



การใช้ Surface Strategy Taxonomy ในการวิเคราะห์ข้อผิดพลาดในการเขียนเชิงโต้แย้ง: กรณีศึกษาของนักศึกษาไทยในระดับปริญญาตรี

มงคลไชย เทียนสุตสินนท์¹ ID นภาศรี สุวรรณโชติ^{2*} จีระศักดิ์ มีสุขสบาย³

Applying Surface Strategy Taxonomy to Analyze Argumentative Writing Errors: A Case Study of Thai Undergraduates

Mongkolchai Tiansoodeenon¹ Napasri Suwanajote^{2*} Jeerasak Meesuksabai³

Received 02/04/2026 Revised 04/06/2026 Accepted 10/06/2026

<https://doi.org/10.60101/jla.2026.7.1.10848>

บทคัดย่อ

งานวิจัยนี้ศึกษาข้อผิดพลาดทางไวยากรณ์ในระดับคำและสาเหตุของข้อผิดพลาดในการเขียนเรียงความเชิงโต้แย้งของนักศึกษาไทยระดับปริญญาตรีที่เรียนภาษาอังกฤษเป็นภาษาต่างประเทศ (EFL) โดยใช้ระเบียบวิธีวิจัยเชิงปริมาณ ประชากรประกอบด้วยนักศึกษาปริญญาตรีชั้นปีที่ 3 จำนวน 98 คน ที่ลงทะเบียนเรียนวิชาการเขียนเชิงโต้แย้งในภาคเรียนที่ 2 ปีการศึกษา 2569 ณ คณะศิลปศาสตร์ มหาวิทยาลัยราชภัฏสุราษฎร์ธานีในภาคกลางของประเทศไทย ผู้เข้าร่วมวิจัยประกอบด้วยนักศึกษา 33 คนที่ได้รับการคัดเลือกโดยวิธีการสุ่มตัวอย่างแบบเจาะจง เครื่องมือวิจัยประกอบด้วยแบบฟอร์มการเก็บรวบรวมข้อผิดพลาดในการเขียนตามหลัก Surface Strategy Taxonomy (SST) ในการบันทึกข้อผิดพลาดในการเขียนของนักศึกษา การศึกษานี้ใช้ความถี่และร้อยละในการวิเคราะห์ข้อมูล ผลการวิจัยพบว่าข้อผิดพลาดประเภทการเขียนผิด (Misformation) เป็นข้อผิดพลาดที่พบมากที่สุดรองลงมาคือการละเว้น (Omission) การเพิ่มคำ (Additional) และการเรียงลำดับคำผิด (Misordering) ตามลำดับ นอกจากนี้สาเหตุของข้อผิดพลาดได้แก่ข้อผิดพลาดในภาษาเดียวกัน (intralingual error) ซึ่งเป็นผลมาจากความยากของภาษาเป้าหมายโดยข้อผิดพลาดนี้เกิดจากการสรุปเกินจริง การไม่รู้กฎ และสมมติฐานที่ผิดพลาด และข้อผิดพลาดระหว่างภาษา (interlingual error) ได้แก่โครงสร้าง "ประธานสองตัว" ซึ่งสะท้อนถึงความสับสนของผู้เรียนในเรื่องของโครงสร้างของภาษาไทยและภาษาเป้าหมาย

คำสำคัญ: การวิเคราะห์ข้อผิดพลาด การเขียนเชิงโต้แย้ง การวิเคราะห์ข้อผิดพลาดตามหลักการ

Abstract

This study examines the grammatical errors at a word level and their underlying causes in argumentative essays written by Thai EFL undergraduates. This study employed a quantitative research design. The population was 98 third-year undergraduates enrolled in an argumentative writing course in the second semester of the

¹สาขาภาษาอังกฤษเพื่อการสื่อสารสากล คณะศิลปศาสตร์ มหาวิทยาลัยเทคโนโลยีราชมงคลกรุงเทพ
Faculty of Liberal Arts, Rajamangala University of Technology Krungthep

²คณะมนุษยศาสตร์และสังคมศาสตร์ มหาวิทยาลัยราชภัฏสวนสุนันทา
Faculty of Humanities and Social Sciences, Suan Sunandha Rajapath University

³คณะมนุษยศาสตร์และสังคมศาสตร์ มหาวิทยาลัยราชภัฏสวนสุนันทา
Faculty of Humanities and Social Sciences, Suan Sunandha Rajapath University
E-mail: ¹mongkolchai.t@mail.rmuth.ac.th ²napasri.su@ssru.ac.th ³jeerasak.me@ssru.ac.th

*Corresponding author e-mail: napasri.su@ssru.ac.th

2026 academic year at the Faculty of Liberal Arts at the public university in central Thailand. The participants included 33 students selected through purposive sampling. The research instrument was the Surface Strategy Taxonomy (SST) collection form used to record students' writing errors. The data were analyzed using frequency and percentage. The results revealed that misinformation was the most common error, followed by omission, addition, and misordering, respectively. Moreover, the causes of errors included intralingual errors such as overgeneralization, rule ignorance, and false hypotheses, as well as interlingual errors related to the "double subject" construction, which reflects confusion among Thai learners regarding direct syntactic transfer from Thai to the target language.

Keywords: error analysis, argumentative writing, surface strategy taxonomy

Introduction

Writing is a complicated cognitive and linguistic process that does not only express ideas (Bulqiyah et al., 2021). It is a mixture of cognitive skills, including planning, writing, and revising, and linguistic skills like grammar, vocabulary, and discourse-level competency (Burns & Siegel, 2018). The argumentative (AR) essay is another genre of writing regarded as one of the most intellectually challenging academic writing genres (Fatimah et al., 2025). This challenge is due to the necessity for advanced cognitive and language skills (Ahmad, 2022; Ferretti et al., 2007). Additionally, students are required to establish an accurate argument, demonstrate premises with empirical evidence, and articulate ideas clearly (Fatimah et al., 2025). Chuang & Yan (2022) assert that argumentative essays are crucial for EFL learners, especially for those in higher education. Even though writing is crucial, many EFL students still face challenges with grammatical accuracy when they have to produce AR writing (Fatimah et al., 2025). Moreover, studies show that EFL students often have trouble writing essays because they fail to organize their ideas clearly and make several grammatical errors. This situation often occurs when they have to demonstrate their logical thinking and display their excellent language skills (Fitrawati & Safitri, 2021). In Thailand, this problem is no exception because students still struggle with constructing sentences and using language independently (Wongkittiporn, 2024).

Numerous studies examined error analysis in AR writing. Fatimah et al. (2025) focused on the common errors displayed by Indonesian students in AR essay writing. The findings revealed that the most common errors were omission, followed by addition, misinformation, and misordering. Kampookaew (2020) researched the types of grammatical errors created by Thai EFL students, as well as the reasons for those errors. The results indicated that the most common grammatical errors were incorrect use of single and plural nouns, omission of the article 'the,' and subject-verb problems. Promsupa et al. (2017) investigated the types of grammatical errors and the sources of these errors in English made by Thai second-year English majors. The data showed that the three most common types of grammar mistakes were mistakes with articles, mistakes with prepositions, and mistakes with singular/plural forms. The causes of errors included interlanguage, where students continued to use L1 structures while learning the target language. Moreover, the overgeneralization, rule ignorance, and incomplete rule application indicate the cause of intralingual and developmental writing errors.



Even though several research studies have examined grammar errors and their fundamental causes to suggest methods of improvement, writing issues continue to persist, especially among Thai EFL university students (Roongsitthichai et al., 2019). Moreover, the application of the Surface Strategy Taxonomy (SST) has not been widely utilized to analyze students' errors in the Thai context. Therefore, this study aimed to further investigate the grammatical errors and their causes in the AR essays written by Thai EFL students at a public university in central Thailand. The findings of this study would provide additional insights that raise awareness of the errors made by Thai EFL students in their AR writing.

Research questions

1. What are the grammatical errors at a word level produced in the argumentative essays written by Thai EFL students of the public university in the central part of Thailand?
2. What are the causes of the frequently found errors in the argumentative essays written by Thai EFL students at the public university in the central part of Thailand?

Literature Review

Error analysis

Error analysis can be defined as a type of linguistic study that identifies errors made by second language learners (Gass et al., 2013). It offers a structured framework to analyze the development and deviations of learners' interlanguage from target-language norms. Thus, the method of error analysis intends to identify the frequency, characteristics, causes, and effects of unsuccessful language usage, as well as to uncover persistent patterns in learners' written or spoken output (Dulay & Burt, 1973). They claimed that second language (L2) acquisition in children is generally comparable to first language (L1) acquisition and suggested that learners employ universal cognitive processes to “reconstruct” the rules of the target language, resulting in distinct, predictable mistake patterns irrespective of their native language. Moreover, they categorized error analysis into three main types: developmental errors, interference errors, and unique errors.

The first category includes developmental errors. These errors resemble those made by children acquiring the language as their first language (Dulay & Burt, 1974). They found that the vast majority of child L2 errors fell into this category, such as overgeneralizing a rule. For instance, language learners say “eated” instead of “ate.” The second category is interference errors. These errors are directly attributed to the influence of the learner's native language. For example, French speakers might use their reflective structure to say in English, “I wash myself.” This is because in French it is “Je me lave.” Finally, the last type of error is a unique error that does not clearly fit into developmental or interference. For example, a learner sometimes finds a rule they like and applies it to every possible scenario, even where it makes no logical sense in either language. He might use the progressive -ing form in every sentence; for example, I am knowing the answer.

The SST was introduced by Dulay and Burt (1974), which enabled researchers to identify the precise cognitive error committed by the learners. It includes omission, addition, misformation, and misordering. Table 1 below provides an explanation for each indicator.

Table 1

The Explanation of the Surface Strategy Taxonomy (SST)

Category	Definition	Example
Omission	Leaving out some grammatical items such as article, auxiliaries	He playing football.
Addition	Adding some necessary items	He doesn't works here.
Misformation	Using incorrect verb forms, wrong morphology	The dog eated the food.
Misordering	Putting items in wrong sequence	What you are doing?

The SST is a common way to find mistakes in students' writing. Suprpto et al. (2022) examined students' errors in employing the passive voice at the word level. The findings indicated that the most frequent errors committed by students were addition, omission, misformation, and misordering, respectively. Not only does the SST employ internationally, it also used to investigate students' writing in Thailand. Suraprajit (2021) attempted to examine the errors present in English essays written by Thai non-English major university students. The results showed that the most frequent errors were leaving out articles, adding the preposition, leaving out the subject, and using the subject pronoun wrongly. Moreover, the most common errors included subject-verb agreement errors, tense errors, unclear sentences, direct translations from L1 to L2, misformation of object pronouns, incorrect use of adjectives as main verbs, the addition of the verb "to be," and the addition of conjunctions, respectively.

The Concept of Interlanguage

The interlanguage hypothesis is one of the most complicated ideas in second language acquisition (SLA). It explains the process that occurs when individuals acquire a new language. They want to adopt a new set of rules that may differ from their native language or the one they are attempting to learn. Dulay et al. (1982) maintained that individuals cannot acquire language without producing systematic errors, particularly when transferring structures and linguistic items from their mother tongue to the target language. For this reason, the interlingual interference often refers to errors produced by learners' native language interference, while the intralingual interference develops due to the difficulties of the language itself. Intralingual errors are categorized into several types, including overgeneralization, simplification, communication-based errors, induced errors, analogical errors, rule ignorance, inadequate rule application, and false hypotheses (Corder, 1982).

In an EFL writing context, Richard (1974) claims that interlingual interference occurs at the word level due to the influence of the L1 on the learner, who thinks in the L1 before translating into the L2. That means the learner writes in the L2 but follows the L1's regulations. This type may have errors in the fragments, word order, or subject-verb agreement. Conversely, he argues that intralingual interference occurs at the word level due to the learner's tendency to make overgeneralizations. To explain, the learner acquires a rule from one language and applies it instead of the rules of another language. For example, "I'm don't a doctor." This type may include different errors, such as those with demonstratives, word choices, and adjectives.

According to Selinker (1972), there are five major sources of errors in SLA resulting from a learner's interlanguage. These include (1) language transfer, where features of the L1 can either help (positive transfer)



or hinder (negative transfer). Positive transfer is when the learner uses some parts of L1 to assist him in learning L2. Conversely, L1 may adversely impact the acquisition of L2 due to negative transfer. (2) training transfer, which occurs when a language learner wrongly applies learned rules such as grammar and pronunciation to the wrong situations. (3) The L2 strategies for learning, which involve learning techniques to improve both their linguistic and sociolinguistic skills. (4) The L2 strategies for communication, which aim to resolve problems during the conversations. (5) Overgeneralization happens when a learner uses a certain grammatical rule of the target language, like a typical verb ending, in all cases without taking into account the exceptions that need to be made.

Research Methodology

Research Design

This study investigated the writing errors and then identified their causes. The population of this study included 98 students. The fundamental principles of an AR writing theory were introduced, and students were afforded the opportunity to complete their writing assignment by composing the initial draft, revising the second draft, and receiving feedback from their peers and teachers. After the instructions, the argumentative writing test was given to them. Then, 33 students' writing test results were selected to analyze errors by using the SST Taxonomy. Finally, the data was analyzed using frequency and percentages.

Population and sample selection

The population of this study was 98 third-year undergraduates who enrolled in an AR writing course in the second semester of the academic year of 2026 in the Faculty of Liberal Arts at a public university in Thailand. All students were native Thai speakers and had passed two compulsory writing courses: an introduction to writing and an essay writing course. The participants included 33 students selected by using a purposive sampling technique. The criteria to select the participants were that they must pass an essay-writing course and receive grade B, which they enrolled in in the second semester of the academic year 2025, indicating that they were at an intermediate level of writing. The rationale of selecting this group is that they do not yet master L2 but may acquire some certain writing ability. The results of the analysis of the errors produced by this group may help teachers understand which errors are still made by students who possess a certain degree of language ability. There were three groups of students. The participants from group A were 13 students, group B (4 students), and group C (16 students).

Research instrument

The SST collection form was used to record students' writing errors. Students were given two hours to complete the writing task and required to compose four paragraphs, which include an introductory paragraph, two main paragraphs, and a concluding paragraph. Moreover, students had to write approximately one hundred words for each, and it must consist of a thesis statement and adequate supporting details according to the AR writing structure. To facilitate students accumulating background knowledge and ideas, there were three distinct topics from which to choose. The AR writing topics were given to two teachers who teach an introduction to

writing and essay writing courses to evaluate the appropriateness of the topics. The IOC calculation was applied for the topic selection process. The topics that obtain a mean score of 0.5 to 1.00 were used for the test.

Data collection

The data chosen for this study's analysis were 33 AR essays written by the participants. The participants were assigned to write the essays in the classroom after completing the AR writing course. They were obligated to write on blank paper by themselves without any dictionaries or mobile devices. They were given two hours to complete the essays. Upon completion, they submitted their essays to the teacher.

Data analysis

This study included five steps to conduct error analysis suggested by Gass et al. (2013). The steps can be explained as the following:

Step 1: Error Collection

The data was collected from AR essays composed by three groups of students who received a B grade in an essay course. The essays were composed on paper for the purpose of analysis.

Step 2: Error Identification

To identify the errors, the SST was used. It encompasses omission, addition, misformation, and misordering. After selecting the approach for error analysis, the researchers assigned a code to each form of error. The codes were written and highlighted after the errors were identified. For instance, the code for the omission of an article was O-AR. The researcher identified the errors in the essay one at a time, which allowed for consistent identification. The researcher categorized the errors into the SST collection form. Each essay was assigned a number and labeled. This method enabled coders to review the information and quantify the errors more precisely for recording. For example, student A was assigned the number one on both the SST collection form and the AR essay. To ensure the reliability, there were two coders. The initial coder examined the errors for all 33 essays, and the second coder verified the errors evaluated by the first coder. Both coders are Thai EFL instructors who have instructed writing courses for over three years. They have had the opportunity to provide writing feedback to students. If there was a disagreement regarding specific errors, a discussion was conducted to resolve the matter.

Step 3: Error classification

After all errors had been identified and verified for correctness, they were transferred into four types of errors proposed by Dulay and Burt (1974).

Step 4: Error quantification

The researcher counted the number of errors for each category of error and ranked them from the highest to the lowest. Both frequency and percentage were used to quantify errors.



Step 5: Source of errors analysis

In the final step, errors were classified into interlingual and intralingual ones. Those that result from Thai language interference would be termed "interlingual errors." Conversely, errors mostly due to the complex grammatical requirements of English are classified as intralingual errors (Kampookaew, 2020).

Findings and Discussion

To answer the first research question, the overall errors produced by Thai EFL students can be demonstrated in Table 2 below:

Table 2

The Overall Errors

Types of error	Total of error	Percentage
Misformation	738	55.61
Omission	481	36.25
Addition	91	6.86
Mis-ordering	17	1.28
Total	1,327	100

The overall errors are that students perform AR writing at a word level with a total of 1,327 errors. The most common type of error is misformation, accounting for 55.61 percent of the total, followed by omission at 36.25 percent and addition at 6.86 percent. The least number of errors is misordering, which is equivalent to 1.28 percent. The overall findings were in line with the study of Fatimah et al. (2025), which indicated that the errors produced by Indonesian students in argumentative essay writing were misformation, omission, addition, and misordering, respectively. The details of the misformation-type errors can be presented in Table 3.

Table 3

Misformation-type Errors

Type of errors	Indicators	Frequency	Percentage
Misformation	Misformation of verb form (M-VF)	172	23.31
	Misformation of spelling (M-SP)	150	20.32
	Misformation of subject verb agreement (M-SA)	148	20.05
	Misformation of pronoun (M-PO)	94	12.74
	Misformation of word choice (M-WC)	72	9.76
	Misformation of capitalization (M-CP)	34	4.60
	Misformation of preposition (M-PR)	32	4.34
	Misformation of quantifiers (M-QA)	28	3.80
	Misformation of article (M-AR)	5	0.68
	Misformation of verb to be (M-VB)	3	0.40
Total		738	100

Table 3 indicates that the most common misformation-type error is misformation of verb form (M-VF), accounting for 23.31 percent, followed by misformation of spelling (M-SP) at 20.32 percent and misformation of subject-verb agreement (M-SA) at 20.05 percent, respectively. The least common type of misformation error is the misformation of the verb "to be" (M-VB), which accounts for 0.40 percent.

The majority of students demonstrated the most frequent misinformation of the verb form. It includes the double use of the verb form; for example, *many children **are develop** slowly when they have smartphones*. The results indicated that they overused the correct verb form in conjunction with the verb to be. Moreover, they also failed to use the correct form of modal verbs, such as “they **can learned** from it” and they also exhibited to use of the wrong negative pattern, such as “I think not have who don’t know about the Internet.” It demonstrates the student failed to master the change in verb form in the appropriate tense. These types of errors are in line with the study of Kampookaew (2020), which indicated that Thai students struggled the most with mastering the use of the subject and verb form. Students misused plural verb forms instead of singular verb forms, which accounted for 8.26% and represented the highest error rate among all subtypes of verb errors.

The second most produced error by students is misinformation of spelling. The common spelling errors produced by students were nouns, adjectives, and verbs, respectively. The following sentences illustrate the error of misspelling a noun. “*The popular **platfroms** is Fackbook*; It is stated that some children can improve their **knowlange**.” In terms of the misspelling of a verb, students produced errors such as “they can **contrat** their families” instead of “they can contact their families.” This M-SP is in line with the error investigation of Fatimah et al. (2025). The students also produce the same type of error, such as *positif* instead of “positive.”

Misinformation of subject-verb agreement ranked the third most produced error by students. The examples of this type of error can be seen in the sentence: “*There **is two reasons** why we should allow **children has** their own phones when **they is 8th** grade*.” The above sentence revealed that the student faced problems between a plural subject and the use of associated verbs. This finding is congruent with the study of Promsupa et al. (2017), which indicated that the subject-verb agreement type of error was presented in the top four errors overall in the study. The details of the omission-type errors can be presented in Table 4.

Table 4

The Details of Omission-type Error

Type of errors	Indicators	Frequency	Percentage
Omission	Omission of punctuation (O-PU)	95	19.75
	Omission of pronoun (O-PO)	77	16.00
	Omission of -s noun inflection (O-SN)	74	15.38
	Omission of verb form (O-VF)	72	14.98
	Omission of gerund (O-GE)	58	12.06
	Omission of article (O-AR)	38	7.90
	Omission of preposition (O-PR)	29	6.03
	Omission of conjunction (O-CO)	25	5.20
	Omission of -s verb inflexion (O-SV)	13	2.70
Total		481	100

Table 4 presents that the most common omission-type error is omission of punctuation (O-PU), accounting for 19.75 percent, followed by omission of pronoun (O-PO), at 16 percent, and omission of s-noun inflection (O-SN), at 15.38 percent, respectively. The least common type of misinformation error is the omission of the -s



verb inflexion (O-SV), which accounts for 2.70 percent. The significant common types of omission errors are discussed below.

The majority of students failed to use periods to end the sentences, and this made run-on sentences such as *“ChatGPT should be banned in school and universities because nowadays, many students use it to help many things in real life such as finding information.”* This error was found in every student's work. This finding supported the studies by Promsupa et al. (2017) which indicated that students continued to write multiple sentences without using commas or periods to separate them. The students produced a second type of omission by omitting pronouns. They appeared to omit the use of the pronoun as a subject in the subordinate clause, such as *“Students shouldn’t be banned from ChatGPT in schools and universities because helps them in doing research and is important for students.”* This example demonstrated the absence of subjects after *“because”*. Moreover, they also failed to use a pronoun after a transitive verb, as in *“It requires to use the Internet.”* This subcategory error is congruent with the study of Promsupa (2017), which indicated that Thai EFL students omitted the subject in a sentence the most. However, the findings of this type of error are contradictory to the study of Fatima et al. (2025), which revealed that Indonesian students make the error with relative pronouns the most rather than the omission of subject pronouns.

The third most common omission error produced by the students was the omission of the -s noun inflection. Several students made this type of error, such as *“There are two reason.”* It is clear that students struggled to use the parallel structure with the appropriate sentence structure and plural quantifiers. This error is like Fatima et al.'s (2025) study, which found that students omitted pronouns with quantifiers like “many” or used *“there is”* or *“there are”* incorrectly. They also failed to construct the appropriate comparison, and this is one of the major verb forms that students struggled with, such as *“it faster than cars.”* This finding aligns with Promsupa's (2017) study, which showed that students most often omit the verb “be.”

Half of students demonstrated a failure to use gerunds after prepositions, which resulted in their omission in other contexts. For example, *“We will see students use it for find the answers.”* In terms of the omission of articles, students exhibited a tendency not to place an article before a countable noun, such as *“It is easy way.”* The omission of prepositions ranked third from the bottom of the table; students produce less under the omission category. Certain verbs, such as *“try”* or *“tell,”* and expressions like *“in the future”* illustrate this error. For example, a student made an error in the sentences *“They try do their homework.”* The details of the addition-type errors can be presented in Table 5.

Table 5

The Details of Addition-type Error

Type of errors	Indicators	Frequency	Percentage
Addition	Addition of preposition (A-PR)	37	40.66
	Addition of article (A-AR)	19	20.88
	Addition of -s verb inflection (A-SV)	8	8.80
	Addition of -s noun inflection (A-SN)	7	7.69
	Addition of gerund (A-GE)	7	7.69
	Addition of punctuation (A-PU)	6	6.59

Type of errors	Indicators	Frequency	Percentage
	Addition of conjunction (ACO)	5	5.49
	Addition of adjective (A-AD)	2	2.20
	Total	91	100

Table 5 demonstrates that the most common addition-type error is the addition of preposition (A-PR), accounting for 40.66 percent, followed by the addition of article (A-AR), at 20.88 percent, and the addition of adjective (A-AD), at 8.80 percent, respectively. Moreover, students produced the equal number of additions of conjunctions (A-CO) and additions of gerunds (A-GE), at 7.69 percent. The least common type of misinformation error is the addition of a verb inflection (A-SV), which accounts for 2.20 percent. The significant common types of addition errors are discussed below.

The most common addition error is adding a preposition. An example of this type of error can be seen, such as *“ChatGPT is so smart because it can remember **in** interesting topics.”* This can imply that they overused prepositions with some verbs that do not require any prepositions. Such error produced by students are congruent with the study of Kampookaew (2020), which indicated that students add unnecessary prepositions in sentences the most. However, this finding contradicted the study of Fatima et al. (2025), which revealed that the errors produced by Indonesian students were caused by the addition of the preposition after the determiner *“most,”* such as *“Most **of** people using TikTok in their daily lives.”*

The second type of error is the addition of an article. Half of the students demonstrated errors in adding an article before the plural nouns. The following sentence is an example of this type of error produced by students: *“It has negative impacts for **a** students.”* The findings of this subcategory of error contradicted the studies of Prompsupa (2017) and Kampookaew (2020), the former of which revealed that students used articles with uncountable nouns the most, and the latter added the article *“the”* unnecessarily. In terms of the addition of the *“s”* verb inflection, students displayed the omission to inflect *“s”* after the singular subject, especially the pronoun *“it.”* This can be seen in the following example: *“it **make** the final decision to decide which social media we should use.”* This finding is in line with Kampookaew (2020), which indicated that students failed to use the plural verb form with a singular subject. Not only did students omit putting *“s”* after the singular subject, but they also added *“s”* to the modal verbs, such as *“You will **uploads** everything when you see it from social media.”* This finding is congruent with the study of Fatima et al. (2025). The details of the misordering type of errors can be presented in Table 6.

Table 6

The Details of Misordering-type Error

Type of errors	Indicators	Frequency	Percentage of total errors
Misordering	Mis-ordering of sentence patterns (M-SP)	17	1.28

It is evident that students performed the misordering of sentence patterns (M-SP) seventeen times, which accounts for 1.28 percent of the overall errors. Half of students used multiple verbs in one sentence and double verb forms, such as *“Student **will** practice on time in homework **will** must sent.”* Moreover, they also placed the wrong order of the sentence, as can be seen from the following sentence: *“The answer of ChatGPT*



no correct is always.” The finding of the wrong order of the sentence is in line with the study of Fatima et al. (2025), as students produced errors such as “*But if we not do that.*”

To answer the second research question, the two categories of causes of error used in this study are intralingual and interlingual. According to Richard (1974), interlingual interference occurs at the word level as a result of the first language's influence on the learner, who thinks in that language before translating into the second language. This indicates that the learner writes in the second language while adhering to the first language's rules. On the contrary, the intralingual interference develops due to the difficulties of the language itself. Intralingual errors are categorized into several types, including overgeneralization, rule ignorance, inadequate rule application, and false hypotheses. The findings of the causes of misformation-type error can be presented in Table 7 below:

Table 7

The Causes of Error

Type of Error	Interlingual errors	Intralingual errors			
		Overgeneralization	Rule ignorance	Inadequate rule application	False hypotheses
Modal and Auxiliary verbs	—	√	—	√	√
Spelling errors	—	—	—	—	√
Capitalization	—	—	√	—	—
Subject and verb agreement	—	—	—	—	—
Double subject	√	—	—	—	—
Wrong part of speech	—	—	—	—	√
Wrong preposition	—	—	√	—	—
Adjective	—	√	—	—	—
Article	—	—	—	√	—
Punctuation	—	—	√	—	—
“S” inflection with noun	—	—	√	—	—
Gerund	—	—	—	—	√

From Table 7, most of the students performed misformation of modal verbs, and this resulted in multiple aspects under intralingual error. The first example is that “*they can learned from it.*” The student might have a false hypothesis when they attempt to describe a completed action or a general truth that has already taken place. For this reason, they used a past tense verb in conjunction with a modal verb. Next, students applied inadequate rules as in the example “*Many children are develop slowly.*” The student chose the auxiliary “are” but failed to complete the morphological change to the main verb. Finally, they also exhibited the overgeneralization error, which can be seen in the sentence “*They can makes many mistakes.*” The student overgeneralized the verb agreement rule by adding “s” to the modal verb, which is not required.

Both misformation of spelling and capitalization are categorized in the rule ignorance under the intralingual error. From the example of “Some *parants* failed to teach their children,” the student might recognize the phonetic /ant/ ending, which is very common in English nouns and adjectives such as “servant.” For this reason, they formed a false hypothesis to make such an error. Wrong capitalization occurred when the student failed to apply to capitalize the word when begin the new sentence, they might neglect that every new sentence must begin with a capital letter to signal a boundary in English. Moreover, the student exhibited overgeneralization in their misuse of subject and verb agreement. This can be seen in the example of “*They is 8th grade.*” From this example, the learner has likely overgeneralized the use of the most common form of the verb “to be” (is) or has not yet fully internalized the rule restrictions for plural subjects.

The student displayed the use of a double subject by adding the pronoun after the subject, as in “*ChatGPT it has many good things.*” This construction is a direct transfer from the Thai language, which is topic-prominent and typically states the topic first before using a pronoun or a “comment” to follow. Moreover, they performed a false hypothesis when they used the wrong part of a speech such as “It is importance to ...” The student failed to distinguish between the use of a noun and the syntactic requirement of the need for an adjective after the verb “to be.” Next, the student ignored the rule restrictions when they misused the preposition as in the sentence “*Firstly, we should be allowed for watching the media for learning.*” They might be ignorant of the special requirement of certain prepositions that can be used with certain verbs. There is a restriction for the verb “allow” that must be followed by a to-infinitive, not the preposition “for.”

Moreover, students appeared to overgeneralize for the use of adjectives, as in the example of “There are many several advantages of ChatGPT.” They overused the quantifier “many” and “several” to make “a lot” stronger because they know that both words mean “more than one.” For this reason, they failed to recognize that they cannot be used together as modifiers for the same noun. In terms of the article, the student misused the article as in the sentence “*We will have a good assistance.*” This example indicated the inadequate rule applications. It revealed the wrong use of an article. The student might know the rule of using English articles, but they fail to apply the specific phonological restriction of using the article “a” before consonants and “an” after vowels.

Moreover, the students ignored the rules when they omitted the use of punctuation and the appropriate “s” with a part of speech “noun”. The use of punctuation appeared to be problematic for students because they failed to break long and complex sentences by using appropriate punctuation. In terms of a “s” inflection with a noun. The students failed to put “s” with appropriate form in the sentence as “It has a negative impact for a students.” This example demonstrates the rule ignorance since certain nouns require specific collocation in English. In terms of using a gerund, the student could have a false hypothesis. This can be seen in the following sentence: “Allowed children under 14 years old to have their phone cannot protect their mental health from social media.” The learner might have thought that the verb should be in the -ed form when a statement conveys a broad rule or a “completed” idea to show that it is a “fixed fact.”



Conclusion

This study investigated the grammatical errors and the causes of errors produced in AR essays by 33 Thai EFL undergraduates. The SST was used as a theoretical framework to analyze the errors; the finding revealed that the students produced 1,327 word-level errors in total. The results also demonstrated that the most common type of error is misformation, followed by omission, addition, and misordering. Verb forms, spelling, and subject-verb agreement were the most common types of mistakes in the misformation category. The most common omission-type errors were omission of punctuation, omission of pronoun, and omission of s-noun inflection. Finally, the addition-type error was the addition of a preposition, the addition of an article, and the addition of an adjective. The investigation of the causes of these errors reveals a significant dependence on intralingual error, which results from the internal complexity of the English language, including overgeneralization, rule ignorance, insufficient rule application, and erroneous hypotheses. Interlingual interference, especially in the form of "double subjects". This is because it directly transfers from the topic-prominent structure of Thai, which often leads speakers to incorrectly apply their native language's syntax when constructing sentences in English.

Implication and Recommendations

This study could enhance Thai undergraduates' AR writing grammar. Therefore, teachers should focus on teaching methods that help students confront intralingual and interlingual interference rather than focusing on the basic grammar. Teachers should pay attention to English morphological rules, such as the use of gerunds and model verbs. Misinformation and omission, the most common errors, often stem from ignorance of the rules or false assumptions. Teachers could also offer "contrastive feedback" sessions to demonstrate how Thai topic-comment patterns and English subject-verb requirements differ to prevent L1 interference. Also, proper punctuation use is important because most participants still made such mistakes, which could lead to run-on sentences. Finally, future research should examine the SST model to investigate another essay-writing error.

References

- Ahmad, Z. (2022). Negotiating meaning relationships in the rhetorical structure of EFL argumentative writing through text cohesion. *Education Quarterly Reviews*, 5(3), 523–533.
- Bulqiyah, S., Mahbub, M., & Nugraheni, D. A. (2021). Investigating writing difficulties in essay writing: Tertiary students' perspectives. *English Language Teaching Educational Journal*, 4(1), 61-73.
- Burns, A., & Siegel, J. (Eds.). (2018). *International perspectives on teaching the four skills in ELT: Listening, speaking, reading, writing*. Springer International Publishing.
- Chuang, P. L., & Yan, X. (2022). An investigation of the relationship between argument structure and essay quality in assessed writing. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 56, 100892.
- Corder, S. P. 1982. *Error analysis and interlanguage*. Oxford University Press.
- Dulay, H. C., & Burt, M. K. (1973). Should we teach children syntax? *Language learning*, 23(2), 245-258.
- Dulay, H. C., & Burt, M. K. (1974). Errors and strategies in child second language acquisition. *TESOL Quarterly* 8, 129-136.
- Dulay, H., Burt, M.K., & Krashen, S. D. (1982). *Language Two*. Oxford University Press.

- Fatimah, A., Hasbullah, H., & Dabamona, M. (2025). An analysis of error in undergraduate students' argumentative essay writing. *Journal of Language and Education*, 4(1), 41-59.
- Ferretti, R. P., Andrews-Weckerly, S., & Lewis, W. E. (2007). Improving the argumentative writing of students with learning disabilities: Descriptive and normative considerations. *Reading & Writing Quarterly*, 23, 267-285.
- Fitrawati, F., & Safitri, D. (2021). Students' grammatical errors in essay writing: A pedagogical grammar reflection. *International Journal of Language Education*, 5(2), 74-88.
- Gass, S. M., Behney, J., & Plonsky, L. (2013). *Second language acquisition: An introductory course*. (4th ed.). Routledge.
- Kampookaew, P. (2020). An analysis of grammatical errors made by Thai EFL university students in an EAP writing class: issues and recommendations. *REF Lections*, 27(2), 246-273.
- Promsupa, P., Varasarin, P., & Brudhiprabha, P. (2017). An analysis of grammatical errors in English writing of Thai university students. *HRD Journal*, 8(1), 93-104.
- Richards, J. C. (1974). *Error Analysis: Perspectives on second language acquisition*. Longman.
- 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.
- Selinker, L. (1972). Interlanguage. *IRAL*, 10, 209-231.
- Suprpto, S., Hasan, J. R., & Suzanne, N. (2022). Students' error of using passive voice based on surface strategy taxonomy. *ELOQUENCE: Journal of Foreign Language*, 1(2), 80-94.
- Suraprajit, P. (2021). An analysis of errors in English essays written by Thai non-English major students. *Theory and Practice in Language Studies*, 11(1), 12-19.
- Wongkittiporn, A. (2024). Thai EFL undergraduate students' attitudes towards syntactic structures in English writing. *Journal of English Language and Linguistics*, 5(1), 1-16.