COMMON ERRORS IN WRITING JOURNALS OF THE ENGLISH-MAJOR STUDENTS AT HO CHI MINH CITY OPEN UNIVERSITY

Pham Vu Phi Ho[1], Pham Ngoc Thuy Duong[2]

[1]Ho Chi Minh City Open University
[2] The National College of Education Ho Chi Minh City
Email: ho.pham@ou.edu.vn

(Received: 08/04/2015; Revised: 15/05/2015; Accepted: 19/05/2015)

ABSTRACT

Students' writing problems are always a primary concern of instructors in writing classrooms, and to know the common errors which frequently occur on students' writing papers is usually what the writing instructors have conducted in the classrooms. However, no research study has been conducted at the Faculty of Foreign languages at HCMC Open University to investigate into this aspect. The purpose of the current study is to investigate the common written errors on students' writing journals and to see whether the extensive writing helps enhance students' writing fluency. 115 first year English-major students participated in this study. They composed five writing journals every week during the course of 15 weeks. Each student composed 62 writing journals in total. The study found that four most common errors frequently occur in students' writing journals are relating to tenses, collocations, spellings, and verb forms. Also, the current study confirms that the extensive writing practices effect the students' writing fluency in terms of length of writing. The results of the study help the writing instructors at the local setting with the facts of their students' writing problems in order to improve the writing practices in the writing classrooms. Particularly, the finding of this study confirms the effects of extensive writing so that the instructors and students could take this issue into their practices beyond the classrooms.

Keywords*: writing journals, errors, mistakes, writing practice, and writing fluency.*

1. Introduction

The importance of English writing is becoming increasingly dominant in both educational programs and in professional writing in non-English dominant countries (Leki, 2001). To become a proficient writer is a wish of many EFL/ESL students especially for those who want to get higher education due to regular writing assignments from the instructors. In addition, EFL/ESL Writing has always been considered an important skill in teaching and learning. According to Rao (2007), EFL writing is useful in two respects. First, it motivates students' thinking, organizing ideas, developing their ability to summarize, analyze and criticize. However, writing is always a big problem for EFL/ESL students in terms language uses, grammatical structures, and cultural communication.

The biggest problem is that Writing is more complex which tests a person's ability to use a language and the ability to express ideas (Norrish, 1983) and writing requires a person to write not only coherently but effectively. Homstad and Thorson (1996) state that writing in a foreign language is a frustrating and difficult activity for students, so the students are often reluctant to incorporate into these kinds of activities in or outside the classrooms. Particularly in a writing activity, language

seems to be the most problematic difficulty for L2 writers (second language) due to their limited language proficiency or limited linguistic knowledge. Silva (1993) and Olsen (1999) agree that EFL writers cannot create an effective written work due to the inadequacy of syntactic and lexical competence. According to Wang and Wen (2002), L2 writers obviously get stuck when writing in the target language because their mother tongue mainly affects the use of the second language; as a result, they may at times combine the systems of the two languages in their L2 writing, which is called "language transfer or syntactic transfer". Moreover, Weigle (2002) also states that because of the constraints of limited second-language knowledge, the students see L2 writing as hampered because of the need to focus on language rather than content. She claims that it is impossible for L2 students to write in a second language properly without linguistic knowledge regarding grammar and vocabulary. In research findings, Olsen (1999) and Sattayatham & Honsa (2007) found that less proficient learners had a higher number of grammatical, orthographic and syntactic and lexical errors.

In terms of error correction, researchers have been arguing for the effectiveness of error correction due to the phenomenon that students keep making the same mistakes even after being corrected many times (Semke, 1984). According to Ferris (1995; 1999), errors corrections have great impacts on students writing revision. However, according to Truscott (1996), grammar correction is ineffective and harmful, and should be abandoned all together in the writing class. Truscott's findings prove that grammatical correction does not work. The students often commit to the same mistakes in different setting of writing.

In a case study, Darus and Ching (2009) aimed at investigating most common errors in essay written in English from 70 Chinese students. The study collected 70 essays to analyze for 18 types of error. The four most errors that the students frequently committed to were mechanics, tenses, prepositions, and subject-verb agreement. The study also found that L1 had great impact on students' L2 writing. Similarly, Watcharapunyawong and Usaha (2013) analyzed Thai students' writing errors caused by the interference of Thai language. 40 2nd year English major students composed 120 paragraphs of narrative writing, descriptive writing, and comparison & contrast writing during the writing course. The study revealed that the students frequently committed to tenses, word choice, sentence structure, article, and preposition.

Pham Vu Phi Ho (2013) conducted a study at the Faculty of Foreign Languages at HCMC Open University and found that the students had poor writing skills, but they were assigned to compose only 4 to 6 writing assignments during the semester of 15 weeks. There seems to be not enough writing practice in terms of extensive writing to improve students' writing fluency. According to Homstad and Thorson (1996), one of the ways to help L2 students enhance their writing kills is to assign them to do extensive writing or writing journals. Extensive writing is defined as writing practices beyond the regular writing activities in the regular writing classrooms. Writing journals is viewed as activities to conduct extensive writing. The writing journal is a place in which students can explore various topics and means of expression to develop fluency by writing extensively without fear of the instructor's red pen. The writing journal focused on the present study will provide the researcher with real situations when the students use free expressions without any control from the instructors/lecturers. Therefore, their common mistakes or errors will be naturally revealed so that the instructors/lecturers might be informed to adjust themselves for better training.

Most studies investigated the students' writing errors in controlled manners such as teacher/peer feedback. Few have investigated those errors in "real situations" when the students use free expressions in their extensive writing. Therefore, the present study takes this issue into account for deeper investigation. This paper investigated a case in an academic writing course among the first year students at Ho Chi Minh City Open University (HCMC

OU). The purpose of the current study is an attempt to seek for the students common errors in writing journals as nature of students' writing problems. In addition to this primary goal, the researchers also want to investigate whether the extensive writing practices help enhance students' writing fluency. These hypotheses will be presented in the research questions bellow.

2. Research questions

1. What are the common errors that the freshmen at HCMC OU frequently commit to when they write journals?
2. Do the writing journals affect students' writing fluency in terms of length of writing?

3. Methodology

Setting & Participants

The English-major students at HCMC Open University need to take three Writing courses during the first and the second year, including Writing-1, learning how to compose paragraphs, Writing-2, learning how to compose short essays, and Writing-3 learning how to write essays. Totally, there were seven Writing-1 classes (363 students) during the second semester of the Academic Year 2011-2012 of the Faculty of Foreign Languages. 115 first year students from 3 intact Writing-1 classes in charged by the researcher/instructor participated in the study. The researcher/instructor was the only one who assigned students to write journals every week during this semester. His purpose of assigning the students to conduct these activities was to improve see if their writing fluency and to get the students used to writing in a foreign language, English. The researcher/instructor also asked the students for collecting their writing journals for research analysis.

Procedure

In Writing-1, students were assigned to write 4 paragraphs during the course as normal curriculum. Apart from the 4 paragraphs, in order to encourage students to practice their writing skills, the instructor assigned the students to write journals every week. Each student had to compose about 5 writing journals every week. The topics for writing were selected by the students' own choice. The researcher/instructor asked them to use free writing styles in order that they could produce any writing on any topic for their journals. The purpose of the instructor to assign students to write journals every week was to help the first year students to get used to writing in a second language and to improve their writing fluency. This activity was to encourage students to do extensive writing with belief (of the instructor) to help enhance students writing fluency. The researcher/instructor did not provide any feedback in terms of grammar mistakes or errors committed by the students in their writing. However, he checked every week if the students completed their duties in these kinds of assignments. The student writers were announced that their efforts on writing journal assignments would receive 5% bonus at the end of the semester. The course lasted 45 periods in 15 weeks. The students wrote their journals in their notebooks. At the end of the course, they submitted their journal writing to the instructor/researcher for data analysis.

4. Data collection & analysis

At the end of the course, the instructor/researcher collected all the notebooks of journals of the students for evaluation. The students would receive 5% bonus depended on their hard work of the journal writing. The purpose of this study was not to measure the students' writing skills in the writing paragraph assignments during the course. Its purpose was to find the common errors in the real context where students had free writing expression. They could help the researcher discover the "real writing errors" in the "real world". This could help the researcher understand the nature of the students in writing skills.

After collecting journal writing of the students, their work was retained for use in this study. Each journal was analyzed for errors and the errors recorded. First, the researcher counted words of every journal of 115 notebooks to know the length of their journals. Second, the researcher analyzed common errors in their journal writing. Common errors were seen as mostly frequent errors appeared in the students' writing. This

analysis was time-consuming. Nine common errors were addressed in this study: tenses, spellings, prepositions, articles, collocations, word forms, verb forms, subject-verb agreement, and adjective-noun orders. The errors in the students' writing were analyzed as following examples of the coding scheme in table 1.

Table 1. Coding scheme for error analysis

Categories	Definitions	Examples of errors	Corrections
Tenses	The relationship between the form of the verb and the time of the action or state it describes (Richards & Schmidt, 2010).	I **studied** English for 6 years.	I **have studied** English for 6 years.
		We **didn't** meet since we went to HCM city.	We **haven't met** since we went to HCM city.
Spellings	A way of pronouncing a word which is based on its spelling and which may differ from the way the word is generally pronounced (Richards & Schmidt, 2010).	I **alway** get up late at week end.	I **always** get up late at week end.
		I can earn more money in the city than in the **contryside.**	I can earn more money in the city than in the **countryside.**
Prepositions	A preposition is a type of a word or group of words often placed before nouns, pronouns, or gerunds to link them grammatically to other words.	When I **listen** music, I feel interested.	When I **listen to** music, I feel interested.
		Nothing can **escape** his eyes.	Nothing can **escape from** his eyes.
Articles	A word which is used with a noun, and which shows whether the noun refers to something definite or something indefinite. For example, English has two articles: the definite article the, and the indefinite article a or an (Richards & Schmidt, 2010).	Today I and my sister went to **supermarket.**	Today I and my sister went to **the** supermarket.
		Accident happened to me last week.	**An** accident happened to me last week.
Collocations	A **collocation** is a sequence of words or terms that co-occur more often than would be expected by chance.	They have to **do hard** to have a better life.	They have to **work hard** to have a better life
		I started to cry when the **plane flied.**	I started to cry when the **plane took off.**
Word forms	Word forms refer to part of speech.	I'm so **worry.**	I'm so **worried.**
		Today was a **bored** day.	Today was a **boring** day.
Verb forms	An English verb can be inflected in five forms: base form, infinitive form, past form, -ing participle and -ed participle, which divided into two categories: semantic and syntactic (Lee & Seneff, 2008).	I **want buy** a laptop.	I **want to buy** a laptop.
		We **must to do** a lot of homework.	We **must do** a lot of homework
Subject-verb agreements	The inflection of the verb to correspond or agree with the subject of the sentence, as in the third person present tense of verbs in English which is marked by adding "s" (Richards & Schmidt, 2010).	People **has** different personalities.	People **have** different personalities.
		She **don't** study at my university.	She **doesn't** study at my university.
Adjective and noun orders	In English adjectives almost always go before nouns.	The traffic in Viet Nam has many **problems serious.**	The traffic in Viet Nam has many **serious problems.**
		People should have **solutions suitable.**	People should have **suitable solutions.**

Results/Findings and Discussion

Research question 1: What are common mistakes that the freshmen at HCMC OU frequently commit to when they write journals?

In order to respond to this research question, 115 students' written journals were collected for data analyses. Nine common errors were addressed in this study: tenses, verb forms, word forms, spelling, collocations, prepositions, subject-verb agreement, adjective & noun order. Table 2 presents the types of most common errors that the students committed to in their writing journals.

Table 2. Frequency of types of errors in students' writing journals

No.	Content	SUM	Mean	SD
1	Journals	7,158	62.24	1.3
2	Lengths	660,140	5,740	224
3	Tense	6,587	57.29	7.96
4	Word Form	1,554	13.51	1.5
5	Verb Form	1,964	17.07	1.5
6	Spelling	2,655	23.08	2.2
7	Collocations	2,763	24.02	2.3
8	Subject-verb agreements	1,033	9.0	1.0
9	Adjective & noun orders	189	1.6	0.3
10	Prepositions	1,852	16.1	2
11	Articles	955	8.6	1.07

* Lengths refer to number of words in a Journal

As revealed in table 2, on average, each student composed 62 writing journals (M=62.24; SD=1.3) during the course with a total of 5,740 words. The analyses indicate that all the participants committed to most of errors investigated, and the four most common errors were reported in this study. Tenses were found to be the most common error (M = 57.29, SD = 7.96) in students' writing journals. In Vietnamese, there is no change in word form to indicate the period of time. People tend to use adverb of time which is enough to express what they want. Therefore, when the students wrote in English, they tended to translate their ideas into English.

The second highest number of errors made was of collocations, with a total of 2,763 errors. Each student committed to about 24 errors of this type (M = 24.02, SD = 2.3). The students might use bilingual dictionary to use the vocabulary or they did not learn/know the collocations. Most cases of lexical transfer in Vietnamese EFL writing are concerned with collocation errors or phrases. Therefore, special attention should be paid to the collocation differences between the two languages in order to reduce the occurrence of transfer phenomena.

Spelling errors were the third highest error type that the students committed to in this study, with a total of 2,655 errors of which each student involved in 23 errors in their journals (M = 23.08, SD = 2.2). Spelling is regarded as the third most challenging of Vietnamese students. Students commit spelling errors easily due to the inconsistence between speaking and writing the words in English.

Verb form errors, with 1,964 errors, were the fourth most error that the students committed to in this study. Each students made 17 mistakes on this type of errors (M = 17.07, SD = 1.5). This type of error might be the cause of so many different rules in English language compared to Vietnamese language.

The results of this study bolster most of previous research studies. According to Wang and Wen (2002), L2 writers obviously get stuck when writing in the target language because their mother tongue mainly affects the use of the second language; as a result, they may at times combine the systems of the two languages in their L2 writing, which is called "language transfer or syntactic transfer". Bhela (1999) also found that the errors caused by the L1 were apostrophe, punctuation, spellings, and Prepositions. Darus and Ching (2009) found that the four most errors that the students frequently committed to were mechanics, tenses, prepositions, and subject-verb agreement and also confirmed the influences of L1 on students' L2 writing. In addition, El-Sayed (1982) revealed that the

students participated in his study committed to errors mostly to verbs, pronouns, articles and prepositions and adjectives. Belhhaj (1997) found most errors that the students committed to were tenses, adjectives, prepositions, and articles. Sattayatham & Honsa (2007) confirmed that the most frequent errors the students frequently committed to were at syntactic and lexical levels which led to the overgeneralization, incomplete rule application, and building of false sentences. Watcharapunyawong and Usaha (2013) found that the students frequently committed to tenses, word choice, sentence structure, article, and preposition.

Most of previous studies found errors on prepositions was the third or fourth most frequent errors while it was in the fifth most errors in this study and in Watcharapunyawong and Usaha (2013)'s also. Surprisingly, the order of adjectives and nouns was the least frequent errors in the current study (M = 1.6; D = 0.3) when the Vietnamese language (mother tongue) has different orders, mostly nouns first, then adjectives. In English, this order was seen opposite. The findings of the current study set lights for the writing lecturers at HCMC Open University who wish to know the most common errors of the students to show or train them in the blackboard (as they usually do) for the frequent errors as samples to help students avoid these mistakes in their writing practice everyday. This indication comes from Ferris (2004)'s suggestion that before providing comments on students' papers, it is crucial for a writing teacher to be aware of error categories frequently found in his/her students' writing. However, the authors of the current study did not imply for error corrections on these areas in the peer response activities because Trustcott (1996) argues that for both theoretical and practical reasons, comments on errors can expect it to be ineffective and it has harmful effects. In addition, Semke (1984) states that student progress is enhanced by writing practice alone. Corrections do not increase writing accuracy, writing fluency, or general language proficiency, and they may have a negative effect on student attitudes, especially when students must make corrections by themselves.

Research question 2: Do the writing journals affect students' writing fluency in terms of length of writing?

To investigate if the writing journals affect students' writing fluency in terms of length of writing, we compared the average length of the 10 first journals of each student to those of the 10 last journals out of 62 journals of 115 students. The 10 first journals (journal 1 to journal 10) were written during the first 2 weeks. The 10 last journals (journal 53 to journal 62) were written during the last 2 weeks of the course. The selection of the 10 first and last journals was to calculate the relatively average number of words that the students composed between the first and the last two weeks. The purpose was to see if there was any difference of the students' writing fluency in terms of number of words. In order to analyze it, first the mean scores were added up, then pair sample t-test was run. Table 3 presents the students' writing fluency in terms of number of words.

Table 3. Students' writing fluency in terms of number of words

N1	Mean	S.D.	N2	Mean	S.D.
Journal 1	**83**	48	Journal 53	102	54
Journal 2	**79**	41	Journal 54	97	48
Journal 3	**80**	42	Journal 55	98	43
Journal 4	**84**	42	Journal 56	96	48
Journal 5	**88**	79	Journal 57	98	44

N1	**Mean**	S.D.	N2	**Mean**	S.D.
Journal 6	**90**	58	Journal 58	100	52
Journal 7	**88**	51	Journal 59	97	46
Journal 8	**86**	45	Journal 60	96	43
Journal 9	**84**	42	Journal 61	99	53
Journal 10	**83**	37	Journal 62	101	53

* N1 refers to the first 10 journals
* N2 refers to the last 10 journals
* Descriptive statistics

As can be seen in the table 3, the means of journals 1 to 10 were between 79 and 90 while those of the journals 53 to 62 were between 96 and 102. Table 4 presents the students' differences in writing fluency.

Table 4. Students' differences in writing fluency Paired Samples Statistics

		Mean	N	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
Pair 1	first	846.83	115.00	352.26	32.85
	last	985.90	115.00	356.35	33.23

Paired Samples Correlations

		N	Correlation	Sig.
Pair 1	first & last	115	.478	.000

Paired Samples Test

		Paired Differences					t	df	Sig. (2-tailed)
		Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean	95% Confidence Interval of the Difference				
					Lower	Upper			
Pair 1	first-last	-139.07	362.13	33.77	-205.97	-72.17	-4.12	114.00	0.00

As can be seen from the table 4, the mean scores of the students' first 10 writing journals was of 846.83 and that of the last 10 journals was of 985.90. The correlation was of .478. The Sig. (2-tailed) reached at .00. This indicates that the students' writing journals affect students' writing fluency in term the numbers of words in their writing. The length of their journals improved by numbers of journals that the students committed to their writing activities. In other words, the more the students write, the more fluent in writing skills they become. According to Heder and King (2012), giving students extensive writing during the writing course will help students improve their confidence, speed, fluency and interest in learning English. Hyland (2002) states that teaching writing is a process and the instructors should let the students write and encourage them to write as much as possible. This might help students' improve their writing fluency and quality.

The findings of the present study correspond to Luu Trong Tuan (2010) who found that journal writing as an extensive activity is to foster learners' writing motivation and enhance their writing skill as well as to build a close bonding between teachers and learners. Furthermore, Homstad and Thorson (1996) confirm the importance of writing journals when stating that weekly writing journals strengthen writing skills and may also enhance critical thinking and cultural interaction. The findings of the present study and the literature discussed above indicate that the writing journals are beneficial activity and should take into account to encourage students to writing English. As a saying goes, "practice makes perfect". The writing journal activities may bring EFL students no longer frustrating and difficult attitudes towards writing a foreign language (Homstad & Thorson, 1996). Bacha (2002) suggests that the writing lecturers should give the opportunities for students to practice writing regularly because the experience in writing practice was not only a very highly motivating basis for developing students' writing skills but also a valuable one for students in acquiring necessary academic research know-how.

5. Conclusion

Firstly, the study reveals the most frequent types of errors the students made in both lexical errors and syntactic error. The results of the study help clarify what the students' learning difficulties are for the writing instructors. Secondly, the study also indicates that the students' writing journals affect students' writing fluency. The length of their journals improved by numbers of journals that the students wrote during course. In other words, the more the students write, the more fluent in expressing ideas they become. Making errors is inevitable in language learning process. Clarifying errors keeps the teachers informed what aspects need further attention in the training process.

The results of this study highlight certain issues regarding teaching and learning writing in English as a second/foreign language. Teachers/educators in similar situations may utilize those results to enhance the teaching and learning of L2 writing. Firstly, language interference should be taken into consideration during writing classes as the use of L1 which might affect writing performance in L2. Teacher/peer feedback should be applied during the writing activities to help students learn from each other to enhance writing quality. Teachers should offer students opportunities for sufficient amount of writing practice.

Although the researcher has made great efforts to carry out the study, the study has got certain restrictions. Firstly, the study just collected papers from 115 students of Writing-1 courses out of 363 in HCMC Open University for error analysis. There should be further investigation to most of the students in three writing levels such as Writings 1, 2, & 3 so that the findings will be strengthened for generalization. Secondly, the data for analyses were journals which were collected from students' writing assigned by only one instructor for 3 classes. This seems not to be in the normal curriculum. Moreover, the instructor didn't correct students' journals so the quality was not measured. There should be research investigating the quality of students writing in the control of peer/teacher feedback to see if the students' writing quality improves in the extensive writing practice.

REFERENCES

Bacha, N. N. (2002). Developing Learners' Academic Writing Skills in Higher Education: A Study for Educational Reform. *Language and Education, 16*(3), 161-177.

Belhaj, A. M. (1997). Contrastive Textual Analysis: An Arabic-English English-Arabic Translation Corpus. *Occasional Papers, 24*(25), 103-150.

Bhela, B. (1999). Native language interference in learning a second language: Exploratory case studies of native language interference with target language usage. *International Education Journal, 1*(1), 22-31.

Darus, S., & Ching, K. H. (2009). Common Errors in Written English ssays of Form One Chinese Students: A case Study. *European Journal of Social Sciences, 10*(2), 242-253.

El-Sayed, A. M. (1982). *An Investigation into the Syntactic Errors of Saudi Freshmen's English Compositions.* Unpublished Ph. D. Dissertation: Indiana University of Pennsylvania, U.S.A.

Ferris, D. (1995). Teaching ESL composition students to become independent self-editors. *TESOL Journal, 4*(4), 18-22.

Ferris, D. (1999). The case for grammar correction in L2 writing classes: A response to Truscott (1996). *Journal of second language writing, 8*(1), 1-11.

Ferris, D. R. (2004). *Treatment of Error in Second language Student Writing.* Michigan: The University of Michigan Press.

Herder, S., & King, R. (2012). Extensive Writing: Another fluency approach for EFL learners . *Extensive Reading World Congress Proceedings, 1*, 128-130.

Homstad, T., & Thorson, H. (1996). *Using Writing-to-Learn Activities in the Foreign Language Classroom - A research grant report.* Center for Interdisciplinary Studies of Writing. Minneapolis: University Of Minnesota.

Hyland, K. (2002). *Teaching and Researching Writing.* Essex: Longman.

Lee, J., & Seneff, S. (2008, June). Correcting Misuse of Verb Forms. In ACL (pp. 174-182).

Lee, L. (1997). ESL learners' performance in error correction in writing: Some implications for college-level teaching. *System, 25*, 465-477.

Leki, L. (2001). Material, Educational, and Ideological Challenges of Teaching EFL Writing at the Turn of The Century. *International Journal of English Studies, 1*(2), 197-209.

Norrish, J. (1983). *Language Learners and Their Errors.* London: Macmillan Press.

Olsen, S. (1999). Errors and compensatory strategies: a study of grammar and vocabulary in texts written by Norwegian learners of English. *System, 27*, 191-205. doi:dx.doi.org/10.1016/S0346-251X(99)00016-0

Pham Vu Phi Ho (2013). Các Hoạt Động Dạy và Học Môn Viết tại Khoa Ngoại ngữ Đại học Mở TP.HCM. *Tạp Chí Khoa học trường Đại học Mở TP.HCM, 3*(31), 96-115.

Rao, Z. (2007). Training in brainstorming and developing writing skills. *ELT journal, 61*(2), 100-106.

Richards, J. C., & Schmidt, R. (2010). *Dictionary of language teaching and applied linguistics* (4th ed.). London: Pearson.

Sattayatham, A., & Honsa, S. (2007). Medical students' most frequent errors at Mahidol University, Thailand. *The Asian EFL Journal, 9*(2), 170-194.

Semke, H. D. (1984). Effects of the red pen. *Foreign language annals, 17*(3), 195-202.

Silva, T. (1993). Toward an understanding of the distinct nature of L2 writing: The ESL research and its implications. *TESOL Quarterly, 27*(4), 657-677. doi:dx.doi.org/10.2307/3587400

Truscott, J. (1996). The case against grammar correction in L2 writing classes. *Language learning, 46*(2), 327-369.

Luu Trong Tuan (2010). Enhancing EFL Learners' Writing Skill via Journal Writing. *English Language Teaching, 3*(3), 81-88.

Wang, W., & Wen, Q. (2002). L1 use in the L2 composing process: An exploratory study of 16 Chinese EFL writers. *Journal of Second language Writing, 11*, 225-246.

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.

Weigle, S. C. (2002). *Assessing Writing.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.