A corpus based analysis of English errors of elementary school teachers: A case study of one school in Chon Buri, Thailand.

Watunyoo Suwannaset (Ph.D.)
Director of International Graduate Studies Human
Resource Development Center
Faculty of Education, Burapha University Thailand.

ABSTRACT

This study aimed to investigate types of errors elementary school teachers in Chon Buri, Thailand committed when expressing ideas in English writing.   Cluster sampling was a technique used to select one of the excellent elementary schools in Chon Buri.   This chosen school was qualified "pass with excellence" by Office for National Education Standards and Quality Assessment.   All 35 teachers working in the school became participants in this study.   An essay test asking participants to express detailed descriptions about their favorite places they had visited during their holidays was given.   Participants spent around 40 minutes completing the task. ATLAS Ti version 6.2 was used as the computer software to count and categorize different types of main errors and sub-errors in their written English. This study found that on average, elementary school teachers could write 46.49 words in 40 minutes or only 1.15 words per minute.   About 461 tokens were found as a total number of errors made by the teachers and they were grouped into 15 main categories.   Some recommendations for school teachers, school management teams, teacher trainers, Office for National Education Standards and Quality Assessment, and Faculties of Education in Thai universities were given based on the findings found in this study.

Background of the study

The ability to communicate well in English has been one of the main objectives stated in Thailand's national education policy.   The Office of the Basic Education Commission of Thailand, as a result, insisted English be made a compulsory subject requesting all Thai students in formal education systems to study English.   However, it has been a continuous problem that not many Thai people are capable of speaking good English even though English has been taught in their schools for more than 10 years. (Wongleka, 2010).   Chareonwongsak (2010) maintained that according to a number of studies, though Ministry of Education tried very hard to develop their foreign language skills, English skills of Thai students were so poor and needed serious improvement.   Rangabtook (2007) mentioned that many educators have expressed this concern widely and tried to identify some root causes of this problem.   The Office of the Basic Education Commission of Thailand, considered that there were many factors that could affect students' ability to learn

English and the quality of their English teachers was one factor that needed developing. Noopong (2002) agreed with this maintaining that while knowing English language has become absolutely vital, teachers are the ones who play a significant role in teaching, improving English, promoting English language environment and sharing a good attitude about the importance of studying English, for their learners.

The low quality of teachers teaching English has been revealed in many studies in the past especially in rural schools.   For instance, it was discovered from a study on the needs of English teacher development in 1997 by the division of educational research, Ministry of Education (as cited in Noopong, 2002) that 65 percent of teachers teaching English in Thai elementary schools did not get their degree in English teaching.   However, a great number of these teachers are requested to teach English in their local schools due to a shortage of qualified native and Thai English teachers.   Chareonwongsak (2010) shared that the quality of teachers teaching English that unqualified teachers do not know how to pronounce and use English grammar correctly.   Learning from mistakes teachers made in English classroom could result in poor learning quality of elementary school students.

It can be ascertained to develop English skills of students in local schools especially in a country side, proper English needs to be trained to non-qualified English teachers who have to teach English to their students.   Before operating an English training course to improve English knowledge of the teachers, it is important for researchers initially to know the English proficiency levels of elementary school teachers and what are the most important English learning units elementary school teachers should undertake to qualify them to teach English.   A corpus based analysis of English errors of elementary school teachers: A case study of one school in Chon Buri, Thailand which could help to identify English errors of these English teachers is therefore worth conducting.

Research Objective:

The main objective of this study is to investigate types of errors elementary school teachers in Chon Buri may commit when expressing ideas in English writing.

Research Question:

What types of errors do elementary school teachers in Chon Buri make in their English writing?

Some Relevant concepts and theories.
   ▪ The benefits of using a learner corpus to conduct English error analysis.

One of the main ways of investigating language is to use Error Analysis (EA) (Shang and Sun, 2010). Corder (1967) gave some explanations of this in that errors a learner makes in their foreign language are not random, they are systematic unlike the unsystematic errors a learner makes in their native language. Flavell (1983) elaborated this mentioned that not learning correct forms of English structures, non-English native speakers or learners of English as secondary language may systematically produce some errors in their use of English. Elementary school teachers, therefore, need to correctly use English in order to improve the English of their students. To improve these teachers' English, their English proficiency level must be measured. Identifying what English areas they need to initially improve seems worth spending time on. Zheng (2006) agreed that identifying English errors of learners was proven to be greatly beneficial to teachers and learners in both pedagogical perspectives and implications, Granger (2003, p.542) suggested that "[l]earner corpus research opens up exciting pedagogical perspectives in a wide range of areas of English language teaching (ELT pedagogy: materials design, syllabus design, language testing, and classroom methodology.)" Luo (2010) in addition, supported this stating that we could use learner corpus to investigate learners' errors so that some pedagogical solutions including designing instructional goals, methods, means, materials and activities could be properly undertaken. Castillejos (2009) agreed with this adding that when we analyze learner's errors, language teachers or English trainers can identify both strategies that they employed for second language acquisition and stages of learning process of second language acquisition. Corder (1981) additionally, confirmed that three groups of people could benefit from looking at errors made by Non-English native speakers learning English. He pointed out that errors made by Non-English native speakers, in fact, are important to educators, teachers, or trainers to assess their learners progress, to researchers when analyzing the best way a language is learned and taught, and to the learner themselves to check their hypotheses regarding the language being learned. Simply put, learners' English errors help teachers to recognize how far their students had to improve or look up to achieve learning objectives. For the students, seeing feedbacks from their own previous mistakes allowed them to test their previous guess concerning the way that new language might be used. Keep testing and retesting learners' English learning based on their own previous hypotheses was part of learning process where learners were permitted to make progress by learning from their own mistakes.

When considering most errors non-English native speaker make, Zhang (2006) found that English language learning and teaching are markedly influenced by Error Analysis Theory and Inter-Language Theory. To understand different strategies

English foreign language learners use in their process of second language acquisition from the errors they make, sources of the errors and how the errors were produced, needs to be analyzed.

- Steps to conduct English error analysis

Flavell (1983) suggested that to undertake English errors analysis, there weretwo alternative approaches.   The first one was researchers or teachers set up some categories of English errors that they wanted to investigate then kept focusing on investigating only those types of errors.   The second was the researchers or teachers set up categories of English errors based on what they found without having specific types of errors before starting investigating.   Once the approach of data analysis was determined, data could then be collected.   To analyze English errors, types of errors should be best identified manually.

However, it was found recently that the advance of technology allowed a researcher to use some linguistic computer software to administrate, categorize and record data systematically.   MacDonald, Garcia-Carbonell and Carot-Sierra (2013) claimed that computer learner corpora were recently used to investigate the pattern of second language data in a systematic criteria.   Castillejos (2009) and Meyer (2002) discovered that using computational tools to code a corpus to provide information as tags or parses helps a researcher to produce accurate information especially when large amounts of data needs to be analyzed .   The researcher viewed that to find out possible types of errors in English writing of elementary school teachers, it would be worth investigating all types of the errors found in their writing instead of setting up some categories of English errors in advance.   Also some linguistic computer software should be, therefore, used to categorized errors and counted the errors found in their English writing.

Relevant previous research

Relevant previous studies in English analysis might be categorized into different groups based on the purpose of their studies.   Some studies of error analysis aimed to detect second language errors in function words could be, for example, seen in the work done by Flavell (1983). She conducted a study to investigate prepositions, punctuation, conjunction, spelling or articles.   Moreover while studies of article errors were found in the work by Crompton (2011), Barrett and Chen (2011), spelling errors were examined by Botley and Dillah (2007). Some studies focusing on sentence levels such as misuse in tenses might be seen in Duan (2011). Whilst some studies might, in contrast, have searched for all possible errors and identify them, some studies looked at errors which involved logic, meanings or how learners

effectively use coherence devices.

However the researcher did not set up one's categories of error, based on a set of preconceptions about the learner's most common problems in this study because the researcher attempt to see the overall pictures of errors elementary schools made. At least four studies presented below were examined as previous studies in this section.

Luo (2010) studied "A composition Corpus-based on error analysis for Chinese EFL learners".   This study revealed kinds of deviant verb-noun collocations her EFL Chinese students used and identify possible sources of errors.   English compositions, English translation – English-Chinese and Chinese-English exercises and exam papers of her students were collected dating back to 2004.   They were later on, utilized to be a composition corpus and translation corpus.   To analyze these learner corpora, the words were coded according to their parts of speech by a machine-aided method. Then a second piece of computer software was used to search and present a list of verb-noun pairs with their three following words from the verbs to their right. 586 lines of verb-noun pairs were inspected and some suspected deviant lines were examined. To verify between usual and unusual collocations, the researcher, as an advanced learner of English graduated from the department of translation first used her own judgment to distinguish between correct and incorrect collocations. In the second step, the British National Corpus (BNC) was consulted to identify the unsure or unusual verb-noun collocations. Unless these unsure or unusual verb-noun collocations were found in BNC, the web search engine Google was finally used to search for their possibility of being written by an English native speaker. To place more confidence on the effectiveness of the collocation extraction procedure, some words from the sample writing corpus were manually picked out. Cobuild Direct Collocation Sampler (CDCS) was then run and the result was compared with the one made by the first machine-aided method. After comparing the two techniques, the results showed that while most of the noun-verb pairs were listed by using machine-aided method, it failed to bring out some related noun-verb pairs due to the following reasons: 1) another noun was inserted between the verb and the true object of the verb, 2) some verbs themselves were assigned and given code as a noun, and 3) the software did not recognize verb-noun and noun-verb inverse construction. The most common sources of deviant verb-noun indentified in this study are presented as follows: 1) their L1 (first language) influence as found in some pairs such as "eat medicine" or "watch email", 2) the wrong use of general verb effect as found in some pairs such as "make crime". Apart from collocation errors, this result showed that the students made some errors which might not be counted as collocation errors but the

errors were made by their confusion of meanings of words in English. For example they use "research" instead of "search…for", or used "prevent" instead of "preserve." The researcher also highlighted that based on her study, Chinese students' knowledge of grammar was quite fine and their use of collocations did not seem particularly weak or fall behind the native speakers.

Popesuc (2007) conducted the study entitled "College essay-writing: A corpus-based analysis." In her study, 30 second year Romanian-speaking university students of economics were asked to submit a 500 word argumentative essay. To ensure that students could produce enough pieces of their writing, two choices of topic requiring no technical knowledge were offered to choose from. They were 1) "Crime does not pay", and "Most university degrees are theoretical and do not prepare students for the real world." To analyze the data, the researcher used corpus-based software to make a list of all words and their frequencies. The most frequent words were discussed. Then, the researcher started identifying and labeling all mistakes made by students before categorizing and presenting them into 6 groups. The researcher found that errors made by the students included : 1) Lexical collocation (147 times), 2) Lexical – inappropriate use of lexis (68 times), 3) Morphological errors (54 times), 4) Syntactic errors (43), 5) Discursive errors (29 times), and 6) spelling errors (25 times). The researcher analyzed that the reason that spelling errors became the lowest number of errors students made might be due to the fact that the computer software the students used could help them to automatically correct some spelling mistakes.   Evidence also showed that spelling errors the students made were also due to L1 transfer deviation between Romanian and English. As all students were intermediate level students, they produced many mistakes in areas of morphology, syntax and discourse. In collocation errors, it was found that the errors could be presented in 8 subtypes. They were 1) Noun + Verb, 2) Verb + Noun, 3) Adj + Noun, 4) Adverb+ verb, 5) Verb + Preposition, 6) Noun + Preposition, 7) Preposition + Noun, and 8) Multi-word expressions.   The researcher finally suggested some pedagogical implications based on her study that educators should spend considerable time teaching their students the correct words used in English collocation

Shang and Sun (2010) conducted a study entitled "A Corpus-based study of errors in Chinese English Majors' English writing. In this study the researchers started collecting their data from participants, then named errors they found and explained each type of error before evaluating the errors. The researcher used learner corpus in which students' compositions were collected from the final test students wrote in 2008, 2007, and 2006. After all compositions were manually typed into word processor software and saved into txt files, the researchers randomly selected some pieces of

writing to check their accuracy. The researchers then started identifying and categorizing the errors they found. There were four major errors made by Chinese English Majors' English writing. They were 1) Errors of words, 2) Grammatical errors, 3) Syntactic error, 4) Error of discourse constructions and content. While 21 sub-errors were found, the researchers highlighted the top ten sub-errors were revealed as follows: spelling errors, agreement errors, wrong sentence structure, wrong collocation, Chinglish, wrong usage, ambiguous sentences, wrong part of speech, tense errors and punctuation errors.

Castillejos (2009) conducted a study entitled "Error analysis in a learner corpus: What are the learners' strategies?" to investigate deviations caused by interlingual and intralingual errors which were produced by Spanish speakers who had a high English proficiency level. The researcher examined English corpus which contained over three million words called International Corpus of Learner English (ICLE). It belongs to Center for English Corpus Linguistics of the University Catholoque de Louvain (UCL). It contained writings which were written by English learners from 21 different mother tongues. This ICLE was compiled and learners' errors were tagged by researchers at the UCL. However, the sample used in this study was the collection of 62,982 tokens. They were argumentative essays which were written by advanced-level English students. The researcher examined only deviation caused by two types of transfer – the errors resulting from the mother tongue influence and the errors from the target language. Seven types of errors were loaded and concordances were run to investigate types of errors. It was found that errors found in this process were both interingual and intralingual errors. In the case of spelling mistakes, it found that 105 tokens or 35% of total errors in the corpus were errors caused by interlingual error, 67 tokens or 22% of total errors in the corpus were caused by intralingual error. In article mistakes, it found that 287 tokens or 65% of total errors in the corpus were errors caused by interlingual error, 48 tokens or 11% of total errors in the corpus were caused by intralingual error. In wrong verb complementation mistakes, it found that 50 tokens or 50% of total errors in the corpus were errors caused by interlingual error, 16 tokens or 16% of total errors in the corpus were caused by intralingual error. In lexical single mistakes, it found that 267 tokens or 50% of total errors in the corpus were errors caused by interlingual error, 122 tokens or 23% of total errors in the corpus were caused by intralingual error. In words missing, it found that 35 tokens or 26% of total errors in the corpus were errors caused by interlingual error, 2 tokens or 1.5% of total errors in the corpus were caused by intralingual error. In register mistakes, it found that 0 tokens or 0% of total errors in the corpus were errors caused by interlingual error, 63 tokens or 69% of total errors

in the corpus were caused by intralingual error, and in style mistakes, it found that 80 tokens or 63% of total errors in the corpus were errors caused by interlingual error, 9 tokens or 7% of total errors in the corpus were caused by intralingual errors. The researcher summarized that the errors found in interlingual errors were found twice as often as errors found in intralingual errors.

Going over a number of related theories and past studies, the researcher feel confident that conducting English errors analysis could, be the way to address the research question of this study aimed to identify areas of English errors elementary school teachers might make.   The methodology about way to conduct English errors analysis presented in this part also suggested that there was no need for the researcher to set up specific types of errors before starting investigating. Without having specific types of errors before starting investigating, the researcher bared in mind that the code names the researcher assigned to the errors found in this study might be differed from what the researcher had reviewed.   The process of data analysis started from collecting data, recognizing errors, describing and explaining the errors.   In this study, the researcher analyzed the data manually. However, computer software would be used just to help record errors into assigned error categories.

Sampling technique and Key informants
        To select participants in this study, the cluster sampling technique was used.
        This administration was done by randomly selecting school size first, and then randomly selecting one schools from all excellent middle sized government elementary schools under the supervision of Chon Buri Elementary Educational Service Area Office 1. The researcher finally included all 35 elementary school teachers in the school to be the key informants in this study.   They were all Thai full-time elementary school teachers. Some of them got English teaching degree but some might graduate from other fields. They may or may not teach English in the selected school.   The schools which they were working for was qualified as one of excellent schools evaluated by Office for National Education Standards and Quality Assessment.   As this study is a qualitative study attempting to find out types of English errors elementary school make, the researchers confident that the total amount of participants (35 elementary school teachers) can provide saturated data representing English errors made by elementary school teachers in middle size schools in Chon Buri province.

Data collection
        The researcher visited the school in April 2014 to meet all 35 elementary

school teachers in a comfortable air conditioned quiet meeting room.   The researcher introduced himself to all teachers and explained the research proposal to them before asking for their kind cooperation in becoming participants of this study.   The researcher promised them that their writing test would not affect their jobs as their names and the name of their school would not be disclosed.   After explaining purposes and answering all questions, a written essay test was given to the participants. They were not allowed to use a dictionary or dictionary software from their smart phone, get help from outside, or consult with any materials. After 40 minutes, all the test papers were collected from the teachers.

Data analysis

To analyze data accurately and systematically, the researcher used a qualitative data analysis software called "Atlas Ti" (version 6.2) to help in creating codes of errors (assigning categories) and recording selected sentences which the researcher found as errors into the codes created.   The researcher started by transforming the collected data by typing every single sentence from all test paper and recorded them into electronic text files.   To ensure the correctness of typing, random sampling checks for their accuracy were made 10 times. To recognize the error, at the first step, the researcher, who is a university English lecturer, together with one English native teacher, manually inspected all sentences.   While reading them sentence-by-sentence, all errors were carefully assigned codes based on types of their errors.

Research Findings

The majority of the participants in this study were female and bachelor degree graduate (31 teachers or 88.57%), about 19 of them (54.28%) have taught 0-12 year students and 10 teachers (28.57 %) had their degree in primary school teaching.

Table 1 presents 15 types of errors found in English writing of elementary school teachers in this study.

Teacher number	Number of written words	Article errors	Conjunction errors	Incomplete sentences	Incorrect part of speech	Incorrect use of Plural form	Incorrect verb pattern	Incorrect word order	Mechanics errors	Miscellaneous	Transliteration	Preposition errors	Spelling mistakes	Unidentified structure	Misuse of Tenses	Wrong use of word	TOTALS:
T1	61	1	0	2	0	1	0	0	10	0	0	1	12	0	5	0	32
T2	49	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	2	2	0	4	0	10
T3	41	0	0	2	0	0	0	2	2	0	0	0	1	3	0	0	10

T4	33	0	0	1	1	0	2	0	2	0	0	1	2	0	3	1	13
T5	21	1	0	2	0	0	0	0	3	0	0	1	3	2	3	0	15
T6	37	0	1	0	0	0	2	0	1	0	0	1	2	0	0	0	7
T7	115	1	0	1	0	0	2	0	1	0	0	1	2	0	3	1	12
T8	83	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	1	2	0	1	2	8
T9	62	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	3
T10	34	7	0	0	0	1	2	1	6	0	1	4	5	2	8	1	38
T11	43	0	1	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	1	1	3	2	1	0	11
T12	34	0	0	0	0	0	3	0	1	0	0	0	3	0	2	0	9
T13	87	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	3	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	7
T14	74	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	2	1	0	2	0	6
T15	66	4	1	1	0	0	1	1	0	0	1	4	9	1	5	0	28
T16	41	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	5	1	8
T17	30	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	2	1	2	0	8
T18	35	1	0	2	0	0	1	2	1	0	0	1	6	3	3	1	21
T19	44	0	1	0	0	0	3	0	0	0	0	2	7	0	3	2	18
T20	33	1	0	0	0	0	3	0	1	0	0	1	1	0	3	0	10
T21	52	0	0	0	1	0	5	0	0	0	1	1	2	0	6	1	17
T22	34	2	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	1	0	2	1	0	2	1	10
T23	60	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	1	4
T24	29	1	0	0	0	0	2	1	1	0	0	0	1	1	2	1	10
T25	22	2	0	0	0	0	3	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	1	8
T26	34	1	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	0	7
T27	35	1	1	2	0	0	0	0	5	0	0	2	1	0	0	0	12
T28	42	0	0	0	1	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	6	2	6	0	17
T29	33	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	0	4	0	0	7
T30	74	1	0	0	0	2	0	0	1	0	0	1	1	0	2	1	9
T31	42	0	0	4	1	1	0	0	8	0	0	0	3	2	5	0	24
T32	33	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	0	0	0	3	2	2	0	10
T33	33	4	0	0	0	0	0	2	2	1	0	2	1	1	6	0	19
T34	43	0	0	3	0	0	2	1	7	0	0	1	6	1	0	1	22
T35	38	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	2	3	3	0	11
Total	1627	32	5	22	5	7	34	13	63	3	5	38	96	31	91	16	461
Percent	**100**	**6.9**	**1.1**	**4.8**	**1.1**	**1.5**	**7.4**	**2.8**	**13.7**	**0.7**	**1.08**	**8.2**	**20.8**	**6.72**	**19.7**	**3.5**	**100**

It can be ascertained that the total number of English words which 35 elementary school teachers could write in 40 minutes was 1,627 words.   In other word,

on average they could write 46.49 words in 40 minutes or only 1.15 words per minutes. About 461 tokens were found as a total number of errors made by elementary school teachers and they were grouped in 15 main categories. This study found that on average, elementary school teachers could write 46.49 words in 40 minutes or only 1.15 words per minutes. About 461 tokens were found as a total number of errors made by primary school teachers and they were grouped into 15 main categories. The spelling errors which accounted for 96 tokens (21%) were found as the most errors made by the teachers. In other words, on average, teachers made one spelling mistake for every 16 words. Misuse of tenses which accounted for 91 tokens (20%) were found to range as the second most number of errors followed by mechanic errors which was 63 tokens (14%) discovered, preposition errors which made up 38 tokens (8.2%) showed up, incorrect verb patterns which showed as 34 tokens (7.4%), article errors which made up 32 tokens (6.9%) were displayed, unidentified grammatical structures [31 tokens (6.7%)] arose, Incomplete sentences [22 tokens (4.8%)] occurred, wrong use of vocabulary [16 tokens (3.5%)] happened, incorrect word order [13 tokens (2.8%)] appeared, incorrect use of plural form [7 tokens (1.5%)] also occurred, conjunction errors, incorrect part of speech and transliteration made up 5 tokens (1.1%) for each type, and miscellaneous comprised 3 tokens (0.7%) .

Table 2 presents 15 types of errors, their subtypes of errors and numbers of errors found in each subtypes.

No.	Types of errors	Tokens	Percent	Sub-types of errors
1	Spelling errors	96	21	1.1) spelling mistake in common words (58 tokens) 1.2) Spelling mistake in proper noun (30 tokens) 1.3) Spelling mistake from running words (8 tokens)
2	Misuse of tenses	91	20	2.1) Misuse of the simple present tense for the simple past tense (79 tokens) 2.2) Misuse of the simple past tense for the simple present tense (4 tokens) 2.3) Misuse of the simple present continuous tense for the past continuous tense (2 tokens) 2.4) Misuse of the present continuous tense for the past continuous tense (1 token) 2.5) Misuse of the future simple tense for the past simple tense (1 token)
3	Mechanic errors	63	14	3.1) Run-ons sentences (7 tokens) 3.2) Incorrect use of capital letter for a common noun or pronoun (32 tokens) 3.3) Not using a capital letter when writing a proper noun (12 tokens) 3.4) Punctuation error I (Period) (6 tokens) 3.5) Punctuation error II (Comma) (1 token)

				3.6) Punctuation error III (Miscellaneous) (1 token)
4	Preposition errors	38	8.2	4.1) Incorrect use of preposition (15 tokens) 4.2) Adding unnecessary preposition (8 tokens) 4.3) Missing a preposition (15 tokens)
5	Incorrect verb patterns	34	7.4	5.1) Incorrect subject-verb agreement (8 tokens) 5.2) Putting linking verbs and action verbs together. (8 tokens) 5.3) Incorrect use of action verbs for gerund (7 tokens) 5.4) Missing infinitive marker. (2 tokens) 5.5) Using action verb for linking verb (4 tokens) 5.6) Incorrect use of past participle form (3 tokens) 5.7) Incorrect use of present participle form (1 tokens) 5.8) Unparalleled sentence structure (1 tokens)
6	Article errors	32	6.9	6.1) Missing article 'a' or 'an' when mentioning a countable singular noun (12 tokens) 6.2) Missing article 'the' when mentioning a specific noun. (1 tokens) 6.3) Missing article 'the' when mentioning a noun for the second time (2 tokens) 6.4) Using article 'the' instead of 'a' or 'an' when mentioning a common noun (4 tokens) 6.5) Using article 'a' or 'an' when mentioning singular uncountable noun. (2 tokens) 6.6) Using article 'the' when it is unnecessary. (4 tokens) 6.7) Using another word instead of the correct article (1 token) 6.8) Using article 'a' or 'an' with an adjective which is not followed by a singular countable noun (2 tokens) 6.9) Using article 'a' in front of a proper noun (2 tokens) 6.10) Missing article 'the' when pointing out a specific direction (1 token)
7	Unidentified grammatical structures	31	6.7	-
8	Incomplete sentence	22	4.8	8.1) Main clause missing (7 tokens) 8.2) Main verb missing (15 tokens)
9	Wrong use of word	16	3.5	-
10	Incorrect word order	13	2.8	10.1) Putting 'an adverb' before 'an adjective' in a sentence (1 token) 10.2) Putting 'a common noun' before 'a proper noun' (4 tokens) 10.3) Putting 'a noun' that modify another noun after the main noun (1 token)

				10.4) Putting 'an adjective' after 'a noun' (7 tokens)
11	Incorrect use of plural form	7	1.5	11.1) Using 'a singular noun' instead of using 'plural noun' (3 tokens) 11.2) Using incorrect plural form in a wrong pattern (4 tokens)
12	conjunction errors	5	1.1	12.1) Missing conjunction 'and' at the end of series. (3 tokens) 12.2) Using other words instead of using correct conjunction (1 tokens) 12.3) Missing conjunction between two nouns (1tokens)
13	Incorrect part of speech	5	1.1	13.1) Using 'an adverb' instead of using 'an adjective' (2 tokens) 13.2) Using 'a noun' instead of using 'an adjective' (1 token) 13.3) Using 'an adjective' instead of using 'an adverb' (2 tokens)
14	transliteration	5	1.1	-
15	miscellaneous	3	0.7	-
	Total	461	100%	

It can be seen based of data in table 2 that elementary school teachers committed 15 main types of errors namely spelling errors, misuse of tenses, mechanic errors, preposition errors, incorrect verb patterns, article errors, unidentified grammatical structures, incomplete sentence, wrong use of word, incorrect word order, incorrect use of plural form, conjunction errors, incorrect part of speech, transliteration, miscellaneous. About eleven of them can be further categorized into 48 sub-categories.

Discussion and conclusion

This study alarmingly found that the total number of English words elementary school teachers could write in 40 minutes was 1,627 words. There were 15 main types of errors the teachers made.   About 11of these main errors could be further grouped and divided into 48 sub-errors. The top three errors in English writing found include 1) spelling errors (21%), 2) misuse of tenses (20%) and 3) mechanic errors (14%). Some main types of errors and sub-errors found in this study were also supported and reported in some related previous studies. For example, the study by Sun (2010) found support for the findings of the present study that not only did Chinese English major students produce spelling mistakes the most, but they also produced similar three main error types which were 1) misuse of words, 2) grammatical errors, 3) syntactic errors. In this study, although the researcher similarly found the same errors that were occurred in previous studies, the researcher might called them differently. For example, what were called punctuation errors in other studies was found and assigned as a sub-error of mechanic errors in this study. Instead of calling wrong tenses, this study called it misuse of tense. Subject-verb agreement errors, incorrect verb pattern and incorrect part of speech were found as sub-errors of incorrect verb

patterns in this study, Unidentified grammatical structure which was a main type of error in this study were called mixed constructions in some studies.   The study by Duan (2011), moreover, corroborated the findings of the present study that Chinese college students made 7 types of wrong use of tenses of which two of them were similar to errors under the misuse of tenses categories in this study. The similar findings included 1) Misuse of simple past tense for the simple present tense, and 2) Misuse of the simple present tense for the simple past tense. The reasons that not many errors matched between Duan's study and findings found in this study might be the fact that in this study, the researcher categorized errors found into more specific groups than the ones grouped by Duan's. Furthermore, a study of Barret and Chen (2011) about English article errors of Taiwanese college students is also in line with the findings of the present study that Taiwanese students also made errors in their use of the article. The similar points of English articles in their study were also called differently in this study. In this study, the researcher similarly found 1) missing article 'a' or 'an', 2) missing article 'the', 3) using article 'the' instead of 'a' or 'an', 4) using article 'a' or 'an' when mentioning singular uncountable noun, and 5) using article 'the' when it is unnecessary.

Recommendations

The researcher believes that several groups of people could benefit from reading this research article.

- For teachers, the teachers should aware of making mistakes of English which were found in this study and try to learn the correct forms or proper English structures so that they can avoid making these common errors by studying correct forms in such areas.

- For school management teams, the school management team should set up a training program to brush up English knowledge of their teachers in the areas errors were found.

- For Office for National Education Standards and Quality Assessment, English language proficiency of both students and school teachers should be counted as one of criteria that the office for National Education Standards and Quality Assessment should closely look at when qualifying a school as excellent.

- Teacher trainers or educators could also consider English errors found in this study as a guide when developing a training program to train English to current school teachers.

- Faculties of Education in universities in Thailand should redesign their curriculum to ensure that not only students studying English teaching majors could have the

opportunity of studying a number of English courses through their university program but students studying other teaching majors should also be trained not to make errors in common or basic English they may use or teach to their elementary schools students.

Reference:

Barrett, N. E., & Chen, L. (2011). English article errors in Taiwanese college students' EFL writing. *Computational Linguistics and Chinese Language Processing, 16*(3-4), 1-20.

Botley, S. & Dillah, D. (2007). Investigating spelling errors in a malaysian learner corpus. *Malaysian Journal Of ELT Research, 3*, 74-93.

Castillejos W. 2009. Error analysis in a learner corpus. What are the learners' strategies? In *A survey on corpus-based research*. Pascual Cantos and Aquilino Sánchez (eds). Murcia: Asociación Española de Lingüística de Corpus. p.675-690.

Chareonwongsak, K. (2010). Teachers and the need of knowing basic English. Retrieved October 1, 2013 from http://www.kriengsak.com/node/544

Coder, S. P. (1967). The Significance of Learners' Errors. *International Review of Applied Linguistics, 5,* 161-169.

Corder, S. p. (1974). Error Analysis. In Allen J. P. B. & Pit Corder (1974, editors). *Techniques in Applied Linguistics* (The Edinburgh Course in Applied Linguistics). London: Oxford University Press.

Corder, S. (1981). *Error Analysis and Interlanguage.* Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Crompton, P. (2011). Article Errors in the English writing of advanced L1 Arabic learners: the role of transfer. *Asian EFL Journal, 50*, 4-34.

Duan, M. (2011). A corpus-based study of the misuse of tenses in the English composition of Chinese college students. *English Language teaching, 4*(4), 173-180.

Dulay, H. C., Burt, M. K., & Krashen, S. (1982). *Language two.* Rowley, MA: Newbury House.

Flavell,   R. H. (1983). *Language learners and their errors.* London: The Macmillan Press.

Granger, S. (2003). Teachers of English to speakers of other language. *TESOL Quarterly, 37*(3), 538-546.

MacDonald, P., Garcia-Carbonell, A., & Carot-Sierra, J. M. (2013). Computer learner corpora: analyzing interlanguage errors in synchronous and asynchronous communication. *Language Learning & Technology, 17*(2), 35-56.

Meyer, C. F. (2002). English Corpus Linguistics. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Noopong, D. (2002). English Teaching Problems and the Needs for Professional Development of Teachers of English in Education Extended Schools under the Jurisdiction of The Office of Primanry Education, Nakhon Ratchasima. (Unpublished master's dissertation). Mahidol University, Thailand.

Rangabtook, W. (2007). English Learning and Teaching Development Strategies. *Wichakan Journal, 10*(2), 6-10.

Shang, L., & Sun, J. (2010). A Corpus-based Study of Errors in Chinese English Majors' English Writing. *Asian Social Science, 6*(1), 86-94.

Wongleka, P. (2010, December 7). Developing English skills of Thai children to be ready for Asian. *Dailynews* Retrieved from http://social.obec.go.th/node/89

Zheng, M. (2006). Error Analysis and Interlanguage. J*ournal of Research and Scholarly Output. 1*, p.85-94.