



การวิเคราะห์ข้อผิดพลาดการเขียนรูปประโยคในการเขียนอีเมลธุรกิจ
ของนักศึกษาไทยที่เรียนภาษาอังกฤษในฐานะภาษาต่างประเทศ

An Analysis of Sentences Error in Business Email Writing of Thai EFL Students

ชยกร สุตะโคตร¹ คมศิลป์ สารทอง² และ พงศธร ภาวะบุตร^{3*}

Chayakorn Sutakote¹ Khomsin Sarntong² and Pongsatorn Pawabutra^{3*}

บทคัดย่อ

การวิจัยนี้มีวัตถุประสงค์เพื่อ 1) ศึกษาและจำแนกชนิดของข้อผิดพลาดในประโยคที่ปรากฏในการเขียนอีเมลธุรกิจของนักศึกษา และ 2) วิเคราะห์ความถี่ การจัดลำดับความสำคัญ และการกระจายเชิงร้อยละของข้อผิดพลาดในประโยคที่พบในการเขียนอีเมลธุรกิจของนักศึกษา ตัวอย่าง คือ การวิเคราะห์อีเมลธุรกิจ จำนวน 192 ฉบับ โดยมีเนื้อหา คือ การสอบถาม การขอร้องให้ดำเนินการ การแลกเปลี่ยนข้อมูล และการจัดทำและยืนยันตารางนัดหมาย เครื่องมือที่ใช้ในการวิจัยและการวิเคราะห์ ได้แก่ 1) แบบเก็บรวบรวมงานเขียนอีเมลของนักศึกษา และ 2) แบบประเมินในการจำแนกข้อผิดพลาด การวิเคราะห์ข้อมูลใช้กรอบการทำงานที่ดัดแปลงจาก Corder (1974) และ Gass et al. (2013) โดยดำเนินการแบบ 4 ขั้นตอน ได้แก่ การเก็บรักษาข้อมูลต้นฉบับ การระบุข้อผิดพลาดโดยนักวิจัย 2 คน การจำแนกข้อผิดพลาดตามกรอบที่ผสมผสานจาก Dulay et al. (1982) และ Langan (2012) และการวิเคราะห์เชิงปริมาณเพื่อหาความถี่และการกระจายเป็นร้อยละ ผลการวิจัย พบว่า 1) ข้อผิดพลาดแบ่งออกเป็น 4 ชนิดหลัก ได้แก่ อนุประโยคอิสระ อนุประโยคไม่อิสระ ประโยคคำถาม และประโยคคำสั่ง รวมถึงชนิดอื่น ๆ เช่น ประโยคที่เชื่อมต่อกันไม่ถูกต้องและประโยคที่ไม่สมบูรณ์ 2) เชิงปริมาณ พบว่า ข้อผิดพลาดประเภทการละเว้นมากที่สุด (48.64%) ตามด้วยข้อผิดพลาดโครงสร้างอื่น ๆ (23.78%) ข้อผิดพลาดประเภทการเพิ่มคำ (22.70%) และข้อผิดพลาดในการเรียงลำดับคำผิด (4.86%) ผลการวิจัยแสดงถึงความท้าทายในการใช้ไวยากรณ์เฉพาะของผู้เรียนชาวไทยในบริบทการสื่อสารเชิงวิชาชีพ และช่วยให้เข้าใจการพัฒนาภาษาในช่วงเรียนรู้ของผู้เรียนภาษาอังกฤษชาวไทยในสถานการณ์การสื่อสารในที่ทำงานให้หลักฐานเชิงประจักษ์สำหรับการปรับปรุงหลักสูตรภาษาอังกฤษธุรกิจผ่านกลยุทธ์การแก้ไขข้อผิดพลาดแบบตรงจุด

คำสำคัญ : นักศึกษาไทยที่เรียนภาษาอังกฤษในฐานะภาษาต่างประเทศ, การเขียนอีเมลธุรกิจ, การวิเคราะห์ข้อผิดพลาด, โครงสร้างประโยค, ข้อผิดพลาดทางไวยากรณ์

Article Info: Received 21 April, 2025; Received in revised form 02 September, 2025; Accepted 03 September, 2025

¹ อาจารย์ประจำสาขาวิชาภาษาอังกฤษเพื่อการสื่อสารทางธุรกิจ คณะมนุษยศาสตร์และสังคมศาสตร์ มหาวิทยาลัยราชภัฏสกลนคร อีเมล: chayakorn@snru.ac.th
Lecturer in Division of English for Business Communication Program, Faculty of Humanities and Social Sciences,
Sakon Nakhon Rajabhat University Email: chayakorn@snru.ac.th

² อาจารย์ประจำสาขาวิชาภาษาอังกฤษเพื่อการสื่อสารทางธุรกิจ คณะมนุษยศาสตร์และสังคมศาสตร์ มหาวิทยาลัยราชภัฏสกลนคร
อีเมล: khomsinsarntongsnu@gmail.com
Lecturer in Division of English for Business Communication Program, Faculty of Humanities and Social Sciences,
Sakon Nakhon Rajabhat University Email: khomsinsarntongsnu@gmail.com

³ อาจารย์ประจำสาขาวิชาภาษาอังกฤษเพื่อการสื่อสารทางธุรกิจ คณะมนุษยศาสตร์และสังคมศาสตร์ มหาวิทยาลัยราชภัฏสกลนคร อีเมล: pongsatorn@snru.ac.th
Lecturer in Division of English for Business Communication Program, Faculty of Humanities and Social Sciences,
Sakon Nakhon Rajabhat University Email: pongsatorn@snru.ac.th

* Corresponding author

Abstract

This research aimed to 1) examine and classify types of sentence errors in business email writing produced by students, and 2) analyze the frequency, ranking, and percentage distribution of sentence errors identified in business email writing of students. The study analyzed 192 business emails with content focusing on inquiries, requests for action, information exchange, and scheduling/confirming appointments. The research instruments employed were 1) a collection form for email writing samples from students and 2) an assessment form for error classification. Data analysis used an adapted framework from Corder (1974) and Gass et al. (2013), implementing a systematic four-stage process including preserving original data, identifying errors by two researchers, categorizing errors using a framework synthesized from Dulay et al. (1982) and Langan (2012), and conducting quantitative analysis to determine frequency and percentage distribution. The findings revealed that: 1) four principal categories of sentence errors: independent clause structure, dependent clause structure, interrogative structure, and imperative structure, along with supplementary categories including run-on sentences and sentence fragments; 2) quantitative analysis revealed that omission errors were most prevalent (48.64%), followed by miscellaneous structural errors (23.78%), addition errors (22.70%), and word order errors (4.86%). These findings demonstrate the specific grammatical challenges encountered by Thai learners in professional communication contexts and contribute to understanding Thai EFL learners' interlanguage development in professional communication contexts. The study offers empirical evidence for enhancing business English curricula through targeted error remediation strategies.

Keywords: EFL students, business email writing, error analysis, sentence structure, grammatical errors

Introduction

English writing proficiency plays a crucial role in global business communication where clarity and accuracy are essential for effective professional interactions. The ability to write clear, grammatically correct business emails in English has become increasingly important. However, Thai EFL learners often face significant challenges in mastering English writing skills, especially in business communication contexts (Waelateh et al., 2019).

Recent research in Southeast Asian EFL contexts has highlighted translanguaging complexity in language learning. Pham and Nguyen (2024) found that while translanguaging can serve as an adaptive response to modern educational demands, it remains questionable among Vietnamese stakeholders as it challenges traditional ELT approaches. Similar L1-L2 interaction patterns significantly impact professional writing in Thai EFL contexts, where students consistently struggle with fundamental sentence construction, producing incomplete sentences, incorrect verb forms, and inappropriate register usage despite general English instruction.

Grammatical errors in business emails can compromise professional credibility, potentially affecting career advancement and business relationships. However, existing research has predominantly focused on general academic writing rather than the specific challenges of business email communication, creating a significant gap in understanding genre-specific error patterns. Business email writing presents particular challenges as it differs from other written communication, requiring not only grammatical accuracy but also awareness of professional etiquette, appropriate formality levels, and specific structural conventions that prioritize brevity, directness, and action-oriented language while maintaining professional courtesy (James, 1998).

This study integrates three complementary theoretical approaches specifically adapted for business email contexts. Error Analysis theory provides systematic methodology for error identification and classification (Corder, 1967). Surface Strategy Taxonomy offers a structural framework for categorizing how learners manipulate target language forms (Dulay et al., 1982). Sentence-level analysis contributes specific criteria for professional writing contexts (Langan, 2012).

The adaptation process systematically addresses framework limitations in professional communication contexts. Traditional Surface Strategy Taxonomy categories were expanded to include business-specific patterns such as subject omission in requests (“Could send me the report?”) and auxiliary verb omission in inquiries (“How much this cost?”). Connectivity issues including run-on sentences and comma splices were emphasized as particularly problematic in business communication where clarity and conciseness are paramount. Langan's classifications were modified to focus on register-appropriate sentence patterns specific to business communication rather than general academic writing.

Understanding error types in business contexts is crucial because professional communication errors compromise credibility and affect career advancement, requiring specialized pedagogical approaches that differ significantly from traditional academic writing instruction. The integration addresses business email writing's unique demands by combining traditional error analysis with genre-specific communication requirements, ensuring both theoretical rigor and practical applicability while accounting for the complex interplay between multilingual competence and formal writing demands in professional settings.

This research systematically identifies and quantifies specific grammatical challenges that Thai EFL students encounter in business email writing. The study aims to: 1) examine and classify the types and subtypes of sentence errors present in students' business email writing,

and 2) analyze the frequency, ranking, and percentage distribution of sentence errors identified in students' business email writing. These findings contribute to theoretical understanding of interlanguage development in professional communication contexts while providing empirical evidence for business English curriculum enhancement through targeted error remediation strategies that address high-frequency error patterns requiring specialized instructional interventions.

This study draws upon established theoretical frameworks in error analysis and second language acquisition, focusing on four key areas: 1) error analysis theory, 2) surface strategy taxonomy, 3) error sources, and 4) methodological frameworks (Brown, 2000; Corder, 1967; Dulay et al., 1982; Touchie, 1986).

1) Error Analysis in Second Language Acquisition

Error Analysis (EA) emerged as a significant approach to understanding second language learning processes in the 1970s. According to Corder (1967), EA serves a dual purpose: theoretical (to understand how learners acquire a second language), and practical (to enhance teaching effectiveness through systematic analysis of learners' errors). This systematic procedure involves collecting language samples, identifying their errors, describing them, analyzing their sources, and evaluating their significance.

Contemporary research demonstrates that error analysis remains vital for understanding systematic patterns in professional communication contexts, which create unique challenges different from traditional academic writing (Thi et al., 2023).

2) Types of Errors Based on Surface Strategy Taxonomy

The Surface Strategy Taxonomy, introduced by Dulay et al. (1982), categorizes errors based on how students manipulate linguistic structures. This taxonomy provides insights into rule-breaking patterns and offers a framework for error analysis:

2.1) Omission errors occur when necessary elements are left out, typically reflecting simplification strategies where learners focus on meaning while neglecting grammatical completeness (Boonraksa & Naisena, 2022; Touchie, 1986).

2.2) Addition errors involve unnecessary elements, often stemming from overgeneralization of rules or attempts to incorporate sophisticated features without adequate competence (Brown, 2000; Ehsanzadeh & Dehnad, 2024).

2.3) Misformation errors occur when students use wrong forms, indicating developmental challenges and incorrect rule hypotheses (Albelihi & Al-Ahdal, 2024; Touchie, 1986).

2.4) Misordering errors involve incorrect word arrangement, highlighting L1 interference and syntax difficulties (Touchie, 1986).

3) Sources of Errors in Second Language Learning

Brown (2000) categorizes errors into interlingual (L1 transfer) and intralingual (developmental) sources. Thai EFL students continue to show systematic L1 interference patterns, particularly in sentence structure and verb usage (Prapobratnakul, 2024).

Intralingual errors reflect developmental processes including overgeneralization and incomplete rule application, with patterns varying across different communication contexts (Murtiana, 2019).

4) Framework Application and Adaptation

The adaptation of traditional error analysis frameworks for business email contexts required systematic modification to address genre-specific challenges. The adaptation process involved three systematic steps: (1) consultation with business communication experts to identify genre-specific error patterns unique to professional email contexts, focusing on register-appropriate language use and organizational structures (Seddik, 2023), (2) pilot testing with business email samples to validate the applicability of traditional error categories while identifying context-specific patterns not captured by general academic writing frameworks (Mubarok & Budiono, 2022; Rusmiati, 2019), and (3) addition of professional communication-specific subcategories including connectivity issues (run-on sentences, comma splices) and register-related fragments that are particularly problematic in business contexts where clarity and conciseness are paramount (Choironi, 2017).

This study adapted the surface strategy taxonomy (Dulay et al., 1982) and sentence structure classifications (Langan, 2012) specifically for business email contexts. The framework retained the four main error categories while adding subcategories tailored to professional communication challenges (Table 1).

Table 1*Framework of Sentence Error Classification*

Sentence Types		Characteristics
1. Independent Clause Structure	1. Omission of subject	7. Misordering
2. Dependent Clause Structure	2. Omission of verb	8. Adding details fragment
3. Interrogative Structure	3. Omission of object/complement	9. Dependent word fragment
4. Imperative Structure	4. Addition of subject	10. -ing/to fragment
	5. Addition of verb	11. Run-on
	6. Addition of object/complement	12. Comma splices

Note. Adapted from *Language Two* (p.102-120), by H. Dulay, M. Burt, & S. D. Krashen, 1982, Oxford University Press (<https://www.scribd.com/document/415446558/316701747-Dulay-Burt-Krashen-1982-Language-Two-pdf>). Copyright 1982 by Oxford University Press.

Adapted from *College Writing Skills with Readings* (8th ed.) (p. 418-444), by J. Langan, 2012, McGraw-Hill (<https://dokumen.pub/english-skills-with-readings-8nbsped-0073371688-9780073371689.html>). Copyright 2012 by McGraw-Hill.

Objectives

1. To examine and classify the types and subtypes of sentence errors present in students' business email writing.
2. To analyze the frequency, ranking, and percentage distribution of sentence errors identified in students' business email writing.

Methodology**Participants**

This study analyzed 192 business email writing samples collected from 47 third-year undergraduate students majoring in English for Business Communication at a university in Sakon Nakhon, Thailand. The selection of 47 students was based on the total enrollment in the English for Emails course during the second semester of 2021, representing the complete population of third-year students in this program who had completed the prerequisite courses. This approach ensured comprehensive representation of the target population while maintaining practical feasibility for detailed error analysis.

The samples were obtained from examination papers completed during the English for Emails course in the second semester of the 2021 academic year. All students had previously completed foundational courses in General English Writing and Business English

Writing. Based on prior academic assessments, the students demonstrated low intermediate English proficiency levels overall, with CEFR levels ranging from A2 to B1. The email writing samples were selected through purposive sampling to ensure representation of various business communication functions, including inquiries, requests for action, information exchanges, and appointment scheduling.

Research Instruments

Two main research instruments were employed: the collection of student email compositions and an error classification assessment framework adapted from Dulay et al. (1982), and Langan (2012). In total, 192 email compositions were collected from participants, encompassing inquiries, action requests, information exchange, and scheduling arrangements. Each email followed a standardized structure with a minimum word count of 150.

The error classification framework was validated through consultation with three qualified experts: one Assistant Professor in English with over 10 years of experience in EFL research, one expert in Assessment with doctoral degree over 10 years of experience in teaching, assessment, and instruction, and one foreign lecturer specializing in business English pedagogy with over 8 years of experience in EFL teaching. The validation process involved two rounds of expert review, where experts independently evaluated the classification framework's appropriateness and comprehensiveness for analyzing Thai EFL learners' errors.

The validation process achieved an Index of item-objective congruence (IOC) score of 0.96, indicating high content validity. A pilot study with ten second-year students was conducted to refine the instruments and establish inter-rater reliability. Two qualified English language instructors independently classified errors from the pilot study samples, and any discrepancies were resolved through discussion and clarification of classification criteria. The process involved multiple rounds of independent coding and discussion sessions to ensure consistent application of the classification framework. This process achieved an interrater reliability (IRR) score of 0.71, which indicates substantial agreement (Landis & Koch, 1977).

Data Collection

The data for this study were collected from both midterm and final examination papers of the English for Emails course during the second semester of the 2021 academic year, yielding 192 business email compositions from 47 third-year undergraduate students. The data collection consisted of two examination phases: The midterm examination required students to complete two types of business email writing tasks: 1) inquiry emails (requesting information about products/services), and 2) request emails (asking for specific actions using polite

language). The final examination included the remaining two types: 3) information exchange emails (sharing or requesting detailed business information), and 4) appointment scheduling emails (coordinating meetings with appropriate temporal expressions). Each task provided specific business scenarios with contextual information about recipient relationships and required a minimum of 150 words following standard business email formatting.

Both examinations were conducted under standardized conditions where students completed all compositions without access to reference materials or external assistance, except for printed dictionaries which were permitted during both examination sessions. Students had previously completed the English for Emails course curriculum throughout the semester, which included theoretical foundations of business communication, practical applications of email writing conventions, and skill development in various professional communication functions.

Data Analysis

The analysis followed an adapted framework from Corder (1974) and Gass et al. (2013), implementing a systematic four-stage process. Initially, all email compositions were photocopied to preserve original data integrity. Two researchers then independently identified grammatical errors, resolving any discrepancies through collaborative discussion. The application of theoretical frameworks was integrated systematically throughout the analysis process. Corder's (1974) error analysis methodology informed the overall research design through its emphasis on systematic error identification and linguistic description. Dulay et al.'s (1982) surface strategy taxonomy provided the foundational categorization system for classifying errors based on learners' manipulation of target language structures. Langan's (2012) sentence-level error analysis contributed specific criteria for identifying fragments, run-on sentences, and connectivity issues common in academic and professional writing.

The identified errors were subsequently categorized using a classification framework synthesized from Dulay et al. (1982) and Langan (2012). This framework focused on four main error types: omission, addition, misformation, and misordering, with various subtypes under each category. The final stage involved quantitative analysis, where errors were tallied and converted to percentages to determine their relative frequency and distribution patterns.

Findings

Types and Subtypes of Sentence Errors in Email Writing

This research investigated patterns of sentence errors in business email communication. The study systematically categorized different types and subtypes of sentence errors, with representative examples drawn from the participants' email correspondence (Table 2).

The research identified five major categories of sentence errors containing 24 distinct subtypes. The main categories comprised errors in independent clauses, dependent clauses, interrogative structures, imperative structures, and other grammatical elements. This detailed classification demonstrates the range of grammatical challenges in business email writing.

Table 2

Types and Subtypes of Sentence Errors in Email Writing

Type 1: Independent Clause Structure Errors		
Subtypes	1.1 Omission of subject	Example: For the price is 500 baht. Correction: The price is 500 baht.
	1.2 Omission of main verb	Example: I'll that at 13.30 p.m. Correction: I'll arrive at 13.30 p.m.
	1.3 Omission of verb be	Example: She interested in this product. Correction: She is interested in this product.
	1.4 Addition of subject	Example: It a price is five hundred per week. Correction: It is five hundred per week.
	1.5 Adding details fragment	Example: And no extra costs. Correction: , and there are no extra costs.
Type 2: Dependent Clause Structure Errors		
Subtypes	2.1 Omission of conjunction	Example: And I buy this cost, will I have to pay? Correction: And if I buy this, how much will I have to pay?
	2.2 Misordering of subject and verb	Example: I would like know where is the store. Correction: I would like know where the store is.
Type 3: Interrogative Structure Errors		
Subtypes	3.1 Omission of helping verb	Example: How much you charge? Correction: How much do you charge?
	3.2 Addition of main verb	Example: Could you ask send me your work? Correction: Could you send me your work?
Type 4: Imperative Structure Errors		
Subtype	4.1 Addition of subject	Example: Please you tell me the time of your course. Correction: Please tell me the time of your course.
Type 5: Other Errors		
Subtypes	5.1 Run on	Example: I would like to know about the schedule please send me via email. Correction: I would like to know about the schedule. Please send it to me via email.
	5.2 Comma splice	Example: How about Friday 22st April, I am going to America. Correction: How about Friday 22st April? I am going to America.

Frequency, Percentages, and Rankings of Sentence Errors

Table 3 presents the analysis that identified 185 total sentence errors across all samples. Omission errors dominated the findings at 48.64% (90 instances), followed by structural errors at 23.78% (44 instances). Addition errors constituted 22.70% (42 instances), while misordering errors appeared least frequently at 4.86% (9 instances).

Table 3

Numbers of Error Items, Percentages, and Ranks

Ranks	Types and Subtypes	Number	Percentage
1.	Omission	90	48.64
	1.1 Omission of main verbs	19	10.29
	1.2 Omission of the verb “to be”	18	9.75
	1.3 Omission of punctuation	16	8.64
	1.4 Omission of subjects	13	7.02
	1.5 Omission of objects	10	5.40
	1.6 Omission of helping verbs	10	5.40
	1.7 Omission of conjunction	4	2.16
2.	Other Errors	44	23.78
	2.1 Run-on sentences	22	11.89
	2.2 Comma splices	10	5.40
	2.3 Dependent Word Fragments	6	3.24
	2.4 Adding Details Fragment	4	2.16
	2.5 “To” Fragments	2	1.08
3.	Addition	42	22.70
	3.1 Addition of the verb “to be”	20	10.81
	3.2 Addition of main verbs	17	9.18
	3.3 Addition of subjects	5	2.70
4.	Misordering	9	4.86
	4.1 Misordering of subjects and helping verbs	3	1.62
	4.2 Misordering of question words and subjects	3	1.62
	4.3 Misordering of subjects and verbs	3	1.62
Total		185	100

Discussions

Analysis of Error Patterns and L1 Interference

The dominance of omission errors (48.64%) represents systematic L1 interference patterns specifically problematic in business email contexts. This study systematically adapted Dulay et al.'s (1982) surface strategy taxonomy by expanding omission categories to include business-specific elements: auxiliary verbs in formal requests, subjects in scheduling contexts, and objects in task delegation, aligning with Watcharapunyawong and Usaha (2013) and Pratami (2019), who confirmed that Thai language structure allowing implicit subjects and auxiliary verbs creates systematic L1 interference patterns in English writing contexts.

Contemporary corpus-based research by Mubarok and Budiono (2022), Seddik (2023), and Ehsanzadeh and Dehnad (2024) demonstrates that omission errors in professional communication contexts reflect systematic cognitive processing patterns where learners prioritize content delivery over grammatical completeness, confirming the necessity of adapting traditional taxonomies for business contexts where communicative efficiency conflicts with grammatical explicitness requirements.

Verb omissions (10.29%) and subject omissions (7.02%) particularly mirror Thai syntactic patterns reflecting L1 transfer mechanisms (Waelateh et al., 2019). The integration with Langan's (2012) sentence structure classifications specifically captures business email fragments that traditional academic frameworks overlook (Choironi, 2017; Rusmiati, 2019), demonstrating genre-specific error patterns requiring specialized pedagogical intervention.

Addition errors, comprising 22.70% of the total, emerged when students overgeneralized grammar rules to inappropriate contexts (Brown, 2000; Murtiana, 2019). The adapted taxonomy categorized these as professional register misapplications where students attempted business-appropriate formality without understanding syntactic constraints specific to English professional communication (Choironi, 2017; Thi et al., 2023).

Contemporary Theoretical Perspectives

Contemporary research confirms that professional writing requires more sophisticated classification systems than traditional academic frameworks provide (Albelihi & Al-Ahdal, 2024; Mubarok & Budiono, 2022; Seddik, 2023). The integration maintains Dulay's four-category structure while incorporating Langan's (2012) classifications for connectivity issues prevalent in business correspondence.

The emergence of 24 subtypes compared to traditional 8-12 in academic writing (Choironi, 2017; Rusmiati, 2019) illustrates how professional communication contexts amplify

grammatical complexity. The framework adaptation specifically identified business-specific subtypes including professional register fragments, connectivity errors in complex information requests, and overgeneralized politeness markers (Thi et al., 2023)—error types absent in traditional academic writing taxonomies but critical for international business communication effectiveness.

Communicative Effectiveness Analysis

Contemporary studies consistently support our error frequency patterns while revealing business-specific distributions. Prapobratanakul (2024) documented comparable addition error frequencies (20-25%) in academic writing contexts. Kampookaew (2020) and Waelateh et al. (2019) confirmed similar omission error dominance among Thai EFL learners across different writing contexts. Ehsanzadeh and Dehnad (2024) and Yang et al. (2024) found similar misordering error frequencies (3-7%) in professional writing contexts. Business email analysis shows these errors concentrate in specific professional functions: auxiliary verbs in formal requests, subjects in scheduling contexts, and objects in inquiry functions (Watcharapunyawong & Usaha, 2013).

Run-on sentences (11.89%) and comma splices (5.40%) align with Ehsanzadeh and Dehnad (2024) findings in professional communication contexts. Thi et al. (2023) documented similar connectivity challenges in EFL student writing through corpus-based analysis. Murtiana (2019) established that connectivity errors represent a distinct category requiring specialized instructional approaches. These patterns demonstrate concentrated occurrences in information-dense business functions, particularly inquiry emails and scheduling correspondence, supporting framework adaptation necessity for professional communication contexts.

Conclusion

This analysis identified 185 errors across 192 business email samples, revealing systematic patterns requiring framework adaptation for professional communication contexts. The adapted Dulay-Langan framework categorized errors into omission (48.64%), structural (23.78%), addition (22.70%), and misordering (4.86%) types. The framework adaptation specifically addressed business-critical subcategories including auxiliary verb omissions in formal requests and connectivity errors in professional correspondence, validating specialized taxonomic approaches for business communication where grammatical accuracy directly impacts workplace effectiveness.

Omission error dominance (48.64%) concentrates in business-critical auxiliary verbs in formal requests, subjects in scheduling, and objects in task delegation affecting professional clarity. L1 interference patterns require business-specific taxonomic treatment addressing Thai-English professional discourse transfer. Professional register challenges necessitate genre-adapted pedagogical approaches addressing both grammatical accuracy and business communication effectiveness.

Systematic error patterns demand pedagogical transformation from general EFL instruction to business-specific intervention strategies. The integrated framework addresses theoretical limitations of applying traditional error taxonomies to professional contexts while providing practical methodology for business English curricula addressing grammatical accuracy and professional communication effectiveness essential for international workplace success. This contributes empirical evidence for curriculum developers seeking systematic approaches to business writing instruction prioritizing both linguistic competence and professional register appropriateness.

Recommendations

Implications for EFL Pedagogy

Based on our findings and supporting research, educators should implement framework-informed pedagogical strategies addressing the 48.64% omission error frequency. First, targeted error hierarchies focusing on omission errors through explicit instruction in subject-verb construction and auxiliary verb usage should be prioritized, as these represent the most frequent challenges (Seddik, 2023). Second, genre-specific scaffolding introducing business email conventions progressively from basic structures to complex professional registers ensures systematic skill development (Mubarok & Budiono, 2022). Third, technology-enhanced feedback systems providing immediate correction of high-frequency errors while allowing teachers to focus on content development optimize instructional efficiency (Mahapatra, 2024; Yang et al., 2024). Fourth, collaborative error analysis activities where students identify and correct common mistake patterns in authentic business email samples promote metacognitive awareness and peer learning. Fifth, systematic L1 transfer awareness training helps students recognize and avoid Thai-specific interference patterns through contrastive analysis exercises (Choironi, 2017; Rusmiati, 2019). This integrated approach operationalizes the adapted Dulay-Langan taxonomy for practical business English instruction,

addressing both grammatical accuracy and professional communication effectiveness essential for international workplace success.

Recommendations for Future Research

Future research should pursue systematic validation through longitudinal studies, mixed-methods investigations, and comparative analysis across proficiency levels. AI-enhanced error detection using our 24-subtype classification should be developed. International comparative analysis can distinguish universal business communication challenges from culture-specific patterns. Priority research should examine framework-identified error patterns and authentic business outcomes in actual business contexts to establish direct connections between classroom instruction and real-world professional communication effectiveness.

References

- Albelihi, H. H. M., & Al-Ahdal, A. (2024). Overcoming error fossilization in academic writing: Strategies for Saudi EFL learners to move beyond the plateau. *Asian-Pacific Journal of Second and Foreign Language Education*, 9(75), 1-14. <https://doi.org/10.1186/s40862-024-00303-y>
- Boonraksa, U., & Naisena, A. (2022). A study on English collocation errors of Thai EFL students. *International Journal of Learning and Development*, 15(1), 164-177. <https://doi.org/10.5539/elt.v15n1p164>
- Brown, H. D. (2000). *Principles of language learning and teaching* (4th ed.). Pearson.
- Choironi, N. (2017). *An analysis of students' grammatical error in writing descriptive text based on surface strategy taxonomy at second grade of SMAN 1 Pesisir Tengah Krui* [Unpublished master's thesis]. University of Lampung.
- Corder, S. P. (1967). The significance of learner's errors. *International Review of Applied Linguistics in Language Teaching*, 5(4), 161-170. <https://doi.org/10.1515/iral.1967.5.1-4.161>
- Corder, S. P. (1974). *Error analysis*. Oxford University Press.
- Dulay, H., Burt, M., & Krashen, S. D. (1982). *Language two*. Oxford University Press.
- Ehsanzadeh, S. J., & Dehnad, A. (2024). Analysis of high-frequency errors and linguistic patterns in EFL medical students' English writing: Insights from a learner corpus. *BMC Medical Education*, 24(1264), 1-12. <https://doi.org/10.1186/s12909-024-06242-z>

- Gass, S., Behney, J., & Plonsky, L. (2013). *Second language acquisition: An introductory course*. Routledge.
- James, C. (1998). *Errors in language learning and use: Exploring error analysis*. Longman.
- Kampookaew, P. (2020). An analysis of grammatical errors made by Thai EFL university students in an EAP writing class: Issues and recommendations. *Reflections*, 27(2), 246-273. <https://doi.org/10.61508/refl.v27i2.248862>
- Landis, J. R., & Koch, G. G. (1977). An application of hierarchical kappa-type statistics in the assessment of majority agreement among multiple observers. *Biometrics*, 33(2), 363-374. <https://doi.org/10.2307/2529786>
- Langan, J. (2012). *College writing skills with readings* (8th ed.). McGraw-Hill.
- Mahapatra, S. (2024). Impact of ChatGPT on ESL students' academic writing skills: A mixed methods intervention study. *Smart Learning Environments*, 11(9), 1-18. <https://doi.org/10.1186/s40561-024-00295-9>
- Mubarok, Y., & Budiono, T. (2022). An error analysis on EFL students' writing. *Englisia Journal of Language, Education, and Humanities*, 9(2), 187-203. <https://doi.org/10.22373/ej.v9i2.11386>
- Murtiana, R. (2019). An analysis of interlingual and intralingual errors in EFL learners' composition. *Jurnal Educative Journal of Educational Studies*, 4(2), 204-216. <https://doi.org/10.30983/educative.v4i2.2544>
- Pham, H. N. U., & Nguyen, T. D. (2024). Translanguaging in EFL classrooms: Practice and implications for lecturers from students' lens. *International Journal of TESOL & Education*, 4(4), 54-68. <https://doi.org/10.54855/ijte.24443>
- Prapobratanakul, C. (2024). Thai EFL undergraduate engineering students' perspectives on academic writing: Challenges and strategies. *PASAA*, 68(1), 1-31. <https://doi.org/10.58837/CHULA.PASAA.68.1.1>
- Pratami, R. M. A. (2019). *First language (L1) interference in errors found in Thai EFL Learners' paragraph writing* [Unpublished master's thesis]. Sanata Dharma University.
- Rusmiati, R. (2019). Surface strategy taxonomy on foreign language writing: A study on verb tense usage. *Jurnal Serambi Ilmu*, 20(2), 189-201. <https://ojs.serambimekkah.ac.id/serambi-ilmu/article/view/1453>

- Seddik, M. A. (2023). Error analysis in EFL students' writing skill: Pedagogical implications for Egyptian contexts. *Journal of English Language Teaching and Applied Linguistics*, 5(4), 163-172. https://www.researchgate.net/publication/376656961_Error_Analysis_in_EFL_Students'_Writing_Skill
- Thi, N. K., Vo, D. V., & Nikolov, M. (2023). Investigating syntactic complexity and language-related error patterns in EFL students' writing: Corpus-based and epistemic network analyses. *Language Learning in Higher Education*, 13(1), 127-151. <https://doi.org/10.1515/cercles-2023-2009>
- Touchie, H. Y. (1986). Second language learning errors: Their types, causes, and treatment. *JALT Journal*, 8(1), 75-80. https://jalt-publications.org/sites/default/files/pdf-article/art5_8.pdf
- Waelateh, B., Boonsuk, Y., Ambele, E. A., & Jeharsae, F. (2019). An analysis of the written errors of Thai EFL students' essay writing in English. *Journal of Social Sciences and Humanities Research in Asia*, 25(3), 55-82. <https://so05.tci-thaijo.org/index.php/psujssh/article/view/242002>
- Watcharapunyawong, S., & Usaha, S. (2013). Thai EFL students' writing errors in different text types: The interference of the first language. *English language teaching*, 6(1), 67-78. <https://doi.org/10.5539/elt.v6n1p67>
- Yang, H., Gao, C., & Shen, H. (2024). Learner interaction with, and response to, AI-programmed automated writing evaluation feedback in EFL writing: An exploratory study. *Education and Information Technologies*, 29(4), 3837-3858. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10639-023-11991-3>