followed by 148 errors in subject-verb agreement (9.49%), 145 errors in the wrong structure of complex sentences (9.29%), and 122 errors in the omission of some parts of a sentence (7.82%) respectively. For the other types of L1 interference errors, they did not carry a big number as those did, as presented in the above table. However, it was so surprising that the total number of L1 interference errors (1,560 errors) was nearly 1/3 of the overall grammatical errors produced by the study's participants.

Discussion

According to the results of this study, the discussion could be presented into two separated parts: a discussion of common grammatical errors and the effects of L1 interference in L2 writing. Firstly, this study found that there were 26 types of grammatical errors with the total number of 4,909 errors that occurred in students' English essay writing. Among this number of errors, the researcher proposed the five most frequently committed types of errors that were produced by the study's participants ; they were errors in the use of punctuation, errors in nouns, errors in the use of prepositions, errors in verbs, and errors in articles.

Therefore, it could probably say that the cause beyond these errors was that ; the structures and usages of complete sentences, nouns and articles might be more complicated to the students than other types of errors, so that the students in each study commonly produced them. The results found in this study were similar to previous studies on the analysis of grammatical errors. Srichai (2002), Na-ngam (2005), and Iamsiu (2014) found that Thai students commonly committed errors in incomplete sentences, nouns, agreement, articles, tenses, and spelling in their writing. Particularly, error in incomplete sentences – especially fragment was the most frequent types that the students generally made. Moreover, errors in nouns – particularly the misuse of singular and plural nouns and errors in articles were also significantly found in these studies.

Secondly, this study also found that out of 4,909 grammatical errors produced by the study's participants, there were 1,560 errors (31.78%) caused by the interference of their first language. Among these 1,560 L1 interference errors, the use of plural forms of the verbs was found as the most frequent type (583 errors). Then, it was followed by errors in the omission of punctuations (201 errors), errors in subject-verb agreement (148 errors), errors in the wrong structure of complex sentences (145 errors), and errors in the omission of some parts of a sentence (122 errors).

Thus, it could be assumed that L1 interference had some influence to Thai students in producing errors in their English writing ; they sometimes employed Thai language structures and rules to complete their English written work. The results of this part were also similar to those found in other previous second language writing studies. Angwatanakul (1975), Ubol (1981), and Torut (1993) found the very similar results that the students' mother tongue caused them in producing errors in the omission of subjects, verbs, and objects. Interestingly, Bootchuy's (2008) study also found that L1 interference caused Thai students in committing many types of L1 interference errors: errors in the omission of subjects, objects, and complements, errors in the omission of auxiliary verbs in negative sentences, errors in fragments and run-on sentences, and word by word translation.

As Brown (2000) and Boey (1975) point out, "L1 interference is the most noticeable source of errors among second language learners because the students use their L1 experience to facilitate the second language learning process." This hypothesis has also been supported by many researchers. For example, Brudiprabha (1972) states that one-third of errors occurred in EFL/ESL students' writing is caused from negative interference of L1. Moreover, Bhela (1999) point out that EFL errors result from word by word translation strategy or thinking in mother tongue language. Namely, when EFL students write in English, they first think in their native language, and then translate into English. In addition, Pongpairoj, (2002) claims that Thai students employ word order in Thai structures to write

in English. This is caused from 'insufficient knowledge' of the similarities and differences between Thai and English grammatical structures. Finally, Thep-Akrapong (2005) proposes that errors in subject-verb agreement were very problematic to Thai students because the concept of subject-verb agreement is not found in Thai sentential concept. That is, specific boundary of a Thai sentence is not obvious. Also, word order in Thai structure is considerably different from that of English.

As many studies proposed above, one of the major causes to Thai students' English writing problems is L1 interference. Hereupon, the differences between Thai and English languages should be seriously pointed out for Thai students in order that they could avoid facing this drawback over and over again.

Pedagogical Implications

The findings of this study have some pedagogical implications for English teaching at NRRU and other universities in Thailand. Thus, it is hoped that these implications can probably help those related people or institutes improve their instruction of English structure and usage as well as English writing. These implications are listed as follows:

1. Based on the study's results, the students in this study produced several errors in term of English structures such as punctuation, parts of speech, spelling, articles, tenses, and incomplete sentences that they have learned since they were in primary schools. Therefore, teachers should encourage students to concentrate more on their problems and motivate them to overcome their weaknesses.

2. The basic structure and usage of English grammar focusing on the most problematic aspects that students frequently make should be introduced to the class. According to Harmer (1998), he also suggested that it is essential to present grammar rules or structures to the class since they can help students see how the particular structures are formed in a sentence. Therefore, if teachers realize that their students still struggle in producing accurate English writing, the extra lecture of English grammar should be taken place. For example, since errors in the use of punctuation was the most commonly produced in this study, types and usage of punctuation should be emphasized in the lecture. Moreover, teachers should build up a clear and right understanding of how each part of speech in English must be used. For example, teachers might make a chart or diagram which presents the specific aspects of each part of speech and provides some sample sentences carrying the point of how each of them is used. Also, word family should be proposed in the classrooms. This can avoid the confusion for the students when they want to construct an accurate English sentence.

3. Teachers should point out the differences of the features in students' L1 – Thai and their target language – English in the classrooms thoroughly. This can encourage the students to avoid employing Thai language structures in their writing. In particular, the specific features in English that do not exist in Thai language should be focused to make them aware of the differences.

Recommendations for Further Studies

Based on the research methodology and research findings of this study, the researcher suggests some recommendations for further studies on grammatical errors in L2 writing and the effects of L1 interference in L2 writing as follows:

Firstly, this study drew students from only one university in Nakhon Ratchasima as the participants of the study. So, the findings that were received from this study could not be generalized to the entire population of Thai learners. In order to increase the generalizability, a large-scale research study is recommended. Students from several universities in Nakhon Ratchasima or different regions in Thailand can be involved.

Secondly, the participants in this study were drawn from only one major – English major at NRRU. Therefore, the researcher recommends that the cross-discipline study should be conducted, so the possibility of the finding generalization can be increased. Moreover, this study examined errors in a written text which provided the results that probably might not similar to the results from the studies on spontaneous speech. Thus, the study on errors in L2 speaking is suggested. Perhaps there might be some errors found in L2 writing that overlap to errors found in L2 speaking.

Thirdly, this study aimed at investigating the common types of grammatical errors in students' English writing and examining whether there were any errors caused by L1 interference. In order to find more varieties of the findings, the study of lexical errors and discourse errors should be included, and the other causes of errors in L2 writing such as over-generalization, incomplete application of rules, and false concept hypothesized should be involved in the study.

Finally, this study investigated errors only in descriptive essay writing. It can be much more interesting to see whether similar errors occur in other types of writing. For example, academic writing, such as essay writing and research proposal writing, is considered as a difficult type of writing in both L1 and L2 writing. If the errors found in this study can also be found in academic written paper, it might give some significant results to the study. Therefore, the study of grammatical errors caused by L1 interference in other types of writing, such as academic L2 writing, is also recommended.

References

Angwatanakul, S. (1975). *An analysis of errors in english usage by Thai teacher- college freshmen and a relevant remedial classroom procedure*. Doctor of Philosophy Thesis in Linguistics, University of Texas.

Bhela, B. (1999). Native language interference in learning a second language: Exploratory case studies of native language interference with target language usage. *International Education Journal 1*, 1.

Boey, L.K. (1975). *An introduction to linguistics for the language teacher*. Singapore: Singapore University Press.

Bardovi-Harlig, K. & Bofman, T. (1988). A second look at T-unit analysis. *A paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Teachers of English to Speakers of Other Languages. 22nd, Chicago, IL.*, March 8-13, 1988.

Bootchuy, T. (2008). *An analysis of errors in academic English writing by a group of first-year Thai graduates majoring in English*. A Master Thesis: Kasetsart University. (Unpublished)

Brown, H.D. (2000). *Principles of language learning and teaching.* 4th Ed. Englewood Cliffs: Prentice Hall Regents.

Brudiprabpha, P. (1972). *Error analysis: A psycholinguistic study of Thai English compositions*. Unpublished Master's Thesis, McGill University, Montreal.

Corder, S.P. (1967). The significance of learners' errors. *International Review of Applied Linguistics, 5*, 161-170.

Darus, S. (2009). Common errors in written English essays of form one Chinese students: A case study. *European Journal of Social Sciences, 10* (2).

Ganji, M. (2009). Teacher-correction, peer-correction and self-correction: Their impacts on Iranian students' IELTS essay writing performance. *The Journal of Asia TOFL, 6* (1), 117-139.

Harmer, J. (1998). *How to teach english.* Harlow: Longman.

Hunt, K.W. (1965). Grammatical structures written at three grade levels. *Research Report No. 3.* Urbana, IL: National Council of Teachers of English.

Iamsiu, C. (2014). *An analysis of grammatical errors in Srinakharinwirot University Students' writing*. A Master Thesis: Srinakharinwirot University.

Junpui, K. (2007). *English in Thai society*. Nation Jr, Nation Publishing.

Na-ngam, S. (2005). *Common grammatical errors in foundation english I written assignments of Prince of Songkla University students with high and low english entrance examination Scores*. Research paper: Prince of Songkla University. (in Thai)

Pengpanich, A. (2002). *Error analysis of english usage and use (5th ed.)*. Bangkok: Ramkhamhang University Press.

Polio, C. (1997). Measures of linguistic accuracy in second language writing research. *Language Learning, 47*, 101-143.

Pongpairoj, N. (2002). Thai university undergraduates' errors in English writing. *Journal of Language and Culture, 20* (2).

Pongsirirwet, C. (2001). *Relationships among grammatical accuracy, discourse features, and the quality of second language writing: the case study of Thai EFL learners*. Research dissertation: West Virginia University.

Richards, J.C. (1971). A non-contrastive approach to error analysis. *English Language Teaching Journal, 25*, 204-219.

Srichai, C. (2002). *Analysis of errors in written work by first year business administration students at Prince of Songkla University, Hat Yai Campus*. Research paper: Prince of Songkla University. (in Thai)

Tawilapakul, U. (2002). *The use of English tense by Thai university students*. CULI's National Seminar.

Thep-Ackrapong, T. (2005). Teaching English in Thailand: An uphill battle. *Journal of Humanities Parithat, Srinakharinwirot University, 27* (1), 51-62.

Torut, B. (1993). *An analysis of errors in english compositions written by Thai university students*. Master of Arts Thesis in English: Silapakorn University Sanamchandra Campus, Nakhon Pathom.

Ubol, C. (1981). *An error analysis of english compositions by Thai students*. Singapore: SEAMEO Regional Language Centre.