"SHE *DON'T* STUDY. SHE *RUNNING* AND *WALKING*": ENGLISH AS A MEANS OF COMMUNICATION BETWEEN THAI TEACHERS AND FOREIGN TEACHERS IN THAILAND

Chory Trisa Yuanilasari[1], Nailah Sa'diyatul Fitriah[2] .

Affiliation: Department of English, Universitas Negeri Malang[1,2]
(chorytrisa@gmail.com)[1], (nailahsf@gmail.com)[2]

Abstract

Teachers in Southern Thailand, especially in Miftahudeen School, Na Thawee, Songkhla, Southern Thailand, communicate with various languages; Thai language, Malay, and English. English as an International language becomes first priority of communication everywhere and every time, unlimited to different background of the speakers. In this case, English is used as a bridge to cummunicate between the Thai teachers and the foreign teachers at Miftahuddeen School. However, since English is used by minority of people in Thailand, they tend to apply their native language (L1) structure and rule, Thai language, to English as the target language (L2). By this, somehow they have their own rule and pattern in producing English utterances becoming different English spokenby Thai people, such as English prosody, grammatical rule, pronunciation, and vocabularies they use. Therefore, the researchers tended to observe how English was spoken by Thai teachers considered asunique English in global communication and the effects of their English in oral communication with foreigners. The data were taken from the recorded daily conversation between an Indonesian Teacher and two female Thai Teachers of Miftahuddeen School who were able to speak in English for about three months. The researchers analyzed the data using qualitative descriptive method. From the analysis, the researchers are able to draw a conclusion that English used by Thai teachers was different from the Standard English. It was indicated from how they produced English utterances, pronunciation, and vocabularies which always involved their native language (L1).

Keyword: Thai-English, English as foreign language

Introduction

The growth of English as either a second language or a foreign language may not be debatable since nowadays English has already been spoken in many non-Native English speaking countries in this global world.The status of English as the language of International communication (Mauranen&Ranta, 2009) has led to many people learn English as a foreign or second language in order to improve their career prospects, to travel, or to gain professional experience abroad. One of the real examples is that English is a language used for International communication. English is used by Thai teachers at Miftahuddeen School, Nathawee, Songkhla, Southern Thailand to communicate with foreigners there. They use English to communicate with the teaching practice students from Indonesia. However, there, English seems to be different from the English spoken in most countries.

Cook (1996) states that errors in the use of foreign language have long been interesting topic since 1970s up to the present (e.g. Amara, 2015; Casas, 2001; Darus&Subramaniam, 2009; Kaweera, 2013;Ridha, 2012; Sarfraz, 2011;&Shen, 2011).Amara (2015) claims that in the past few years, there had been a large and growing amount of literature on error analysis of second language acquisition.These scholars haveconducted research in the area of second language acquisition errors through their participants' writing. Shen (2011) observed errors in the written composition of Chinese learners of English from a typological perspective. The results indicated that the learners' L1 structures in inter-language development were especially prevalent in the early stages. The less proficient learners used more topic-prominent structures (as shown in Mandarin Chinese), while those with better proficiency tended to be able to use the structures closer to the target language (English, a subject-prominent language). Sarfraz (2011) examined the errors made by 50 undergraduate Pakistani students in written essay. He saw that the overwhelming majority of errors the students made resulting learners' interlanguage process and some errors resulted from mother tongue interference. Darus and Subramaniam (2009), using Corder's (1967) model on error analysis, looked at the errors in a corpus of 72 essays written by 72 Malay students. They observed that students' errors are of six types, in singular/plural form, verb tense, word choice, preposition, subject verb agreement and word order.

In addition, most of the students' errors can be due to L1 transfer. Furthermore, most of the learners rely on their mother tongue in expressing their ideas. It needs to be noted that the grammatical errors and the mechanical errors are the most serious and frequent ones. Ridha (2012) observed English writing composition of 80 EFL college students and then categorized the errors according to the following taxonomy: grammatical, lexical/ semantic, mechanics, and word order types of errors. Based on the researcher's experience, it happens due to their first language interference in constructing the targert language. As asserted by Brown (2006) that in the early of learning second language, learners usually draw upon their native language (L1) as references before gaining more familiarity with the target language (L2).

Different from the study above, Casas (2001) presented phonological errors of sixty-five Spanish adult learners of English as a Foreign Language. He tried to shed some light on one of the well-known problems related to the acquisition of a foreign language by non-native speakers, analyzes the different types of phonological processes shaping the fossilized interlanguage (IL) of adult FL learners in order to see some major points: a) whether they were adhered to by those adult learners sharing identical L1; b) whether frozen IL reflected transfer from the learners' L1 or is the result of developmental (Le. universal) processes. As a result, unlike most research considering that adult learners of a foreign language do not always produce foreign sounds which have a clear counterpart in their native language, the results maintained here showed that, as far as adult Spanish speakers were concerned, it was not clear that processes represent universal constraints unequivocally. Rather it appears that LI exerts an overriding role in the acquisition of the phonology of English as a foreign language as reflected in the majority of the processes under analysis.

By this study, Casas, (2001) adds that the study of the participants' oral output has yielded ten fundamental phonological processes shaping their IL which ultimately are reflections of the three universal macro-processes of addition, subtraction and substitution. From those three processes, it can be explained into these categories; consonant substitution errors turned out to be the hardest to eradicate (100%), closely

followed by vowel quality (80%). At the other end of the scale, synaeresis or vowel elision, vowel epenthesis and consonant epenthesis ranked lowest (37%, 38 % and 40% respectively). Middle range values corresponded to prothesis and voicing devoicing (both 52.3 1%), vowel substitution (duration) (63%), cluster simplification (66%) and consonant assimilation (68%). To sum up, the result views that, as far as adult Spanish speakers are concerned, it is not clear that processes represent universal constraints unequivocally. Rather it appears that LI exerts an overriding role in the acquisition of the phonology of English as a foreign language as reflected in the majority of the processes under analysis.

From all the studies reviewed above, we can see that second language acquisition studies do not simply investigate the steps of second language learners acquire their target language, whetheras second or foreign language, but also a way for scholars to investigate more something behind second language acquisition. Most of the studies above touch on second language acquisition errors basically, teachers, students and their English proficiencies as the main data. Some of the data are taken in the form of written or spoken data in the classroom. Based on this, we might say that all of those researchers above only focus on how students as second or foreign language learners acquire the target language, English, and thus they are able to seek the problems on this phenomenon.

Nevertheless, in fact, English is also naturally spoken by second language learners in their environment, aside spoken in the classrooms. From this, we can see deeper on how English of those non-native English speakers spoken naturally as a part of second language acquisition. Through this thought, second language learners are not only always found in the area of formal places, for example in classroom, but also in informal places. However, there are no many scholars touch this issue. And thus, to fill the gap, the researcher proposes this study based on the researcher's experience in having relations with Thai people at Miftahuddeen School, Thailand. This study would not only show you on how English is spoken in Thailand, but also present the impact of this spoken English to foreigners.

Based on the explanation of background of the study above, the researcher designed the statement of problems in this research into two, they are;

1. What types of errors occured in English used by Teachers at Miftahuddeen School?

2. What were the effects of their English in oral communication with foreigners?

This studyfocused on English of two Thai teachers at Miftahuddeen School, Thailand, who can little bit speak in English. Those two teachers were the participant of this study for English is limitedly spoken in Thailand. From those two participants, the researcher was able to reveal how Thai-English of teachers at Miftahuddeen School so that the researcher got the pattern and analyzed the linguistics features of Thai-English as a part of second language acquisition based on the recorded data for four months when those two participants communicated with the foreign teacher from other country, Indonesia. Furthermore, from this study the researcher was able to draw a conclusion on the effect of Thai-English they used in communicating with foreigners.

By proposing this study, the researcher does hope that the result of this study will give contribution and benefits for the researcher and the readers both theoretically and practically. Theoretically, this study is expected to give a deep knowledge focusing on the linguistics features of Thai-English so that the reader will know a hidden knowledge which has not been exposed by many scholars. Next, it will give benefits for the readers to see why the linguistic features of Thai English show off and

the impact of this Thai-English in a communication with foreign people. Thus, we will have wider knowledge to see English as an International language of communication in another type of English spoken in a non-native English speaking country so that we can respect the English of other people with different L1 background. Practically, this study is expected to give better view and understanding on how people speak English with some different linguistics features and show the specific pattern of Thai-English spoken by Thai people.

Finding and Discussion
There are 17 daily conversations between two Thai teachers and a foreign teacher from Indonesia as collected data. These two Thai teachers are English Program home class's teachers who are considered to have good English and hoped to be able to communicate actively using English. These collecteddata were taken for about 3 months in Miftahudeen School, Na Thawee, Songkhla, Southern Thailand.

The collected datawere analyzed by using classification of error in a book entitled "Language Two" written by Dulay, Burt, and Krashen (1982) and based on the researchers' interpretation. From 17 recorded data, the researchers find 25 conversations uttered by Thaiteachers containing 39 errors in total for both grammatical and phonological errors.The classification of the errors are seen as follow:

No.	Conversation	Lexical Errors (Using choice of words)	Pronunciation Errors		Grammatical errors
			Phonetic deviation (Foreign accent)	**Phonemic/p honological errors**	
1.	X: "Teacher, *she don't study. She walk walk and run. Walk-walk, teacher. Every day, teacher, she not same."* Z: It's OK, teacher.	*She Walk walk. Walk walk, teacher.* • She takes a walk	Study /setʌdɪ/	Phonemic Addition • Study /setʌdɪ/	1. Morphology • Third person singular verb incorrect: *She don't study.* She walk walk and *run. Walk-walk, teacher. Every day, teacher,* 2. Missing parts • Simple predicate,*be* missing*: she not same.*
2.	X:*Suay* (Beautiful in Thai language), teacher. (while touching the hijab I wore) Z: Thank you so much,	*Suay*(Beautiful in Thai language) • L1 interference			

teacher. This is from Indo.

No.					
3.	X:Shaf, teacher, shaf. Z: OK, teacher.	*Shaf*arabic language) • She wants to rearrange the students' table arrangement.			
4.	X: Beautiful, teacher. (while touching the hijab I wore). Indo, teacher? Z: Yes, teacher. X: Oh. Beautiful, teacher.		Beautiful /ˈbjuːtɪfun/	Phonemic substitution • Beautiful /ˈbjuːtɪfu*n*/	3. Some transformation • Question transformati on 4. Missing part • Subject pronoun missing 5. The auxiliary system • *Be* missing *Beatiful, teacher.* *Indo, teacher?*
5.	Y: Teacher, you think...you think aboutASEAN for *Pra'thum* one to six in the afternoon. Z: Where is it, teacher? Y: In the gym..gym... In the afternoon before the student come back.	• *Pra'thum* (in Thai language it means Elementary School) • gym..gym... She does not know how to say school yard in English. Due to her limited vocabularies, she simply says that word in a word she knows.	about /əˈbaʊ/	Phonemic deletion • about /əˈbaʊ*(t)*/	
6.	Z: Teacher, does the time change? Y: Yes, *two time* change.	• *Two time* She intended to say "at two o'clock". Yet, she expresses it in L1 order.			
7.	X: Teacher, some people water-prayer. Wait a minute, teacher. Z: OK, Teacher.	7.Water prayer • She does not know how to say "take	People / ˈpiːp*ə*n/	Phonemic substitution • People / ˈpiːp*ə*n/	

		wudhu" in English. Due to her limited vocabularies, she simply says that word in L1 word order. . 8. *Some people* She wants to say "some students"but she replaces the word into some people.			
8.	Z: Is it finish, teacher? (asking the material for today) X: Finish, teacher. Take home, teacher. So, How is now, teacher? Z: The material today is equal – unequal, teacher. X: OK, Teacher. Thank you very much.	9. *How is now, teacher?* • The intended to say, "what is the material for today?". Yet, she expresses it in L1 expression. Take home • She intended to say homework.	Finish /ˈfɪnɪt/	Phonemic substitution • Finish /ˈfɪnɪ*t*/	
9.	X: Come, teacher..come. What time you teach? Z: I teach at 10.45. What chapter should I teach today, teacher? X: *What today teach?* N: OK, teacher. T: Teach this. After you teach they do. I help, teacher. I help.	10. Come • She says come rather than come in to ask someone come in to her class. 11. Do • She translates do to "mengerjakan". However, in English, do shold be followed by object.	Time /tʌm/	Phonemic substitution • Time /tʌm/	6. The Auxiliary system • Do underuse in question 7. Missing parts • Subject pronoun missing *What today teach?*
10.	S: teacher, *where country you*, teacher ? N: Indonesia.	12. Jakarta • She says the word "Jakarta" rather than	• Go /kɔ/ • Like/laɪ/ • Study	Phonemic substitution • go /kɔ/	8. Some transformation • Question transformati

S: No, teacher, jakarta, teacher, jakarta. N: Oh....that's city, teacher. I come from Malang. S: I *have*Tamboro teacher. *My brother study*, teacher know Tamboro ? Go mountain, teacher. I..... go teacher very cold, teacher. I....... athma sleeping one day one night. N: Have you visited Indonesia, teacher ? S: Next year, teacher, with my husband, *two daughter*, and my mother. N: Which one do you like, teacher ...... Indonesia or Thailand ? S: I like Indonesia teacher.There are many vegetables, - what is it teacher ? (While showing me the picture of vegetables).	city to ask where my hometown is. 13. Have • She uses the word have to say that she once went to Tomboro.	/sətʌdɪ/ • Have /hæp/	• Have /hæp/ Phonemic deletion • like/laɪ/ Phonemic addition • study /sətʌdɪ/	on 9. The Auxiliary system • *Be* missing • Omission of possesive adjective *Where country you, teacher?* 10. Morphology • Third person singular incorrect (failure to attach –ies) *My brother study* 11. Syntax • Subtitution of singulars for plurals *Two daughter*
11. X: So sleepy, teacher.Sleep in the hospital, teacher. In university, you learn English, teacher ? Z: Yes, teacher X: Oh excellent, teacher. In Thailand, no English teacher, only some.. Z: *S*o where can we study English here? In what University ? X: I don't know teacher. *I learn English in high school in Malay, teacher*.	14. Hospital She says the word hospital rather than school clinic	• Sleepy /səlɪpɪ/ • Hospital /hɔspɪtɔn/	Phonemic addition • Sleepy /səlɪpɪ/ Phonemic substitution • Hospital /hɔspɪtɔn/	12. Some Transformation • There transformation 13. The auxiliary system • Be missing *In Thailand, no English teacher,only some..* 14. Subject pronoun missing 15. *Be* missing *So sleepy, teacher. Sleep in the hospital*

					16. Simple past tense incorrect *I learn English in high school in Malay, teacher.*

12.	Z: Why adek doesn't want to study, teacher ?
	X: *She sick*, teacher in *Anuban. She one, teacher.*
	Z: Do her parents know that she doesn't want to study?
	X: *Parent know*, teacher.
	Z: But *adek*understands, teacher.
	X: Yes, teacher. *But she don't study. She walking, running, and sleeping everyday.*
		15. *Anuban*
		• She does not know how to say Kindergarten in English. Due to her limited vocabularies, she simply says that word in L1
			• sleeping /seliping/
			• study /setadi/
				Phonemic addition
				• sleeping /seliping/
				• study /setadi/
					17. The auxiliary system
					  • Be missing
					
					She sick, teacher
					
					She one, teacher.
					
					18. Morphology
					  • Third person singular incorrect (failure to attach –*s*)
					
					Parent know
					
					19. The auxiliary system
					  • Underuse in negatives
					
					She don't study
					
					20. Morphology
					  • Third person singular incorrect (failure to attach –*s*)
					
					She walking, running, and sleeping every day.

13.	Y: *Where you go holiday, teacher?* Z: Yala, teacher. Y: Saturday teacher ? This Saturday ?				21. The auxiliary system • Do underuse in question

Z:Yes, teacher. Y: *Many dress* teacher Yala.				*Where you go holiday, teacher?* 22. Some Transformation • There transformation 23. Use of proposition • Omission of preposition 24. Syntax • Subtitution of singulars for plurals *Many dress teacher Yala*
14. Z: Teacher what do you choose ? Y: One ?two ? Oh secret, teacher. Z: Teacher, who chooses? Teachers only or students only ? Y: *Teacher only. Student only. Teacher only and student only, teacher choose.*		student /sətudən/	Phonemic addition • student /sətudən/	25. Morphology • Third person singular incorrect (failure to attach –s) 26. Misordered parts • Subject before adverb *Teacher only and student only, teacher choose*
15. T: *Teacher, where you open poso today?* N: At home, teacher T: *You don't open poso at school ?* N: I don't know, teacher.	16. *Open poso* She uses this word to say breakfasting.	Open /ɔpaen/	Phonemic substitution Open /ɔpaen/	27. The auxiliary system • Do underuse in question *Where you open poso today?*
16. N: Teacher do you go to Songkhla on Friday ? S: No, teacher. *Cannot.* I have *father husband.* I cook teacher. He	17.*Father husband* • She uses this word to say father in law			28. Morphology • Irregular past tense (substitution of simple non- past)

	cannot eat carry. I cook teacher. *Night (last night) I cannot teacher. I don't come.*	18. Night • She uses this word to say last night.		*I don't come*
17.	T: Teacher, I go to market, teacher. N: OK, teacher. I will go to class. T: *You teach, teacher?* N: Yes, teacher. T: *I class, teacher oh class me, teacher?* N: Yes, I teach in your class, teacher.			29. Auxiliary system • Do underuse in question *You teach, teacher?* 30. Syntax • Use of pronoun (omission of possessive pronoun) • Use of pronoun (Omission of subject pronoun). *I class, teacher oh class me, teacher?*
18.	S: Teacher, don't speak? N: Actually Fareeda has memorized 1 and 3 S: And, *nich*teacher ? N: Not, yet teacher N:Where'sfareeda, teacher ? S: *Fareedaniankom, teacher.*	19. Don't speak • She uses this word to say memorize. 20. *Nich*(this in Thai language) 21. *Niankom*(Computer library in Thai language)		31. Auxiliary system • Be missing 32. Omission of preposition *Fareedaniankom*
19.	T: Teacher I go to *Sagon*na N: Canteen, teacher? T: Yes, teacher I sell	21. *Sagon, na* • She uses this word to say canteen.	Sell /seu/	Phonemic substituion • Sell /seu/

The 1ˢᵗ Education and Language International Conference Proceedings
Center for International Language Development Unissula

ELIC2017

N: Ok, teacher.

20.	T: Teacherare you okay? *You not good (sick), teacher yesterday.* N: Yes teacher, I got fever yesterday. T: *Now, you okay, teacher?* N: Yes teacher , now I am okay. T: Sorry teacher I do research time.	22. Sorry teacher I do research time. • She intended to say, "I am sorry, teacher. I have to finish my research"	Time /tʌm/	Phonemic substitution Time /tʌm/	33. Question transformation • Omission of auxiliary (missing be in past form) *You not good teacher yesterday* 34. Question transformation • Omission of auxiliary (missing be) *Now, you okay, teacher?*
21.	Y: Teacher Z: what, teacher? Y: *Pen, teacher.Where?Pen black.* Z: *Ustadz*borrows your pen, teacher.				35. Word order in adjective (NP construction) *Pen black*
22.	X: Teacher.... teacher...... *khruPiroh have?* (she asks me if *Khru*Piroh in the class) Z: KhruPiroh went to *Sagon*, teacher.	23. Have • She uses the word have to ask if her friend is in her class.			36. Question transformation • Omission of auxiliary (be missing) *khru*Piroh have ?
23.	Z: Can I help you to sweep the floor ? X: *My pen rai*, teacher *mai pen rai.....*	24. *My pen rai*(Thai language meaning no problem in English).			

559

24	Z: Santicha does not do the homework, teacher. X: *She lazy teacher*.				37. Word order in adjective 34. Auxiliary system • Be missing *She lazy teacher*
25.	Z: OK, Teacher. Y: *Charintorn happy. And have..have*..mother. Aa..*charintorn love* mother. Love mother very N: very much? S: very much. Charintorn...*charintorn. ..give mother strong*, teacher *Charintorn give mother arai* N: Strength teacher? S: Ya...Every day, teacher. And make *chop* N: Like, teacher? S: Like..EE..*chop*teacher.. *chop..ngan*. make..make make money. N: Oh, Charintorn has money, teacher. S: No, charintorn have money. Mom momcharintorn. *Money moneyalot alot*.From..from..anik. nick name. I love mother and father. N: Ok, teacher.*Niarai*teacher? S: Mother day. N: Thank you, teacher. Wait, teacher. *Tairub*, teacher.	25. *strong* • She uses the word to say strength.	Mother /mʌtə/	Phonemic substitution and phonemic deletion • Mother /mʌtə/	38. Word order in adjective 36. Auxiliary system • Be missing *Charintorn happy* 39. Morphology • Third person singular incorrect (failure to attach –*s*) *charintorn love mother charintorn...give mother strong* 40. Wrong quantifier 41. Word order *Money moneyalota lot*

Based on the data analyzed above, the subject of this study mostly showed up phonological errors by adding, substituting, or deleting phoneme based on Thai

phonological aspect with total errors for about 18 errors. From this, we can see that in Thai language there is no ending /l/ and /sh/ in Thai language. Therefore, those two Thai teachers cannot pronounce ending /l/ and /sh/ in English words. Instead of using /l/, Thailand teachers are using /n/ to substitute consonant ending /l/ in /hɒspɪtl/to become*/hɔspɪtɔn/.* Also, there is no letter /st/. They add vowel /ə/ in *study* and *sleep or sleeping*. Hence, their English is show up their L1 interference.Moreover, we still find the phonetic deviation in their English because of their L1 interference.

This phenomenon is able to prove Dulay, Burt, Krashen (1982:112) opinion that the learner makes extensive use of L1 phonological aspects as a communicative strategy in the early stage of L2 acquisition. The new phonology is built up based on L1 phonology. So, they use their L1 phonology as a foundation to build L2 phonology and the learners' L2 speech will have a substratum of L1 sounds.

Not only phonological errors shown up in the subjects' spoken English, but also lexical errors which are grammatical interference based on this taxonomy; morphological, syntactical error, auxiliary, and transformation were also produced by Thailand teachers in their daily English conversation. They often left out the detail in English such as *be* missing in *you happy*, substitution of past form, and error in word order in *pen black* instead of *black pen*.

Furthermore, the data above shows that CA hypothesis presents that where structures in the L1 differ from those in L2, errors that reflect the structure of the L1 will be produced. Such errors occur due to the influence of L1 habits on L2 production (Dulay, Burt, Krashen, 1982:97). They added that CA hypothesis reveals that:

1. In neither child nor adult, L2 performance do the majority of the grammatical errors reflects the learners' L1.

2. L2 learners make grammatical errors that are comparable in both L1 and L2 (errors that should be made if "positive transfer" is operating.

3. L2 learners' judgments of the grammatical correctness of L2 sentences are more related to L2 sentence type than to their own L1 structure.

4. Phonological errors exhibit more L1 influence than do grammatical errors, although a substantial number of the L2 phonological errors.

Those errors made by Thai teachers as the L2 learners show that they still tend to use the idea and the structure of their L1 applied in their L2. The pattern of grammatical is still influenced by their L1 and the failure to pronounce some certain sounds in English by substituting them into similar L1 sounds. The errors above are considered as negative transfer as categorized on CA Hypothesis where structures in the L1 differed from those in the L2, errors that reflected the structure of the L1 would be produced (Dulay, Burt, Krashen, 1982:97-102). They also presented that the psychological use of the term interference refers to the influence old habits. Just like in this case, that English as the new language spoken by the subject of this study. Hence, L1 interference is still found in their spoken English due to unfamiliarity with the L2. This kind of errors that reflect the learner's first language structures called as "interlingual errors".

The errors in English spoken by Thai teachers of Miftahuddeenschool might give impact in communication with foreign teacher. As asserted by Dulay, Burt, Krashen (1982:189) that certain types of errors affect a critical different comprehension of the reader or listener toward the speakers' intended message. They added that overall organization of speech that is affected by errors hinder successful communication, while errors that affect a single element of the sentence usually do not hinder communication. Reflecting to this theory, the researcher, who is one of the foreign teachers at Miftahuddeen School, also has the an experience where there are

errors that effect single element of sentence during the researcher and the Thai teacher of Miftahuddeen English conversation, the intended message uttered by the Thai teachers might not hinder successful communication, but it only affect in confusion toward the researcher to interpret the spoken English of the subject.

Conclusion

Based on the findings and discussion, the researchers come to the conclusion that language interference result in error of producing L2. In this case, Thailand teachers produce some errors in grammatical and phonological error when speak actively with the foreigner. All in all, there are 62 errors contained. They are distinguished into two categories phonological errors: 41 errors (morphological, syntax, auxiliary, and word order) and grammatical error: 21 errors (phonetic deviation and phonemic error). These errors are possibly produced because of the influence of L1 and it is considered as the process of learning L2. The effect of errors toward foreigners is it makes the foreigners confuse in understanding the utterances spoken by the Thai teachers, yet the intended message is still understood since the errors occur in conversation only affect a single element of the sentences.

Lexical

References

Shen, Y. M. 2011. Errors in Written Production of Chinese Learners of English: A Typological Perspective. *International Journal of Linguistics* 3, 1: E8

Cook, V. 1996: Second Language Learning and Language Teaching Second Edition. United States of America: Oxford University Press Inc. p. 1

Amara, N. 2015.Errors Correction in Foreign Language Teaching.*The Online Journal of New Horizons in Education* 5, 3: 58-68

Casas, R. M. 2001. Profiling the Phonological Processes Shaping the Fossilised IL of Adult Spanish Learners of English As Foreign Language. Some Theoretical Implications.*International Journal of English Study* 1, 1:157-217

Dulay, et al. 1982.*Language Two.*New York Oxford: Oxford University Press