

An Analysis of Interlingual Errors and Intralingual Errors in Thai EFL Students' Writing at Khon Kaen University

การวิเคราะห์ข้อผิดพลาดที่เกิดจากการแทรกแซงของภาษาแม่ และข้อผิดพลาดที่เกิดจากอันตรกิริยาในงานเขียนของนักศึกษา มหาวิทยาลัยขอนแก่น ในฐานะผู้เรียนภาษาอังกฤษเป็นภาษาต่างประเทศ

Fonthip Phetdannuea (ฝนทิพย์ เพชรด่านเหนือ)^{1*} Dr.Sutida Ngonkum (ดร.สุธิดา โง่นคำ)**

ABSTRACT

The purposes of this study were to identify two sources of errors: interlingual errors and intralingual errors occurring in English major students' writing at Khon Kaen University and to explore the degree of communication disturbance caused by those errors. The participants of this research study were 25 second year English major students of the Faculty of Humanities and Social Sciences, Khon Kaen University. The instrument used in this study was the writing assignment. The results revealed that interlingual errors were the main errors conducted by students followed by the intralingual errors. In terms of intralingual errors, students' writings revealed all four intralingual types: overgeneralization, ignorance of rule restrictions, incomplete application of rules, and false concepts hypothesis. The two most frequent types of errors committed by students were incomplete application of rules and ignorance of rule restrictions which could be interpreted as that although students had learned English grammar; they haven't mastered the overall linguistic knowledge. The results also revealed the minor errors that cause communication disturbance.

บทคัดย่อ

การวิจัยครั้งนี้มีวัตถุประสงค์เพื่อ 1) จำแนกประเภทของข้อผิดพลาดสองประเภทที่พบในงานเขียนของนักศึกษาเอกวิชาวภาษาอังกฤษ มหาวิทยาลัยขอนแก่น ได้แก่ ข้อผิดพลาดที่เกิดขึ้นจากการแทรกแซงของภาษาแม่ และข้อผิดพลาดข้อผิดพลาดที่เกิดจากอันตรกิริยา และ 2) เพื่อศึกษาระดับความรุนแรงของข้อผิดพลาดที่สามารถส่งผลกระทบต่อความเข้าใจในงานเขียนของนักศึกษา กลุ่มตัวอย่างของงานวิจัยนี้ได้แก่ นักศึกษาเอกวิชาวภาษาอังกฤษ คณะมนุษยศาสตร์และสังคมศาสตร์ มหาวิทยาลัยขอนแก่น จำนวน

¹ Correspondent author: phetfonthip@hotmail.com, nsutid@kku.ac.th

* Student, Master of Arts Program in English, Faculty of Humanities and Social Sciences, Khon Kaen University

** Assistant Professor, Department of English, Faculty of Humanities and Social Sciences, Khon Kaen University

25 คน เครื่องมือที่ใช้ในงานวิจัยคือ งานเขียนที่นักศึกษาได้รับมอบหมาย ข้อมูลงานวิจัยได้ถูกนำมาวิเคราะห์เพื่อหาค่าความถี่ และร้อยละตามชนิดของข้อผิดพลาดทั้งสองประเภท ผลการศึกษาพบว่าสาเหตุหลักของข้อผิดพลาดที่เกิดขึ้นในงานเขียนของนักศึกษา คือ ข้อผิดพลาดที่เกิดขึ้นจากการแทรกแซงของภาษาแม่ กล่าวโดยภาพรวมก็คือ นักศึกษายังคงมีการใช้ภาษาแม่เมื่อมีการเขียนงานในภาษาที่สอง ในแง่ของข้อผิดพลาดที่เกิดจากอันตรภาษานั้นมีข้อผิดพลาดที่พบได้ในงานเขียนของนักศึกษาอยู่สี่ประเภท ได้แก่ การพยายามทำให้เป็นกฎ การไม่รู้กฎเกณฑ์ทางไวยากรณ์ การใช้กฎเกณฑ์ทางไวยากรณ์ไม่ครบถ้วน และการสรุปกฎผิดสองประเภทหลักที่พบบ่อยในงานเขียนของนักศึกษาได้แก่การใช้กฎเกณฑ์ทางไวยากรณ์ไม่ครบถ้วน และการไม่รู้กฎเกณฑ์ทางไวยากรณ์ การพยายามทำให้เป็นกฎโดยทั่วไปจัดว่าเป็นข้อผิดพลาดที่พบน้อยที่สุดในงานเขียนของนักศึกษา ตามมาด้วยการสรุปกฎเกณฑ์ผิด จากผลการศึกษา สามารถตีความได้ว่าถึงแม้ว่านักศึกษาจะผ่านการเรียนกฎไวยากรณ์ภาษาอังกฤษ แต่โดยภาพรวมแล้วนักศึกษาก็ยังไม่มีความเชี่ยวชาญในความรู้ที่พวกเขาได้เรียนมา ผลการวิจัยยังพบอีกว่าข้อผิดพลาดเหล่านี้ส่งผลกระทบต่อความเข้าใจในการสื่อสารเพียงเล็กน้อยเท่านั้น

Keywords: Error analysis in EFL writing

คำสำคัญ: การวิเคราะห์ข้อผิดพลาดในงานเขียนของผู้เรียนที่ใช้ภาษาอังกฤษเป็นภาษาต่างประเทศ

Introduction

In Thailand, English has been used as a foreign language, in completing academic, professional, and business missions. Therefore, it has been given importance to and has been taught in all educational levels in the country [1]. In fact, it is offered as a compulsory course to the primary, secondary and university students [2]. The main goal of English learning is to develop Thai students' four skills which are listening, speaking, reading and writing. However, of the four English skills, the writing skill is heavily emphasized in the Thai context of English class. This is due to the fact that in our real world communication, writing has been used to complete various purposes including academic purposes, business purposes, and professional purposes. Therefore, it is important to develop Thai students' writing skill so that they become competent graduates

who are ready for job.

Like other EFL students across the world, many Thai students are unable to compose a good piece of writing. One factor that prevents them from improving their English writing is their lack of English linguistic knowledge or L_2 [3]. When they have to write, they often commit errors. In general, the error that exists in the language being learnt (target language) and that is not of the native language is called intralingual errors. In describing intralingual errors Richards (1971) [4] said that they are items produced based on partial exposure to the target language. In fact, intralingual errors are seen as "the deviations from the norms of the target language" [5].

Another problematic factor is that Thai students usually use their L_1 linguistic knowledge (Thai) to help them compose target language writing (English). A result

of this is the errors called interlingual errors [5]. Theoretically, interlingual errors are errors attributed to the native language. These kinds of errors occur when the learners' habits (patterns, systems, or rules) interfere or prevent him or her from acquiring the patterns and rules of the second language [6]. In general, learners make such errors because they assume that the target language and their native language were similar; in fact, they were different [7]. The distinctive differences of linguistic knowledge between the first language and the target language distort their written products [8]. The phenomenon that learners' L1 intervening their target language writing process is also widely known as L₁ interference [9].

Both having low proficiency in L₂ linguistics and using L₁ to interfere their English composition are considered as the two main problems for Thai student writers [10]. One way to identify students' writing errors is by conducting error analysis (EA) [5]. Besides identifying learners' errors, error analysis also helps the teachers to identify the sources of the errors. In L₂ writing classes, among different error sources, interlingual and intralingual have been considered as two major sources of EFL learners' errors [11].

Believing that both interlingual and intralingual errors can hamper student's writing performance, this study aims to investigate the extent to which interlingual and intralingual errors influence the writing of Thai students, particularly of the university undergraduate graduates. In doing so, the study investigates the features of sources

of errors in essay writing of 25 second year English major students. These students were enrolled in an essay writing course of academic year 2014 during the second semester, at Khon Kaen University, Thailand. Two sources of errors, namely interlingual errors and intralingual errors were analyzed from samples of the students' essay writing and interpreted in consideration of the error analysis theory. The obtained results are expected to be useful for the EFL teachers in Thailand to have a clear understanding of the sources of language learners' errors which will help them in designing classroom teaching and learning that can help to reduce students' writing errors.

Literature Review

Error analysis (EA)

Error Analysis (EA) refers to the systematic investigation that examines linguistic ignorance and explores the linguistic points that learners do not know as well as how the learners attempt to cope with their ignorance [12]. Such systematic investigation includes the steps of observing, analyzing, and classifying the deviations of the rules of the second languages and then revealing the systems operated by learners [13].

Interestingly, current research on investigating L2 learners' errors has applied error analysis as the theoretical framework of research due to its several benefits [14]. The first advantage is that error analysis provides data on actual problems and so it forms a more efficient basis for designing

pedagogical strategies. The second benefit is that error analysis is used to identify and predict areas of errors (names of errors) as well as the sources of errors. In terms of the error's sources, the interlingual errors and intralingual errors have been widely analyzed.

In order to find each source of errors, Corder (1974) [6] and (Ellis & Barkhuizen, 2005) [15] suggested that researchers need to strictly follow the five steps in error analysis process. The first process in error analysis is the collection of a sample of learners' language. The aim of this process is to prepare the sample of learner language for the analysis. Once a corpus of learner language has been collected, the errors have to be identified. This step involves a comparison between what the learner has produced and what the target language native speaker would produce in the same context. After errors were identified, they are then described in the next step. The description of learners' errors involves specifying how the forms produced by the learner differ from those produced by the learners' native-speaker counterparts as stated by Corder (1974) [6]. The fourth process is explaining the errors, which deals with sources of errors. In terms of psychological aspects, the causes of competence errors are transfer, intralingual, and unique processes [6]. The fifth and last process is error evaluation which involves determining the gravity of different errors with a view to deciding which ones should receive

teachers' attention. In general, in the evaluating process, the evaluator needs to keep in mind that the evaluation should be based on degree of seriousness in terms of communication disturbance in both sentential and lexical level [15]. In doing that, the evaluator needs to realize that there are two kinds of errors: global and local.

Sources of errors

Numbers of researcher broadly view errors in two major sources, interlingual errors and intralingual, which were categorized by Richards (1974) [5], and these two sources of errors have been currently the focus of the error analysis research. Interlingual errors refer to errors resulting from the interference of learners' L_1 knowledge while producing the target language writing [8]. It is the way that learners decide to use their L_1 linguistic knowledge to help them completing a target language written product. Such decision is made when L_2 learners have difficulty in applying the linguistic structure of the target language to complete a writing task. In relying on their L_1 when producing the target writing text, they inevitably transfer their L_1 linguistic knowledge into the production of L_2 which in turn can produce writing errors along the writing process.

Interestingly, most of the errors that occur in L_2 writing are related to the transfer of grammatical structure [16]. This might happen because every time L_2 learners have target language linguistic problems while writing, they tend to rely on their L_1 linguistic

knowledge as they assume that the two languages share the equivalent structures [17]. Unfortunately, such assumption is not always the case or cause of errors. For example, if there are differences of structure properties between L_1 and L_2 , the combination of the systems of L_1 and L_2 in L_2 writing can lead to errors [18].

Empirical evidence has shown that interlingual errors can occur in all language components that include phonological, morphological, lexical and syntactic. However, two language components that are significantly attracting the researchers' interests are the lexical and syntactic ones. Bennui (2008) [10] investigated L_1 interference and found evidence of that in Thai university students' paragraph writings. The results indicated discourse level errors in addition to lexical and syntactic errors. To further explain, he reported that lexical interlingual errors found in the study included the wrong use of vocabulary in the manners of direct translation, and borrowing of Thai words. For syntactic errors, word order of Thai sentence structure, subject-verb agreement, tense, the infinitive, the verb 'have', prepositions, and noun determiners were found in Bennui's study. In terms of the discourse errors, he indicated that writing organization, language style, and cultural knowledge were the main causes of discourse interlingual errors. In addition, the study of Na-ngam (2005) [19] classified the errors made by students with high and low English Entrance Examination (EEE) scores at

Prince of Songkla University (PSU), Hat Yai Campus into 23 types ranging from sentence to word levels. He mentioned about six types of errors occurring most frequently were errors in incomplete sentences, nouns, agreement, spelling, tense, and articles.

Like interlingual errors found in all L_2 classes across the world, errors found in the Thai context in both lexical and syntactic levels are due to the direct translation, word borrowing, and the difference between English features and the Thai features. In trying to distinguish the Thai language features from the English ones, Ampornratana (2009) [20] elaborated that even though the English and Thai languages are both SVO languages (having the same sentence pattern which is subject + verb + object/complement), there are many differences between them both in word and sentence levels.

The first major difference is that Thai words are isolated words. This means that number, gender and tense are added as an extra word. The second major difference is that there are no articles used in a sentence. Thirdly, in Thai structure, adjectives are used as nouns modifiers, and adverbs (as well as adverbial clauses) are used as verb modifiers. It is worth noting that their positions in a sentence appear initially or lastly. Another difference is that classifiers are used after things, persons and animals that are counted by numbers. This is because according to the Thai basic rule of word order, modifiers follow what they modify [21]. One important point is that in Thai sentence,

subjects, pronouns, prepositions and other words which are not required to make a statement comprehensible can be deleted from the sentence [22].

Intralingual errors refer to the difficulty of the target language learning. It usually occurs when L₂ learners have difficulties in using the target language. Such difficulties result from faulty or partial knowledge of the target language or because learners do not know the target language very well [23]. As a result, they tend to generalize parts of the target language rules when they produce the target language text. According to many linguists, these errors seem to occur naturally as parts of second language development. In general, intralingual errors were grouped into four types: overgeneralization, ignorance of the rule restriction, incomplete application, and false concepts hypothesis [4]. Bootchuy (2008) [13] also explored the ill-formed sentences that are constructed by transferring Thai L1 structures into the academic English writing. The data were collected from a writing task and final term papers of forty-one first year graduate students studying in an English Master program at a university in Bangkok. There were three types of errors found in this study: interlingual errors, intralingual errors and developmental errors. Among the intralingual errors, the most frequent types of errors found were overuse of verb *to be*, redundancy of verbs, unnecessary inclusion of subjects, unnecessary inclusion of objects, incorrect verbs and -verb

constructions, wrong form of a main verb after a *modal verb*, omission of auxiliary verbs in the passive voice constructions, omission of conjunctions/subordinators, incorrect use of conjunctions, omission of verb *to be* in *seem to + infinitive* constructions. Similarly, the results of Ampornratana (2009) [20] have revealed that all three error types were interlingual errors, intralingual errors and developmental errors. Intralingual errors and developmental errors appeared the most among three types of errors. There were 12 other types of errors found in Ampornratana (2009) [20] which were overuse of verb *to be*, the wrong form of a main verb in negative sentences, subject/object repetition, incorrect verb and -verb construction, incorrect use of pronoun, incorrect use of adjective, incorrect use of agreement, omission of verb *to be* in passive form, incorrect use of preposition, incorrect use of conjunction, incorrect use of noun, and incorrect use of verb forms.

The Description of Errors' Communication Disturbance

There have been suggestions from many linguists in the field that teachers should not correct all errors committed by their students. This is because the frequent correction might disrupt the learning process and discourage students to produce the writing work. Therefore, the teachers' reaction towards errors and the type of feedback to be given should usually be determined based on the necessity of the students' language development. In this regard, Brown (2000) [24] suggested that teacher should correct only errors that

affect intelligibility such as errors that interfere with the general meaning and understandability of learners' writing. In other word, the communicability of the product should be the criterion for the decision on type of treatment. Accordingly, a number of different categories for describing errors underlying the language comprehensibility have been identified. One is to describe errors in terms of its magnitude [25]. Taking this stance, errors may vary in magnitude and this could be viewed as being either global or local errors [25].

According to Burt and Kiparsky (1974) [25], global errors refer to errors that significantly affect the contents or structure of the whole sentences. As global errors interfere in the sentence structure, they inevitably hinder the communication. They prevent a message from being comprehended. Unlike the global errors, local errors do not prevent a message from being understood. Such errors damage only certain parts of a sentence. They only cause a minor violation of one segment of a sentence. This means that readers of a text can still guess the intended meaning.

Despite the fact that research studies on students' language errors have been focused on both interlingual and intralingual errors to offer insights into the possible errors occurred in EFL students' compositions, teachers are still facing challenge when teaching English writing to EFL students [14]. Having such a clear

exigency of problems in writing of EFL students, the analyses of errors in writing are continuously needed to be carried out [26]. This is also the case in Thailand where the research studies underlying L2 writing errors have been the interested topic in the country since 2005[3]. This reflects that Thai EFL writing learners still have writing problems/ difficulties, and so there is still a need for research studies in this area [3].

The two main research questions are set up to find the answer for:

(1) *What are the interlingual errors and the intralingual errors found in the written products of English major students at KhonKaen University?*

(2) *To what extent do the interlingual and intralingual errors cause the communication disturbance in the written products of English major students at Khon Kaen University?*

Methods

Research design

This research employed a combination of quantitative and qualitative approaches to conduct a study of error analysis in English essay writing of 25 undergraduate students at the Faculty of Humanities and Social Sciences, Khon Kaen University. To find out the number of occurrences of each error in the data collected and to see how much the research participants may have transferred Thai into their English and how much they lack of L2 linguistic knowledge, this research study used Corder (1974) [6] and (Ellis

&Barkhuizen, 2005) [15]'s five steps in error analysis as the error analysis framework.

Participants

The participants in this study were 25 second- year English major students who enrolled in 411232 English Essay Writing course during the second semester of the academic year 2014 at the faculty of Humanities and Social Sciences of Khon Kaen University. The participants were chosen by a purposive sampling technique which is known as judgmental, selective, or subjective sampling that is employed to select the best and appropriate people, case, event, or pieces of data to be studied [27]. In case of this study, the participants were studying in bachelor's degree of English major and they were being taught how to write a five paragraph English essay during the semester. So, they were assumed that they were proficiency in both L2 linguistic knowledge and English essay writing.

Research instrument

A corpus of students' written work was created as data for this study. This corpus was compiled from 25 written products of the participants when they were assigned to write a five-paragraph process essay. In this study, the process essay was chosen because it is a type of writing that presents uncomplicated contents. Therefore, while writing this essay, students didn't need to employ intense cognitive load as they didn't need to think

of the difficult and complicated writing contents. In addition, the process essay was taught as the last type of writing. It was assumed that students would have already become familiar with the easy writing organization by the time they were assigned to write a process essay. Without content and organizational burdens, students were assumed to put all efforts on the linguistic features while working on the writing task. This writing environment could facilitate students' use of linguistic knowledge that they have already learned. Such environment would offer data that could yield their real errors.

For the process writing in the present study, the participants were asked to write a five paragraph directional process essay entitled "How to Show Appreciation to Others". The length of the essay was approximately 550-650 words. They were also asked to give a clear picture and use appropriate tense sequence transitions in their writing.

Data collection

The writing activity was administered in the participants' respective classrooms by data collectors under the observance of the researcher. In order to receive the data for the error analysis, all the research participants were asked to write a composition at the end of the semester after they had learned about process writing. They were required to complete this assignment by themselves without receiving any suggestion from their teachers. They were not allowed to consult

anything with their classmates either. Students were provided 1.5 hours for writing. The advantage of collecting data by asking the research participants to do a writing task at the particular moment is that the researcher could obtain highly authentic data since they were in a controlled environment [13].

Data analysis

In the stage of data analysis in this research study, the errors were coded separately as interlingual errors and intralingual errors. The error coding patterns of this study have been modified from the previous models. In previous studies, the coding pattern for the interlingual errors was modified from Na-ngam (2005) [19] and Bennui (2008) [10]. The coding pattern for the intralingual errors has been modified from Richard (1971, 1974) [4, 5]. Each sub-category was modified from the study of Bootchuy (2008) [13] and Ampornratana (2009) [20]. Table 1 and 2 present the coding patterns of both interlingual and intralingual errors, respectively.

While coding the errors, the researcher read the participants' writings sentence by sentence in order to find students' errors. All the errors found were identified on the basis of whether they were correct or incorrect by making a comparison between the language that the learner had produced and the language that the target language speaker would produce in the same context.

After all the errors were identified, they were described according to the grammatical description of each error, which were omissions, additions, misinformation and disordering [12]. To help boosting the strength of the errors' classification and analysis, the concept of data analysis was applied from more than one rater. In doing this, the researcher invited an expert (native English-speaking instructor) as an inter-rater, working in sample reviewing and errors categorizing. After completion of describing the errors, a native speaker was asked to check whether all errors were described correctly. The native speaker took about two weeks to check and confirm the identification of the errors. There were some disagreements from linguistic points of view, so discussions were organized between the English native speaker and the researcher to come to an agreed conclusion. In the final draft of identifying and describing errors, both the researcher and native speaker shared the same agreement. After identifying and describing, all data were explained and categorized into interlingual and intralingual types of errors. At this stage, it was found that there were some overlapped errors between interlingual errors and intralingual errors. To solve this problem regarding explaining and categorizing the errors, a meeting was held among the thesis adviser, the English native speaker, and the researcher. At the end of the discussion, everyone shared the same understanding and agreement. After

grouping all errors according to their sources, the number of each errors found were counted and calculated into percentage in order to find the frequency. Later, the results of the frequency were revealed, and the data were analyzed again in order to find the degree of seriousness in terms of those errors 'effect on the comprehensibility of students' writing. The degree of seriousness was chosen to analyze because this research study would explore the degree of communication disturbance caused by these errors. In this step, the errors were analyzed and described in terms of global and local errors.

Results and Discussions

The results are presented in response to the research questions. Thus, the results of overall errors found in the students' process writing based on sources of errors are presented to answer the first research question. The description of the degree of communication disturbance caused by the errors is also presented to answer the second research question.

Results of overall errors found in students' process writing

The analysis of errors revealed that the first three highest frequent errors belonged to the interlingual categories, namely subject-verb agreements (15.46%), run-on sentence (9.62%), and determiner-noun agreements (8.93%), respectively.

Results of errors found in students' process writing based on sources of errors

Analysis of the data reflects that there are three main sources of errors found in this study. Table 3 shows the results based on the sources of errors found in this research study. It can be seen that the first most source of errors found in this present study is interlingual error source (52.58%). Intralingual errors (40.55%) and careless errors (6.87%) are the second and the third errors identified, respectively.

In order to understand each source of errors thoroughly in detail, the results are elaborated separately in the following sub-sections.

Results of interlingual errors found in students' process writing

The analysis of errors revealed that among the interlingual type, the frequency of agreement errors appeared the most (46.40%) which included subject-verb agreement (29.41%) and determiner-noun agreement (16.99%). Run-on sentences (18.30%) and literal translation from Thai to English (10.46%) were taking the second and third positions of most frequent errors, respectively. The fourth frequent errors were the verb tense errors, that were revealed having (7.84%), and incomplete sentences with (5.23%) were the fifth. Pluralization errors were the sixth errors with (5.23%), and the seventh errors were using Thai words (3.92%) to replace English vocabularies. Punctuation errors and wrong word choice were the least frequent errors occurred, with 1.96 % and 0.65%, respectively.

Regarding the interlingual errors found in this study, it can be said that students distorted both the regulations of subject-verb agreement and determiner-noun agreement. The occurrence of this phenomenon is the interference of Thai language structure [24]. As mentioned earlier, there are two patterns of run-on errors, namely the long sentence, and the stringy sentence types. Out of the two run-on error patterns, long sentence appeared to cause incomprehensibility of the text as it is quite difficult for the readers to follow the writers' run on expressions. However, the second pattern allows readers to follow the writers' ideas as the writers used comma and conjunction to break the ideas down. So, the readers can still understand the meaning of the whole sentence. An example of such pattern found in his study is "I hope that you will take some step from me to apply in your daily life when you want to appreciate the other and make sure that you do it from your real mind". The analyzed data also indicated that errors named literal translation from Thai to English play a key role in causing students' writing errors. This phenomenon is in line with the results from Rattanadilok Na Phuket's (2015) [28] study which investigates the types of errors conducted by students in a Thai university. Rattanadilok Na Phuket (2015) [28] also argues that verb tense errors are seen being committed by students.

Results of intralingual errors found in students' process writing

Four categories of intralingual writing errors were found in this study. These

four errors were incomplete application of rules having (43.22%) of appearance, ignorance of rule restrictions with (33.05%), overgeneralization with (16.95%), and false concepts hypothesis with (6.78%), respectively. It was found that among the errors of incomplete application of rules, omissions in use of English grammatical rules were found in this study. The fourth high frequency found in incomplete application of rules were omission of punctuation with (17.80%), omission of auxiliary verbs with (11.02%), omission of preposition with (5.93%), and omission of conjunction with (5.08%) followed the sequence.

Underlying the ignorance of rule restrictions, the total number of errors was 33.05%. Using the wrong word choice with (19.49%) was found having the most frequency. The second most errors noticed among the errors occurred due to ignorance of rule restriction were incorrect use of preposition and incorrect use of verb forms revealing (4.24%) of total errors. The incorrect use of auxiliary verbs with (1.69%) was found to be the third ranked one. The total number of errors in overgeneralization was 16.95%. Overuse of some grammatical points was the sub-categories of overgeneralization. The overuse of punctuation was the most frequent error found at 5.93%. The overuse of conjunction (4.24%) was the second most frequent and overuse of pronoun (2.54%) and auxiliary verb (2.54%) was the third most frequent errors found among these category of errors. The false concepts hypothesis were the least intralingual errors found in this

study. The total number of errors found in the false concepts hypothesis category was 6.78%. Splitting was ranked as the highest errors found among the errors in false concepts hypothesis (2.54%) group. The second highest ranked which share the same numbers of errors were of using the wrong tense (1.69%) and wrong spelling (1.69%). The least errors found in false concepts hypothesis were the use of wrong forms of negation with (0.85%). Of the four types of intralingual errors, errors deriving from false concepts hypothesis could indicate students' development in language learning. Thus, such errors are the good sign of target language linguistic acquisition.

In terms of intralingual errors, omission of punctuation, especially comma, are the most common errors deriving from the incomplete application of rules. From the data obtained, it is quite surprising to see that even though students had learned the punctuation rules in their writing course, they still exhibited the lack of knowledge which is reflected through all the omission of the punctuation errors in the sentences. In addition, the errors deriving from ignorance of rule restrictions seem to reflect students' target language acquisition the most. This is because students who conduct such errors are the one who have not yet mastered the target language linguistic as they tend to apply the rules they have learned in the different forbidden context [11]. According to Richards (1971) [4], overgeneralization is employed when students need to reduce the cognitive burden while learning the tar-

get language linguistics. Thus, these errors seem to only annoy the readers rather than causing any incomprehensibility of the writers' message. In this study, overuse of punctuation, conjunction, pronoun, and auxiliary are found. Data also show that underlying the false concepts hypothesis, students tried to work on word's spellings and the structures of negation. However, they could not yet reach the full acquisition of English grammatical rules [29] which are the structure and form of words.

Results of careless errors

There are 20 careless errors found in this study. They can be grouped into two types: misspelling and capitalization. Capitalization is the most frequent error revealing (95%) of the total number and misspelling ranked as the second having (5%).

The errors' degree of communication disturbance

In this section, the analyzed data are presented in order to identify the types of errors that could affect the comprehensibility of the written text, which in turn will devalue the students' composition. The errors' degree of communication disturbance is interpreted in term of global and local errors. Below is a brief discussion provided on the presentation of data yielded in both interlingual and intralingual errors.

Interlingual errors' degree of communication disturbance

Among the interlingual errors, the errors in agreements, run-on sentence (stringy pattern), verb tense, pluralization,

and punctuation do not significantly affect the overall meaning of the sentences. In contrast these errors seem to allow the overall understanding of the written messages. As expected, data of this research study have revealed that interlingual errors deriving from run-on sentences (long sentence pattern), literal translation from Thai to English, incomplete sentences, using Thai words, and wrong choice of vocabularies immensely prevent the understanding of the readers. They ruin the whole writing discourse if they are used intensively in the paragraph level [30].

According to the results found in this study, errors in the interlingual source can be both local errors and global errors. Errors in run-on sentence (long sentence pattern), literal translation from Thai to English, incomplete sentences, using Thai words, and wrong choice of words are categorized into global errors as they affect the meaning of the text in sentences which lead to communication incomprehensibility. On the other hand, errors in run-on sentence (stringy pattern), agreement, verb tense, pluralization, and punctuation affect only some certain parts of the sentences, but the meaning of the text are still understandable, so they are analyzed as local errors.

Intralingual errors' degree of communication disturbance

In this study, it seems that most of the errors resulting from the incomplete application of rules are local errors, and therefore, they rarely cause any difficulty in understanding of the text. Moreover,

overgeneralization errors seem to only annoy the readers rather than causing any incomprehensibility of the writers' messages. In this study, overuse of auxiliary, punctuation, and articles are the overgeneralization errors identified, and so they don't significantly affect the comprehension. However, some errors like omission of preposition are considered as global errors which could alter the message that the writer intended to send. In addition, errors like omission of preposition found in this study are considered as global errors which could destroy the message that the writer intended to send [31].

From the above discussions on the finding of this research, it can be said that most of the errors found in the intralingual errors are considered as local errors since they do not cause communication incomprehensibility in the text. Most of the errors from incomplete application of rules and overgeneralization are examples of local errors found in this study. However, omission of preposition, the sub-categories errors from incomplete application of rule are analyzed as global errors.

From the analyzed data, it could be seen that the overall global errors which caused the incomprehensibility of the written sentences were the interlingual errors categorized as the literal translation from Thai to English and using Thai words. These errors are claimed to be the global errors, according to Dulay, Burt, and Krashen (1982) [31]. The data analyzed in this study also revealed that, the overall intralingual

errors haven't had much effect on the text understanding. This is congruent with Farrokh (2011) [32] who stated that local errors tend not to impede the intended meaning of the text. Although the global errors are identified as interfering text understanding in this study, data display only moderate occurrences of them. This can be stated that this group of students did not produce incomprehensible writing tasks in overall as they generally appeared to conduct not a larger number of many global errors in their written works.

Conclusion

The findings of this study have revealed that interlingual errors were the main errors conducted by this group of students. Broadly speaking, the students were depended on their mother tongue when composing English text. The intralingual errors were also found playing a role in students' errors. In this study, students conducted all four intralingual types of errors. The most two frequent types committed by students were incomplete application of rules and ignorance of rule restrictions, and the least frequent ones were overgeneralization and false concepts hypothesis, respectively. This could be interpreted that although students had learned English grammar, they haven't mastered the overall linguistic knowledge of what they have learned so far. One worth mentioning point is that although students generally were able to overcome the

dangerous global errors, they still need more target language knowledge training.

Recommendations and Limitation

The study on error analysis may not suit the high proficiency students as they already have sufficient knowledge of English linguistic knowledge. However, for training the low proficiency students, the error analysis can still be helpful because the kinds of errors that the students make while writing in English can be avoided if both the teachers and students are trained to be able to differentiate between the varieties of L_1 and L_2 in the areas of oral articulation and syntactic construction. Additionally, given the results of this study, a number of recommendations for further research are suggested. First, it is recommended that further research can be undertaken to investigate the errors made by undergraduate students of both English and non-English major. Second, further investigation into interlingual and intralingual errors made by Thai EFL graduate students is strongly recommended. Thirdly, conducting an interview in order to confirm whether those errors are interlingual or intralingual errors is important because some errors can be overlapped. For example, errors found in subject-verb agreement sometimes may not only be due to interlingual or intralingual errors, but may occur because of the difficulty in articulation leading to wrong perception of students. It could be further said that perception in articulation can cause errors in

writing [29]. Lastly, the findings of this study can also be useful for teachers in 'English as a second language or foreign language teaching' especially in English writing instruction. Most importantly, error analysis can help to identify the types of errors with overlapping whether they are caused by L_1 interference or by L_2 knowledge gap, which can be very helpful for teachers to prepare teaching strategies. It is suggested that teachers can plan some teaching strategies that would encourage the students to think in English, so that students can produce effective pieces of writing without the transference from their mother tongues. It is also suggested that the teachers can plan suitable lessons or gain teaching techniques to help their students learn how to produce complete and grammatically correct sentences of English language.

References

1. Wiriyaichitra A. English Language Teaching and Learning in Thailand in this Decade. 2001. Retrieved on January 15, 2015 from <http://www.apecknowledgebank.org/resources/downloads/english%20language%20teaching%20and%20learning%20in%20thailand.pdf>.
2. Khamput P. First language interference on second language writing of mathayomsuksa 5 students [Master of Arts Independent Study in English]. KhonKaen, The Graduate School, KhonKaen University; 2004.
3. Chuenchaichon Y. A review of EFL writing research studies in Thailand in the past 10 years. *Journal of Humanities Naresuan University*. 2014; 1: 13-30.
4. Richards JC. "A non-contrastive approach to error analysis." *English Language Teaching*. 1971; 25 (3): 85-94.
5. Richard JC. *Error Analysis: Perspective on Second Language Acquisition*. London: Longman Group Ltd. 1974.
6. Corder SP. *Error analysis: Perspectives on second language acquisition*. London: Longman. 1974.
7. Srichai C. Analysis of errors in written work by first year business administration students at Prince of Songkla University, Hat Yai Campus [Master of Arts Thesis in Applied Linguistics]. Songkla, The Graduate School, Prince of Songkla University; 2002.
8. Kaweera C. Writing error: A review of interlingual and intralingual interference in EFL Context. *English Language Teaching*. 2013; 6(7): (54-67).
9. Ellis R. *Second Language Acquisition*. Oxford: Oxford University Press. 1997.
10. Bennui P. A study of L1 interference in the writing of Thai EFL students. *Malaysian Journal of ELT Research*. 2008; 4(4): 72-102.
11. Touchie HY. Second language learning errors: Their types, causes, and treatment. *JALT Journal*. 1986; 8(1): 75-80.
12. James C. *Error in language learning and use*. New York: Addison Wesley Longman. 1998.

13. Bootchuy T. An analysis of errors in academic English writing by a group of first-year Thai graduates majoring in English [Master Thesis in English for Specific Purposes]. Bangkok: The Graduate School, Kasetsart University; 2008.
14. Heydari P, Bagheri MS. Error analysis: Sources of L2 learners' errors. *Theory and Practice in Language Studies*. 2012; 2(8): 1583-89.
15. Ellis R, Barkhuizen G. *Analysing Learner Language*. New York: Oxford University Press. 2005.
16. Alonso M. Language transfer: Interlingual errors in Spanish students of English as a foreign language. *Revista Alicantina de Estudios Ingleses*. 1997; 10: 7-14. Retrived 20 June 2015 from http://rua.ua.es/dspace/bitstream/10045/5990/1/RAEI_10_01.pdf
17. Bhela B. Native language interference in learning a second language: Exploratory case studies of native language interferences with target language usage. *International Education Journal*. 1999; 1 (1): 22-31.
18. Wang W, Wen Q. L1 use in the L₂ Composing Process: An Exploratory Study of 16 Chinese EFL Writers. *Journal of Second Language Writing*. 2002; 11: 225-246.
19. Na-Ngam S. Common grammatical errors in foundation English I written assignments of Prince of Songkla University student with high and low English entrance examination scores. [Master Thesis in Applied Linguistics]. Songkla: The Graduate School, Prince of Songkla University; 2005
20. Ampornratana C. The Error Analysis on English Composition: A Case Study of Year 6 Students in St. Stephen's International School [Master of Arts Independent Study in English for Specific Purposes]. Bangkok, The Graduate School, Kasetsart University; 2009
21. Ingkaphirom P, Iwasaki S. *A Reference Grammar of Thai*. 2005.
22. Higbie J, Thinsan S. (Eds.). *Thai Reference Grammar: The Structure of Spoken Thai*. Bangkok: Orchid Press. 2002.
23. Abusaeedi R, Asghar, Faezeh B. A quantitative analysis of Iranian EFL learners' sources of written errors. *International Journal of Research Studies in Language Learning*. 2014; 4(1): 31-42.
24. Brown H. *Principles of Language Learning and Teaching*. New Jersey: PrenticeHall Inc. 2000.
25. Burt KM, Kiparsky, C. *The gooficon: a repair manual for English*. Rowley, Mass: Newbury House Publishers. 1974
26. Erdogan V. Contribution of error analysis to foreign language teaching. *Journal of the Faculty of Education*. 2005; 1(2): 261-270.

27. Gass S, Mackey A. Second language research: Methodology and design. New Jersey: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Inc. 2005.
28. Rattanadilok Na Phuket P. Understanding EFL Students' Errors in Writing. *Journal of Education and Practice*. 2015; 6 (32): 99-106.
29. Bancha W. What causes spelling errors of Thai EFL students? *ARECLS*. 2013; 10: 107-129.
30. Nukit S. An error analysis of free English compositions written by students at three proficiency level. Unpublished Independent Study. [Independent Study in English for Specific Purposes]. Bangkok: The Graduate School, Kasetsart University; 2007
31. Dulay HW, Burt M, Krashen S. *Language Two*. New York: Oxford University Press. 1982.
32. Farrokh P. Analysing of EFL learners' linguistic errors: Evidence from Iranian translation trainees. *Theory and Practice in Language Studies*. 2011; 1 (6): 676-680.

Table 1 The coding pattern for interlingual errors

| Types of Errors | Frequency | Percentage |
|-----------------------|-----------|------------|
| 1.Sentence Structure | | |
| 2.Incomplete Sentence | | |
| 3.Agreement | | |
| 4.Connecting words | | |
| 5. Verb Tenses | | |
| 6.Prepositions | | |
| 7.Punctuations | | |

Table 2 The coding pattern for intralingual errors

| Types of Errors | Frequency | Percentage |
|-----------------------------------|-----------|------------|
| 1.Overgeneralization | | |
| 2.Ignorance of rules restrictions | | |
| 3.Incomplete application of rules | | |
| 4.False concepts hypothesis | | |

Table 3 Errors found in students' process writing based on sources of errors

| No. | Sources of Errors | Numbers of Errors | Percentage |
|-----|---------------------|-------------------|---------------|
| 1. | Interlingual Errors | 153 | 52.58 |
| 2. | Intralingual Errors | 118 | 40.55 |
| 3. | Careless Errors | 20 | 6.87 |
| | Total | 291 | 100.00 |