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Students’ preference to remain silent in English-speaking classrooms has long been a problem in Thailand where the communicative language teaching (CLT) approach is widely used. This study investigates the reasons why Thai students do not want to use English to communicate in their EFL class. The theoretical framework for this study is based on research by MacIntyre et al. (1998) and Wen and Clement (2003). MacIntyre et al.’s (1998) framework concerns the process underlying the inclination to choose to speak a second language given the opportunity. This phenomenon is called, “Willingness to Communicate” (WTC) in a second language (L2). MacIntyre et al.’s framework was adapted by Wen and Clement (2003) and applied to non-western classroom settings, where a learners’ volition to speak in a second language may be influenced by cultural orientations.

The theoretical framework of this study posits that WTC in the Thai EFL classroom context varies depending upon the immediate situation in the language classroom. This situation reflects the role of interlocutors as a product of cultural protocol, and the classroom communication patterns which are controlled by the classroom teacher. Based on this theoretical framework, the study primarily investigates the students’ WTC in a second language within the classroom context. Also, it aims to understand what EFL teachers do in their teaching practices to promote students’ WTC and how these practices affect students’ WTC. The framework of this study determined the rationale for methods of investigation that use qualitative inquiry to understand the contextually dependent nature of WTC in a second language. The rationale is based on a view of motivation called the person-in-context relational view of L2 motivation, a term recently coined by Ushioda (2009). The use of qualitative methods to investigate perceptions from both students and teachers concerning’ students WTC in the Thai EFL classroom context captures relevant contextually-related variables.

The participants in this study were 29 undergraduate students, enrolled in five first-level English speaking classes at two universities in Bangkok, Thailand. These students were selected from 84 students who completed a WTC questionnaire. The selection of the participants was based on their WTC scores. Five teachers from these classes also participated, three of whom were Thai and two were native English speakers. The perceptions of both student and teacher participants were investigated.
through multiple methods: interviews, stimulated recall, and classroom observations. After the classroom observations, student and teacher participants participated in individual interviews, which were composed of general questions and stimulated recall questions based on classroom videos. Content analysis was used to identify themes indicating the variables contributing to students’ WTC and the teachers’ attempts to encourage students to speak English. Interpretation of the findings involved the analysis of data derived from the three sources of student and teacher interviews, stimulated recall data and observations.

The proposed theoretical framework of the study was supported by the findings. Cultural orientation was found to be the basis of four identified variables underlying students’ WTC, classified as: Cultural Context, Social and Individual Context, Classroom Context, and Social and Psychological Context. Variables in the cultural context category highlighted two key principles underlying the norms of social interactions in Thai culture: the desire to establish a network of relationships and the need to maintain the hierarchical system embedded in the society. These two principles highlight the role of significant others over an individual’s decisions to interact or remain silent. In the social and individual context category, WTC was dependent on the role of significant others, as well as one’s personal characteristics and learning experiences. Within the classroom context, students’ WTC varied according to the influence of peer interlocutors, with whom the participants communicated. Also, teaching practices, reflecting language learning tasks and class management were found to affect students’ WTC. Finally, the social and psychological context comprised psychological variables (i.e., language anxiety, self-related beliefs, and goal orientations) that are affected by evaluations from significant others. Cultural orientation, emphasising the importance of significant others over students’ WTC was found to be relevant in all four WTC contexts. This interactive function of culture is comparable to the view of culture as a process, as proposed by Zusho and Pintrich (2003). Moreover, the use of a qualitative methodology in this study highlighted the explicit role of some variables on WTC (i.e., self-concept, self-efficacy, and goal orientations); a qualitative methodology has not been widely employed in previous WTC research.

The findings from the present study were used to develop a model of WTC in a second language for Thai EFL learners in which the role of culture is emphasized.
The profound influence of culture on WTC implies that teachers need to be aware of students’ cultural backgrounds when designing classroom tasks and activities, so as to enhance WTC in English and promote English communication among students. This study contributes to theorizing of WTC in a second language from the Thai EFL perspective. Additionally, the study contributes to the investigation of WTC through qualitative research methods which have rarely been employed to date. The study also presents implications for designing teaching applications to maximize students’ WTC in EFL classrooms in Thailand.
CHAPTER 1

Introduction

Willingness to communicate (WTC) in a second language (L2) involves a learner’s desire to communicate in a second language conversation when given opportunities (MacIntyre, Dörnyei, Clément, & Noels, 1998). They stress that the inclination to speak, as reflected by WTC, leads to an increased frequency of language use. The topic of WTC has thus attracted the attention of researchers in second language learning. The focus of WTC links to the goal of language acquisition which emphasises the advantage of the speaking opportunity to language learning (Skehan, 1989). The concept of WTC is relevant to communicative language teaching (CLT), the language teaching methodology that highlights the important role of communication (Brumfit, 1979). CLT is marked by the atmosphere of using and working with the target language. Hence, it emphasises the active involvement of the learners (Piepho, 1981). This approach has been promoted in Thailand since 1996 (Wongsothorn, Hiranburana, and Chinnawong, 2002). Its focus, however, challenges the traditional Thai teaching method, which emphasises passive learning and a teacher-centred approach to instruction. In Thailand it is typical to see the majority of students passively participating in an English classroom, even though CLT is now being implemented. This problem is the departure point of the current research study. To achieve the goal of CLT, it is important to understand the reasons why students are hesitant to use English to speak in class, that is, their WTC in a second language. This chapter offers an overview of the study. It begins with the background of issues relevant to the study, followed by a brief version of the theoretical framework. It specifies what the study aims to achieve and the research questions related to these aims. Next, it provides an overview of the research design. Finally, it rounds off with an overview of the following chapters in this thesis.

1.1 Background to the study

English claims its status as a lingua franca because it is widely used as a medium of communication in knowledge exchange, as a result of the process of globalisation. In
Thailand, English is considered the most important foreign language that is learned in formal classrooms, starting from early primary level to secondary level. Students have to take English, one of the compulsory subjects in the Entrance Examination, to enter to university. However, Wiriyachitra (2004) states, “Thailand has not prepared Thais for the changing world.” The English curriculum in Thai universities does not meet the demands for English used in the workplace where listening and speaking are the most important skills (Wiriyachitra, 2004). In order to be able to compete in the international market in business, education, science and technology, Thailand, as a non-English speaking country needs to seriously consider ways to improve the teaching and learning of English (Wiriyachitra, 2004).

With a high demand of English proficiency needed for national economic growth, the English curriculum in Thailand has undergone major changes in: 1960 and 1996, respectively (Wongsothorn, Hiranburana, and Chinnawongs, 2002). Before the change in 1960, rote memorization and grammar translation with the aural-oral method were the dominant methods of teaching in English classrooms. Resulting from language instruction based on grammar-translation methodology, required achievement tests centred on translation, pattern drills and structures (Prapphal, 2008). In 1996, the English curriculum in Thailand undertook a goal that aimed to promote a student’s linguistic and communicative competence (Wongsothorn et al. 2002). Under the education reform in 1996, the communicative language teaching (CLT) approach was prescribed for the English curriculum (Kwangsawad, 2001). The CLT approach focuses on “communicative competence”, which can be acquired through producing meaningful tasks in real communication situations (Brown, 2001; Richards, 2002).

Although the new CLT syllabus has been adopted, most of the tests still remain unchanged (Prapphal, 2008). In the university entrance examination, the test items are designed to measure reading comprehension and knowledge of English grammar, with none of the productive skills components incorporated (Wongsothorn et al. 2002). The test items are in multiple-choice format. These testing practices impact on the current teaching practices, a tendency called the washback effect of language tests (Prapphal, 2008). Resulting from testing practices, many English classrooms arrange their class activities based on the content and format of the university entrance exams in order to prepare the students for these exams (Prapphal, 2008). This teaching practice requires
students to focus on the teacher’s explanation of grammar features, instead of using language as a communication tool where meaning is the focus. Within this teaching system, students are familiar with their usual routines of passive listening and taking notes. Fortunately, English classrooms at university level are likely to be more communicatively oriented. However, students who take English communication class are still likely to keep quiet although they are given opportunity to speak.

The reluctance of Thai EFL learners to speak in English in communicative classrooms may be because they are familiar with the learning routines they practiced in the past. In addition to their experience of teaching and learning styles, the students may hesitate to speak English because of the code of behaviour, a product of Thai cultural values. For example, some students who know the answers to the teacher’s questions may refrain from speaking because they are afraid of being accused of showing off. Some who are not sure about their answers may not speak up because they may be afraid of losing face if they make mistakes. These presumed cultural practices and the practices of passive learning in the past provided me a pathway to look for the literature that I could use to form my theoretical framework.

Students’ reluctance to speak in a second language given opportunity is related to the concept of willingness to communicate (WTC) in a second language enunciated by MacIntyre et al. (1998). This concept involves a process where language learners make a decision to choose or not to choose to use a second language to speak. The MacIntyre et al.’s (1998) model of WTC drew together linguistic, communicative and social psychological variables as factors contributing to WTC in a second language. Primarily, it emphasises that a learner’s decision to speak or not, depends on the situations they are in, is determined by the persons with whom they speak and the speakers’ state communicative self-confidence. Additionally, a learner’s choice to speak also depends on stable variables, such as personality. They recommend that teaching can be improved to accommodate a student’s’ WTC in a second language if we understand the reasons why the learners are reluctant to use the target language to speak. However, their model was constructed in a Canadian bilingual context, where the majority of subjects used English as a native language (L1) and French as a second language (L2). In a bilingual context, there is a great opportunity for language learners to have optimal exposure to L2. This is different from the Thai EFL context where English is positioned
as a foreign language in Thailand and there is much less opportunity for Thai students to use the language outside the classroom. Due to the differences in the characteristics of cultural settings, Wen and Clément (2003) modified the structure underlying the MacIntyre et al.’s WTC Model to reflect the nature of EFL learning in China, with close attention to the cultural perspectives. The underlying principle of the modification of WTC structure in this model is comparable to the Thai context.

Wen and Clément (2003) argued that Chinese cultural characteristics underlie Chinese students’ general unwillingness to communicate in public, and is not restricted to English language learning only. They proposed a conceptualisation of the WTC model for Chinese ESL students that is rooted in two relevant cultural aspects: other-directed self and submissive way of learning. The other-directed self concept results from a type of cultural trait called “collectivism”. The characteristics of collectivist values emphasise the interdependent relationship of people in the community. The submissive way of learning results from the notion that students need to be submissive to teachers who are in an authoritative role. These characteristics of the English language classrooms in China seem to be similar to those of the Thai context. The analysis of cultural factors’ influence on WTC in the Chinese context was used as a guideline for examining the Thai cultural values affecting WTC in this thesis. In the Thai context, it is likely that cultural values play an important role in WTC. Two cultural values in particular which seem to be relevant are the desire to build a network of social relationships and to maintain the Thai hierarchical structure. Although cultural values were not explicitly included in MacIntyre et al.’s WTC Model, the variables comprising the Model seem to be universally applicable. I then created the theoretical framework of the present study based on the frameworks given by MacIntyre et al. (1998) and Wen and Clément (2003). A brief overview of the theoretical framework of the current research is presented below.

1.2 Theoretical Framework

Examination of the extensive WTC research derived from the MacIntyre et al.’s WTC Model provided the theoretical framework for my study. In the framework of my study, the WTC process is subject to change from moment to moment depending on the immediate context. The contextual variables that formulate students’ WTC within the
classroom are motivational situations and classroom teaching practices. The motivational situations are characterised as affiliation and control, which are generated by different types of interlocutors, based on the MacIntyre’s et al. (1998) model. The classroom teaching practices, which are controlled by the teachers, are developed based on the teachers’ frames of reference. Within this theoretical framework this study aims to explore students’ WTC in a second language from students’ perspectives, with a consideration also of teachers’ perspectives on how they encourage their students to speak English through their teaching practices. Detailed information of the development of the theoretical framework of this study, based on the review of literature, is presented in chapter 2.

1.3 Purposes of the Study

The theoretical framework of this study informs me with what needs to be achieved in this research in order that I can understand the students’ WTC in a second language. The characterisation of WTC within the framework of my study led me to focus on two main issues. First, it is essential to examine the WTC within its context, because WTC is contextually related. Second, it is also important to pay attention to the teacher’s perspective to understand students’ WTC.

As for the first issue, WTC adapts to changing situations within classrooms, as proposed by the theoretical framework. This perspective of WTC serves as an underlying principle for the rationale of the study. This perspective is in accordance with a recent view of motivation in L2, called the “person-in-context relational view of L2 motivation” by Ushioda (2009). This recent perspective is considered appropriate to explain the rationale of this study, because it highlights the dynamics and complex features of motivation that are interconnected with the context. Within this perspective, motivation is conceived of as personal meaning-making which can be understood through multiple perspectives in context. The rationale for this study, developed some years ago, is aligned with this recent view of motivation.

On the second issue, it is perceived that students’ WTC is associated with the classroom context which is controlled by the teachers. Thus, it is important to examine teachers’ perspectives to supplement the students’ experiences. This study then aimed to understand the teachers’ perspectives on what they did and how they attempted to
encourage students’ WTC through their teaching practices. These two issues were used to form the research questions of the present study, presented below:

**RQ1.** What do the student participants consider are the factors which influence their willingness to communicate in English in class?

**RQ2.** How do teachers, in their planning, teaching and use of resources, try to create environments which encourage students in their WTC?

**RQ3.** How do classroom teaching practices affect the students’ WTC?

### 1.4 Overview of the Research Design

To understand the WTC in its EFL classroom context, this study was designed to gather a range of data from both students and teachers. Multiple data sources included interviews, stimulated recall based on video data, and classroom observations. Data gathered from these sources were cross-validated to increase the level of reliability and validity of the data. A detailed account of the actual research methods is provided in chapter 4, Methodology.

The *interview technique* was used as the main research tool to gather the data from both students and teachers. The *stimulated recall technique* was used to collect retrospective data from both student and teacher participants. The stimulated recalled method is an introspective technique, used to encourage the participants to think back to a certain point of time, when they were performing a task or participating in an event, with the use of a reminder, such as an audio-recording or a video-recording (Mackey & Gass, 2005). Stimulated recall data function to complement the interview data. Also, it allows the amalgamation of the context to the WTC process to happen, because it stimulates participants to recall thoughts that they had while they were making decisions to perform actions during activities in class (Polio, Gass & Chapin, 2006). *Classroom observations* were conducted with two purposes in mind. First, they were conducted to supplement the purpose of the stimulated recall interviews, as a tool to elicit the recall of participants’ thoughts at the moment while they were performing actions. Second, I used the data from classroom observations as evidence to form my interpretations of the raw data.
1.5 Outline of the Thesis

In addition to this chapter which introduces the study, the thesis is composed of six chapters. Chapter 2, Review of Literature, outlines what has been done from the previous research studies in order to see how the focal issues have been investigated. The primary issue of this study is the concept of willingness to communicate in a second language. The first section of this chapter begins with background information about the L2 WTC construct which was developed from WTC in L1. It focuses on the explanation of WTC in L2 construct and discusses major issues of research in L2 WTC in both Western and Asian contexts. Then, it examines how the WTC variables from the existing research relate to the Thai context. The next section explores the nature of classroom conversation. The following section then discusses the role of the cultural context on variations of L2 WTC, followed by an analysis of Thai social interaction values relevant to the L2 WTC for Thai EFL learners. Finally, the major issues arising from the literature guide a theoretical framework which is used as the rationale of this study and is presented in the next chapter.

Chapter 3, Rationale, relates the important points derived from the literature review to the research methodology selected for this study. Based on the theoretical framework, a learner’s WTC is related to the dynamics of the context. When considering how to investigate the WTC within this framework, I focussed on two main issues. First, it is essential to examine the WTC from within its context, which is the EFL classroom. Second, to examine the dynamics of the EFL classroom, it is important to understand how the teaching practices are structured, based on the teachers’ point of view. From these two main issues, a qualitative research methodology was chosen. Initially, this chapter provides a brief specification of the literature that forms the basis of the rationale of the study. It then explains the essential issues that form the rationale of this study under two headings: the person-in-context relational view of motivation and the roles of teachers’ perspectives in students’ WTC. The former issue concerns the recent view of L2 motivation that corresponds to the dependent nature of WTC. The latter issue concerns the influences of teaching practices on WTC, based on teachers’ perspectives. The next section explains the reasons why the research methodology was chosen. Then, it outlines the research questions, as well as the rationale behind each of them. Finally, the rationale behind the selection of research methods for data gathering is justified.
Chapter 4, Methodology, establishes the link between theoretical issues of WTC and the pragmatic aspects of the way in which the research was conducted. It is split into four main sections. The first section provides an overview of the research design. It addresses the key aspects in the overall process by which the data were collected. The next section provides detailed information about the participants and their relevant backgrounds, as well as the instrumentation used in this study. The third section outlines the research design, data collection procedures, and data analysis. Finally, the fourth section considers important ethical issues.

Chapter 5, Results Part I, reports on the outcomes of the data analysis which was conducted to answer research question 1. The findings presented in this chapter focus on what the participants said in their general interviews and stimulated recall interviews. The interpretation is made through my perspectives grounded in the classroom observations and interview sessions. The variables contributing to WTC that emerged from students’ voices in general and stimulated recall interviews were classified into four main dimensions: Cultural Context, Social and Individual Context, Classroom Context, and Social and Psychological Context. The issue of significant others that affected the participants’ WTC occurred in all contexts of variables affecting the WTC. This result emphasised the power of cultural influences on the participants’ WTC. Moreover, this finding shows the connections between the variables in all contexts.

Chapter 6, Results Part II, discusses the outcomes of the analysis in an attempt to answer the research questions 2 and 3. Answers to both research questions are classified by teachers in each of the 5 classes. Analysed data were classified into themes and interpretation of analysed data was based on my observations. Under each teacher, answers to research question 2 are categorised as Teaching principles and Teaching practices. Answers to research question 3 are categorised as Effects of teaching practices on students’ WTC. Concerning the answer to research question 2, teaching practices performed by teachers in all classes reflected their teaching practices. The analysed interview data from each teacher were compared for similarities and differences of teaching practices based on teaching principles of teachers in each class. For research question 3, I made a comparison between data from students and teachers’ perspectives and my observations. The effects of teaching practices on students’ WTC are grouped as interlocutors, tasks and class management.
Chapter 7, Discussion and Conclusion, discusses the findings which address the research questions 1, 2, and 3 in the light of the relevant research literature. In this final chapter, a summary of the findings that address all the research questions is provided, together with a higher level of analysis of findings, based on the modified MacIntyre et al., model of WTC. Most importantly, it focuses on the links between the findings of this study to those of previous research work. It emphasises how the findings from this study make an original contribution to the research in L2 WTC and the EFL instruction in Thailand. Applications to the language learning classroom are recommended based on my findings. Finally, this chapter discusses issues which need further exploration, as well as limitations in the current study.
CHAPTER 2

Literature Review

2.1 Introduction

This study aims to understand the reasons why Thai EFL learners are typically reluctant to use English to speak in English speaking classes. Also, it aims to investigate the teachers’ attempts to encourage the students to speak English in class and the effects of teaching practices on students’ WTC in English. To achieve these aims, it is important to understand what we know from previous research studies in order to see how the focal issues have been investigated.

The primary issue of this study is the concept of willingness to communicate in a second language. The first section of this chapter begins with background information about the L2 WTC construct which was developed from WTC in L1. It focuses on the explanation of WTC in L2 construct and discusses major issues of research in L2 WTC in both Western and Asian contexts. Then, it examines how the WTC variables from existing research relate to the Thai context. The next section explores the nature of classroom conversation. Then, the following section discusses the role of cultural context on variations of L2 WTC, followed by an analysis of Thai social interaction values relevant to the L2 WTC for Thai EFL learners. Finally, the prominent issues arising from the literature guide a theoretical framework which is used as a basis for the rationale of this study to be presented in the next chapter.

2.2 Understanding the L2 WTC Construct

WTC in L2 developed from communication studies about WTC in L1. The original concept of L1 WTC should be considered, because it can provide a better understanding about the development of L2 WTC conceptualisation. The key aspects of the origin of the WTC construct and the change in the development of WTC perspectives to the current views are discussed. From the issues of WTC in L1, this section moves on to target a conceptualisation of WTC in L2 by MacIntyre et al. (1998), followed by the key
research which is relevant to the present study. Finally, potential variables contributing to WTC in L2 for Thai EFL learners are discussed, based on an evaluation of the previous work.

2.2.1 The Origins of WTC

The concept of WTC emerged from the work on communication in a native language in the late 1950s and early 60s (McCroskey, 1997) in North America, where interpersonal communication is strongly valued (McCroskey & Richmond, 1990). Although people who communicate well are positively evaluated, some people do not communicate much. The difference of communication behaviours was conceptualised as regularly occurring across situations, as determined by certain personality traits (McCroskey & Richmond, 1990; McCroskey, 1997). This concept was called “willingness to communicate” (McCroskey & Richmond, 1987), which “…is defined as a stable predisposition toward communication when free to choose to do so” (McCroskey & Baer, 1985, cited in MacIntyre & Charos, 1996, p.7).

WTC was developed to denote a consistent tendency of communication behaviours in a given native language (L1) across interpersonal communication situations (McCroskey & Richmond, 1990; McCroskey, 1997). It was conceptualised as a cognitive process of volitional choice to speak, which is determined by an individual’s personality (McCroskey & Richmond, 1990). Based on McCroskey’s own research and a review of other studies on L1 WTC, McCroskey (1997) argued that WTC in L1 is highly dependent on two major antecedents: Communication Apprehension and Self-Perceived Communication Competence (McCroskey, 1997). Communication Apprehension (CA) is viewed as “an individual’s level of fear or anxiety associated with either real or anticipated communication with another person or persons” (McCroskey, 1997, p. 82). People with a high level of CA are likely to be less willing to communicate. Also, researchers found that WTC is more highly related to Self-Perceived Communication Competence (SPCC) more than actual competence (McCroskey, 1997). Self-Perceived Communication Competence concerns the perception of one’s ability to communicate.

The original construct of WTC implies its trait-like nature that remains stable across time and situations. However, researchers (e.g., McCroskey and Richmond, 1990) have acknowledged that WTC is also dependent on specific situations. A study by MacIntyre,
Babin & Clément (1999) that examined WTC in L1 confirmed the complementary contributions of trait and state variables to WTC. In this study, the researchers examined the trait and state WTC variables through the subjects’ voluntary participation in a laboratory and the tendency to participate in a difficult communication task. They suggested that trait WTC initiated the voluntary participation in a laboratory and, when in a particular situation, state WTC determined whether the communication would take place. The results of this study highlight the complementary contributions of trait and state variables to WTC. The examination of L1 WTC was the foundation of the development of L2 WTC, which is viewed as being more complex than WTC in L1 (MacIntyre et al., 1998). In the next section, the L2 WTC model proposed by MacIntyre et al. (1998) will be discussed, together with its associated research in both Western and Asian contexts.

### 2.2.2 MacIntyre’s L2 WTC Model

MacIntyre et al. (1998) developed a theoretical L2 WTC model based on the L1 WTC model of McCroskey and Baer (1985). Their model explains the mental processes conducive to initiating communication in L2 a pyramid-shape. Figure 2.1 illustrates the MacIntyre et al.’s Model. L2 WTC was defined as “a readiness to enter into discourse at a particular time with a specific person or persons using L2” (MacIntyre et al., 1998, p.547). This model emphasises that learners will seek out the opportunity to engage in L2 conversation if they are willing to communicate. The WTC is conceived of as a mental process where multi-layered variables operate in a distal continuum. MacIntyre (2007) argued that the model captures the previous literature’s kernels of wisdom, which involve the level of conceptualisation, intergroup communication processes, and the issue of time.
Figure 2.1. Heuristic Model of WTC in L2 of MacIntyre et al. (1998)


The model comprises twelve variables arranged in six layers which are classified into two main levels: level one involves situational variables (Layers I-III) and level two involves individual influences (Layers IV-VI). The situational variables (e.g., desire to speak with a specific person) are subject to change, depending upon the specific context at a given time. The individual variables (e.g., intergroup relations, learner personality) are conceived as being stable properties of a person that can be applied to any situation. The distal arrangement of the situational variables and the individual influences in the model indicates the significance of situational variables over individual influences, because situational ones are located in the upper level closer to the top of the pyramid, while the individual variables are located in the lower level at the base of the pyramid. Despite having non-immediate impact on WTC, individual influences form the fundamental level of the WTC process.

Layer I situated at the top of the pyramid represents the L2 Use, which not only refers to speaking activities, but also to other activities, such as reading newspapers and
watching TV in L2. Layer II represents behavioural intention, which refers to *Willingness to Communicate*. Layer III indicates situated antecedents which immediately influence the WTC and involves *Desire to Communicate with a Specific Person* as well as *State Communicative Self-Confidence*. These two situationally dependent variables are the most salient determinants of WTC, that are formulated by the enduring influences or individual differences located underneath. *Desire to Communicate with a Specific Person* depends on situations where two types of motives operate. These motives are *Affiliation and Control*. *Affiliation* refers to a need to establish a relationship with the interlocutors that comes from integrative motives such as attractiveness, similarity, and familiarity, while *Control* refers to a type of communication which depends on instrumental motives, such as more powerful interlocutors, where interlocutors aim to manipulate each other when communicating, often with specific aims, such as requiring their assistance, cooperation or services. These two types of situations also impact on enduring variables (i.e., *Interpersonal Motivation* and *Intergroup Motivation*) in layers below. *State Communicative Self-Confidence*, which is oriented by situational variables, is determined by *State Anxiety* and *State Perceived Competence*. *State Anxiety* refers to levels of worry in speaking in a specific situation, which can be attributed to many factors, such as negative past experiences. *State Perceived Competence* refers to how a person perceives her or his capacity to communicate at the moment of speaking. The latter two variables were evident as the most important antecedents of WTC (MacIntyre, 1994; MacIntyre & Charos, 1996).

Under the situational variables remote from the summit of the pyramid are located the enduring influences or individual differences level. Layer IV, *Motivational Propensities*, contains three variables. First, *Interpersonal Motivation* depends on either *Control* or *Affiliation*. Second, *Inter-group Motivation* is directly affected by a particular group to which a person belongs and which is impacted by *Intergroup Climate* and *Intergroup Attitudes* in layers below and also depends on either *Control* or *Affiliation*. Third, *L2 Self-Confidence* consists of two components, *Cognitive* and *Affective*. The L2 self-confidence at this level is more stable than state communicative self-confidence in the situational level. Layer V, *Affective-Cognitive Context* includes three variables: *Intergroup Attitudes*, *Social Situation*, and *Communicative Competence*. Finally, layer VI, *Social and Individual Context*, comprises two factors, *Intergroup*
Climate and Personality. Intergroup Climate reflects the special characteristics of the bilingual context, where the issue of availability of the language or linguistic vitality (Structural characteristics of the community), as well as attitudes towards ethnic groups (Perceptual and affective correlates), becomes important. Control and Affiliative motives are important elements that drive WTC, because they are repeatedly emphasised in both situational and individual variables in the model.

In this study, the WTC in English for Thai EFL learners refers to the willingness to use English in different situations in class which can be determined by the participants’ scores in their self-evaluation questionnaires. The participants’ responses to the WTC questionnaire are further validated by the observations of their frequency of English use in class. The difficulty of measuring WTC is acknowledged in the limitations of the study which are included in the final chapter.

2.2.3 L2 WTC Research in ESL and EFL Contexts

Following the development of MacIntyre et al.’s 1998 model, variables underlying this WTC model were examined in a number of research studies. Most were conducted in an ESL context, especially with language learner samples in North America. Little research has been done in an EFL context. WTC research conducted in both ESL and EFL contexts employed both quantitative and qualitative approaches. A review of relevant WTC research presented here is classified by the research methods employed, under the following headings: relevant quantitative research and relevant qualitative research. In each section, research conducted in both ESL and EFL contexts are included, categorised by the key variables found.

**Relevant quantitative research**

*Perceived competence and communication apprehension*

Perceived competence (PC) and communication apprehension (CA) were consistently found to be the two most important variables that influenced WTC and the frequency of communication accordingly in both ESL and EFL contexts. In the ESL context, MacIntyre and Charos (1996) developed a path model for WTC in L2, using path analysis, to investigate the relationships between affective variables (e.g., PC and CA) and the impact of these variables on the frequency of L2 communication. The study was conducted with 92 native English speaking students taking introductory level
conversational French in Canada. The model suggests that L2 communication in a bilingual context is related to WTC in L2, motivation for language learning, the opportunity for contact, and, most importantly, perceived competence. The perceived competence is in turn influenced by language anxiety, intellect, and the social context.

The influence of PC and CA on WTC is also supported by two studies by Yashima and associates in the Japanese EFL context (Yashima, 2002; Yashima, Zenuk-Nishide & Shimizu, 2004). In Yashima’s work, both perceived competence and anxiety were combined into one factor, communication confidence. She used the scale employed by MacIntyre and Charos (1996) to measure this communication confidence. Structural equation modelling (SEM) results of these studies confirmed perceived competence and anxiety make up L2 communication confidence, and a high relationship from L2 confidence to WTC was found (β=.68) in Yashima (2002) and (β=.59) in Yashima et al. (2004).

Confidence in English communication was found to be directly related to WTC in English in the study using SEM to examine the reliability of MacIntyre et al.’s model in explaining WTC in English among Korean students (Kim, 2004). Data were collected from 191 Korean university students by using 10 survey instruments employed from previous studies. Furthermore, this study found that Communication Anxiety in English was negatively related to Confidence in English Communication, while being positively related to Perceived Competence in English.

Similar results were found by Hashimoto (2002), who examined predictors of L2 use with Japanese students in an ESL context in Hawaii. Hashimoto (2002) reported the influence, using path analysis, of perceived competence (β=.31) and L2 anxiety (β=.10) on WTC, which replicated the results from MacIntyre and Charos’ (1996) model in the Canadian context (Hashimoto, 2002). Unlike MacIntyre and Charos (1996), in Hashimoto’s study, the path from perceived competence to L2 communication frequency was not found to be significant. This might be attributed to the different level of language proficiency of the participants in these two studies. It appears that participants in MacIntyre and Charos’ study were language beginners, while Hashimoto’s participants were more advanced second language learners. Hence, it can be argued that perceived competence does not significantly contribute to L2 use for
more advanced students. Similar results were found in studies by Baker & MacIntyre (2000) and MacIntyre, Baker, Clément & Donovan (2003).

Although it appeared that PC and CA were closely related to WTC, one seemed to work more effectively than the other for student populations with different learning situations. The study of WTC variables among students from immersion and non-immersion programs found that perceived competence was more highly correlated with WTC for students from non-immersion programs than from immersion programs, possibly because of the former group’s lack of L2 contact (Baker & MacIntyre, 2000; MacIntyre, et al., 2003).

Baker and MacIntyre (2000) conducted a study with immersion and non-immersion students who were native English speakers studying French as L2 from Grades 10, 11, and 12. They found that perceived competence in French was not significantly correlated with willingness to communicate in French among immersion students, but was quite strong for the non-immersion students. Non-immersion students are more pressured by perceived competence, because they have fewer opportunities to use the language. On the other hand, immersion students who have more opportunity to speak in L2 are more anxious than non-immersion students, because they have high expectations for their performance. Consequently, they are more likely to be threatened by negative experiences, since they are used to positive experiences. A similar result was found in a study by MacIntyre et al. (2003). The characteristics of non-immersion students appear to be similar to Thai EFL learners because of both groups’ lack of L2 contact. Therefore, perceived competence may be regarded as a promising variable for influencing the WTC of Thai EFL learners.

Social Support, Language Learning Orientations, Attitudes and Motivation in L2 learning

WTC in L2 has been found to be associated with social support, language learning orientations, attitudes and motivation in L2 learning. MacIntyre, Baker, Clément, and Conrod (2001) examined the influence of social support and language learning orientations on L2 WTC in 79 grade nine students of L2 French immersion from a junior high school in Canada. They found that social support from parents and teachers led to students’ WTC inside class, while support from peers was related to their WTC
outside class. The finding of no significant role of peer support on students’ WTC inside class may be because the participants were young and not as dependent upon peer support. This study also found a positive correlation between five orientations for language learning to WTC both inside and outside the classroom. The five language learning orientations were travel, job-related, friendship with Francophones (i.e., people who love the French culture), personal knowledge, and school achievement.

Motivation resulted from two basic attitudes: integrativeness and attitudes towards the learning situation, based on Gardner’s (1985) model. The concept of motivation from Gardner’s model has been applied in WTC studies (MacIntyre & Charos, 1996; Hashimoto, 2002). Hashimoto (2002) examined affective variables as predictors of reported L2 use in the classrooms of Japanese ESL students in Hawaii. This study was partially replicating a study by MacIntyre and Charos (1996). Motivation was found to lead significantly to WTC in Hashimoto’s study, but not by MacIntyre and Charos. In Hashimoto’s study, a path from L2 WTC to motivation was found to be significant which demonstrated that WTC has motivational properties. The differences of the results from two studies (i.e., MacIntyre & Charos, 1996, and Hashimoto, 2002) may be due to the contextually bound aspect of motivation. Clément and Kruidenier (1983) suggested that motivation is related to learner characteristics in specific situations. Yashima (2002) developed integrative attitudes towards learning situations to be more aligned with the Japanese EFL context. This attitude towards learning situations is called International posture. It is a concept that represents the general attitude of Japanese EFL learners towards the L2 community, which is developed in the EFL context in Japan, where there is little L2 contact. Thus, the students’ understanding of L2 communities may not be very clear. International posture, coined by Yashima (2002), refers to “…interest in foreign or international affairs, willingness to go overseas to study or work, readiness to interact with intercultural partners, and, one hopes, openness or a non-ethnocentric attitude toward different cultures, among others” (Yashima, 2002, p.57). Yashima (2002) found that International posture (β=.22) had a weak, but direct path to WTC. Despite a weak relationship to WTC, the direct influence of international posture on WTC is significant, suggesting that the more the students are internationally oriented, the more they are eager to communicate in English. Individuals who are motivated to study English have the motivation that contributes to their L2 proficiency and L2 confidence, as found in Yashima’s study. Based on the
result of her study which showed that confidence has a strong and direct influence to WTC, Yashima (2002) argued that confidence is more important to WTC than perceived competence.

**Relevant qualitative research**

Most empirical models constructed to explain the phenomenon of WTC have been based on quantitative data. Until recently, there have been few attempts to explore the variables contributing to WTC through qualitative research inquiry (Cao & Philp, 2006; Kang, 2005). Kang (2005) investigated variables affecting WTC in the classroom among four Korean learners from a conversation partner program conducted at a state university in northern USA. The model of situational WTC, developed from the qualitatively oriented data, suggested three newly emerging antecedents of situational WTC. Figure 2.2 illustrates the model of situational WTC developed by Kang (2005), showing how situational WTC emerges from the joint function of multilayered variables. The psychological antecedents to situational WTC are Security, Excitement and Responsibility, all of which are subject to momentary change, influenced by situational variables, such as topic, interlocutors and conversational context (Kang, 2005). Security refers to feeling secure from fear (e.g., “I feel insecure and reluctant to speak English in front of people who do not know my English proficiency”). This example shows the influence of interlocutors on security. Excitement refers to a feeling of enjoyment. It was found the participants seemed to be excited when talking about topics about which they had interest, background experience or knowledge. For example, one of the participants was excited about skills needed to pass the road test, because he wanted to get a US driver’s licence. Responsibility refers to feeling obliged to understand or clarify the message that was derived from personal, interpersonal, or intergroup motives. An example of responsibility is the statement “I think I will look foolish if I cannot fully explain the topic that I introduced voluntarily.”

This revised model demonstrated the influence of situational variables on the three psychological antecedents of WTC. Given that the situational variables change over the course of communication, the situational WTC will vary over time despite talking with the same interlocutors. Although these three variables related to WTC were claimed to be different from those in the research literature, they still shared some qualities with previous variables in the literature. Security and Responsibility was claimed to be
similar to variables from MacIntyre’s model: *State Communicative Self-Confidence and Motivational Propensities*, respectively. Moreover, both Security and Responsibility can be seen as partially overlapping, because both of them seem to be concerned with others’ evaluation. The concept of Excitement seems to be similar to the concept of situational interest, because both emphasise the feeling that momentarily arises in the communication situation. Situational interest is seen as “…generated by certain conditions and/or stimuli in the environment that focus attention, and it represents a more immediate affective reaction that may or may not last” (Hidi & Harackiewicz, 2000, p.152).
Cao and Philp (2006) investigated learners’ perceptions of factors influencing WTC in the classroom context among eight language learners enrolled in an intensive General English program at a university-based private language school in New Zealand. The overseas students had diverse L1 backgrounds: Chinese, Korean, Japanese, and Swiss-German. The findings indicated the typical factors influencing WTC were group size, familiarity with interlocutor(s) and interlocutor participation. Lack of self-confidence was reported as the main antecedent of low participation in a whole-class discussion. Topic familiarity and interest were also identified as factors affecting WTC behaviours.

Saint Leger and Storch (2009) investigated learners’ perceptions and attitudes towards oral class activities in order to see how their perceptions and attitudes influenced their
WTC in L2. 32 native English speakers who enrolled in the most advanced level of a French course at an Australian university participated in a range of data gathering methods: Self-assessment questionnaire, subject evaluation questionnaire, focus group interviews, and the teacher’s assessment of class participation. Confidence increased over time. During whole class discussion, participants’ level of anxiety increased, which adversely affected their WTC. However, this does not mean that every student preferred to speak in small groups than in whole class discussion. The desire to speak in small groups, which was not uniform, depended on interlocutors and affiliation motives. Some learners felt more relaxed to speak in French in small group discussion, while some perceived that to speak French with their English speaking peers was artificial, because they have to use their affiliation motives in order to establish rapport with the French speaking community (i.e., intergroup affiliation).

Yesim (2005) examined WTC of EFL students in Turkey using both quantitative and qualitative methods. In the qualitative study, 15 students out of 365 students who answered the questionnaires were randomly selected for an interview. Lack of opportunity to use English in daily life was the main reason why the students were reluctant to use English when given the opportunity. Although students were able to communicate in English, they did not want to use English with other Turks because they thought that communicating in English with Turks was “absurd”. This value indicated the cultural reflections of the Turkish students.

Kim (2007) explored the perceptions of academic oral communication needs and verbal participation among East Asian international graduate students (EAGS) in content classrooms at the graduate level in USA. She employed a two-phase design: surveying 139 EAGS and interviewing 15 EAGS. Findings from her interview study suggested the differences in cultural backgrounds of EAGS compared to domestic students regarding the definition of active participation. Some EAGS argued that remaining silent is a reasonable way of active participation and being verbally active is the way to show their L2 confidence to be accepted as competent class members.
2.2.4 Evaluation of WTC Models and WTC Research for the Thai EFL Context

The MacIntyre et al. (1998) model, developed in a bilingual context in Canada, is an overarching L2 WTC model that serves as a framework for the research in L2 WTC in both ESL and EFL contexts. The WTC research in both Western and Asian contexts is heavily based on quantitative research methodology, such as structural equation modelling (SEM), in examining variables which contribute to the prediction of WTC. The findings from the quantitative research suggested some variables with a powerful influence underlying WTC: perceived competence and communicative apprehension (Baker & MacIntyre, 2000; MacIntyre, et al., 2003), and L2 confidence and international posture (Yashima, 2002; Yashima et al., 2004). Very few studies have attempted to explore the WTC determinants by employing a qualitative perspective (e.g., Cao & Philp, 2006; Kang, 2005). The variables emerging from the qualitative investigations were more context-specific than the predetermined variables as measured from questionnaires. For example, Kang (2005) found three psychological antecedents (i.e., security, excitement and responsibility), which vary according to situational variables (e.g., topic, interlocutors and conversational context). Moreover, other recent studies by Cao and Philp (2006) and by Saint Leger and Storch (2009) found that self-confidence impacted on L2 learners’ WTC in L2. These variables were discovered from a closer look at the WTC determinants by using interviewing techniques. This section aims to evaluate the important WTC variables found from both quantitative and qualitative studies in relation to the relevancy to the Thai context. As indicated above, PC, CA, and self-confidence have consistently been found in both quantitative and qualitative studies as key variables in L2 learners’ WTC. These variables are discussed below.

Examination of Communication Apprehension and Perceived Competence

The measurement of communication apprehension used in several studies (e.g., Baker & MacIntyre, 2000; MacIntyre, Babin & Clément, 1999; MacIntyre, Baker, Clément & Donovan, 2003) is the 12-item Communication Apprehension Scale, developed by McCroskey, Richmond & McCroskey (1987). This measurement was used to measure communication apprehension with strangers, acquaintances and friends in four communication contexts: public, meeting, group and dyad (MacIntyre, Babin & Clément, 1999). It has a high reliability of 0.88 (MacIntyre, Babin & Clément, 1999). However, some items from this instrument may be regarded as irrelevant to the Thai
context. For example, using L2 with strangers in a meeting is unlikely to occur for Thai EFL students in Thailand. Although the instrument used to measure communication apprehension by McCroskey, Richmond and McCroskey (1987) is not entirely appropriate to the Thai context, the construct of anxiety seems to affect Thai students’ WTC. The instrument developed for testing anxiety in classroom situations called the Foreign Language Classroom Anxiety Scale (FLCAS) by Horwitz, Horwitz and Cope (1986) seems more appropriate to the Thai EFL classroom, because it focuses on the specific situations that EFL learners are likely to encounter in their language classrooms. It includes items such as “I start to panic when I have to speak without preparation in language class.”

The common measure for Perceived Competence is the Self-Perceived Communication Competence scale (SPCC). This measurement has a similar structure to the apprehension communication scales because the SPCC is evaluated in three types of receivers: strangers, acquaintances and friends in four communication contexts: public, meeting, group and dyad (McCroskey & McCroskey, 1988). It also has an acceptably high level of reliability (0.92) for group research projects. This framework of self-perception evaluation is considered to be measuring how competent people feel in using L2 in general. Nevertheless, it does not reflect the experience of using L2 in EFL classrooms for Thai students, because Thai EFL students normally use L2 with their teachers and their classmates when doing their group works or presenting in front of class. It is unlikely that they would experience using L2 with strangers or using L2 in public or in a meeting, until or unless they experience working in some international workplaces in Thailand or overseas. Thus, they may not have a clear reference point to judge their competence towards L2 conversation in general. Thai students are familiar with using L2 to perform specific classroom tasks. The judgement of one’s own ability towards a specific task seems relevant to Self-Efficacy (SE), because SE concerns a judgement of ones’ own ability in performing a specific task. Therefore, the more relevant motivational construct for the context of this study is Self-Efficacy (SE), not Self-Perceived Competence, as assessed by the SPCC. The characteristics of SE beliefs are multidimensional and differ in their domain of functioning and also vary in different contexts and depend on a mastery criterion of performance that is related to a judgement of one’s capabilities about performing a particular task at a particular level of difficulty (Zimmerman, 2000). Moreover, the applicability of SE to the WTC model
was supported by the examination of the role of SE on WTC that found a direct path from SE ($\beta = .66$) to WTC (Matsuoka, 2006). Therefore, the variable of SE will be included in the present model of this study.

**Self-confidence**

Low CA and high PC contribute to self-confidence. Self-confidence is defined as “self-perceptions of communicative competence and concomitant low levels of anxiety in using the second language, associated with increased usage of and communicative competence in the second language” (Noels & Clément, 1996, p.216). The role of self-confidence in the motivation to acquire communicative competence in a second language was introduced by Clément (1980). In Clément’s (1980) model, self-confidence was illustrated as a secondary motivational process functioning as a mediator of primary process on motivation to acquire communicative competence in a second language which is determined by the resulting tendency, based on social milieu. Based on a multi-ethnic context, individuals who have frequent contact with and who enjoy the contact with members of other ethnic groups are likely to experience a high level of self-confidence. Hence, self-confidence results from frequency and quality of L2 contact (Clément, 1980; Clément & Kruidenier, 1985; Dörnyei, 1994; Noels & Clément, 1996). According to Clément (1980), the aspect of inter-ethnic contact in a multi-ethnic setting is crucial to the development of self-confidence which leads to communicative competence. Taking this perspective to contemplate the English learning situation in a mono-cultural context, like Thailand, self-confidence is not likely to be a critical factor affecting motivation to use English to speak among Thai EFL learners, because the Thai EFL learners do not have adequate opportunity to communicate in English, for which they could develop their self-confidence in speaking English.
While it is related to the self-confidence construct, Self-Efficacy (SE) concerns a more specific judgement of one’s capabilities towards a specific task (Bandura, 1997). This specific type of self-perception concept is more likely to be related to L2 WTC for Thai EFL learners in Thailand. This concept was found to be the strongest predictor of WTC for Japanese college students (Matsuoka, 2006). In Matsuoka’s (2006) model, SE was influenced by the indicator variables, Perceived Competence ($\beta=.81$) and Motivational Intensity ($\beta=.72$). SE was found to be highly linked to WTC ($\beta=.66$). Moreover, it moderately predicted English Proficiency ($\beta=.36$).
Based on the empirical research on WTC variables, language anxiety, self-confidence, and self-efficacy should be considered for examining L2 WTC for Thai EFL learners in classrooms in Thailand. As discussed above, the research examining variables contributing to WTC in L2 was mainly based on ESL contexts where L2 is easily accessible. Opportunity to speak English for L2 students is not limited to the classroom context. However, the Western situation is completely different from the context of this study which is an EFL context. Because of the different nature of learning contexts, the perceptions that shape both students’ and teachers’ interaction behaviour in EFL classrooms should differ from that of the ESL context. Hence, it is important to understand the dynamics of classroom communication in EFL classrooms.

2.3 Dynamics of Classroom Communication

Classroom interaction is different from communication patterns in real life in any cultural context. In class, the teacher is the key factor determining the patterns of communication (Johnson, 1995). Whether the students are allowed to speak with their partners or to respond to the teacher’s questions depends on the teacher. To understand the patterns of classroom communication, then, is not only to understand the students’ perception, but it is also necessary to examine what the teacher perceives about the classroom interaction. Both the teacher’s and students’ perceptions which influence what actually occurs in class should be examined for an understanding of classroom interaction. Barnes (1976, cited in Johnson, 1995) argued that two dimensions are to be examined to understand how teachers and students talk, act and interact in second language classrooms. The first dimension is the moment-to-moment actions and interactions that represent what actually occurs in second language classrooms. The second dimension characterizes what teachers and students bring to the second language classroom.

The framework for understanding communication in second language classrooms, adapted from Barnes’ original model (Johnson, 1995), is presented in Figure 2.4. Student knowledge and use of language in the left-hand box represent their native language and the second language they have acquired within the linguistic, social and cultural contexts of their real-life experiences, which characterise the frames of reference through which the students use language to interact with the world around them. The degree that the students can demonstrate this knowledge depends on the
patterns of communication in second language classrooms, which is represented by the central area of the framework. These patterns are not stable. They change according to how teachers control the patterns of communication and how the students interpret and respond to the teacher’s control. The teachers’ control of the patterns of communication is shaped by their frames of reference. Students’ perceptions of the patterns of communication are shaped by other aspects of their frames of reference, which are their norms and expectations. Finally, the way the students use the language to communicate in classrooms, either constrained or prolific, is a result of teachers’ control and students’ perception of the communication patterns.

Figure 2.4: A Framework for Understanding Communication in Second Language Classrooms

Note. From Understanding communication in second language classrooms. (p. 8), by K. E. Johnson, 1995, Cambridge UP.

Barnes (1976, cited in Johnson, 1995) argued that classroom learning is a negotiation between the teacher’s meaning and the students’ understanding. Hence, it is important to examine what actually occurs in the classroom and also what teachers and students bring to second language classrooms. What both teachers and students perceive as classroom participation is important to be understood, because differences in perception of teachers and students can lead to misinterpretation and misunderstanding about
participation in classroom. Cultural background shapes both teachers’ and students’ perceptions that influence their communication behaviour in class.

2.4 The Role of Cultural Context in WTC

The cultural orientation to WTC in L2 in a Chinese EFL context was highlighted in a conceptual work by Wen and Clément (2003) and empirical research by Peng (2007). This perspective was not considered in MacIntyre’s model, which was based on a bilingual Canadian context. Both studies will be examined to see how cultural orientation affected the students’ WTC.

Wen and Clément (2003) analysed the Chinese culture and argued that culture is the key factor that influenced WTC in L2 for Chinese EFL learners. They proposed the conceptualization of WTC in L2 for Chinese EFL learners, based on two main factors through which the students’ WTC was restrained. These factors were Other-directed self and Submissive way of learning. The value of Other-directed self refers to an evaluation by significant others on one’s self. The other-directedness is characterized by a value of Face-saving (Face protection) and a sense of group relatedness (Insider effect). This concept may link to the unwillingness to become involved in classroom participation, because students are overwhelmed with how others will evaluate them in class. The other factor of WTC is Submissive way of learning which is based on the traditional Confucian philosophy that favoured the silent way of learning, where knowledge was transmitted from teachers. This may result in the preference of learning English through emphasis on grammatical rules, rather than on communicative competence.

Based on the influence of culture, as indicated by the two main concepts, Wen and Clément (2003) illustrate the WTC as a psychological process that operates along a continuum (See Figure 2.5), beginning from students’ Desire to Communicate (DC) that may or may not result in WTC, depending on four cultural-oriented factors. Wen and Clément distinguished between the DC and the WTC: “Desire refers to a deliberate choice or preference, while willingness emphasizes the readiness to act” (2003, p. 25). It is conceptualised that every student may have a DC, but they may not end up speaking in class because their DC is restrained by cultural-oriented factors. The four factors are culturally-oriented, unifying around the concept of face-protection and insider effect.
These factors are *Societal context, Personality, Motivational orientation* and *Affective perception*. Wen and Clément (2003) claim that the DC will result in WTC when the four factors are promoted by the teacher, because the increase in the four factors will result in a positive communication environment.

**Figure 2.5.** Wen and Clément’s (2003) model of WTC for EFL students in China


Corresponding to Wen and Clément’s contribution of cultural influence on L2 WTC for Chinese EFL learners, Peng (2007) found cultural-oriented factors to WTC in L2 in her study that explored the factors that contribute to the L2 WTC among Chinese university students. The findings from interviews and learners’ diaries suggested eight main factors of WTC in L2 that were categorised into two main contexts: Individual and Social Contexts. In the individual context, there were four factors involved: communicative competence, language anxiety, risk-taking, and learners’ beliefs. In the social context, the factors were group cohesiveness, teacher support, classroom climate, and classroom organisation. Most of these variables seem to be consistent with the earlier findings of MacIntyre (1994) and Wen and Clément (2003), except learners’ beliefs, classroom climate, and classroom organisation that seem to be newly emerging variables. The learners’ beliefs include doubts in the usefulness of language achievement in L2 classroom and learners’ concerns of classroom domination, as evidenced by some students’ showing off. Classroom climate refers to the atmosphere in the foreign language classroom, which influences how learners produce the language. In a quiet classroom, more silence and less willingness to communicate are detected.
Classroom organisation refers to the effect of collaboration in a small learning group, which increases students’ confidence in expressing their ideas in English to the group in a low-risk environment.

Both the conceptual work by Wen & Clément (2003) and the empirical research by Peng (2007) emphasised the cultural perspectives of WTC in L2 in Chinese EFL context, which was not explicitly included in the MacIntyre et al.’s model of WTC. The role of culture on communication is validated by Gudykunst (1998)’s article which suggested that culture guides communication. Therefore, cultural factors may be used to explain unfavourable characteristics of social interaction behaviours among Thai EFL learners in classrooms. The next section will analyse Thai value systems that are believed to be related to Thai students’ WTC.

2.5 WTC in Thai EFL Classrooms: Cultural Influences

Student characteristics, such as being quiet, inhibited and respectfully fearful, are commonly seen in communicative language classrooms in Thailand. These behaviours of Thai EFL learners are similar to Chinese EFL learners. Cultural orientation, which was used to explain the unfavourable characteristics to L2 WTC of Chinese EFL students (Wen & Clément, 2003; Peng, 2007), may be applied to the Thai context, because implicit theories of culture have great influence on how the members of a society choose to behave in different situations (Gudykunst, 1998).

Culture has been categorised into the dichotomy of individualism and collectivism, based on several characteristics (Triandis, 1995). According to Hofstede’s (2001) survey of cross-cultural differences, Thailand was ranked high in collectivism. Collectivist characteristics, according to Triandis’ (1995) classification of cultures, are:

Collectivism may be initially defined as a social pattern consisting of closely linked individuals who see themselves as parts of one or more collectives (family, co-workers, tribe, nation); are primarily motivated by the norms of, and duties imposed by, those collectives; are willing to give priority to the goals of these collectivists over their own personal goals; and emphasise their connectedness to members of these collectives. (Triandis, 1995)
Triandis’ (1995) characterisation of a collectivist culture emphasised the high level of interdependence of people in the society. This feature of a collectivist culture has been used to describe the customary nature of Thai society by many social scientists (e.g., Wichiajarote, 1973; Sensenig, 1975; Holmes, 1995; Mulder, 1996). One of them is an affiliative society theory proposed by Wichiajarote (1973). In his theory, Thailand is an affiliative society, where an establishment of personal network is emphasised, because it serves as an affiliative path that individuals can use to gain access to the authority from whom they can ask for benefit. In an affiliative society, a desire to establish a network of personal relationships is a fundamental motive underlying interpersonal relationships (Wichiajarote, 1973).

Because personal relationships are important in the Thai culture, when interacting with other people, Thai people need to know who the persons are in order that they can interact with them properly. Thai people distinguish people with whom they have interpersonal relationships into groups of intimates and non-intimates. Also, they assign a hierarchical level to both intimates and non-intimates, according to social status and age. Intimates or near persons involve home, family, and community; non-intimates or distant persons involve strangers, power, and suspicion (Mulder, 1979; 1996).

To interact with intimates, people can express their thoughts and feelings because they do not have to fear power. They are likely to enjoy themselves in a friendly atmosphere where they are relaxed and uninhibited with their intimate friends. The relaxation characteristic, sometimes called “sanuk”, is an important component in Thai social interaction. To the non-intimates, people need to remain silent in order to protect themselves from outside forces. This self-protection mechanism from the outside power relates to the concept of face-protection. Thais are enormously concerned about their “face”, which was placed as the top ranked value in a survey of Thai national values (Komin, 1990). Moreover, Thais are cautious when talking to people of higher status or authority figures. The authority figures have control power over any inferiors through a means of rewards or punishment. The inferiors are supposed to do what they are told and not to pursue intellectual inquiry, as it is viewed as an offence to the superiors which will sabotage their established relationship (Wichiajarote, 1986). Hence, it is common to see the inferiors keep quiet when they communicate with superiors. Overall, there are two cornerstones that capture variations of social interactions within Thai
society. These are building strong relationships and maintaining hierarchy (Holmes, 1995).

To establish a pleasant relationship in their interactions, Thai people need to know with whom they are talking. To interact with the ‘right’ persons, one adopts the Kreng-jai attitude to smooth and pleasant interaction (e.g., Wichiajarote, 1973, 1986; Komin, 1990). Kreng-jai is a critical communication tool for any interpersonal relationship behaviour in Thai society, because Kreng-jai is displayed in many interaction types, ranging from distal relationships to intimate ones, although the differences appeared by degree. The practice of Kreng-jai has been widely analysed by Western social scientists. The most comprehensive definition of Kreng-jai is that of Komin (1990), who stated that the concept is “to be considerate, to feel reluctant to impose upon another person, to take another person’s feeling (an ego) into account, or to take every measure not to cause discomfort or inconvenience for another person” (Komin, 1990, p.164). A usage of the kreng-jai value is illustrated by the excerpt below (Senawong, 1999):

Q: Why did you go out with him?
A: He picked me up so I didn’t want to disappoint him.

This excerpt shows the practice of kreng-jai value that inhibits one from speaking one’s mind. Having this value in mind, when Thai people converse with one another, there is an inhibition to express one’s feelings and thoughts in order to avoid conflict.

The power of others on self, resulting from Thai cultural values, should impact on students’ WTC in a second language of Thai EFL students in classrooms. In class, the students are involved in situations where they could communicate with either their classmates or their teachers. With their classmates, Thai students may distinguish between their peers as intimates and non-intimates. For teachers, the level of hierarchy applies. The students will see themselves as inferior and teachers as superior. Classmates can be considered either as intimates or non-intimates depending on how close they feel towards each other. With close friends, students are likely to express themselves and enjoy interaction. For non-intimate classmates, students may be inhibited, because they may think that they may embarrass themselves and “lose face”. Teachers are considered as intimates with a superiority status. Students feel obliged to obey and respect their teachers, because they appreciate teachers’ benevolence in passing on their knowledge. This grateful relationship is called Bunkhun. The influence
of Bunkhun, emphasising the important role of teachers in Thailand, is witnessed in the annual ceremony called “Wai Kruu”, that takes place on any Thursday of a month when a new academic year starts. At the ceremony, students present a symbolic flower bouquet or garland to their teachers and Wai (i.e., putting one’s palms together near the chest and bowing the head) them as a sign of respect. This ceremony highlights the teachers’ authority over the students. It is very uncommon to see Thai students debate with teachers, unless they feel close to them. These characteristics of classroom communication situation under the Thai cultural condition can be mapped out in Table 2.1.

Table 2.1 Conceptual framework of classroom situation-oriented of L2 WTC based on cultural implications

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Classroom Contexts</th>
<th>Motivational Orientations</th>
<th>WTC/ Communication Behaviours</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Formal situation:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Unfamiliar friends and teachers</td>
<td>Task-orientation/ Control</td>
<td>Low WTC/ Inhibited</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Informal situation:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Familiar friends and teachers</td>
<td>Affiliation</td>
<td>High WTC / Relaxed</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As shown in Table 2.1, the affiliation concept plays an important role for social interaction for Thai people. It is argued that Thai EFL learners are willing to communicate in classroom situations where they feel relaxed and when presented with interlocutors to whom they are affiliated. In contrast, if presented with unequal-status interlocutors in controlled situations, they may feel reluctant to utter a word or low willing to communicate. The discussion of Thai cultural orientation in this section will be used as a basis for the evaluation of the WTC models and research in the Thai context in order to assist the process of conceptualising the proposed research study.

2.6 Theoretical Framework

The theoretical framework of this study was developed from the evaluation of the review of literature on related issues to this study and was used to guide the data collection of this study. The foundation of the theoretical framework was critically determined by MacIntyre et al. (1998) and Wen and Clément (2003). Moreover, several
issues that affect L2 learners’ WTC based on the evaluation of the WTC research were incorporated into the theoretical framework. The MacIntyre et al. (1998) WTC model was framed based on the characteristics of bicultural norms in a bilingual context in Canada. However, it is less relevant to the Thai context where there is little contact with L2 communities. This issue about the impact of social contexts on students’ WTC was advocated by Wen and Clément (2003) who analysed the Chinese culture and argued that culture is the key factor that influenced WTC in L2 for Chinese EFL learners. This section discusses the variables relevant to the context of this study which are addressed in the theoretical framework.

Although the 1998 Model was designed within the Canadian bilingual context which is context specific, it incorporates several variables that seem appropriate to Thai EFL classroom context. Most importantly, two types of motivation, Affiliation and Control, are reiterated in both situational and individual levels of the modified WTC model. These two types of motivational orientations seem comparable to the Thai EFL classrooms, because they emphasise the role of interlocutors who generate different types of motivational orientations that influence learners’ choice to speak. Affiliation should create voluntary choice to speak for Thai EFL learners, because it strengthens the value of relaxation and joyfulness when talking among the intimates, while Control may inhibit the Thai EFL learners’ WTC in English, because, in speaking with non-intimates or authority figures, Thais may feel the fear of negative evaluation from them, which would inhibit their WTC in English.

Apart from the two motivational orientations influenced from types of interlocutors, other situational and individual variables appear to be relevant to Thai EFL learners. From a number of empirical studies in both ESL and EFL contexts, using different research methods, Communication apprehension (CA) and Perceived competence (PC) should be taken into account. Based on my evaluation of previous research, CA which concerns the L2 learners’ worries about using English in general situations, becomes language anxiety within the classroom context. Moreover, the factor analysis of communication apprehension or anxiety showed a marginal prediction of WTC from the Other-directedness (Matsuoka, 2006), confirming the relevance of communication apprehension to Thai social interaction values. Perceived Competence which concerns
the general perceptions of one’s own ability in using English seems to be too broad for Thai EFL learners. The focus in my study will thus be shifted to self-efficacy (SE).

*International Posture was* highlighted as an important variable in an EFL context in Japan. Despite its weak linkage to WTC (Matsuoka, 2006; Yashima, 2002; Yashima et al., 2004), it was found to be a high predictor of SE ($\beta=.73$), which was a strong predictor of WTC (Matsuoka, 2006). Therefore, the variable, International Posture, will also be included in this study. Moreover, the three variables, Security, Excitement, and Responsibility, which emerged from a qualitative investigation of WTC among Korean EFL learners in the US (Kang, 2005), appear to be relevant to the context of this study. The concepts of Security and Responsibility may originate from ego-orientation, because they focus on the fear of evaluations from others. Excitement seems to be related to the situational interest of learners. Not only is the situational interest important for WTC in L2, but the individual interest is also important, because both are interactive variables, in that one can influence the other (Hidi & Harackiewicz, 2000).

According to the review of literature on the dynamics of classroom communication, the students’ use of language for classroom learning is a product of students’ perceptions of patterns of communication, based on students’ frames of references, that depends on teachers’ control, based on teachers’ frames of references. Thus, in order to explore the students’ WTC in Thai EFL classrooms, it is also necessary to examine teachers’ perceptions to understand why and how the teachers created the classroom teaching to encourage students’ WTC. From the analysis of literature on the relevant issues of L2 WTC, the theoretical framework of the present study is provided in Figure 2.6.
Figure 2.6 Theoretical framework of L2 WTC for Thai EFL learners employed in this study.

Key to abbreviations:
- SE refers to Self-Efficacy;
- IP refers to International Posture;
- LANX refers to Language Anxiety;
- RES refers to Responsibility;
- SC refers to Security;
- EX refers to Excitement.

Note: The variables in the overlapping section of the two ovals are merely the factors predicted to be found in the participants’ responses.

Figure 2.6 represents the conceptualisation of how WTC in L2 for Thai EFL learners is affected by possible variables, based on the review of relevant research. Within the EFL classroom context, students’ WTC, which is influenced by psychological elements (e.g., SE, Language anxiety), is determined by two main factors. These two factors are the teachers’ control of the communication patterns in class and the interlocutors, who are
the students spoken to in class, either intimates or non-intimates. The teachers’ control of the communication patterns shapes how the students develop their motivation under different types of situations: affiliation and control, as represented by the two ovals. The left-hand oval represents the situation where the students speak with the interlocutors with whom they feel familiar and which characterizes the affiliative motives that are predicted to enhance students’ WTC. In contrast, the right-hand oval that represents the situation where students have a conversation with people with whom they are not familiar identifies the control motives where the students do not want to speak. This theoretical framework guided how the study was conducted in order to gather the data and answer the research questions.

2.7 Chapter Summary

This chapter provides the background to the issues that are relevant to L2 WTC for Thai EFL learners. The review of literature serves as a guideline to construct this study’s theoretical framework which guided the research methods for data collection. In sum, although MacIntyre et al.’s (1998) model was developed in the bilingual context which is different from the Thai context, it also generated and tested some variables related to the Thai context. Affiliation and Control were the most prominent variables, related to the Thai cultural perspective, that emphasised the role of interlocutors. Other situational variables that were brought into the modified theoretical framework were Language Anxiety, Self-Efficacy. The individual variables added were International Posture and Language Learning Orientation. Classroom communication is a complex phenomenon where students’ perception and behaviour is related to what the teachers do, which comes from their beliefs about teacher-student relationships. Thus, to understand students’ WTC in L2 in class, it is necessary to understand the teachers’ perceptions in order to obtain a better understanding of the students’ formation of perception. The next chapter will provide the study’s rationale which is based on the theoretical framework of this study outlined in this chapter.
CHAPTER 3

Rationale

3.1 Introduction

The previous chapter provided the theoretical framework which informs the rationale of this study. This chapter connects the important points in the theoretical framework and the selected research methodology. Based on the theoretical framework, a learner’s WTC is related to the dynamics of the context. When considering how to investigate the WTC within this framework, I focussed on two main issues. First, it is essential to examine the WTC from within its context, which is the EFL classroom. Second, to examine the dynamics of the EFL classroom, it is important to understand how the teaching practices are structured, based on the teachers’ point of view. From these two main issues, the research methodology was chosen.

Initially, this chapter provides a brief summary of the literature that forms the basis of the rationale of the study. The theoretical framework will be presented under the two headings: Person-In-Context Relational View and Roles of Teachers’ Perspectives on Students’ WTC. The next section explains the reasons why the research methodology was chosen. Then, it outlines the research questions, as well as the rationale behind each of them. The chapter concludes with a discussion of the rationales behind the selection of research methods to gather data to answer the research questions.

3.2 Rationale of the Study

The review of literature has provided the theoretical framework for an exploration of the factors underlying WTC in L2, which is the primary aim of the study. Based on the theoretical framework, the WTC process is subject to change from moment to moment, which specifies its inseparable quality from the context. The contextual variables that formulate students’ WTC within the framework are motivational situations and classroom teaching practices. The motivational situations are affiliation and control,
which are generated by different types of interlocutors, as characterised in the MacIntyre (1998) model. The classroom teaching practices, which are controlled by the teachers, are developed based on teachers’ frames of reference. In classroom situations conditioned by different types of interlocutors and teaching practices, the psychological variables are interactive. The relevant psychological variables are language anxiety and self-efficacy. Other individual variables that may influence students’ WTC are international posture and language learning orientation. In order to understand the contextually dependent nature of WTC, a qualitative methodological approach was selected.

3.2.1 Person-In-Context Relational View

The characterisation of the WTC is in accordance with the recent view of language motivation, called “person-in-context relational view”, first proposed by Ushioda (2009). This perspective highlights the dynamic and complex feature of motivation that is interconnected to the context. This approach challenges the findings of L2 motivation research in its early phases. Dörnyei (2005) structures L2 motivation research into three phases: the social psychological period (1959-1990), the cognitive-situated period (during the 1990s), and the process-oriented period (starting from early 2000). In the social psychological period, the research in L2 motivation that followed the social psychological approach, initiated by Lambert, Gardner, and their associates, focused on the individual rather than socially and culturally oriented aspects. Research based on social psychological theory relied on self-report measures. The research in the cognitive-situated period, however, characterised the features of the micro-context in which learning takes place. This approach focused on how the context affects motivation based on students’ self-reported perceptions of their learning environment, rather than exploring the complexity of meaning-making that the individual developed from the social context.

Ushioda (2009, p. 218) points out that “…much of existing research on language motivation, context or culture is located externally, as something pre-existing, a stable independent background variable, outside the individual”. She presents the alternative approach, focusing on “person-in-context”, rather than on context as an independent variable. Her approach fits in with the category of the process-oriented period of research, as classified by Dörnyei. According to Ushioda (2009, p. 220), motivation is
viewed as “…an organic process that emerges through the complex system of interrelations”. Her research examined how individuals developed their motivation, which is characterised as idiosyncrasies of personal meaning-making, rather than general commonalities of the learning behaviours. To understand motivation from this relational viewpoint, we should employ multiple methods to analyse motivation within the context from multiple perspectives (Turner, 2001). Therefore, this study used multiple methods under a qualitative research paradigm to analyse the students’ WTC in L2 in Thai EFL classrooms.

3.2.2 Roles of Teachers’ Perspectives on Students’ WTC

Because the nature of students’ WTC is dependent to the context, it is important to take into account all the components grounded in the classroom context. As indicated in the literature review, teachers have an essential role to play in shaping students’ perceptions (Johnson, 1995). This point is confirmed by Dörnyei’s (1994) framework of L2 motivation, where the role of teachers is important in influencing students’ motivation in learning situations.

In Dörnyei’s (1994) model, three motivational components were addressed: course-specific, teacher-specific, and group-specific. The course-specific motivational component concerns the teaching syllabus, materials, teaching methods, and learning tasks. The teacher-specific motivational component concerns teachers’ personality, teaching style, feedback, and relationship with the students. Finally, the group-specific motivational component concerns the dynamics of the learning group. All three components emphasise that how the teachers set up the classroom teaching-learning practices is important for students’ motivations. Therefore, teachers’ perceptions about their teaching practices were examined in this study.

3.3 Selection of Research Paradigm

A qualitative research approach was considered appropriate for this study, because it allowed me, as a researcher, to interpret the meanings of the phenomena being studied from the natural setting through multiple sources of evidence (Denzin & Lincoln, 2003; Patton, 2002; Denzin & Lincoln, 1994). Also, the qualitative research paradigm
enriches the context (Erlandson, Harris, Skipper & Allen, 1993) which is an important factor contributing to WTC.

The capability to capture the issues contingent upon the context of qualitative studies is different from the main advantage of quantitative studies that facilitate comparison of data through the use of standardised measures with predetermined responses (Patton, 2002). Although the quantitative approach allows a comparison of data across different groups, it is unable to retain the value of detailed information contingent upon the context. As mentioned earlier, most WTC research employed quantitative methods to quantify the determinants of WTC. Our knowledge of WTC determinants is then dependent on the predetermined responses in the questionnaires. Thus, this study chose to employ a qualitative approach to investigate the issues affecting students’ WTC from within the context which has been rarely available in the WTC literature.

3.4 Research Questions

This study aimed to explore the reasons why Thai university students are unwilling to speak English, their second language, in EFL classes. This aim was achieved by examining students’ WTC which existed in relation to the context of classroom communication. Because the classroom communication situation is complex, the broad aim needed to be narrowed down into specific research questions (Creswell, 2003). This study posed three research questions which were designed to respond to the broad aim of this study:

**RQ1. What do the student participants consider are the factors which influence their willingness to communicate in English in class?**

**RQ2. How do teachers, in their planning, teaching and use of resources, try to create environments which encourage students in their WTC?**

**RQ3. How do classroom teaching practices affect the students’ WTC?**

**Rationale of the research questions**

As reviewed in the literature, the modified WTC model serves as a guideline for examining the L2 WTC. Although the literature provided the framework of the WTC conceptualisation, there may be some other factors that are not identified in the
conceptual model. In order to elucidate the reasons for students’ WTC, the main research question remains open-ended in order to allow other issues to emerge.

**RQ1.** What do the student participants consider are the factors which influence their willingness to communicate in English in class?

As WTC is contextually dependent, the examination of classroom teaching practices is essential, because it illuminates the understanding of WTC. The teaching practices are also understood by examining the teachers’ perceptions, because teachers’ practices are influenced by the principles behind their teaching plans (Genesee & Upshur, 1996). When the teachers’ perspectives are understood, the actual practices also need to be examined. Taking the goals of the speaking classes as a baseline, the teachers are supposed to encourage the students to speak. The question, then, is to understand how the teachers attempted to encourage students’ WTC.

**RQ2.** How do teachers, in their planning, teaching and use of resources, try to create environments which encourage students in their WTC?

The answer to research question 2 provided the teachers’ principles behind their teaching practices to encourage the students to speak. However, the most important point is how the teaching practices impact on students’ WTC. To give a complete picture of the issue on WTC, it is important to understand how the WTC relates to the actual context. The final question, then, is aimed at understanding how the students perceive the teaching practices they experience in class. The answer to this final question allows me to match the teaching practices to the outcomes.

**RQ3.** How do classroom teaching practices affect the students’ WTC?

### 3.5 Research Methodology

This study used a qualitative approach to investigate the issues affecting WTC in a second language of Thai EFL learners. The research methods within the qualitative paradigm were chosen to gather data that would provide the most effective outcomes for answering the research questions. Because all three research questions aimed at uncovering what the participants, both students and teachers, thought and how they felt about their classroom experiences, outcomes of the research questions, then, relied on
the data collected by means of interviews. To complement the responses obtained from
the interviewing method, stimulated recall technique and classroom observation were
employed. The research methods used in this study were interviews, stimulated recall,
and classroom observations. These multiple methods were employed to extract the
complexity of WTC in the classroom context.

To achieve the goals of the study, an intentional design of the research is important.
This section explains the principles behind the selection of participants. Also, it
discusses the rationale behind the selection of the research methods as well as the
methods of analysis.

3.5.1 Participant Selection

In-depth understanding of WTC requires a close examination of the phenomenon and its
context. This can be obtained through selecting ‘information-rich cases’ for study in
depth. A selection of information-rich cases is termed ‘purposeful sampling’ (Patton,
2002). Purposeful sampling offers insights and in-depth understandings about WTC in
the context, which leads to the data’s credibility (Lincoln & Guba, 1985; Patton, 2002).

One of the sampling strategies, called ‘intensity sampling’, was adopted in this study.
Patton (2002, p.234) described an intensity sample as consisting of “information-rich
cases that manifest the phenomenon of interest intensely (but not extremely)”. The
intensity sample can be regarded as providing rich examples of the phenomenon of
interest, but not highly unusual cases. To select the intense cases, the nature of
variations in the study needs to be examined. A quantitative measure was used to obtain
a broad picture of students’ WTC variations in order to select intense samples of
students with high and low WTC.

3.5.2 Research Methods

To understand the L2 WTC in its EFL classroom context, this study was designed to
gather a range of data from both students and teachers. Multiple data sources included
interviews, stimulated recalls, and classroom observations. Data gathered from these
sources were cross-validated to increase the level of quality and validity. The rationale
behind the use of different data sources is discussed below, followed by the use of analysis method.

**Interviews**

The interview technique was used as the main research tool to gather the data to answer all three research questions. Interviews were used because they serve as a means to understand others’ perspectives (Patton, 2002). This study adopted the interviewing approach called a semi-structured ‘interview guide’, because it provides a list of questions to be explored during the interview and remains open for the interviewer to probe to illuminate some points given spontaneously by particular subjects (Patton, 2002).

**Stimulated recalls**

The stimulated recall method is an introspective technique, used to encourage the participants to think back to a certain point of time, when they were performing a task or participating in an event, with the use of a reminder, such as an audio-recording or a video-recording (Mackey & Gass, 2005). Stimulated recall data function to complement the interview data used to answer all questions. Also, it allows the amalgamation of the context to the WTC process to happen, because it stimulates participants to recall thoughts that they had while they were making decisions to perform actions during activities in class (Polio, Gass & Chapin, 2006). The stimulated recall technique was used to collect retrospective data from both student and teacher participants. Both students and teachers were asked to view the excerpts of video-recording of class activities and they were asked to recall their thoughts at the particular point in time. The elicitation of the participants’ verbalised thoughts with the video recording of classroom events made available the data that were not obtainable from the interviewing technique. Students were asked to recollect the moment when they were engaged in their speaking tasks in class. Teachers were asked to reveal their thoughts when they decided to direct the students to take part in certain activities, and how they perceived students’ participation.
**Classroom observations**

Classroom observations were conducted with two purposes in mind. First, they were conducted to supplement the purpose of the stimulated recall interviews, as a tool to elicit the recall of participants’ thoughts at the moment while they were performing actions. Second, I used the data from classroom observations as evidence to form my interpretations of the raw data. Classroom observations provided me with valuable insights to position my interpretations, when I tried to make meaning of the data. During the classroom observations, I took the role of non-participant, by not getting involved in the class activities, in order to avoid any interference by my presence in the classroom activities (Kumar, 1996).

**Content analysis**

Data obtained from qualitative methods of inquiry can become extremely overwhelming in magnitude. To examine the factors behind WTC through a qualitative perspective, the massive amount of data gathered from the interviews needed to be reduced to allow the core meanings to become accessible. This study applied a content analysis for making sense of the interview data. Content analysis is used to refer to “any qualitative data reduction and sense-making effort that takes a volume of qualitative material and attempts to identify core consistencies and meanings” (Patton, 2002, p. 453). The core meanings found through content analysis serve as primary patterns or themes. The aim was to identify the significant patterns of data. Recurrent patterns or themes were quantified for their significance. The use of quantitative techniques to complement qualitative accounts has been widely accepted (Berg, 1998).

**3.5.3 Strength of Methodology**

The strength of the methodology was based on the criteria used to judge the quality of the qualitative research. Several practices were carried out to enhance the quality of the method of inquiry, based on recommendations from qualitative research scholars (Lincoln & Guba, 1985; Miles & Huberman, 1994; Patton, 2002)

Some techniques suggested by Lincoln & Guba (1985) were conducted to ensure the credibility of the methodology. First of all, I performed ‘prolonged engagement’ within the context. With the purpose of understanding students’ WTC and its contextual
influence, I spent around 7 weeks to engage with both students and teachers, observing the five classes and interviewing participants. The course of 7 weeks was considered long enough to allow me to understand the nature of the classroom practices and characteristics of the teachers and students. Over time, I gained trust and rapport with both students and teachers. With the students, I contacted them by telephone and spent some time talking with them before class. In the case of the teachers, I spent time talking with them before class and at other times when they were available. Also, I discussed with some teacher participants during lunch breaks. “Trust” is very important in conducting qualitative research because only through trust are the participants willing to have their say (Richards & Morse, 2007). To employ a qualitative inquiry, the researcher is considered a primary instrument (Guba, 1994), because the researcher’s job is to execute interpretive activities of phenomena occurring in natural settings in order to understand the existence of phenomena in their particular contexts. To immerse myself in the setting, interacting with the participants for seven weeks was considered appropriate.

Moreover, I conducted ‘persistent observation’ for each class. I visited each class three times, except the class taught by Teacher 5, which I observed twice due to time constraints. The observation time allowed me to see the completion of a task in progress. Hence, it added depth to the act of prolonged engagement. Persistent observation helped me to sift irrelevancies out from relevancies. As all classrooms are comprised of a mix of listening and speaking activities, only relevant activities were selected for the analysis. Third, peer debriefing was conducted occasionally. I discussed with my professional colleagues who worked on a similar topic with different perspectives for their critical views several times during the data collection. Such discussions helped me sharpen my arguments, and to produce findings of greater validity. Fourth, triangulation between methods was conducted for all three research questions. Data from interviews, stimulated recalls and classroom observations were cross-validated for data obtained from both students and teachers. Particularly with the teacher participants, member checking was conducted. Thai teachers were asked to check the translated version of the original transcript. Moreover, the use of videotape to enrich the contextual role to respondents’ perspectives was regarded as providing reference materials that support the credibility of the findings. At the stage of data analysis, a check-coding strategy was applied to codes obtained from student interview
data to ensure the reliability level of data analysed and to clarify the definitions of the codes (Miles & Huberman, 1994).

### 3.6 Chapter Summary

As informed by the theoretical framework and research reviewed in chapter 2, this study used a qualitative approach to explore the factors underlying L2 WTC of Thai EFL learners. Multiple methods were employed to gather data from both students and teachers in classroom contexts. A range of data sources included interviews, stimulated recalls, and classroom observations. All of these data collection methods were applied with both students and teachers. The next chapter will discuss the actual procedures of the data collection conducted in two universities in Thailand.
CHAPTER 4

Methodology

4.1 Introduction

The methodology of the study was designed to allow investigation of the research aims and questions identified in the previous chapter. It is split into four main sections. The first section provides an overview of the research design. It addresses the key aspects in the overall process by which the data were collected. The next section of this chapter records detailed information about participants and their relevant backgrounds and the instrumentation used in this study. The third section outlines the research design, data collection procedures, and data analysis. Finally, the fourth section of this chapter discusses ethical issues.

4.2 Overview

This qualitative study primarily aimed to investigate the reasons behind WTC in English of Thai EFL students. Also, it aimed to explain the influence of classroom teaching practices on students’ WTC. This study was conducted in two major universities in Bangkok, Thailand. The participants were 29 students from five classes and 5 teachers who taught those classes. The study was undertaken in two phases. The first phase served as a selection phase of the student participants by means of a questionnaire. The second phase was the main study phase, in which both student and teacher participants took part. In the first phase, the 29 student participants were recruited from 84 students who responded to WTC questionnaire. After the students were selected, both students and teachers participated in classroom observations and individual interviews which included the stimulated recall technique. The classroom observations were conducted in order to elicit retrospective views from both students and teachers to be used in the stimulated recall method. After all the classroom observations were completed, individual interviews were conducted with both students and teachers. The interview questions were composed of two sections: general questions and stimulated recall questions. The general questions for students aimed to examine the
reasons behind their WTC, while the general questions for teachers aimed to investigate how the teacher attempted to encourage students’ WTC. The stimulated recall questions for students aimed to reveal how the students thought while they were performing the speaking tasks, while the stimulated recall questions for teachers aimed to reveal the purposes behind the teachers’ attempts to encourage the students to speak. Data obtained from interviews in both general and stimulated recall questions were content analysed for significant patterns. Data from classroom observations were selected and summarised to serve as a prompt to generate findings from the stimulated recall technique. Data derived from multiple sources were triangulated to increase the validity of the findings. The following sections outline detailed information of the context of study, the selection of student participants, and the profiles of student and teacher participants.

4.3 Participants

The participants of this study were 29 students and five teachers. Student participants were undergraduate students enrolled in five English speaking classes from two universities and the teacher participants were those who ran these classes. The 29 student participants were selected from 84 students who responded to WTC questionnaire. Table 4.1 shows a distribution of students responding to WTC questionnaires from each of the five classes. To ensure the confidentiality of the participants, names of these universities were labelled as University A (UA) and University B (UB). As shown in Table 4.1, there were 67 students from four classes from UA taught by Teacher 1-4 and 17 students from one class from UB taught by Teacher 5. There were more classes available in UA than UB due to timetabling.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Teachers</th>
<th>Universities</th>
<th>Number of respondents to questionnaires</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>UA</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>UA</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>UA</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>UA</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>UB</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.1 Distribution of number of students responding to WTC questionnaires
4.3.1 Participant selection

Student participants were selected from 84 students who responded to the questionnaires. Data gathered from the questionnaires were used to divide the students in each class into top and bottom categories. The criterion to select student participants from each class was based on a one-third formula. The number of students to be selected was a number close to one-third of the total number of students in each class. For example, the total number of students in Class 1 was 19; therefore, 6 students were selected. These selected six students were made up of three from high and three from low WTC groups. The selected students from each class were invited to participate in the study. Table 4.2 shows the distribution of student participants in the selection process.

Table 4.2 Distribution of student participants in the selection process

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Class/Universities</th>
<th>Students responding to WTC questionnaires</th>
<th>High WTC</th>
<th>Low WTC</th>
<th>Students participating in phase 2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1/ UA</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2/ UA</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3/ UA</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4/ UA</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5/ UB</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.3.2 Participant Background

Student participants

The 29 students participating in the main phase of the study included 21 students from UA and 8 students from UB. Students from UA were ranged in years 1 to 4 whereas those from UB were currently in year 1. Students from UA came from various majors of study, whereas those from UB were all in English major. The majors where students from UA came from were Languages (7), Linguistics (6), and Library Science (2), Business and Economics (4), Political Science (1) and Undecided (1). Although the student participants came from various backgrounds of study, they were supposed to have similar English competency, because they were enrolled in the first English communicative classes from both universities. Moreover, they were considered as having similar area of study which was Social Sciences, as opposed to Physical Sciences. Brief information of student backgrounds is presented in Table 4.3.
Table 4.3 Brief information of student backgrounds

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Universities</th>
<th>Number of students</th>
<th>Currently in year</th>
<th>Major</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>UA</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>1-4</td>
<td>Languages (7), Linguistics (6), and Library Science (2), Business and Economics (4), Political Science (1), Undecided (1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UB</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>English (8)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Teacher participants**

There were five teacher participants in this study. Teachers 1-4 were from UA, while teacher 5 was from UB. Three of the five teachers were Thai. Two were native speakers of English. Their experience in teaching English in Thailand ranged from 3 to 20 years. Four were male. Only one was female. Four were aged in their thirties. Only one person was in his late forties. Demographic information of the teachers is shown in Table 4.4.

Table 4.4 Demographic information of the teachers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Teachers/Universities</th>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Years of teaching experience in Thailand</th>
<th>Nationality</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1/ UA</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>30-35</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>Thai</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2/ UA</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>35-40</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>Thai</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3/ UA</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>35-40</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>Thai</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4/ UA</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>45-50</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>American</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5/ UB</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>30-35</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>American</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**4.4 Instruments**

Instruments used to collect data in this study were classified into two types which were instruments for students and teachers. Instruments used for students included the WTC questionnaire, interview questions, stimulated recall questions, and classroom observations. Instruments used for teachers were interview questions, stimulated recall questions, and classroom observations.
4.4.1 Instruments for Students

**WTC Questionnaire**

The WTC questionnaire consisted of 25 items representing situations that the participants were likely to encounter in their English speaking class. These situations were adapted from WTC questionnaires used in Weaver (2005). The original version of the questionnaire, developed by Weaver (2005), contained a total of 34 items which constituted speaking and writing situations, 17 items of each situation. To comply with the purpose of this study, seventeen items concerning speaking situations were selected from the original questionnaire. In the original items, where the Japanese language was referred to, the word “Japanese” was replaced by “Thai”. For example, “Ask someone in English how to say a phrase you know how to say in Japanese but not in English.” Japanese was changed to Thai. In the original questionnaire, there were items referring to the speaking situations where the students were required to speak with ‘someone’. It might be not clear for the students about ‘who’ they had to speak with. Items that referred to ‘someone’ were eliminated and they were replaced with specific interlocutors in class which were teacher and friends. The 4-point rating scale, developed by Weaver (2005), to eliminate neutral responses was used. The scale used ranged from 1 = definitely not willing; 2 = probably not willing; 3 = probably willing; and 4 = definitely willing. The complete version of the WTC questionnaires used in this study in both English and Thai versions is presented in Appendix A. The questionnaire was pilot-tested with students from a different section of the class taught by Teacher 5 at UB who were not students participating in the research. This group of students was considered similar to the target group of students in terms of their English learning background because they were enrolled in the same course. The internal consistency reliability value derived from the pilot-test was $\alpha = 0.93$.

**Interview questions**

The student interview questions aimed to measure students’ perspectives about WTC which were framed based on variables included in the theoretical model. The main aspects of the WTC variables included social and individual context, classroom context, and psychological context. The complete version of interview questions in both English and Thai versions is in Appendix B. All interview questions were translated into Thai
by myself and were checked for their accuracy by a Thai lecturer at the University of Sydney.

At the level of social and individual context, the questions asked about participants’ attitudes towards learning English derived from their English learning experience, personality, and interest. Table 4.5 shows the questions constructed based on variables in the social and individual context.

**Table 4.5. Questions based on variables in the social and individual context**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Social and individual context</th>
<th>Q1 What faculty are you from? What major are you in?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Q2 When did you start learning English?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Q3 Tell me about your experience in learning English.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3.1 Did you only study English in Thailand? If not, where?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3.2 Why did you choose to study English?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3.3 (For English major students) Why did you choose to take English as a major?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3.4 Do you enjoy learning English? Why? If not, why not?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3.5 Are there any classes that impressed you the most? Or are there any classes that made you so disappointed?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Q4 How often you do use English?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Q6 How would you describe your personality? How do you think your personality affects your speaking?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Q8 Have you ever been abroad?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Q9 How important do you think English is?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

At the level of classroom context, the questions were concerned with how the participants felt when they spoke English in class in different situations and with different interlocutors. Questions developed based on this level are presented in Table 4.6.
Table 4.6. Questions based on variables in the classroom context

| Classroom context | Q11 How do you feel when you use English to speak with your teacher in class?  
|                  | 11.1 How did you feel when your teacher asked you some questions?  
|                  | 11.2 Did you choose to ask your teacher some questions when you didn’t understand something in class?  
|                  | 11.3 How did you feel when your teacher corrected your English?  
|                  | 11.4 What did you feel when your teacher was watching you while you were speaking?  
|                  | Q12 How did you feel when you had to use English with your friends in class?  
|                  | 12.1 Do you feel that your friends outperform you?  
|                  | 12.2 Were you afraid of your friends laughing at you?  
|                  | 12.3 Were you afraid that your English was not as good as your friends’?  
|                  | 12.4 Do you have a feeling that your friends are looking at you when you speak English in class?  
|                  | Q13 In what situation would you speak more, between speaking in pairs or speaking in groups?  
|                  | Q14 Do you choose to speak English with some particular people only?  
|                  | Q15 Whom do you speak English with more, between your teacher and your friends?  

At the level of psychological context, the questions addressed issues about psychological factors and WTC. Table 4.7 shows questions developed based on this level of WTC variable.

Table 4.7. Questions based on variables in the psychological context

| Psychological context | Q5 How do you evaluate your own English ability?  
|                      | 5.1 What about your speaking skill?  
|                      | Q10 How did you feel when you were speaking English in class?  
|                      | 10.1 Were you confident?  
|                      | 10.2 Were you afraid of making mistakes?  
|                      | 10.3 Were you embarrassed when you made mistakes?  
|                      | 10.4 Were you afraid that your friends would think you were showing off?  
|                      | Q16 What are the reasons why you don’t want to speak English?  
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**Stimulated recall questions**

The stimulated recall questions for students aimed to encourage the students to recollect the moment they were performing their speaking tasks in class. The complete version of interview questions in both English and Thai versions appeared as Appendix B. Questions 1 to 4 were developed to tap the particular feelings students had. If students were brief in their expressions, more specific questions were asked, for example: How did you feel when you were doing this task? If they could not respond to this vague question, a more specific question was used. “How confident were you when you did this task?”

**Classroom observations**

The classroom observation schedule for students was designed to collect students’ actions in speaking situations to be used as evidence for determining conditions influencing students’ WTC. The focus of the observations was on interaction situations. Interaction situations in class were classified as situations where students interact with their teachers and their peers. Students’ interactions with teachers were divided into two types of situations. First, students had to respond to teachers’ questions. Second, students voluntarily used English to answer questions or ask questions. In the interaction with peers, students used both English and Thai. Students’ actions were noted by the number of turns, the length of the turns, and how active the students were when they interacted with their peers. All of these items are in the observation sheet (See Appendix D). Each observation sheet was used for each activity.

In each observation, I asked the participating students to sit in places designated by me, in relation to their WTC scores. In the observation sheet, next to the item of students’ action in focus, I noted what I saw the participants do. For example, about the turn of English in group discussions, I noted who spoke the most to the least as Student (St) 4>3>2>1>6>5 and I wrote their actions in a descriptive form. After class observations, I used the data gathered in the observation sheet to make the field notes of classroom observation, and, where applicable, I included my reflections. Example of field notes of classroom observations is presented in Appendix E.
4.4.2 Instruments for Teachers

**Interview questions**

Teacher interview questions were developed based on the purpose of research question 2 that aimed to understand how the teacher attempted to encourage students to use English to speak. The structure of the interview questions moved from questions asking about general information of their perception about student speaking behaviours, for example, “Do you think students enjoy learning English? What about speaking in particular?” to more specific questions asking about how the teacher encouraged students to speak, for example, “How do you attempt to encourage students to speak English?” The complete interview schedule in both English and Thai versions is in Appendix C.

**Stimulated recall questions**

The questions for stimulated recall section were constructed to probe the reasons behind teachers’ choices of implementing the activities to examine how they presumed that the activities could encourage the students to speak (e.g., “How do you think this activity would encourage students to speak?”). The complete interview schedule in both English and Thai versions is in Appendix C.

**Classroom observation schedule**

The classroom observation sheet used for teachers was designed to capture characteristics of classroom teaching practices and teachers’ actions. The observation sheet for teachers is the same sheet used for the students (See Appendix D). The focus of the observation was on characteristics of classroom teaching practices and teachers’ actions. The overall characteristics of classroom practices constituted the nature of tasks, class management, and skill and language focus. During low activity times in the class or when I made a full description of the data collected after class, I ticked off what was involved in the classroom characteristics of each activity. Teachers’ actions were divided into three phases: before task, during task, and after task. I noted what the teacher did in each phase. After class, I reviewed the data collected from the class to make a full description of teachers’ actions in the field notes. Example of field notes of classroom observations is presented in Appendix E.
4.5 Research Design

This study employed qualitative research methods to explore the variables contributing to WTC within its context. Methods of qualitative inquiry used in this study were interviews, stimulated recall, and classroom observations. Multiple sources of qualitative inquiry were used for the purpose of data validation. Moreover, this study incorporated quantitative methods to select participants for the qualitative study. During the analysis stage, quantification was applied to WTC variables for significant patterns. Although elements of quantitative approach were involved in this study, the quantitative techniques were used to complement the qualitative inquiry. The major research methods were qualitative. The selection of the qualitative research promised the understanding of the contextualised WTC factors and also helped fulfil the lack of qualitative research in the WTC literature. Application of data collection methods during the fieldwork are discussed in the data collection procedure.

4.5.1 Context of study

The purpose of the study - to examine the students’ perspectives about their WTC - determined the selection of the context of study. The purpose required that one of the characteristics of the participants was to have an adequate command of English to handle a basic conversation in English. For this reason, UA and UB were selected because the students in these two universities are presumed to have a satisfactory English level, because they were accepted into these high ranking universities with high Entrance Examination scores, in which English constitutes one of the compulsory examination subjects. The study was conducted with the introductory English speaking class from these two universities, because it was expected that students enrolled in these classes had a similar level of English background knowledge.

Classes from UA

The introductory English speaking course, entitled “English Listening and Speaking I”, was selected for this study. There were 25 classes included in this course. Four from 25 classes of the course participated in this study. This course aimed at promoting students to be able to communicate in English, using language functions and other features of spoken English to handle basic situations of everyday life they may face in Thailand. The class met for four periods per week in a normal classroom setting. This course used
textbooks developed by Thai teachers. There were two textbooks to be selected by the teachers. For classes participating in this study, Teachers 1-3 used the book called, “English for Communication” by Pibulnakarin & Pokthipiyuk (2007). Teacher 4 used the book called, “Conversation Matters: English Conversation Builder for University Students” by Kwanjira Chatpunnarangsee. The course syllabus is included in Appendix F.

**Classes from UB**

The introductory English speaking course, entitled “Fundamentals of English Listening and Speaking”, was selected in this study. One class was selected from the three classes of the course. This course aimed at developing students’ listening and speaking skills for effective oral communication in English. Student should be able to improve their English pronunciation and be able to express themselves with appropriate vocabulary, expression, stress and intonation patterns. Each class was organised in a language laboratory and a normal classroom. The class met for two hours per week in both places. The class in the language laboratory, conducted by a Thai teacher, was for listening activities, while class in the normal classroom run by an English native speaker teacher was for communicative activities. Only the speaking class met in a normal classroom was selected for this study. The primary textbook was “Let’s Talk 3”, by Leo Jones. The course syllabus appears in Appendix G.

**4.6 Data Collection Procedures**

The data collection started two weeks after the mid-term exam in Semester 2 of the 2007 academic year that started in November and finished in March, in order to allow for the students’ ability in English to have improved from the beginning of the academic year. The fieldwork was carried out over a period of 7 weeks. The data collection procedure was structured into two phases: participant selection and data collection. In phase one, the participating students completed the questionnaire whose results were used to select participants for the main study in phase two. In phase two, both students and teachers were invited to participate in classroom observations and interviews which included general questions and stimulated recall questions. The data collection schedule was made to best suit the class timetable and availability of the students and teachers. Table 4.8 describes the schedule of data collection procedures.


<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Class/ Uni</th>
<th>Questionnaire</th>
<th>Observation 1</th>
<th>Observation 2</th>
<th>Observation 3</th>
<th>Interview</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1/ UA</td>
<td>Week 1</td>
<td>Week 2</td>
<td>Week 2</td>
<td>Week 3</td>
<td>Week 4-5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2/ UA</td>
<td>Week 1</td>
<td>Week 2</td>
<td>Week 2</td>
<td>Week 3</td>
<td>Week 4-5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3/ UA</td>
<td>Week 1</td>
<td>Week 2</td>
<td>Week 3</td>
<td>Week 4</td>
<td>Week 6-7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4/ UA</td>
<td>Week 1</td>
<td>Week 4</td>
<td>Week 4</td>
<td>Week 5</td>
<td>Week 6-7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5/ UB</td>
<td>Week 1</td>
<td>Week 3</td>
<td>Week 4</td>
<td>Final exams</td>
<td>Week 6-7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 4.6.1 Phase I: Participant Selection

Before I commenced the data collection, I contacted the teachers from both UA and UB to ask for permission to conduct the research with their classes. Five teachers from both universities agreed to participate in the research. During the initial meeting with the teachers, I discussed with them the purposes of the research and both of the involvement of themselves and the students to take part in the research. During the discussion, I gave them the Participation Information Sheet (Teachers) to read (Appendix H). Also, they were given a Consent Form (Teachers), which is presented as Appendix I. They were allowed to decide whether or not they wanted to participate in the study by completing the Consent Form. During the first week of the data collection period, I visited each participating class, 20 minutes before class was dismissed, to invite the students to participate in the study. I made an announcement of the research project in Thai and gave a packet of documents including the Participation Information Sheet (Students), Consent Form (Students), and WTC questionnaire. The Participation Information Sheet (Students) and Consent Form (Students) in English and Thai appear in Appendix J and K, respectively. All documents were written in Thai. The students were asked to sign the Consent Form as to whether or not they agreed to participate in the study. Those who voluntarily agreed to participate were asked to complete the WTC questionnaires.

I examined the returned Consent Forms to identify who agreed to participate in the study in each stage. Also, I analysed the questionnaire results to classify the students into groups of high and low WTC. The criterion used to select the participants was explained earlier in the Participants section. I compared the names of volunteer students and their WTC scores to find one-third of students in each class plus two more in case...
that the selected students were unwilling to participate. Then, I contacted the students on my list by telephone.

4.6.2 Phase II: Data Collection

Classroom observations

Classroom observations began in a second week of the data collection for classes taught by Teachers 1, 2, and 3. Due to practical issues, it started later in week 4 for classes taught by Teacher 4 and week 3 for Teacher 5 (Table 4.8). The observations were conducted over the entire class time in order to observe a complete set of class activities. A series of classroom observations allowed me to examine the characteristics of the teaching practices implemented over a period of time. For Classes 1-4, the observations were conducted three times. For Class 5, the observations were conducted twice, due to the final exams in the last week. Despite only two observations for class 5, the duration of observation time was not too different from other classes from UA. Table 4.9 shows the duration of class time in each observation of the five classes. The observation time for five classes ranged from 170 to 229 minutes.

Table 4.9 Duration of class time in each observation of the five classes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Class</th>
<th>Observation 1 (minutes)</th>
<th>Observation 2 (minutes)</th>
<th>Observation 3 (minutes)</th>
<th>Total (minutes)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>195</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>176</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>196</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>229</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>170</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Each class was videotaped. The video recording primarily served as a tool to remind both teachers and students to think back to the classroom events in which they were involved. Also, it was used as a back-up recording tool to remind me of what happened in the class if I missed any parts during the actual observations. The observations were conducted by myself. As the observation was focused on both teacher and some participating students, the participating students were arranged to sit in an assigned order. The seating arrangement facilitated the observations of the participating students and also provided a uniform setting for videotaping. To alleviate the effect of the videotaping during the class, the video camera was set on a tripod placed at one particular spot where it could capture all participating students. I usually sat in a certain
spot where I could manage to see participating students easily. On some occasions, if
the participants moved their seating, I had to move closer to the participants in order to
hear if they spoke in English or Thai.

Student interviews

After all observations were completed, each participating student was asked to choose
their preferred time to have an interview. Interviews with students and teachers from
Classes 1 and 2 were arranged in weeks 4 and 5, while weeks 6 and 7 were devoted to
interviews with students and teachers from Classes 3, 4, and 5. Before each interview, I
made clear that the interview would be audiotaped, as the students had been advised of
this procedure before they agreed to participate in the study. All interviews were
conducted in Thai. Each interview involved two parts: general questions and stimulated
recall questions. Time for general questions varied from 15 to 30 minutes. After the
general questions section, the stimulated recall section began. In this section, I showed
the video-recording of classroom events and described what had happened on that day
in details from my notes to remind the students of the situations. Once the students
remembered what happened, I forwarded the video and played the video at the minute I
marked in my notes. The point of time selected was determined by one of the following:
the moment where the students were called upon to speak; voluntarily responded to the
teacher; spoke with their peers; when I saw the students struggling with speaking; or
when they remained quiet when they were supposed to speak. I also stopped the video
at the point where either the students or I had comments to make spontaneously. The
time for stimulated recall section also varied from 15 to 30 minutes. The total interview
time ranged from 30 to 45 minutes. An example of student interview transcript and
stimulated recall transcript are presented in Appendix L and M, respectively.

Teacher interviews

Teacher interviews were conducted the same week as the student interviews. The
teacher of each class was invited to choose their preferred time during the same weeks
that their students were interviewed. I asked for their permission to audiotape again,
although all teachers were aware of it beforehand. Interviews were conducted in the
native language of each teacher. Thai was used for Teachers 1, 2, and 3, while English
was used for Teacher 4 and 5. Each interview comprised two parts: general questions
and stimulated recall questions. Time for general questions varied from 45 minutes to
one hour. The time for the stimulated recall section varied from 15 to 30 minutes. In the stimulated recall section, I played the videotape of each class. Criteria for selecting the scene were similar to those for the students. Total interview time for each teacher ranged from one hour to one hour and a half. Example of a teacher interview transcript including stimulated recall transcript is presented in Appendix N.

4.7 Data Analysis

Data gathered from multiple sources were analysed for answers for all the three research questions. These sources were interviews, stimulated recalls, and classroom observations. The analytical approaches were selected, based on the aims of research questions and the practicality of analysis methods to be suitable for the nature of data obtained. Data obtained from multiple sources were textually-based, hence, content analysis was employed. Table 4.10 summarises the data used for analysis to answer each research question, based on the purposes of the research questions.

Table 4.10 Research questions, purpose, data sources and data analysis

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Research questions</th>
<th>Purpose</th>
<th>Data sources</th>
<th>Data analysis</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 1. What do the student participants consider are the factors which influence their willingness to communicate in English in class? | To explore the variables contributing to students’ WTC | - Student interview data  
- Stimulated recall data  
- Classroom observations | Content analysis  
Triangulation |
| 2. How do teachers, in their planning, teaching and use of resources, try to create environments which encourage students in their WTC? | To examine how the teachers attempt to encourage students’ WTC | - Teacher interview data  
- Stimulated recall data  
- Classroom observations | Content analysis  
Triangulation |
| 3. How classroom teaching practices affect the students’ WTC? | To understand how the nature of the classroom teaching context (in each class) affect students’ WTC | - Analysed Stimulated recall data from students and teachers  
- Classroom observations | Triangulation |

As shown in Table 4.10, data used for all research questions were content analysed and triangulated. Data sources for research questions 1 and 2 were general interview data,
stimulated recall data, and classroom observational data obtained from both students and teachers, whereas the data sources for research question 3 were the set of stimulated recall data which were also analysed for answering research questions 1 and 2. This set of analysed stimulated recall data was cross-validated for consistency with observational data.

Focusing on the analysis procedure, I content analysed the data from general interviews and stimulated recall into themes. Then, I crossed-validated the themes from the two different sources based on my interpretation from observational data. Techniques used for content analysis and triangulation are discussed in section 4.7.1 and 4.7.2, respectively. Procedures for triangulation were discussed in detail in chapters 5 (page 66-67) and 6 (page 132-133).

4.7.1 Content Analysis

Content analysis was applied to interview data in both the general interview data and stimulated recalled data. It was employed to understand the meaning conveying in the text that represented the students’ and teachers’ “social reality” (Bos & Tarnai, 1999). Content analysis allowed me to sift through the voluminous data to discover the focus of the message through the use of codes (Stemler, 2001). The central element of the analysis was to establish the codes that represent the meaning of the text. The most common technique to use when the codes are saturated, is to perform frequency counts (Stemler, 2001). The codes that frequently occurred represent the patterns which merit concentrated focus. The codes generated from the analysis need to be organised in a hierarchical manner. This study employed NVivo7, a software program for qualitative analysis, to help organise the codes and counting. The codes generated out of the content analysis facilitated the organisation of relevant information, and to answer the research questions (Miles & Huberman, 1994).

Coding

Coding is the term used for categorising data using the concept of a category as “a group of words with similar meaning or connotations” (Weber, 1990, p.37). Coding was developed through an ‘analytic induction approach’ (Patton, 2002). Analytic induction allows inductive analysis that begins deductively. At the beginning, I deductively analysed the data by using the literature-derived concept in the theoretical framework as
a guideline to identify the unit of analysis and attach the code to it. Alongside this deductive analysis, I remained open to discover any emergent concepts that were not addressed in the theoretical framework. During the analysis process, I ensured that the categories were not overlapped, because it is stated in GAO (1996, p.20) that “categories must be mutually exclusive and exhaustive”. Mutually exclusive categories are achieved when there is no overlapping between more than one category (Stemler, 2001). The process to arrive at the mutually exclusive category was addressed in this study through the process of check-coding, which will be described in the reliability section.

Reliability of coding

Reliability of the coding is essential because it can ensure that the inferences made from the text are valid. Weber (1990, p.12) remarks: “To make valid inferences from the text, it is important that the classification procedure be reliable in the sense of being consistent: Different people should code the same text in the same way”. It is difficult for different people to derive the same category attached to the text. An attempt to overcome this problem was made by the use of a coding guide. The coding guide is a list of the codes and their definitions that serve as coding instructions for a co-coder. The coding guide developed during the coding process is presented as Appendix O. The draft of the coding guide was verified for clarity of the definitions of each code by a co-coder. This was conducted to attain mutually exclusive categories. Once the coding instruction was well-developed, check-coding was carried out. The check-coding was performed by a co-coder who had the background knowledge of the research topic. This person is referred to as a critical peer and is a person who contributes to the quality of the research as discussed in the final section of this chapter. One entire student interview was selected for check-coding. The co-coder was invited to code the selected interview transcript using a list of code definitions. The intercoder reliability was 93%, using the formula provided in Miles and Huberman (1994, p.64). The coding guide ensured the reliability coefficient was not artificially inflated (Krippendorff, 1980).

4.7.2 Triangulation

Data collected from different sources in this study were triangulated to increase the validity of data. Triangulation was performed with the data obtained from interview, stimulated recall, and my own observations, in order to gain answers to all research
questions. This triangulation practice is considered as triangulation by methods (Patton, 2002). I followed the practice of making contrasts/comparisons as suggested by Miles & Huberman (1994). For research questions 1 and 2, after the textual data derived from interviews and stimulated recalls were content analysed into categories, I was able to compare the categories that emerged from these two types of data. The outcome of the comparison of these two data types was validated by my interpretations, based on my observations. For research question 3, only triangulation was conducted. I compared findings analysed from stimulated recall data taken from research question 1 and 2.

4.8 Ethical Consideration

This study obtained an approval of ethical clearance from the Human Research Ethics Committee (HREC). The approval letter from the HREC is presented in Appendix P. This study was conducted with care for ethical issues at all stages of the research process. Before the data collection began, I discussed the research with the teachers and invited them to participate in the study. I went to classes where teachers agreed to participate to make an announcement about the research and invited the students to participate. I made sure that students were aware of all information related to participating in the research. The students were given the Participation Information Sheet written in Thai to read along while I was making the announcement. After the announcement, the students were given some time to ask questions related to participating in the research. The students could then to make decisions about participating in the research project. Those who decided to participate then signed the Consent Form. No coercion was involved in asking people to consider participating in the study.

During the data collection period, I avoided causing discomfort to both students and teachers. During the class observations, the video-camera was set at one spot where only participating students were captured. The research assistant and I tried to stay at certain spots in order not to interfere with the classroom activities. During the interview section, both students and teachers were informed that their interviews were to be recorded. When analysing and writing up the results, issues of confidentiality were strictly maintained. The universities where the research was conducted were labelled as UA and UB. Also, false names were given to both students and teachers. Readers of the
report are not able to identify the participants and the institutions to which the participants belong.

4.9 Chapter Summary

This chapter described the way in which the study was conducted in order to answer the research questions. Multiple research methods within the qualitative paradigm were carried out with both students and teachers. These qualitative research methods included interviews, stimulated recalls and classroom observations. Content analysis was used to identify the meaning attached to the messages given by both students and teachers. Data from different sources were triangulated. Ethical consideration was strictly adhered to. The outcome of the analysis of the data is divided into two parts according to the research questions, presented in the next two chapters. Chapter 5 will report the findings that answer research question 1, while chapter 6 focuses on the findings for research questions 2 and 3.
CHAPTER 5

Results Part 1: Variables Contributing to Willingness to Communicate (WTC) in English

5.1 Introduction

This chapter reports on the outcomes of the data analysis which was conducted to answer the overarching research question (i.e., research question 1) of this thesis: “What do the student participants consider are the factors which influence their willingness to communicate (WTC) in English in class?” The goal of research question 1 was to understand the reasons why the participants chose or did not choose to use English to communicate in their English speaking classes. Given the goal of the research question, I focused on what the participants said in their general interviews and stimulated recall interviews, and used it as a basis to interpret the accounts underlying the participants’ testimonies and actions. The interpretation was made through my perspectives grounded from classroom observations and interview sessions. Prior to making the interpretations, I analysed the data obtained from student interviews and stimulated recall interviews using content analysis.

The analysis process involved three interim activities: data reduction, data display, and conclusion drawing and verification (Miles and Huberman, 1994). Initially, I identified the messages which were relevant to the WTC and assigned the codes for them. I assigned general codes which were descriptive in nature at the early stage of coding. At this stage, the analysis was based on the conceptual framework of Miles and Huberman (1994). In the later stages, an inductive approach was employed, because I could see the distinctive features of the participants’ perspectives which were immersed in the context of the study. At this stage, the codes became more specific and interpretive in character. Where applicable, I marked whether the coded remarks facilitated or debilitated the participants’ WTC and whether the coded remarks directly or indirectly influenced their WTC. After a few rounds of analysis, I
was able to see that the codes were saturated, because the changes to the existing codes and the emergence of new codes were relatively few. Then, I used the Nvivo7, to help organise the data that had already been analysed (Seidman, 2006). I imported the document onto Nvivo and performed the coding based on the codes generated on hard copy. The software package allowed me to store the coded remarks in its category and arrange the codes into hierarchical levels. After I had completed the coding process using Nvivo, I was able to see who reported the remarks and check the frequency distributions of references in each category. Then, I checked the excerpts that were coded under each category to avoid any false matching. Finally, I created the links between the findings and interpreted them in terms of the model that has been proposed. From the analysis, variables contributing to the participants’ WTC were organised into four main contexts which included Cultural Context, Individual and Social Context, Classroom Context, and Social and Psychological Context. Figure 1 shows the variables contributing to the participants’ WTC categorised into the four main contexts.
Figure 5.1 displays the four main categories of the variables contributing to the participants’ WTC which comprised Cultural Context, Social and Individual Context, Classroom Context, and Social and Psychological Context. Each category was composed of various sub-categories. Cultural context concerns Thai cultural aspect which usually hindered students’ WTC in English. Social and individual context involves the roles of social factors and individual differences which have an impact on the participants’ choice of speaking in English. Although some issues relating to the social and individual context did not usually explicitly affect the WTC, they may have influenced them in some indirect ways. Classroom context concerns classroom situations which directly influenced the participants’ desire to speak or not to speak. Issues relating to the classroom context were frequently reported in the stimulated
recall section more often than the variables in other contexts. Social and psychological context concerns affective and cognitive factors which functioned prior to or at the moment when the participants chose to speak. The participants’ remarks were coded into the categories to which they belonged. The use of Nvivo allowed me to investigate the number of times that each instance was coded, as well as who the excerpts belong to. However, quantification was not a primary aim of this study.

In this chapter, the factors affecting WTC, categorized into the four contexts, are interpreted, supported by excerpts taken from students’ testimonies. The findings are discussed in the following fashion. Initially, I introduce a brief description of the category. For most of the categories, the specification of each category was conceptually defined, based on the data analysis. In some categories, the underlying concepts were similar to those suggested in the previous research literature. The reference to similar categories in the previous literature will be acknowledged for a better understanding. My interpretation will be supported by the evidence drawn from the students’ testimonies. The variables contributing to the participants’ willingness to communicate in English, which are categorised into the four main contexts, are discussed below.

5.2 Cultural Context

The cultural aspect of WTC in English in class among Thai EFL learners emerged clearly from the participants’ responses to my interview questions. The participants were reluctant to speak in class because they did not want to cause discomfort to their peers. Sometimes, they did not dare challenge their teacher in class, because, according to Thai cultural values, teachers are regarded highly as an authority figure, whom students are obliged to obey. The manifestation of this cultural aspect of WTC reflected Gudykunst’s (1998) argument about the role of culture in social interaction. Gudykunst (1998) asserted that a predominant culture in a certain community has a major impact on the social interaction of its people.

According to Triandis (1995), one of the major dichotomies of cultural characteristics that differentiates the behavioural tendencies of people in different cultures is individualism and collectivism. This cultural dichotomy may be employed to examine
the role of cultures in social interaction. According to a survey of cultural differences by Hofstede (1991), Thailand is placed in the collectivism category, where the collectivist cultural characteristic type predominates over the individualistic type. Characteristics of people in collectivistic cultures differ from those in individualistic cultures, because the collectivists view themselves as being connected to others (i.e., as inter-dependent selves), while the individualists view themselves as being apart from others (i.e., independent selves). People in a collectivist culture emphasise social harmony as their ultimate goal (Triandis, 1995). The characteristics of collectivists match those of most Thai people, because the social interaction behaviour of Thai people depends to a marked extent on significant others. Based on the significant role of others on one’s self, Thais are very concerned about relationships between members of society. In Thailand, relationships between people in the society are both horizontally and vertically distributed, according to Holmes (1995). Horizontal relationships define people who are close to them, as their in-group members, and strangers as their out-group members. They share their concerns towards their in-group’s goals without a demand for equitable returns. In a vertical relationship, they distinguish between the status of their in-group members and out-groups. When interacting with superiors, they are likely to be inhibited in order to show respect to their superiors. However, when they interact with their inferiors, they are usually more directive. It can be argued that the issue of horizontal and vertical distribution of relationships among members of Thai society underlies the two main components of Thai social interactions, as demonstrated by Holmes (1995), who argued that the fundamental factors underlying Thai social interaction were building a network of relationships and maintaining the hierarchical structure of society.

Based on Holmes’ perspective, I argue that a desire to build a network of relationships demonstrates the horizontal relationships of people in Thai culture, and the issue of hierarchy reflects the vertical relationships. These cultural characteristics seemed to impact upon the participants’ willingness to communicate in class. Some issues that were connected to the desire to build a network of relationships were categorised as “Kreng jai”, Unity and Fear of Negative Evaluation. The issue that reflected the hierarchical structure was categorised as Teacher Status. Kreng jai is the Thai attitude whose meaning has no equivalent in English (Klausner, 1993). Generally, kreng jai is the attitude displayed towards someone else in consideration for their feelings. In
adopting the kreng jai attitude, the participants were concerned about how their actions affected others. They restrain from speaking if they deem that the message they would speak might discomfort others. The next issue that is associated with the network building was unity. The participants’ responses labelled as unity concerned the value of complying with others in order to remain in unity. The participants hesitated to speak, because their peers did not speak. The final cultural value of importance here was the participants’ Fear of negative evaluation. The participants were concerned about how others would evaluate them when they speak, because they were afraid of negative evaluation by the teacher, sometimes called in Asian societies “losing their face”. This value is connected to the need to remain part of the social network, because it highlights the fact that individuals give attention to how others would judge them. Finally, the teacher status that reflected the issue of the hierarchical structure of Thai society concerned the fact that Thai people consider the teacher to be a person of superior status and the student as being of inferior status. The participants were not willing to speak with the teacher, because they felt great social distance between them. These four main cultural variables influencing willingness to communicate in classrooms, involving the values of kreng jai, unity, fear of negative evaluation, and teacher status are discussed in detail below.

5.2.1 Kreng jai

Kreng jai, the value of being considerate to others’ feelings, is embedded within Thai society. The role of this cultural value in social interaction has been studied by many scholars (e.g., Komin, 1990; Holmes, 1995; Mulder, 1996). In the practice of kreng jai, an individual would contemplate the effect of their action on significant others. They would avoid any action that may cause discomfort or inconvenience to others. Although some may argue that this quality is universally exhibited in any culture, for most Thais, it is extraordinarily exercised and results in a submissive type of social interaction. It may be said that Thais are willing to sacrifice an inquiry for knowledge in their pursuit of kreng jai. The practice of kreng jai is evident in the participants’ responses.

The participants who adopted a kreng jai cultural value in a speaking situation stated that it inhibited them from speaking openly in class. The adoption of a kreng jai value was witnessed in the responses from the participants with both high and low WTC in
different communication situations in class. In class, the participants were presented with the opportunity to speak with their peers more frequently than with their teachers, and evidence of the use of kreng jai was found in a variety of interaction situations with peers.

High WTC participants worried that others would not be given chance to speak if they spoke too much. Kloy, who always actively spoke up in class, held back her desire to speak to leave opportunities for others to speak: “We have to share the opportunities for other people to speak also because if we speak all the time, like if I speak all the time, it looks like I want to be the one who get the score. So I had to look at other people and see what they do” [Kloy/ Female - High WTC/ Class 3].

Some did not want to occupy the class time to think before speaking up and to lengthen their speaking. Given an opportunity to speak, Bua, who reported high WTC, was worried that if she took up class time to think before speaking, it would waste the class time. So, she just said anything that came to mind, although she did not mean to say it, in order to respond to the questions. “I was worried that if I took a too long time to think about something to speak, it would waste the class time. So, I said anything without thinking it through because I didn’t want anybody else to wait for me. Then, it turned out wrong. All I cared about was just to say it so they could move on; otherwise, I’m nervous when others are waiting.” [Bua/ Female - High WTC/ Class 1].

Some would avoid criticism if they had an argument during group work. From the stimulated recall response, Bua recalled her feelings while working in a group. She refrained from expressing her opinion when the majority of the group arrived at a unified view: “I don’t like speaking in a big group like this because people have different point of views. Working in a group, there is a sense of ‘Kreng jai’. When the majority of people in the group have a unified view, I don’t want to argue with them. So, I don’t say much.” [Bua/ Female- High WTC/ Class 1].

Those who were low in their WTC perceived themselves as being low competent language learners and deemed that if they spoke, it would burden their higher competent peers. Pim was asked about how she would feel when she worked with people who were more competent than her. Pim was worried that others would be in
trouble because of her low English competence. “I’d feel upset. It’s like, they are good, but I’m not. I would feel weak. ‘Why can’t I do it?’ Sometimes, I even think that my friends would think that I’m dragging them down.” [Pim/ Female - Low WTC/ Class 4]. Consequently, this deferential krung-jai attitude influenced the in-class behaviour of both high and low WTC students, because of its powerful influence in Thai society.

5.2.2 Unity

The participants’ responses that indicated the need to comply with what others do in class was referred to as unity responses. Because the participants chose to speak or not to speak depending on their peers, this type of response highlighted the role of their peers in the participants’ decision to speak. This type of response also affected participants with both low and high WTC.

To maintain unity, high WTC participants were reluctant to speak because their surrounding peers did not speak. Nuna, whose WTC score was high, held back from speaking in class, because she was concerned that her classmates would think that she was trying to show-off: “Sometimes, I thought I have spoken too much. Perhaps, my friends would think I would like to show off. Even Cookie, she speaks very well, but she doesn’t speak much. So it restrained me from speaking.” [Nuna/ Female - High WTC/ Class 3]. Belle, who always participated in class discussion, was reluctant to speak up, because she thought that her quiet classmates would think that she was showing off. She offered the following comment on this topic: “…for people who don’t want to speak, they might not want to speak to me. They might think I’m overdoing it.” [Belle/ Female - High WTC/ Class 5]. On the other hand, the value of unity may facilitate participants’ desire to speak when their classmates spoke in English. Makam voiced the opinion that she spoke more than before, because her classmates spoke a lot: “Compared to when I studied English in high school, now I speak more because people here cooperate well. If I’m the only one to speak in class, it would be awkward. I’d rather stay quiet. I would look at how other people do.” [Makam/ Female – Low WTC/ Class 1].
5.2.3 Fear of Negative Evaluation

Participants’ responses, which disclosed their concerns about others’ negative evaluation towards themselves, were referred to as fear of negative evaluation. This issue is related to the strong Asian cultural value of face-saving. Thai people consider criticism or negative evaluation about themselves as an ego-offense, because they deem that what they spoke represented themselves or their “face” (Komin, 1990). As they are concerned about their “face”, the participants chose to stay quiet to avoid the risk of losing face at the expense of making an inquiry that would increase their knowledge.

Fear of negative evaluation was seen in the participants’ responses when they referred to the situations in class where they interacted with both of their teachers and their peers. Also, I found that fear of negative evaluation affected both high and low WTC participants. It can be argued that fear of negative evaluation was associated with low self-perceived competence and anxiety. The overlapping elements of the fear of negative evaluation will be explored in a psychological context.

Fear of negative evaluation from both teachers and peers is displayed in the following excerpts of responses reported by low WTC participants. An excerpt from Pim’s response is an example of fear of negative evaluation from teachers. Pim, who scored in a low category in her WTC questionnaire, was reluctant to ask her teacher any questions. She said: “I shouldn’t ask [him] because it’s too basic. I’d worried that he would think why I asked such a thing” [Pim/ Female - Low WTC/ Class 4]. A fear of being negatively evaluated by classmates was exemplified by Yanee. Yanee, who had a low WTC score, was afraid that if she asked questions of her teacher during the class, she would be negatively evaluated by her classmates. She admitted that “I wouldn’t ask the teacher during the class, I’m afraid that other people would think that I’m a fool” [Yanee/ Female - Low WTC/ Class 4].

High WTC participants also displayed their fear of negative evaluation. Nuna recalled that she sometimes was afraid to speak up in class because she had low confidence in the words to use and so she was afraid of losing face. An example of this fear is expressed in her statement: “Sometimes, I would like to speak but I am not sure about the vocab to use. So I didn’t want to speak because I’m afraid that I would make
mistake everywhere. It’s like showing my stupidity” [Nuna/ Female- High WTC/ Class 3].

5.2.4 Teacher Status

The participants’ responses that were categorised as Teacher Status displayed the participants’ feelings of social distance between themselves and teachers, based on the belief that they are obliged to respect the teachers. The issue of teacher status seemed to be a product of two cultural characteristics: the hierarchical structure of Thai society and a grateful relationship. Based on the hierarchical system, teachers are considered to be an authority figure whom students are not supposed to challenge (Wichiajarote, 1986). From the perspective of a grateful relationship, students are obliged to obey and respect their teachers in return for the teacher’s benevolence (Komin, 1990).

The issue of a hierarchical structure is evident in the participants’ testimonies. For example, Kim preferred to speak to her classmates, rather than with her teacher, despite having a high command of English. She stated: “I’d prefer to speak with friends than the teacher...I still feel some distance when speaking with teacher. I don’t know why; it’s like he’s a teacher. I don’t know what to talk to him. Seniority, perhaps” [Kim/ Female – High WTC/ Class 2].

Some participants chose not to challenge or argue with the teacher, because they were suppressed by the sense of a grateful relationship. For example, Bay voiced the opinion that she did not like it when her classmates argued with the teachers: “I came from a school where they don’t put students in front of class to report something. This is different from other friends who have been overseas, they are outspoken and if they didn’t agree with teachers, they could argue with them, even with foreign teachers. It’s like they don’t respect them, too confident... It’s like they don’t respect teachers, like when teachers said something wrong, they just shout out, like showing off...I wouldn’t do it. I’d rather stay quiet” [Bay/ Female- High WTC/ Class 1].

5.2.5 Summary: Cultural Context

The cultural factors that influenced the participants’ willingness to communicate in English were rooted in two key Thai cultural values, which are a desire to maintain network of relationships and the hierarchical structure of Thai society. The desire to
maintain these two cultural elements highlighted the power of significant others on
the Thai people which was displayed in the participants’ responses. These culturally
related variables seemed to hinder students’ WTC.

5.3 Social and Individual Context

The roles of social influence from socially significant others and individual
differences factors were found to be associated with the participants’ WTC in English
in class based on the students’ interview responses. Social influences seemed to relate
to the participants’ attitudes towards learning and speaking English, which may lead
to their WTC. The participants were willing to speak English in class, because they
would like to be good at English to please their parents. Some had positive attitudes
towards learning English, because they received support from their significant others.

As for individual differences, some participants chose to stay quiet while working in
groups, because they enjoyed listening to others rather than voicing their opinions.
Some were reluctant to speak, because they were not able to understand the language
input or they did not know how to express their thoughts. Moreover, some were keen
to speak in class, because they used to participate in English conversation either inside
or outside class in previous learning contexts.

An emergence of social influences from the participants’ interview responses
strengthened the role of ‘significant others’ in Thai social interaction behaviours, as
was evident in the responses reported in the cultural context. Although social
influences were found in the participants’ responses, they did not appear to directly
influence the participants’ WTC. Despite the lack of an explicit relationship to WTC,
the impact of social influences on students’ attitudes towards learning English
appeared to influence their WTC in English.

Unlike social influences, individual differences are internally related. Individual
differences involved Personal Characteristics, Communicative Competence, and
Language Learning Experiences. Personal characteristics and communicative
competence seemed to directly impact the participants’ willingness to communicate.
However, language learning experiences seemed to form their attitudes which may
have led to their WTC. A full discussion of social influences and individual differences variables is provided below.

5.3.1 Social Influences

Two types of social influences were evident in participants’ responses. The first type of social influence concerns a pressure that the participants receive from significant others, including their family members and friends. This seemed to be related to their attitudes towards learning English and it may have indirectly influenced participants’ willingness to communicate. The second type of social influence included help and encouragement that was classified as social support and that seemed to affect the participants’ WTC.

Social pressure seemed to affect low WTC participants, while social support seemed to affect high WTC participants. Examples of social pressure are seen in the following testimonies. Bay reported the desire to be good at English that came from her father. She said: “My dad wants me to be fluent in English to able to communicate with native speakers for job opportunities. I want to work in the hotel industry” [Bay/ Female - Low WTC/ Class 1]. Plearn was required to speak English, because her family ran an international business, as expressed as: “My family runs an international business, so we have to use English” [Plearn/ Female - Low WTC/ Class 3].

The following testimonies were examples of help and encouragement from significant others. Kloy who actively responded to the teacher in class recalled the encouragement she received from her parents in the past. The reason why Kloy was highly willing to communicate in class might be attributed to this social push given by her parents: “…when I go anywhere with my family and we saw some foreigners, they always pushed me to talk with them. I felt shy because I didn’t know them. It’s like they would like to train me to get used to it” [Kloy/ Female - High WTC/ Class 3]. Yanee, who used to have a negative attitude towards learning English, reported that she became more confident speaking English after she received support from her teacher’s friend. She stated that “…when I had a chance to speak with my teacher’s friend from England, I felt better after I spoke with him. He told me that I could speak English well. So I asked for his email and I sent him emails. He told me not to worry
about the grade. As long as I can understand you that’s enough” [Yanee/ Female - High WTC/ Class 4].

5.3.2 Individual Differences

Individual differences that were associated with the participants’ choice of speaking involved Individual Characteristics, Communicative Competence, and Language Learning Experiences. Individual characteristics referred to different types of personal attributes. Some students were more willing to communicate than others. Communicative competence concerns ability to handle communication which involves receptive and productive skills. Some learners were not willing to communicate, because they were not able to understand the message. Some were reluctant to speak, because they believed that had limited linguistic resources, such as vocabulary. Finally, language learning experience concerns different types of language learning experiences that the participants had been involved in. Those who had been overseas were more likely to speak up in class than those who had no overseas experience.

Individual Characteristics

Participants’ responses showed that their WTC in English varied according to their individual characteristics. Participants who were always willing to communicate in class tended to have personality attributes which can be described as being extroverted, friendly, playful and risk-taking. On the other hand, participants who seemed to be inhibited reported they were shy, quiet, worried and reserved. Participants who had the personality characteristics that facilitated them in speaking were, for example, Nuna and Kloy. Nuna described herself as a friendly person: “I’m lively, I like teasing somebody else. I’m confident to speak” [Nuna/ Female – High WTC/ Class 3]. Kloy was an example of person who had a risk-taking personality: “I am kind of like trying out new things. If I made mistakes, they would correct me. We are not native speakers” [Kloy/ Female - High WTC/ Class 3]. On the other hand, Duen was an example of a participant who had the type of personality that discouraged them from speaking. Duen described herself as a “worried person”: “I’m a worried person. I’m not going to express myself. I’m afraid of making mistakes so I
dare not to speak. But I always thought about words to use but never said them.”
[Duen/ Female – Low WTC/ Class 1].

On the other hand, Golf, who was always eager to speak in class and described himself as a talkative person. He said: “I’m a kind of talkative person either Thai or English. I used to be an MC at many events. I don’t like it when we read from the script. It’s not natural. It’s dull” [Golf/ Male – Low WTC/ Class 2].

**Communicative Competence**

Some participants attributed their unwillingness to communicate in English to a lack of communicative competence. The lack of communicative competence found in the participants’ interview responses corresponded to two components of communicative competence proposed by Canale and Swain (1980), which was *grammatical competence* (i.e., the knowledge of rules of grammar) and *sociolinguistic competence* (i.e., the knowledge of rules of language use). The participants who lacked grammatical competence experienced difficulty in understanding the message and articulating their thoughts into actual speech. Those students who lacked sociolinguistic competence had difficulty in selecting the appropriate words to use within the cultural context.

Examples of participants who reported lacking communicative competence were Kate, Nim, and Aoi. Kate, but always stayed quiet in class, ascribed her unwillingness to communicate to a failure to comprehend the teachers’ lectures. She stated: “I felt like ‘please don’t ask me’. I prefer to listen to other people talking. I don’t know if I can answer it. I only want to speak if it’s something I understand. But, if I couldn’t understand, please just ignore me. If I understood about what is being said, I’m okay to answer. But for anything I don’t understand, I would be making pauses…” [Kate/ Female – High WTC/ Class 5]. Nim attributed her difficulty in responding to the teacher’s questions to her small vocabulary repertoire. “I listen attentively to the teacher. Sometimes, I understand what the questions are, but I don’t know how to respond to them maybe because I only know little vocab” [Nim/ Female - Low WTC/ Class 3]. Sometimes, the participants who were willing to speak in class were reticent, because of a lack of communicative competence regarding the choice of words. Aoi,
who was always keen to participate during class discussion, attributed the pauses in her speech to uncertainty of which words to use: “Before I speak, I felt nervous, but when I actually speak it’s okay. But, I might get stuck sometimes when I don’t know words to use” [Aoi/ Female – High WTC/ Class 4]. A lack of sociolinguistic competence may be illustrated by Pim’s response. Pim reported that she avoided speaking, because of her lack of knowledge in using the appropriate words in the target language cultural context: “I don’t know if the words I used are acceptable in their culture” [Pim/ Female -Low WTC/ Class 4].

**Language Learning Experiences**

Participants’ language learning experiences that related to how they formed their attitudes towards language learning may have influenced their willingness to communicate. The responses related to language learning experiences were found in two main ways: *formal* and *informal experiences*. Formal experiences refer to the participants’ experiences derived from their involvement in EFL classes in Thailand. Informal experiences refer to the participants’ experiences in using English in real-life situations.

In comparing the two types of experiences, formal experiences seemed to be less helpful than informal experiences for the students to form their willingness to communicate in English, because it was difficult for the students to visualise a clear picture of themselves using English if they had only formal experiences in class. At a more abstract level, it would be even harder for them to have a clear idea of using English in grammar-based classes, compared with communicatively oriented classes.

Participants’ formal experiences from EFL classrooms suggested that the classes which focused on communicative purposes seemed to promote students’ WTC more than grammar-oriented classes. Boom recalled her past experiences with the two types of teaching methods. She commented that she was not given chances to communicate in English in her grammar-based class, compared with her experience in the communicative class: “…I felt that when I was in a convent school, they really focus on grammar. I didn’t actually have much chance to speak like when I went to high school” [Boom/ Female- High WTC/ Class 4].
Informal experiences outside class resulted in a high level of WTC. Participants’ involvement in using English in a real situation outside class was based on their own initiative and the opportunities presented to them. Prim was an example of a participant who was highly self-disciplined to seek out opportunities to use English outside class. For example, she stated: “Sometimes, when I was on the net, I’d go to an English language website and I’d normally leave comment on a web board” [Prim/ Female – High WTC/ Class 5]. She commented that her attempts helped improve her English. “Sometimes, when I don’t know any words I have to look it up in the dictionary, then, I know what it means and I can use it in the future.” [Prim/ Female – High WTC/ Class 5].

Moreover, there were some participants who had a chance to study in extra classes with native speaker teachers and some participants whose parents could afford to have a holiday or provide for them to attend a short course overseas. As a result, they were more willing to speak English. Nuna’s past experience as a school speech maker improved her confidence in speaking in English: “I used to be in a group of speech makers for my school. There were people who speak better than I, so I don’t know why the teacher chose me. So I’m familiar with it. It made me more confident to speak” [Nuna/ Female – High WTC/ Class 3]. Kim had a one-year experience attending a high school program in the USA and had joined a Work and Travel program every year during her Summer vacation since her first year as a university student. Her working experience in the USA enabled her to be more inclined to speak, as expressed as: “Like last time when I went to join the Work and Travel program, they told me to talk to the customers to build a friendly atmosphere and the make myself more confident. I am the only child, so I don’t like socialising much. But after I came back from the WT, I felt more confident and I’m able to associate with people easier” [Kim/ Female – High WTC/ Class 2].

5.3.3 Summary: Social and Individual Context

The factors associated with the participants’ WTC in this context comprised social influences and individual differences. Individual differences seemed to be more important to the participants’ WTC compared with social influences, because individual differences factors seemed more related to the participants’ WTC. Although the social influences did not explicitly relate to the participants’ WTC, they
may have influenced it indirectly. The emergence of social influences on the participants’ WTC emphasised the importance of significant others, a factor which was addressed previously in the cultural context.

5.4 Classroom Context

The data indicated that WTC in English in class was greatly affected by classroom situations. Participants’ desire to speak English varied when they spoke with different people in class. Some were more willing to speak with their close friends than others. Some were likely to speak more if they spoke with more competent peers. Some were more reluctant to speak with teachers than peers, while others were not. The participants had different feelings when communicating in different situations in class. Some preferred to speak in pairs more than in groups, while this was opposite for some others. Teachers were also found to be important in the participants’ WTC. The participants were more willing to speak if the teacher was friendly. Moreover, their desire to speak increased if teachers gave them some encouragement. The issues of classroom tasks were also related to the participants’ willingness to speak in English. If tasks topics were interesting to them, they would be willing to speak. Some were more inclined to speak if they had language structure to follow when performing the tasks. These issues about classroom situations emerged more frequently from the stimulated recalled interviews than from other WTC contexts.

Participants’ responses regarding the effect of classroom situational factors which affected their willingness to communicate were structured in three main groups: *Interlocutors, Class Management,* and *Tasks.* First, *interlocutors* in class situations involved both teachers and classmates. Because the participants had more opportunity to speak with their classmates than their teacher, their willingness to communicate markedly depended on the peers with whom they communicated. Second, *class management* concerned how the class was organised for the participants to use English to communicate in class. Class management was further divided into *Communication Situations, Class Atmosphere,* and *Teaching Methods.* Finally, *Tasks* concerned the characteristics of tasks that the participants were involved in and which affected their WTC. The classroom situational factors, including interlocutors, class
management, and tasks are discussed below. Because these issues emerged in relation to the specific situations, the specific contexts in which the participants were involved are identified.

5.4.1 Interlocutors

Participants’ WTC in English differed according to whom they spoke. In classroom situations, the participants were involved in the English conversations with their teachers and their peers. The issue of the persons whom the participants spoke to had an important role in their inclination to speak English, as was witnessed in the cultural context. The participants compared how they felt in the situations where they spoke in English with peers and teachers. The majority were more willing to speak with their peers than their teachers, because they felt more relaxed with peers than with the teachers. When interacting with peers, the participants were concerned about how familiar they felt with their peers, how they perceived the attitudes and characteristics of their peers, and how they evaluated their peers’ English proficiency compared to them. With teachers, they were concerned about whether the teachers were native speakers or Thai. The analysis of the participants’ characteristics as to whether they may have been influenced by the interlocutors, as well as evidence of the roles of interlocutors on the participants’ WTC is presented in the following structure: comparison of how the participants felt when speaking with teachers and peers, how they felt when speaking with their peers, and how they felt when speaking with their teachers.

Comparisons between Speaking with Peers and Teachers

When asked about the preferred interlocutors in class, participants generally reported that they were more willing to speak with their peers than teachers. When speaking with peers, the participants were amused and relaxed. Also, they were not afraid of making mistakes compared to speaking with teachers. However, some preferred to speak English with teachers more than with peers, because they saw the benefit they would get from speaking with their teachers. Moreover, some were not familiar with speaking English with their peers.
The participants frequently reported that they preferred to speak with their peers more than teachers. Participants who indicated that they enjoyed speaking with their peers more than teachers had both low and high WTC. Pim, who had low WTC, said: “I’m nervous to speak with teachers. I’m more relaxed with friends. It’s okay if we made mistakes” [Pim/ Female- Low WTC/ Class 4]. Ouan, who had high WTC, did not like to speak English with her teachers: “(With teacher) Sometimes I fear, sometimes I feel embarrassed… with friends, I’ll speak for fun. I’d like to make it funny, like making funny accents” [Ouan/ Female – High WTC/ Class 1].

However, some preferred to speak English with teachers more than friends. Golf saw the benefit of speaking with teachers because he could improve his English from teacher’s feedback: “If I’d like to get to know how much I can do, I have to speak with the teacher because the teacher will fix it up for you. If I speak with friends, I will be relaxed. But, speaking with teacher will improve my English” [Golf/ Male - Low WTC/ Class 2]. Moreover, some were not familiar with using English with friends. For example, Orn who preferred to speak English with her teachers than her friends said, “I’m not used to speak English with my friends” [Orn/ Female - High WTC/ Class 5].

**Roles of Peers in Participants’ WTC in English**

Peers had an important role on the participants’ WTC in English. First, the participants’ inclination to speak depended on how close they felt towards their peers. Some were more willing to speak with their close friends than with their other friends. However, some did not want to speak English with their close friends. Second, the participants’ choices in speaking depended on attitudes and characteristics of their peers. The participants preferred to speak with peers who had similar attitudes to their own opinions. Also, they were more willing to speak if their peers were friendly. Finally, and most importantly, the participants’ WTC in English depended on the level of English competency of their peers. Their level of WTC may be encouraged and discouraged with their friends who had higher or lower English proficiency than them. However, they tended to speak more when they perceived that their friends and they had a similar level of English proficiency.
The participants were generally willing to speak with their close friends more than their other friends. The participants who preferred to speak English with their close friends usually were those who indicated a low level in their WTC questionnaire. Bay was relaxed to speak English with her close friend: “...we can tease our close friends. We can act out so it comes out automatically. Friends from the same class are still okay to speak with” [Bay/ Female - Low WTC/ Class 1]. Nim, who always stayed quiet in class, said: “If it’s my close friends, they would know that I am not good. So if I made mistakes, like wrong structure, they would understand me” [Nim/ Female - Low WTC/ Class 3]. The issue of familiarity was also displayed in their responses to stimulated recall questions. When asked about their feelings while they were in the group, Bay enjoyed speaking in the group she was in, because she had her close friend in the same group. “Because I have Makam. She is one of my close friends. I never got together with the rest of this group, but it’s okay. We can speak” [Bay/ Female - Low WTC/ Class 1]. Kai refrained from speaking English in her group, because she was not familiar with the group members: “If I sat with Noi and Tei, it would be more relaxed because I feel familiar with them. It’s more relaxed to speak with people you feel close to. If I couldn’t think about the answer, I would ask my friends” [Kai/ Female – Low WTC/ Class 2]. However, some low WTC participants did not want to speak English with their close friends, because they preferred to speak Thai with their close friends. Yanee tended to use Thai with her close friends: “…I don’t speak much in English with my close friends because we’re not used to speak in English with each other.” [Yanee/ Female - Low WTC/ Class 4].

The issue of the similar attitudes and characteristics of those to whom they speak emerged from high WTC participants in stimulated recall interviews. Manuaw recalled her feelings when she paired with Prim. She liked speaking with Prim more than other friends because they had similar attitudes: “I spoke with her more than I did with other friends because we had similar ideas. We could understand each other...she used gestures. She looked very confident. When I spoke with her, she never acted as if she didn’t understand me. When I spoke with other friends they said “I don’t understand” [Manuaw/ Female - High WTC/ Class 5]. With regard to the characteristics of their peers, Belle reported that she enjoyed speaking with her partner, although they were not close friends, because she was friendly: “…she’s friendly so we got along well. She’s talkative and funny. So it’s fun to talk together”
Belle/ Female - High WTC/ Class 5. On the other hand, Kloy recalled the feelings she had towards Nim, who never spoke. She stated: “Nim never spoke. When people didn’t speak, we didn’t know if they could do it or not, so it put me off” [4/3- High WTC/ Female].

The participants’ willingness to communicate in English appeared to be markedly affected by the level of English competence of their peers. Speaking with their more competent peers seemed to encourage some high WTC participants. However, it discouraged other high and low WTC participants. The high WTC participants who were encouraged to speak English with their more competent peers deemed that their English would improve. Aoi, who had high WTC, contended that her English would improve if she spoke with friends who had higher ability than she had. “Working with people who outperform me is like I found a treasure. They can tell me what is wrong. It’s better than having people with same level of English because they wouldn’t tell me what’s wrong. And I wouldn’t improve” [Aoi- High WTC/ Female].

High WTC participants, who did not want to speak with more competent peers, claimed that they had no chance to speak and they were afraid of negative evaluation from their peers. Bua, who had high WTC, said that she had no chance to speak if she were in a group of higher ability peers: “…if they are better than me, I will not be given a chance to speak. Like when we were asked to share our ideas in groups, only those who can speak the best will be chosen to present to the class” [Bua/ Female- High WTC/ Class 1]. She also added that the peers with higher ability may not understand her. “I don’t want to speak if there are people who are better than me. I’m afraid they didn’t understand me because of my accent” [Bua/ Female- High WTC/ Class 1]. Based on the stimulated recall interviews, Nuna was afraid of negative evaluation from her more competent peers. She said: “I paired with Cookie. We used Thai. When I got into this group, it’s like their English is far better than me even though they are Law students. But I’m English major, why am I so stupid. I felt pressured, so I didn’t share much of my ideas” [Nuna/ Female - High WTC/ Class 3].

For low WTC participants, they felt pressured because they believed that the rest of the group were more competent than themselves. Nim, who usually stayed quiet, said: “I didn’t say anything…I don’t want to because other people are already good” [Nim/ Female - Low WTC/ Class 3]. Yanee expressed her stress as follows: “I wasn’t
confident when I got into the group of friends who were better off than me because I couldn’t do it well. Other people spoke very well, except me” [Yance/ Female – Low WTC/ Class 4].

To speak with lower English competence peers seemed to encourage low WTC participants to speak, but prevented those with high WTC from speaking. Oui, who had low WTC, was willing to speak with peers who were less competent than her. “I think I would speak more with people who are less competent. When they have questions, I can answer them” [3/5- Low WTC/ Female]. Tan, who had high WTC expressed the view that his desire to speak dropped when he spoke with lower English ability friends. “If I had to speak with people who speak less like Kai, it’s a bit difficult to speak with, not like speaking with people who speak a lot, it’s easier” [4/2- High WTC/ Male]. Unlike speaking with more or less competent peers, speaking with friends with similar level of English competence seemed to encourage the participants with both high and low WTC to speak. Kloy and Apple were the examples of this phenomenon. Kloy said: “It depends on how good my friends are. We can understand if we speak with people in the same level, but not with people who are better or worse than us” [Kloy/ Female – High WTC/ Class 3]. Apple, who had low WTC, reported that she enjoyed speaking in English with peers who had a similar level of English to her. “If I paired with same level of English friends, we spoke comfortably. But we don’t know if it’s right or wrong” [Apple/ Female - Low WTC/ Class 4].

Roles of Teachers in Participants’ WTC in English

The participants’ WTC in English was affected by teacher characteristics and teacher behaviours. Teacher characteristics refer to the teachers’ personal characteristics and whether they are Thai or native speaker teachers. Friendly, relaxed teachers encouraged the participants to speak more than unfriendly, stressed teachers. The participants seemed to be more willing to communicate in English with native speaker teachers than with Thai teachers. Teacher behaviours refer to the teachers’ actions in class. The teachers who provided encouragement enabled the participants to speak.
Teacher characteristics

Participants’ perceptions of their teachers’ characteristics influenced their decision to speak. The participants were concerned about teacher personal characteristics. Also, they were concerned whether the teachers were Thai or native speakers.

Teacher characteristics that facilitated the participants’ WTC were being friendly, kind, humorous, and relaxed. Teacher characteristics that diminished students’ WTC were strict, stressed, pressured and unrealistic expectations. Bay indicated the importance of teacher’s friendliness for her decision to speak: “It depends on the teacher. If the teacher is friendly, we are willing to speak with” [Bay/ Female - Low WTC/ Class 1]. When asked to respond to the video, Manauw was willing to speak because the teacher was friendly. “The teacher always smiles even though we made it wrong. He smiled and told us to say again. I think it’s fun. And the teacher’s friendly” [Manauw/ Female - High WTC/ Class 5]. Joy attributed her attempt to speak to her teacher’s kindness: “Well, the teacher is not strict at grammar. He’s kind. I speak as I can do. It’s enough to get him understand. Sometimes, if I couldn’t speak in sentences, it came out as words” [Joy/ Female – Low WTC/ Class 3].

On the other hand, Pim indicated that her WTC was obstructed, because her teacher was strict and used an unpleasant voice: “For some teachers, they are strict. The way he talked to me upset me. ‘Why did the teacher say that?’ He made harsh voice and unfriendly look” [Pim/ Female - Low WTC/ Class 1]. Joy recalled her awful experience in the class where her teacher was very strict. “In my experience, some classes I had made me feel so pressured, like I’m almost to pee. I used to have a native speaker taught me in a class at my old school. He didn’t allow us to make any movement. He even put my friend a hard time when she picked her nose. Everybody was like frozen; all of us almost had to pee. We were all looking forward to when the class finished” [Joy/ Female - Low WTC/ Class 3].

Belle was restrained to speak because her teacher was stressed: “We just kept quiet when the teacher asked because he looked stressed. Many times he asked us if we understood, but we said ‘yes’ in spite of not knowing” [Belle/ Female - High WTC/ Class 5]. Moreover, Yanee recalled she did not have a positive attitude towards her English teacher when she was younger, because her teacher had unrealistic
expectations: “They’re not as relaxing as teachers in other subjects. English teacher thought that they knew English, so they’re arrogant. They thought that we should know what they know. Whatever they gave us, we should be able to get it. But we just learned it. Everybody had different backgrounds. Some learned it since kindergarten, some learned it in P3 (Grade3). We’re kids. We’re not going to just listen to the teacher” [Yanee/ Female - High WTC/ Class 4].

Another issue related to the role of teachers on the participants’ WTC concerned whether the teachers were Thai or native speakers. Participants distinguished between the situations where they used English to speak with Thai teachers and native speaker teachers. The participants frequently reported that they preferred to speak English with native speakers than Thai teachers. Although the majority of the participants preferred to speak English with native speaker teachers, some were more willing to speak English with Thai teachers.

The participants who preferred to speak with native speaker teachers seemed to be those who had high WTC. They admitted that they did not have to worry about mistakes when speaking with native speakers. They felt that native speaker teachers were more friendly than Thai teachers. They believed that they were able to acquire the correct accent with native speaker teachers. They claimed that they had to force themselves to speak in English with native speaker teachers. However, some low WTC participants did not like to speak with native speaker teachers. Some had difficulty understanding the native speaker teachers’ accents. Also, some were not familiar with speaking with native speakers, so they were scared of speaking with them.

The following excerpts were examples of responses from high WTC participants. Ouan did not worry about mistakes when speaking with native speaker teachers. She said: “I’d like studying with native speakers...I can speak without much worry, not like when I speak with Thai teachers... I feel anxious when speaking with Thai teachers because they always picked on mistakes, grammar. Not like native speakers, they don’t care” [Ouan/ Female - High WTC/ Class 1]. Manuaw said her English native speaker teacher was friendly: “I had a native English speaker named Jay-Jay. He’s so friendly. He’s nice to everybody. He takes a good care of everyone. He never
told me off. I like him. So, I thought foreigners should be nice” [Manuaw/ Female - High WTC/ Class 5]. Nuna said she could acquire a correct accent from native speaker teachers: “...(with native speaker) we will get the accent. We can imitate how they speak. And the native speakers, they are not strict” [Nuna/ Female - High WTC/ Class 3]. Bua remembered her impressive experience about the impact of her native speaker teacher’s humour that motivated her to speak English: “I really like it because foreign teachers entertain us. It makes me feel like it. They have sense of humour. I can control myself not to speak Thai” [Bua/ Female - High WTC/ Class 1]. Also, she did not try hard to speak English if speaking with Thai teachers. She said: “Sometimes, we can’t think of the vocab. If I study with Thai teacher, I will speak Thai. I don’t bother thinking about English” [Bua/ Female- High WTC/ Class 1]. Nevertheless, some participants did not like to speak with native speaker teachers. For example, Bay and Joy were both low in their WTC. Both of them were not used to having native speaker teachers in their formal class experiences. Bay said: “I’m afraid that I couldn’t understand the questions because it’s hard to understand the accents” [Bay/ Female- Low WTC/ Class 1]. Joy was scared of native speakers: “He’s very strict, but he's kind actually. But it’s like; he’s a foreigner, so we get scared” [Joy/ Female- Low WTC/ Class 3].

**Teacher behaviours**

Participants’ perceptions of their teacher’s behaviours affected their WTC. The teachers’ behaviour could enhance or diminish the participants’ decision to speak. The participants were willing to speak more often when the teachers provided them with some support, giving them chances to speak, giving them clear explanations, and employing the English only rule during class time. On the other hand, the participants’ WTC was undermined when the teacher did not provide clear explanation or feedback, or paying attention, or provide equal opportunities for everyone to speak, underestimated students’ contributions, and misinterpreted them.

The support provided by teachers that promoted the participants’ WTC was characterised as providing help and establishing rapport. The teacher support affected the participants of both high and low WTC. Nuna and Duen were examples of high and low WTC participants whose WTC increased because of teachers’ help. Nuna
expressed: “We don’t have to worry about saying everything correctly. He said, ‘Just speak it out, as long as I understand you, I will correct you.’ He’s like my native speaker teacher at school.” [Nuna/ Female – High WTC/ Class 3]. Duen said, “When I made grammatical mistakes, the teacher would suggest me how to say it correctly. This makes me remember more because I can use it. I like it and enjoy it a lot.” [Duen/ Female - Low WTC/ Class 1]. Responses given by Boom and Apple referred to their teacher’s attempt to establish of good rapport. Boom, who had high WTC, said that her teacher promoted a sense of friendship: “Teachers and students are more like friends. We can say anything we think about. The teacher didn’t make it serious. He normally suggested us. But we got less in terms of grammar, but more in terms of listening and speaking” [Boom/ Female – High WTC/ Class 4]. Apple, whose WTC was low, appreciated the teacher’s attempts to promote good rapport with the students by using Thai when needed: “…He is a native speaker, but he could understand Thai. If we couldn’t understand anything, he would say it in Thai after English. He tried to use English first, then Thai. So we don’t feel pressured. I used to have foreigners who can speak Thai, but they didn’t speak Thai at all, maybe, because of different attitudes. Teacher Martin used Thai, but not often.” [Apple/ Female – Low WTC/ Class 4].

The opportunity given by the teacher seemed to benefit the participants with low WTC. Bay accredited her teacher’s practice in trying to get students to speak by having students speak individually: “The teacher made everyone speaks. I can practice speaking. The more she asked us, the more we can practice. I like it when the teacher asked us to give opinions one after the other. We can be more expressive.” [Bay/ Female - Low WTC/ Class 1]. Based on stimulated recall interviews, the participants in Class 4 referred to the technique employed by their teacher to give an equal chance for the students to speak. Teacher 4 always used name cards to call students to speak up in class and he always shuffled the cards, so everyone could get equal chance to speak. Pim said in her stimulated recall interview: “I like it because it’s not specifically for someone but for everyone. Normally it’s like the teacher called people who he can remember their names. Maybe we are not one of them.” [Pim/ Female – Low WTC/ Class 4].
Based on stimulated recall interviews, contradictory perceptions between participants who had low and high WTC were found when they evaluated the opportunity given by the same teacher (Teacher 3). Joy who, had low WTC, perceived that there was an adequate opportunity for students to speak in class: “Actually, he gave us chances to speak. It depends on how we would like to speak. He never picked us to speak. He opened for everyone to speak.” [Joy/ Female – Low WTC/ Class 3]. Moreover, she enjoyed listening to his talk: “I was interested in what he said. He likes to tell us story about his life. It’s fun.” [Joy/ Female – Low WTC/ Class 3]. Nevertheless, Nuna, who had high WTC, believed that the teacher did not provide enough opportunity for the students to speak in class: “It’s more on listening. I like to speak more than this… Sometimes, it’s boring because in other classes, students can speak a lot. There should be a balance.” [Nuna/ Female - High WTC/ Class 3].

The teacher’s explanations also promoted the WTC for low WTC participants. Plearn appreciated a clear explanation from her teacher: “When I was in M6 (Year 12), I had a teacher from university came to teach us. So we got to understand things more. Before that my job is only to memorise the patterns, but the teacher explained us, it became more understandable.” [Plearn/ Female - Low WTC/ Class 3]. Some participants attributed the use of English to teachers’ attention and the rules imposed by the teachers. This was usually reported by low WTC participants. From my observations, the students in Class 5 spoke English almost all the time compared to other classes, because the teacher told them to. Oui’s response confirmed my observation: “…because the teacher told us to use English. If he could hear we speak Thai, he would take marks off.” [Oui/ Female – Low WTC/ Class 5]. The responses from the stimulated recall interviews also supported this observation. Duen said: “My group would mostly speak Thai. But when the teacher came, we switched into English.” [Duen/ Female - Low WTC/ Class 1]. Plearn commented: “I would speak English if I’m asked to.” [Plearn/ Female - Low WTC/ Class 3].

On the other hand, the participants’ WTC was undermined when the teacher did not provide a clear explanation or feedback, not paying attention, not giving equal opportunities for everyone to speak, underestimate students’ English ability, and misinterpreted their answers. These negative types of teacher behaviours could decrease WTC for both high and low WTC participants. Duen was confused about her
teacher’s feedback: “The teacher told me to add this and that, but when I added it, I still got it wrong even for what I copied from the book. I was still wrong.” [Duen/ Female - Low WTC/ Class 1]. Bua perceived that she was not given the opportunity to speak by her teacher: “...sometimes, I’d like to speak, but the teacher never called me. She would pick only some people. You should be able to tell...She always calls on the same persons to speak. This is boring... they always responded, like Makam, she is good at speaking and Jan actively answers. I understand.” [Bua/ Female - High WTC/ Class 1].

Prim recalled her experiences as being underestimated and discouraged by her teacher: “It should be in my secondary school. The teacher wasn’t paying attention to us. I was in a government school. And also the teacher always underestimate us and saying things that discourages us like you can’t do this and that. So I don’t want to study.” [Prim/ Female - High WTC/ Class 5]. Yanee attributed her negative attitude towards her teacher to misinterpretation: “I remember once he said ‘I don’t care’. And I felt he didn’t care. It seemed as if he’s so arrogant which perhaps it’s not true.... Sometimes, when I said something and he didn’t seem care. I was like, ‘What?’ I felt upset. I think it is this feeling that I’ve created a wall to him.” [Yanee/ Female - High WTC/ Class 4].

5.4.2 Classroom Management

Classroom management refers to how the class was organised which affected the participants’ WTC. The classroom management was composed of Communication Situation, Class Atmosphere, and Teaching Methods. Communication situations refer to different types of communication situations which affected the participants’ choice to speak. The participants’ WTC differed in different communication situations, including situations where the participants speak in pairs, in groups, in front of the class, class discussion, at their own desk, and in public. Class atmosphere refers to how the participants perceived the characteristics of the class. Enjoyable and relaxing classes encouraged them to speak more than boring classes. Moreover, the participants were able to feel comfortable with their classmates and were willing to speak more in small classes compared to large classes. The final element of class management is teaching methods. Two types of teaching methods, communicative
and grammar-oriented classes, were reported. Communicative classes were likely to promote WTC more than grammar-based classes.

**Communication Situation**

Different communication situations in class affected the participants’ choice to speak English. The reporting situations may be grouped into two main types, according to the nature of the speaking style required. The first type concerned the conversational style of speaking in pairs or in groups. The second type concerned responding to questions, giving opinions, and reporting the outcome of tasks, in front of class, class discussion, at their own desk, and in public. Evidence of the participants’ responses concerning their feelings in different communication situations is presented in two sections: Speaking in Pairs and in Groups and Speaking in Other Situations.

**Speaking in pairs and in groups**

Speaking in pairs and in groups shared similar characteristics that encourage and discourage the participants to speak English. At the same time, each of them had its unique ways to promote and decrease the participants’ WTC. Similar characteristic of the pair and group work that encouraged the students to speak concerned the help they could get from their partners and their group members. Pair and group work also shared similar characteristics that prevented the students from speaking. Working in pairs and in groups allowed the participants more opportunity to speak Thai. Due to the different nature of group and pair work, group work discouraged the participants from speaking English more than pair work. In group work which involved many group members, the participants were reluctant to speak English, because of different opinions, domination of one over the rest of the group, less responsibility to speak up for every individual group member, and also a sense of kreng jai.

One characteristic shared by pair and group work was that students were able get help from partners and group members. This appeared to be beneficial for low WTC participants. Based on the stimulated recall interview, Kai who did not usually speak English in class reported that she was comfortable to speak in pairs because her partner could help her: “*When I speak with my friends, I felt quite confident, but not much. If I didn’t know how to say, Golf would help me*” [Kai/ Female – Low WTC/
Similarly, Joy who was always quiet in class enjoyed working in groups, because group members helped her build the English sentences: “We can help each other to build the English sentences. We did it word by word” [Joy/ Female – Low WTC/ Class 3].

A reported disadvantage of pair work and group work concerned the opportunity to switch to use Thai, although this was found mostly in group work. For pairs, on some occasions, the participant’s desire to speak English was overshadowed by using Thai. Oui switched to Thai when her and her partner did not understand one another. She said: “…if we couldn’t understand each other, we would switch to Thai” [Oui/ Female - Low WTC/ Class 5]. Prim said she would use Thai when she did not know some English words: “I remember we still spoke Thai. Some words, we don’t know how to speak. So we speak Thai softly” [Prim/ Female – High WTC/ Class 5]. For group work, it was observed that use of English was even less than pair work. There were many reasons why the participants used Thai while doing group work. The participants indicated that they used Thai because their group mates spoke Thai. They were not familiar with using English while doing group work. Some misinterpreted the aim of the task and acknowledged that speaking Thai to brainstorm the ideas was appropriate, because they could help transfer into English. Pim and Nuna said they had to speak Thai because their group mates used Thai, although they did not think it was appropriate. Pim said: “We all speak Thai even though it’s an English class. I thought it’s not appropriate. We should speak in English. But all my friends used Thai. How can I speak English alone?” [Pim/ Female – Low WTC/ Class 4]. Nuna said: “We didn’t use English when we discussed. I used both. But someone like Nun, she used Thai all the time” [Nuna/ Female – High WTC/ Class 3]. Joy and Kloy reported that they were familiar with using Thai to brainstorm ideas. Joy said: “We don’t speak English in group; it’s like we’re not used to it. We had to make it into English anyway so discussing in Thai is easier” [Joy/ Female - Low WTC/ Class 3]. Kloy said: “We’ve been familiar with it (i.e., using Thai during group work). I know, we should speak English. Only sometimes we slipped out words like, ‘Really?’” [Kloy/ Female - High WTC/ Class 3].

Pair work and group work provided distinctive features to facilitate the participants’ WTC in other ways. Pair work seemed to be more beneficial to low WTC participants
than group work. For pairs, both high and low WTC participants frequently reported that they had more chance to speak in pairs than in groups. Duen and Kim were examples of low and high WTC participants who perceived that they benefited more from pair than group work. Duen said: “In a conversation, when another person speaks to me, there, I have a chance to speak. But in a group, many people are being responsible to speak. I will just let them speak because they’re good. But if in a pair, I’m worried to have another person speak solely.” [Duen/ Female – Low WTC/ Class 1]. Kim said: “I’d like to speak in pairs because I would get more chance to speak.” [Kim/ Female- High WTC/ Class 2].

For group work, high WTC participants wanted to and enjoyed speaking and exchanging ideas with different people: “(I like speaking in groups). If we speak in pair when the other person was quiet, I don’t know what to do. If we speak in groups, we can share ideas and we can get to know what other people think. Also in groups, if anybody stops speaking, somebody else would speak up” [Kloy/ Female - High WTC/ Class 3]. In the stimulated recall, Bay seemed to enjoy the activity where she could exchange opinions with her friends: “We can share what we think. When we think about the reason, I spoke about one thing, my friends spoke about other things, and we put them together. We are all having different views. Sometimes, we spoke in Thai first, then we helped made it into English” [Bay/ Female – Low WTC/ Class 1]. One technique used in managing group work in Class 5 was group changing. Changing groups enabled the participants to keep the conversation going to exchange their ideas with different people in different groups: “I speak more because it’s my own opinions. Also it’s a group work. So if somebody get stuck, we have to help keep the conversation going. Otherwise, it’s going to be so quiet. I have to say what I think to make other people understand. When we change the group, we get to know more ideas from different people. I like it” [Manuaw/ Female - High WTC/ Class 5].

The fact that the participants could exchange ideas with their group members enabled them to feel it was fun. Prim who always spoke in class gave similar answers in general interview and stimulated recall interview. In the general interview, she said: “When we discussed in groups during class time, it’s super fun.” [Prim/ Female - High WTC/ Class 5] When asked to respond to the video, she recalled again that she enjoyed speaking in groups. “It’s fun. We discussed with different people. We’ve got
more ideas” [Prim/ Female - High WTC/ Class 5]. Moreover, Joy was confident to use English in a group because there was no pressure from others’ evaluation: “I’m quite confident. With this situation where we sit in a group, I feel confident. But if I had to talk alone, I wouldn’t want to. I don’t like speaking in front of class because everybody would look at me” [Joy/ Female – Low WTC/ Class 3].

On the other hand, there were some disadvantages reported of group work and pair work on the participants’ WTC. It seemed that group work had more disadvantages than pair work, because the participants gave more negative responses about group work than pair work. For pair work, Boom said she was greatly influenced by her partner: “I spoke not so good when I paired with a person who didn’t have good English. She did lots of mistakes. Then, I got her influence” [Boom/ Female – High WTC/ Class 4]. For group work, the participants voiced many more reasons that debilitate their WTC than pair work. The participants who always spoke in class said that their WTC decreased because of the characteristic of the group members. Belle said that she did not want to speak if she joined a group that was stressed: “…my friends’ group or any groups that is fun. It depends on who you speak to…If I joined the group that looked very stressed, I couldn’t speak. I felt that they didn’t want to speak with me.” [Belle/ Female - High WTC/ Class 5]. Kim, who was in a group of classmates who were talkative, said: “In group like this, we all spoke at the same time. It’s not good” [Kim/ Female – High WTC/ Class 2].

Moreover, after watching the video of their group work in class, participants gave other reasons that lessen their willingness to speak in a group. The following excerpts were taken from stimulated recall data. Bua said she hesitated to speak because of a conflict of opinions: “I don’t like working in such a big group like this. Like, some people in the group thought like a child. I don’t like it. …Bay, Makam, and Ouan. But not only them. All think like a child. I didn’t agree with them, but I couldn’t say anything. … Also, Kam is good at speaking so she just speaks, speaks, speaks” [Bua/ Female – High WTC/ Class 1]. Also, Bua was pressured by her sense of kreng jai when working in a group: “Working in group, there was a sense of ‘Kreng jai’ when somebody said something. Everybody just, hmmm” [Bua/ Female - High WTC/ Class 1]. Makam said that one person may dominate the rest of the group: “Ouan said most of it, then we discussed about it and I said other things.” [Makam/ Female - Low
Moreover, the participants felt that they did not have to be responsible for speaking when working in a group, because there were other people who were speaking: “I don’t know I don’t speak much in a group…It depends on the situations. If I see someone speaks, I just play. If friends asked if this is good, I would say yeah yeah” [Makam/ Female - Low WTC/ Class 1]. More seriously, Makam said that the group did not stay focussed on the task: “…we went off the task. But when the teacher came we spoke English” [Makam/ Female - Low WTC/ Class 1].

**Speaking in other situations**

Apart from speaking in pairs and in groups, the participants reported some issues while they spoke in front of class and group discussion. The participants’ WTC in English seemed to decline in these situations because of nervousness of negative evaluation from others. Nonetheless, some participants who had high WTC enjoyed class discussion especially when the teacher asked for short and easy responses.

The situations that prevented the participants from speaking were speaking in front of class and speaking in public. Nervousness was the main reason that decreased the participants’ WTC. Makam said: “If it’s a presentation in front of class, I will feel more nervous because the class is quiet…It’s like everybody is listening” [Makam/ Female – Low WTC/ Class 1]. Orn said: “Also I don’t like talking in public. I don’t like when I’m watched by people. When people looked at me, I would worried if I make mistakes” [Orn/ Female – High WTC/ Class 5]. Very few participants found group discussion enjoyable. Belle said it was fun to speak in class discussion: “When the teacher is talking in front of class and we were discussing about something. It’s fun. We can share ideas. Mostly it’s about something easy and shor.” [Belle/ Female - High WTC/ Class 5].

For any task requiring an outcome, a group representative who was nominated by group members or individuals selected by teachers to report to the class seemed to be discouraged from speaking. Duen envisioned herself as being tense if she was a reporter because of her fear of mistakes: “I didn’t report to the class. I don’t want to be a reporter. I’m afraid of making mistakes. But I will help adding some comments” [Duen/ Female – Low WTC/ Class 1]. Nuna was a reporter of her group. She read from the script and was not satisfied with it: “I didn’t like it. I felt that it didn’t come
out smooth when I read from the script. I like to speak without a script and I can put my emotion in” [Nuna/ Female - High WTC/ Class 3]. Aoi was called on to give advice about the problem, ‘I got a flu what should I do’. She recalled that she was unable to think of the word, so she resorted by saying something that she did not intend to say: “I felt that I couldn’t think of words about having a severe condition. It took me so long. So I just said anything at that moment because I didn’t want anyone to wait” [Aoi/ Female – High WTC/ Class 4]. In another task, Aoi, whose name was singled out by the teacher from a random selection of name cards to play the role of the tour guide to give brief information of a given tourist place as an outcome of her group discussion, became panicked. However, she managed to stay calm and give a comprehensive and humorous speech: “I wasn’t sure if I could make it right. I haven’t been...oh I’ve been there but I couldn’t remember. We were arguing so we’ve got only a few sentences but I had to report to the class...When I came up to the front, I was pressured. Why me? I haven’t prepared much, but I had to improvise, I add anything I thought of at that moment; otherwise it wouldn’t look like a tour guide” [Aoi/ Female – High WTC/ Class 4].

On the other hand, it appeared that some participants did not have a negative attitude towards being a reporter. Bay seemed to enjoy her role as a reporter when nominated by her friends: “It’s was fun, like I gave my reasons so my friends asked me to speak about it and when another person gave good reasons for other cases, we asked them to speak” [Bay/ Female – Low WTC/ Class 1]. Ouan believed the role of a reporter was one more opportunity to speak: “…the one who speak the most was the reporter” [Ouan/ Female - High WTC/ Class 1].

**Class Atmosphere**

Participants reported that class atmosphere could facilitate or restrain their WTC. The participants were willing to speak English in a class which was characterized as being fun and relaxing, while the class that was quiet and boring inhibited the participants from speaking. When the participants were familiar with the classroom atmosphere, they were more willing to speak up. Class size seemed to be related to how familiar the participants felt with the class. If the class was small, the participants could
become accustomed to their class members and they could become willing to speak with them more easily than with a large class.

Class atmosphere affected both high and low WTC participants. Makam and Ouan were examples of low and high WTC participants whose willingness to communicate varied according to their perception of the atmosphere of the class. Makam who had low WTC enjoyed the class atmosphere. She said: “We talk and we laugh together. It doesn’t have to be something in the lesson. We can bring something from outside the lesson and make it in English. And we can share our ideas. When we help each other, it’s fun” [Makam/ Female - Low WTC/ Class 1]. Ouan, who had high WTC, would feel bored if the class was quiet. Ouan said: “If it’s all quiet, we don’t know what to do. It’s like we are not studying. It’s boring and I will fall asleep” [Ouan/ Female - High WTC/ Class 1]. Another element of class atmosphere is related to class size. Tan, whose WTC was high, reported that he felt familiar with classmates because it was a small class: “It’s fun because we don’t have many people, so we all know each other. Even if I studied with friends in my own major, I still didn’t feel this way. It’s fun and everyone was funny. This made class atmosphere enjoyable. I really want to come to school because I would like to come to this class” [Tan/ Male - High WTC/ Class 2].

**Teaching Methods**

Teaching methods referred to different types of teaching methods that the participants experienced. Types of teaching methods included teaching focusing on grammar and communicative purposes. The grammar-oriented instruction refers to the instruction that focuses on English rules and formal structures, where there is little opportunity for students to speak in class. The communicative-oriented instruction refers to type of instruction where the students were given plenty of opportunity to speak and they did not have to worry about grammar while speaking in class.

The participants who had experiences in a communicative-oriented class seemed to enjoy themselves and speak more. Kan recalled her pleasure in her communicative-focused class: “I once studied with a Thai teacher, and she made us come out to the front and talk like a debate in English. Not using script, we just had to speak. ...we
don’t have to worry about grammar. It all depends on what we think” [Kan/ Female - High WTC/ Class 1]. On the other hand, in the grammar-based instruction class, the participants were given few chances to speak. Boom recalled her experiences in her grammar-based class: “I felt that when I was in a convent school, they really focus on grammar. I didn’t actually have much chance to speak” [Boom/ Female - High WTC/ Class 4].

5.4.3 Task

Task referred to characteristics of the activities in which the participants were involved. The task responses which affected the participants’ WTC in English included Topic, Nature of the Task, Task Difficulty, and Time Allotted. The topic concerns what the participants were required to speak about. There were two types of topics employed in all classes: real-world related topics and fantasy-world related topics. These two types of topics stimulated the students to speak differently. The Nature of the task concerns how the task was designed to stimulate the students to speak. There were two types of tasks found in all classes: highly structured and non-structured tasks. They differed with regard to how they required the participants to use the target language. Task difficulty concerns how the participants perceived the level of difficulty of the tasks. Difficult topics did not encourage the participants to use English to speak as much as easy topics. Time allotted concerns the time provided for the students to perform the task. Time allotted can affect the participants’ WTC, depending on the difficulty level of the task. If the task was difficult and the participants were given a relatively short time to perform the task, the use of Thai would exceed English.

Topic

Most topics employed in all five classes observed were related to real world knowledge. The topics that linked to participants’ interests and background knowledge seemed to enable them to enjoy speaking more than the topics that were far from their knowledge. The topics that were distant from their interests and background knowledge were considered to be difficult and seemed to weaken students’ WTC. Although most classes used real world type topics, Class 1 used a fantasy topic once. The participants were encouraged to speak in the fantasy type of
topics where they did not have to worry about accuracy and appropriateness of their responses, because there was no reference to their real world knowledge.

From the interviews, the participants of both high and low WTC seemed to be willing to speak if they were interested in the topic. Kai indicated that she enjoyed speaking about sports because she liked playing tennis: “...it was great when I had to speak about sports because I like playing tennis” [Kai/ Female - Low WTC/ Class 2]. Likewise, Belle mentioned the topic of interest: “There’s one topic about cultural differences. ‘Is it better to marry someone with the same cultural background?’ We all spoke. It’s fun. It’s not stressful. Some of us even likes foreigners. So we’re vying to speak” [Belle/ Female - High WTC/ 4/5]. On the other hand, if the topic is boring or stressful, students’ WTC would be undermined: “…it depends on the topic. If it’s about stressful thing like laws, we wouldn’t speak much” [Teera/ Male - Low WTC/ Class 5].

Based on stimulated recall interviews, the participants were encouraged to speak if they perceived that the topics were useful and enjoyable. Participants in Class 4 were asked to do the activity where they had to speak about illnesses (Figure 5.2). They reflected that topics on illnesses were useful and relevant to them. Boom said that language about illnesses, as illustrated in Figure 5.2, was useful: “It’s fun...it’s about illnesses. We have to use it...” [Boom/ Female - High WTC/ Class 4]. Yanee said the topic was relevant to the language she needed to know: “It’s not too difficult. It’s just everyday life language...It’s close to us.” [Yanee/ Female – Low WTC/ Class 4].
Practice
A.
Direction: Match advice to the problem. You may choose more than one piece of advice for each problem.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Problem</th>
<th>Advice</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. a backache.............</td>
<td>a. drink warm tea with lemon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. a burn..................</td>
<td>b. put some ointment on it</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. a cough..................</td>
<td>c. drinks lot of liquids</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. a fever..................</td>
<td>d. put a heating pad on it</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. an insect bite or bee sting.....</td>
<td>e. press a key hole around the wound</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. a leg cramp...............</td>
<td>f. put it under cold water</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. a toothache...............</td>
<td>g. go to bed and rest</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. the flu....................</td>
<td>h. take some aspirin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. bad dandruff.............</td>
<td>i. see a dentist</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>j. use kaffir lime juice to wash hair</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>k. get some cough drops</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>l. stretch/massage the cramped muscle</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

B. Class work
Direction: Your teacher isn’t feeling well today. Ask him/her what the problem is. Unbelieveably, he/she has all health problem in activity A. Give advice to your teacher. What other advice do you have?

Example
Student A: *What’s the matter? You don’t look well.*
Teacher: *I have a backache. What should I do for a backache?*
Student A: *You should put some ointment on it*
Student B: *Way don’t you put a heating pad on it?*
Student C: *You had better see a doctor*
Student D: *Why not?*

Useful Language

*Asking about health or problems*
- What’s the matter?
- How’ve you been feeling?
- What’s wrong?
- What’s happened to you?
- Is anything wrong?

Figure 5.2. Example of class activity: Asking and giving advice about illness (Class 4)

Note. From *Conversation matters: English conversation builder for university students* (p. 104), by K., Chatpunnarangsee (n.d.).
Participants from Class 5 reflected on given topics about cultural differences as enjoyable. Figure 5.3 presents the activity used in Class 5. The students enjoyed the topic about cultural differences, although different attitudes about different topics were found. The following excerpts of participants’ responses were taken from stimulated recall data. Manauw gave an overall view about all topics given for this class that were more enjoyable than other topics from previous classes: “Today was very fun. It’s funnier than what we have done so far. It’s not as difficult as laws, education, and culture” [Manauw/ Female - High WTC/ Class 5]. Teera found that topic number 1 was difficult to speak about: “Number 1 was about immigration and culture. It’s hard. It’s far away from us. Even in Thai, it’s already hard” [Teera/ Male - Low WTC/ Class 5]. Prim also found the second topic hard: “The topics are difficult. The second one is hard. I wasn’t confident to speak about these things. I don’t have enough background. I’m worried that I would have it wrong” [Prim/ Female - High WTC/ Class 5]. Teera enjoyed talking about topic 3, because his classmates were interested in it: “Perhaps number 3. It’s about marriage. The girls enjoyed the topic. And I enjoyed their talking” [Teera/ Male - Low WTC/ Class 5].
The participants from Class 1 compared the topic of the two tasks. The first task contained fantasy-world orientation (See Figure 5.4), while the second task referred to real-world knowledge (See Figure 5.5). Based on the stimulated recall interviews, the topic featuring a realistic reference seemed to be less motivating for the participants than a fantasy related story. Makam said she could freely express her opinion in a fantasy task: “I like the Judges (the former task) better because I can say whatever I
thought, but for Love (the latter task), it’s like we have to have some background’’ [Makam/ Female - Low WTC/ Class 1]. Also, the imaginary topic can lead to humor more easily than a realistic topic: “I like the judges because it’s not real. It’s fun because it’s not real” [Ouan/ Female - High WTC/ Class 1].

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PART I: WARM-UP</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Activity 1

**Directions:** Take turns speaking out your opinion on any topic (e.g., politics, drugs, the University, this course, your instructor, etc.) Begin your sentence with I think ... or In my opinion, ...

Activity 2 **Group work** (3-4 students in a group)

**Directions:** You are a group of judges. You live in Fantasyland. The following people have been arrested:

- B - for cheating in an exam.
- C - for shoplifting two bottles of shampoo.
- D - for throwing litter on the street.

Decide how long to send these people to prison for.

The minimum is one month. The maximum is ten months.

*Figure 5.4. Example of class activity: Judges in Fantasyland (Class 1)*

*Note.* From English for communication (p. 80), by J., Pibulnakarin, & Y. Pokthitiyuk, 2007, Bangkok: Thammasart University Press.
Figure 5.5. Example of class activity: Giving opinions (Class 1)


**Nature of task**

The tasks have different goals and outcomes with regard to language production. There was a variety of tasks, as observed from the five classes. They were ranged
from highly structured to non-structured tasks. The highly structured tasks were
designed to elicit the production of the language structures. The aim of the tasks
focused on the language forms. On the other hand, the non-structured tasks were
designed to allow the participants to use the language as a means of communication
where the emphasis of the non-structured task was on the meaning. For low WTC
participants whose English competency was low, the former tasks seemed to promote
the use of English more easily than the latter ones. This may be attributed to their low
level of English competency, so they were unable to produce the language freely. For
those who had high level of WTC and English competence, they tended to prefer the
latter task, because they could speak without any worry about the accuracy of the
language form.

Highly structured tasks

Highly structured tasks included pronunciation practice, pattern and dialogue practice,
and grammar practice. For pronunciation practice tasks, most participants were
relaxed during the activity, but some were bored and stressed. For pattern and
dialogue practice tasks, most were confident to practice the language provided.
However, some found it boring. The grammar task was disliked by all participants.
Presentation was not a problem for everyone if they had prepared themselves. These
characteristics of highly structured tasks found in this study were related to the type of
task called “closed task” in Willis (1996).

Pronunciation practice

In Class 3, the students were asked to do a pronunciation exercise which contained a
series of activities. In one of the activities, each student was asked to give one word
that had either /t/ or /th/ sounds. Most participants were relaxed during the activity,
but some were bored and stressed. Kloy was not confident to pronounce the words,
although she usually spoke in class. She was concerned about the correct way to
pronounce individual words: “I tried to look for the words from the book, I didn’t
want to make mistakes… I am nervous if I had to pronounce individual words. It’s like
when I am the one who spoke and other people looked at me, I feel embarrassed.
When I was in primary (school), I had to pronounce ‘number one, number two,
number three’ in the lab, but I pronounced like, ‘tree’ instead, so everybody laughed.
I don’t know if it’s right or wrong. So I got worried whenever I had to pronounce individual words in class” [Kloy/ Female - High WTC/ Class 3].

Pattern and dialogue practice
Provided with language patterns, the participants were confident to speak. In Class 4, students had to practice using the language patterns about giving advice and used the answers from the previous task (See Figure 5.2). They were given some time to practice the patterns from the book and they were asked to close their books. The following excerpts of responses were taken from stimulated recall data. Apple said, “We used English. We followed the patterns and also we changed it sometimes. I like it when we have the pattern, otherwise I’m not sure how to make it right” [Apple/ Female – Low WTC/ Class 4]. Despite her inadequate practice of the patterns, when her book was closed Yanee was comfortable: “I didn’t practice a lot with the book, so I just tried whatever I could. No stress” [Yanee/ Female - High WTC/ Class 4]. Chom spoke more if there was language provided: “We speak with the partners. There’s the language pattern we can use. We speak more with the language pattern provided” [Chom/ Female - High WTC/ Class 4].

In Class 5, students had to do a dialogue practice about cultural differences before a group discussion. There were both positive and negative opinions about doing the dialogue practice. The following excerpts of responses were taken from stimulated recall data. Olarn viewed it as practicing: “We talked with partners. We can get to practice” [Olarn/ Female - Low WTC/ Class 5]. Belle enjoyed doing it: “It’s fun. It’s a long dialogue. We can speak in sentences not just words. It’s easy to speak from the script. I paired with Prim” [Belle/ Female - High WTC/ Class 5]. As with Belle, Prim found it fun: “It’s fun because it’s just reading the script. I’m confident because we’ve got the script” [Prim/ Female - High WTC/ Class 5]. Orn paired with a less competent friend and had to slow down to match her partner: “My partner speaks very little. So I had to slow down. We’ve got the script, it’s relaxing” [Orn/ Female - High WTC/ Class 5]. On the other hand, Teera found reading the script boring: “My tongue twisted. I paired with Ohm, my close friend. I’d prefer speaking with friends without using the script. Having the script is boring. I don’t like practice pronunciation” [Teera/ Male - Low WTC/ Class 5].
Grammar

In Class 4, students had to complete sentences focusing on the use of the passive form. The following excerpts of responses were taken from stimulated recall data. Aoi was stressed while doing the task, because she had to be careful about grammar: “This one was a bit stressful because we had to use the patterns given. We just can’t speak as we’d like. We had to be more careful” [Aoi/ Female – High WTC/ Class 4]. Pim said that, although she had known about the rule on passive voice construction, she was not sure about the word order: “It’s about what we knew already but we didn’t use it correctly. It looked easy but I still found it confusing to arrange the word order. I’m not sure which should go first the road, the address, or the province. Or Where is Tajmahal? It should be Where is the Tajmahal? It’s a bit stressful when we need to be careful about the grammar” [Pim/ Female - Low WTC/ Class 4].

The participants from Class 5 had to work with their partners to respond to the questionnaire (Figure 5.6). They had a choice for each question. The following excerpts of responses were taken from stimulated recall data. Prim liked the task: “I don’t know what advice I should give them. I was blanked. I wrote just only little on my notes. I like the first one better because we’ve got the choices. Sometimes, I like to speak freely if I have some ideas to share but not for things I don’t have any ideas. My partner also has no ideas” [Prim/ Female - High WTC/ Class 5]. Orn commented that the choices given in this task left her no room to speak. She could not speak much. She only read the questions and answered them: “We don’t know what to talk about. We just read the questions and answered” [Orn/ Female - High WTC/ Class 5].
Activity 1  
A Pair work read this questionnaire with a partner and imagine you are in each situation. Discuss your answer. Give reasons for your choices.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>What would you do in your country?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>You’re in a clothing store shopping for jeans. The price on the tag is a bit high. What would you do?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>a. ask for a discount if you pay cash</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>b. pay the amount on the price tag</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>c. ask if the price on the tag is correct</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>d. bargain for a lower price</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>e. none of the above</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Some tourists ask if they can take a photo of you. How would you feel?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>a. flattered</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>b. annoyed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>c. embarrassed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>d. amused</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>e. none of the above</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>You’re on the subway platform. The train arrives, but it’s full. What would you do?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>a. wait patiently until it’s your turn to get on</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>b. let the people behind you push you in</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>c. push to make sure you get on</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>d. wait for the next train, hoping it will be less full</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>e. none of the above</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>You’re walking in a city park with your boyfriend/girlfriend. What would you do?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>a. hold hands</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>b. walk arm in arm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>c. walk close but not touching</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>d. walk far apart</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>e. none of the above</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>You and three friends take a taxi home after midnight. How much would you give the driver as a tip?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>a. nothing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>b. small change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>c. 10% of the fare</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>d. 15% of the fare</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>e. none of the above</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>You’re in a restaurant with two friends. The bill arrives. Who would normally pay?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>a. the person who invited the other</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>b. each person would pay only his/her share</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>c. the person with the most money</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>d. the bill would be divided equally</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>e. none of the above</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 5.6. Example of class activity: Survey questionnaire (Class 5)
Note. From *Let's talk3*. (p. 30), by L. Jones, (2002). Hong Kong: Cambridge UP.

**Non-structured tasks**

The non-structured tasks employed in all five classes can be categorised into two main groups: restricted-language-demanding and extensive-language-demanding tasks. The former type of non-structured task involved the activities that required the students to provide brief opinions freely. The latter type of non-structured task involved the opinion exchange and problem-solving tasks which required the students to use the target language to interact with their group members or dyads to achieve the task goals. These characteristics of non-structured tasks found in this study were related to the type of task called “open task” in Willis (1996). Open task will be used to refer to non-structured tasks in chapter 6.
The participants were likely to speak in English more in restricted-language-demanding tasks than in the extensive-language-demanding tasks, because they have language patterns to follow. The tasks that demanded the use of language extensively were considered too difficult for the students to negotiate for meanings using English. Hence, the use of Thai increased in most of extensive-language-demanding tasks, except in the class (e.g., Class 5), where the students were competent to use English.

**Restricted-language-demanding task**

In Class 2, the teacher had the students perform a survey task as a warm-up activity in two of the three classes that I observed. In the two survey activities, the students were asked to gather in the centre of the classroom and go around to as many of their classmates as possible to ask for their opinions about the given situations. In one activity, each student was given a question which reflected the student’s characteristic, for instance, the student who had a big nose was given the question read, “What do you think about my nose?” In another activity, the students were given a situation and they had to ask for advice from their classmates. The situation was designed to draw out their laughter (e.g., “I might fail EG 241.” and “I have a bad breath”).

Both survey activities encouraged the participants to speak in many ways. The following excerpts of responses were taken from stimulated recall data. Kai was relaxed to speak in this activity, because she could speak with many people: “*When I had to speak with many people like in this activity, I felt more relaxed. I felt fun to do this activity. But I would feel anxious if I had to sit at my desk and the teacher asked me because everyone would stare at me*” [Kai/ Female – Low WTC/ Class 2]. Kim said she could speak with her classmates from across the room: “*…it’s like I don’t have to sit at one spot. I can chat with friends sitting away from me*” [Kim/ Female - High WTC/ Class 2]. Tan was confident, because he did not have to be concerned about evaluation: “*I was quite confident because no one was listening to us*” [Tan/ Male - High WTC/ Class 2]. Kai added that the task was easy: “*…we can use easy vocab… it’s not difficult. It’s about things not far away from us*” [Kai/ Female – Low WTC/ Class 2]. Golf was willing to speak more when he made it funny: “*We were to ask to give advice for our friends’ problems. We were joking like one senior guy, he asked for advice about his hair-cut that looked bad. So I told him to kill the barber.*
When I speak in English, it was so funny. It made me dare to speak” [Golf/ Male – Low WTC/ Class 2]. However, Golf perceived that he could not improve himself from this activity, although he could fulfil the goal of the task: “I think it’s like informal conversation which is not very serious...I can speak like the teacher expected but did not get much improvement” [Golf/ Male – Low WTC/ Class 2].

In Class 4, the teacher asked students to work in pairs to guess the problem each person in each picture had and to make short dialogues about good advice for each illness (See Figure 5.7). Most students used English, although some used Thai. The following excerpts of responses were taken from stimulated recall data. Chom could not give advice for the bold problem: “I asked my partner ‘what’s wrong?’. But I don’t know what advice I should give for bold problem. It’s genetic. But you can get your hair grown, but it’s expensive. I speak with Bum, she has good English background. It’s fun” [Chom/ Female - High WTC/ Class 4]. Boom said she could use her imagination to guess what each picture referred to: “I can use my imagination. Some pictures are not so clear” [Boom/ Female- High WTC/ Class 4]. Apple said that this task was fun and required thinking skills: “This one, we had to come up with the prediction. For example, picture 2, we said Fat, but the teacher said it’s not appropriate to say Fat. So we changed to chubby, but the teacher said it’s not a disease. So he gave us the answer “overweight”. It’s fun. We have to use our thinking skill. I paired with Benjaporn, we spoke in both Thai and English. I switched to Thai whenever we couldn’t think of the answer in English. And we would like to make it quickly” [Apple/ Female – Low WTC/ Class 4].
E. Pair work
Directions: Can you guess what is wrong with people in the picture? Discuss with your partner, then, make up a dialog and find good advice for each illness/problem

Example

A: What’s wrong with a person in picture number one?
B: I think she has a sore throat.
A: Oh that’s too bad. What do you think she should do?
B: I think she should drink warm liquid and take some lozenges. Especially, she had better not speak.
A: It sounds like good advice./ Well, I don’t think it helps.

Figure 5.7. Example of class activity: Asking and giving advice about illnesses (Class 4)

Note. From Conversation matters: English conversation builder for university students (p. 106), by K., Chatpunnarangsee (n.d.).

In Class 4, the students were asked to work in pairs to make a short dialogue about asking and giving advice (See Figure 5.8). Students worked in pairs to create dialogue about giving advice for situations provided. Each pair was assigned to do one situation. The following excerpts of responses were taken from stimulated recall data. Chom found it fun: “This is fun. We use English in this activity” [Chom/ Female-
High WTC/ Class 4]. Apple found some situations difficult to make up a dialogue in English: “This one is okay, but we couldn’t think of the answer sometimes. I don’t know how to advice my partner. I think it’s hard. Even if it’s in Thai, I don’t even know how to answer. For example, love triangle, it’s complicated. But it’s fun. I just speak it out. For example, you broke because you spent all your salary. I know that I should advice my partner to divide the money into smaller parts for different purposes. I don’t know if it’s okay to use the word “divide”, but I just used it” [Apple/ Female – Low WTC/ Class 4].

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>H. Role play</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Directions: Work with a new partner. Choose one of the situations below and make up a dialogue that last about three minutes. You need to state a problem, ask for advice, give advice and accept or reject the advice. It’s recommended that you add more detailed information to make your role play interesting.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Situations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. You always sleep in class.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. You want to have your nose pierced by your parents won’t allow you.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. You’ve spent too much money this month. Now you’re broke.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. You made a bad grade on the mid-term examination.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. You saw your friend’s boyfriend/girlfriend with another woman/man.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. You are too shy to speak English in front of other people.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. You are going to a formal reception but you don’t have a suit/evening gown to wear.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. You and your friends decided to go to a concert. You kept all tickets but you can’t find them.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Figure 5.8. Example of class activity: Asking and giving advice (Class 4)*

*Note. From Conversation matters: English conversation builder for university students* (p. 109), by K., Chatpunarangsee (n.d.).

**Extensive-language-demanding task**

In Class 3, the students used Thai while they did their group work. For example, in the activity where they had to work in groups and each group took a role as a censorship board to make a decision for which movie to be shown on Thai television,
the students had to watch the excerpts of the movies which contained violent scenes and to discuss them among their group members. In another task in Class 3, the students used Thai while doing their group work. Each group acted as an editorial board of the paper and chose the letters about which they gave their advice. From my observations, the students used Thai most of the time while doing their group discussion in these two activities.

In Class 5, students had to give advice for their foreign friends (See Figure 5.9). This activity was preceded by an activity where they had to respond to a questionnaire (See Figure 5.6). In the questionnaire activity, they were given choices, but, in this activity, they had to come up with their own advice. The following excerpts of responses were taken from stimulated recall data. Oui found it difficult to give advice: “Yes because we had to give advice by ourselves. Sometimes I don’t know what advice I should give. But for the previous one, we had the choices to choose” [Oui/ Female - Low WTC/ Class 5]. Manauw stated that she did not know how to give advice: “I’m not good at giving advice. I normally make it funny because I don’t know what I should advise” [Manauw/ Female - High WTC/ Class 5]. Although it was difficult, some enjoyed to speak more in this activity than the former activity where they had choices. Orn spoke more in the second task: “(the second task) it’s more difficult. We had to think about what we could answer...I had to think about what I should advice them...I spoke more than the last one (with choices) because it’s more like reading out for the last one. But this, it’s like we had to speak from ourselves” [Orn/ Female - High WTC/ Class 5]. Belle spoke in the second task more than the first one: “We got similar answers. It’s not difficult because it’s just normal situation. Also we can express our opinion freely. I speak about this more than the previous one” [Belle/ Female– High WTC/ Class 5]. Manauw said the second task was fun: “the second one. Because we could think about it. It’s funny. When we reported our answer to the class, it’s funny” [Manauw/ Female– High WTC/ Class 5].
Activity 3  

**A Pair work** Imagine that someone from aboard will be visiting your country. What things might be different or unusual? Write down advice that would be helpful to a first time visitor.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Situation</th>
<th>Advice</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>meeting someone for the first time</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>greeting a friend</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>starting a conversation with a stranger</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>going to someone's house for dinner</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>eating in the restaurant</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>shopping</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sight-seeing and travelling</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 5.9. Example of class activity: Giving advice about cultural difference (Class 5)

Note. From *Let's talk*3. (p. 31), by L. Jones, (2002). Hong Kong: Cambridge UP.

**Task Difficulty**

Level of difficulty of the task can facilitate or decrease the participants’ WTC. If the task is too difficult, the participants were unwilling to speak. In Class 2, the students were to listen to a story and discuss it. They were given a choice of different opinions about the story on which they had to express their opinion. The following excerpts of responses were taken from stimulated recall data. Kai could not comprehend the story: “I couldn’t understand it straightaway because there were more than two people speaking in the conversation” [Kai/ Female - Low WTC/ Class 2]. On the other hand, Kim did not find it difficult, but she acknowledged that it was quite fast. “It’s not so difficult, but if you are not so familiar, it would be hard because it’s quite fast” [Kim/ Female – High WTC/ Class 2]. She went on to say that the choice guided their discussion in a variety of ways. “It’s good. We discussed in many ways...we have a guideline so we can just add more comments.” [Kim Female - High WTC/ Class 2]

In Class 4, the students were asked to tell the location of some neighbouring countries. The following excerpts of responses were taken from stimulated recall data. Apple said, “Like what we are doing now about giving direction, I don’t like it because it’s complicated. And there’re many steps involved” [Apple/ Female - Low
WTC/ Class 4]. She was pressured with the language forms and she lacked knowledge about them: “It’s about the passive form. We had to talk about locations. It’s hard. It stresses on passive form. For example, ‘Where is Japan?’ I know it’s in Asia, but I couldn’t be able to specify the exact locations. We need to have graphical knowledge. Although the teacher gave us the pattern to use, it’s still hard to tell the specific location. We just said in East Asia and then the teacher asked ‘Where is East Asia?’ We went blank. We don’t know how to explain. Then, the teacher asked, ‘Where is China?’ It’s like, the questions go on and on” [Apple/ Female - Low WTC/ Class 4].

Aoi found it difficult to arrange her ideas and transfer them into English. “We brainstormed in Thai about what Kanchanaburi is known for, but no one has been to Kanchanaburi before. There’s some guideline for us about what to bring. Was it difficult? No, not difficult. But it’s hard when we had to put ideas and sentences together” [Aoi/ Female - High WTC/ Class 4].

**Time Allotted**

The time allotted for students to perform the task may reduce the use of the target language, especially for difficult tasks. Pui stated that they can finish the task more easily if they used Thai: “It’s more convenient to use Thai. We can just speak it out. It’s quicker” [Pui/ Female – Low WTC/ Class 4]. She also stated that they used Thai because they ran out of time: “We had a long argument about Wat Pho so it took it so long to make the English one. What language did you use? All Thai because we have no time” [Boom/ Female – High WTC/ Class 4]. Moreover, Thai was used because of the time constraint. In stimulated recall session, Joy said that her group could finish the task more quickly if they spoke Thai: “if we think in English, it would be very slow. So we speak Thai while we work, but we present it in English” [Joy/ Female - Low WTC/ Class 3].

**5.4.4 Summary: Classroom Context**

The factors contributing to the participants’ WTC in the classroom context involved three main aspects: interlocutors, classroom management and task. The major influences of interlocutors on the participants’ WTC supported the important role of significant others. Being stimulated by the video of the classroom events, participants’
responses in stimulated recall interviews were found in this context the most frequent because the participants’ motivation in speaking was triggered by their immediate environment which was grouped under the three main aspects referred to above.

5.5 Social and Psychological Context

The participants’ willingness to communicate in English was influenced by social and psychological factors. The participants’ desire to communicate in English was affected by influences from others. For example, some did not want to speak because they felt nervous. Some perceived that their English was not good and they were worried that they would look stupid if they spoke out. Some were not hesitant to speak English because they would like to be good at it in front of their peers. However, influences from others did not affect the choice to speak in English for some participants. Instead, they chose to speak or not depending on themselves. Some were reluctant to speak if they deemed that they could not articulate what they thought and they were not sure what to speak about. Some were keen to speak, because they would like to improve their English. Some may not want to speak if they felt sick or upset.

The factors in the social and psychological context included Language Anxiety, Self-Concept, Self-Efficacy, Self-Confidence, Goal Orientations, Language Learning Orientation, Interest, and Emotions. Language anxiety concerned the nervousness that was aroused at the moment of speaking which was primarily based on a fear of making mistakes. Self-concept, self-efficacy, and self-confidence concerned self-evaluation of their English competency. Although they are superficially similar, they are all logically distinct.

Self-concept concerns the self-perception that the participants have about their general English competence which is based on how they compared their English competency with their self-satisfaction (i.e., internal comparison) or how they compare their competency with other’s performance (i.e., external comparison). The participants’ self-concept reflected their sense of self-worth. For example, the participants who had high self-concept felt proud of themselves, because they perceived that their English
is better than their friends. Self-efficacy differed from self-concept, because self-efficacy concerns the participants’ perceptions of their English competence in doing specific task using specific skills. This perception is based on their self-satisfaction and it has no relationship to self-worth. For example, the participants who had low self-efficacy in her English pronunciation knew that it is difficult for them to make /r/ and /l/ sounds. Self-efficacy is more cognitively oriented than self-concept. Another concept of self-perception is self-confidence. Self-confidence is concerned with how certain the participants feel when they speak English in class. It is discussed in more detail in the self-confidence section of this chapter.

Goals orientations concern the purposes that participants set in their minds which relate to their choice of speaking English. Goal orientation was divided into mastery and performance goals. Participants who adopted mastery goals chose to speak English in order that they could improve their English, while participants who adopted performance goals chose to speak English because they wanted to outperform their peers. Language learning orientations concerns the reasons why participants chose to learn English. Interest concerns how the participants feel towards learning English. Emotions concern how the participants felt before speaking or at the moment while they were speaking. A discussion of how each factor in the social and psychological context affected the participants’ WTC is provided below.

5.5.1 Language Anxiety

Language anxiety may be defined as negative feelings that accompanied the learners while they were using the target language in class (MacIntyre, 1999). Language anxiety is a complex affective factor which resulted from many factors (Dörnyei, 2005). Based on the participants’ interviews, the major element underlying the participants’ anxiety was a fear of making mistakes. The fear of making mistakes reported by the participants was seen in two aspects: language use and content. The participants were afraid of making mistakes because they deemed that they would be negatively evaluated by others if they made mistakes. This attitude is closely related to the fear of negative evaluation displayed in the cultural context. Furthermore, some were afraid that if they made mistakes it would affect their grades. This is associated with test anxiety (Horwitz, Horwitz, and Cope, 1986). Some participants felt nervous
when they sat for the test or when they were uncertain whether they were being graded.

Language anxiety seemed to affect both high and low WTC participants. The participants frequently reported that they were worried about the language use which included the use of grammar, structure, and vocabulary. Nuna voiced that she was concerned about vocabulary use: “Sometimes, I would like to speak but I am not sure about the vocab to use. So I didn’t want to speak because I’m afraid that I would make mistake everywhere. It’s like showing my stupidity” [Nuna/ Female - High WTC/ Class 3]. Also, language anxiety seemed to be accompanied by uncertainty in speech content. This seemed to be related to fear of making mistakes, although it was not explicitly shown. Oui said: “If I’m not sure about things that I don’t really know, I would feel nervous” [Oui/ Female - Low WTC/ Class 5]. “I was worried when I have to speak that I couldn’t think of words to say because I didn’t know how to express it out. But if I could prepare for it, I’m sure I can do it well…If I can prepare, when I actually speak I might just slightly change it. But, if I had to speak spontaneously, I felt a bit scared. If I am scared about anything, it would turn out the way I thought. If I’m worried that I couldn’t speak, I then couldn’t speak. But when I don’t worry about it, it turned out that I’ve got it right” [Yanee/ Female - Low WTC/ Class 4].

Their fear of making mistakes comes from their interlocutors. The participants were nervous when they spoke with their teacher and more competent classmates, because of fear of making mistakes. Under the circumstance where Orn was speaking individually in class, she perceived that she was judged by classmates or teachers, so that she was afraid that she might make mistakes: “When people looked at me, I’d worried that I’d make mistakes. I’m more relaxed when I speak in groups or in pairs” [Orn/ Female - High WTC/ Class 5]. When talking with teachers, Kan got nervous, because she was afraid of making mistakes: “Mostly (I felt nervous) with teachers. I’m not too bad with peers. With teachers, I’m afraid of making mistakes or how I can make it correct” [Kan/ Female - High WTC/ Class 1]. When Tan found himself among classmates who were more competent than him, he was so worried that he would make mistakes: “...the classmates spoke really well. I didn’t want to speak. I’m afraid I spoke wrong” [Tan/ Male - High WTC/ Class 2].
Test anxiety is exemplified by the response given by Olarn, who mentioned that several factors accompanied his feelings while he sat for the test. He attributed his anxiety to the topic of speaking about which he had insufficient background knowledge and he found the vocabulary so difficult that he did not want to use it. He went on to state that the preparation time was not enough. All factors underlying his test anxiety seemed to result from his concern about accuracy: “I would feel anxious when doing the tests. Sometimes I couldn’t think of words to speak. For example, the test about cultural differences. There’re lots of difficult vocabs. I was dread to use it. Even though we’ve got time to prepare but it’s not enough. It’s too broad and we lack background knowledge.” [Olarn/ Male - Low WTC/ Class 5].

5.5.2 Self-Concept

Self-concept refers to participants’ perceptions of their general English competence, and resulted from a comparison either based on the participants’ internal or external references which reflected their sense of self-worth (Bong and Skaalvik, 2003). Internal comparison refers to how the participants evaluated their competence in using English based on their own standard of references. External comparison refers to how the participants evaluated their competence in using English in specific areas, or how they compared themselves to others’ competence. Both comparisons reflected their sense of self-worth.

The self-concept, based on both internal and external comparisons, seemed to be associated with how the participants developed their attitudes towards English, and did not directly affect their WTC. However, it may have mediated their WTC through their attitudes towards English. The influence of self-concept on WTC was important, because it was found that high WTC participants tended to perceive themselves as being good at English, while low WTC participants were the opposite. It is argued that the participants with high WTC tend to have high self-concept, whereas low WTC participants are likely to have low self-concept.

The participants evaluated themselves based on an internal comparison in three aspects. Firstly, participants evaluated their English ability in general compared to their self-satisfaction. The participants who perceived that they had poor English tended to be inhibited in speaking. Nim was an example. She said: “I don’t have a
good English background, so I couldn’t be able to cope with higher level” [Nim/ Female - Low WTC/ Class 3]. However, students’ WTC may increase if they perceived themselves as good at English. For example: “I feel I look forward to come to class. It's like the class that is easy to make good grade. For me, I don’t have to do much, I can just use my background knowledge and come to class, do a bit of reading, I could get good grade easily” [Kloy/ Female - High WTC/ Class 3]. Secondly, participants compared English competence in different skills. Teera did not speak much because he perceived that his speaking was not as good as his reading skill: “I’m not good at speaking and writing. I’m okay with reading” [Teera/ Male - Low WTC/ Class 5]. Thirdly, participants compared their English competence with other subjects. Nuna perceived that her English was better than her math: “It (English) is my cup of tea. My father is a merchant. But I don’t dare to do Marketing, because I’m not good at maths. For me, English is okay” [Nuna/ Female – High WTC/ Class 3].

The participants made a comparison of their competence based on information from three aspects of external sources. This type of self-concept seemed to reduce students’ WTC. Firstly, the participants often reported that they compared their ability with some selected friends in class: “I looked at Tan and he was like so good. Then, I thought, ‘Would I be able to beat him?’…” [Golf/ Male - Low WTC/ Class 2]. Secondly, the participants compared their ability with group-average ability or school-average ability. For example, Bay said: “When I was in high school, my English was better than anyone in my group, so my friends always asked me. Sometimes, my old friends called me to help them to prepare for their exams. Sometimes, when I was in a department store, I had to talk with my friends about the tenses usage. So, I am proud that I can help them” [Bay/ Female - Low WTC/ Class 1]. Finally, some participants appraised their English competence based on significant persons, like family members and friends. Joy felt that she was a weak member of her family because of her poor English: “At home, my family member is an English teacher. And, my relatives are also good at it. So it made me feel that I am a weakness” [Joy/ Female - Low WTC/ Class 3].

5.5.3 Self-Efficacy

Self-efficacy refers to how the participants judge their English competence in completing specific tasks in specific domains where a specific skill is required (Bong
This type of self-evaluation had a closer connection to the participants' WTC than self-concept. Unlike self-concept, self-efficacy is skill-oriented, context-specific, and primarily based on a self-standard. Also, it is a more cognitive construct and less affective than is self-concept.

Self-efficacy influenced both high and low WTC participants. Participants’ responses indicated that the role of self-efficacy on their WTC was associated with specific domains of language use. For instance, the participants had difficulty in pronouncing words correctly. Some were not able to articulate their thoughts. Some had trouble in speaking English due to an interference of translation from their mother tongue. Some had poor English grammar. These perceptions seemed to link to their WTC directly.

Bua, who had high WTC, attributed her unwillingness to communicate to her incompetence in pronouncing certain sounds: “I couldn’t make /r/ and /l/ sounds. I wanted to say ‘reef’ I tried it so many times, but they didn’t get it, so I lost my confidence” [Bua/ Female - High WTC/ Class I]. Tan, who also had high WTC, was restrained from speaking because he deemed that he lacked specific skills to express himself fully. “I don’t think I’m good at speaking because I couldn’t really express myself fully. I couldn’t make it clear. I couldn’t speak in a full sentence. It’s not good...Sometimes, it’s hard to answer (when the teacher asked). I didn’t know how to answer...I’m not good at expressing opinions. I used to take the class, Reading for opinion, and I got a very low mark because I couldn’t be able to voice my opinions. It’s not right to the point” [Tan/ Male - High WTC/ Class 2]. Apple, who had low WTC, declined to speak English because of the interference of translation from the Thai language: “I understood what the teacher said. But I couldn’t manage to say in English straight away. I had to think in Thai then translate it into English. It took me a long time to speak. I couldn’t speak immediately” [Apple/ Female - Low WTC/ Class 4].

Interestingly, Golf, who reported himself as low WTC, spoke frequently and actively in class. He knew that his speaking was not perfect when he had to speak spontaneously, but he did not worry about it: “…I like to speak. Sometimes, I just speak for the sake of communication. I didn't put much attention to it. I think my speaking skill is not perfect. When I had to speak right away, my grammar is not good” [Golf/ Male - Low WTC/ Class 2].
5.5.4 Self-Confidence

Self-confidence is different from self-efficacy and self-concept. Self-confidence here refers to a student’s belief in their own competency in speaking English. It can be classified into three levels: high, medium, and low, according to how the participants themselves defined their confidence. There were many factors associated with how the participants developed confidence in themselves towards different speaking situations. Factors affecting the participants’ confidence included familiarity, certainty of knowledge, reactions of interlocutors, opportunities provided, experiences and age. These factors both facilitated and decreased student’s confidence.

High and medium confidence was related to being both high and low WTC participants, while low confidence was associated with low WTC. Makam was an example of a low WTC participant who reported high confidence: “I think I’ve studied until now. I am quite confident to speak in class and everybody also tries their best” [Makam/ Female - Low WTC/ Class 1]. Golf, who reported that he had low WTC, was an example of a medium confident participant: “Not a hundred percent sure. I still have some weaknesses” [Golf/ Male - Low WTC/ Class 2]. An example of low confidence was given by Plearn who had low WTC: “I didn’t feel confident (When I speak)” [Plearn/ Female - Low WTC/ Class 3]

The participants’ level of confidence resulted from many factors. When the participants felt familiar with speaking English in class, they would feel more confident and they were likely to speak more. Bay stated that her confidence improved after she felt familiar with the class: “It’s getting better and better. I didn’t feel confident when the semester began. But, after I saw people spoke in class and responded to the teacher’s questions, I get used to it. Then, I’ve changed. I’ve started to speak” [Bay/ Female - Low WTC/ Class 1]. Low self-confidence was a result of uncertainty about speech content, as Plearn expressed: “I would only speak about what I’m sure that I can make it right. If I’m not sure, I’d rather stay quiet” [Plearn/ Female - Low WTC/ Class 3]. However, the participants might overcome this uncertainty if they had time to prepare their answer. Duen said: “I’m confident because I’ve prepared the answer” [Duen/ Female - Low WTC/ Class 1]. Participants’ confidence depended on teachers’ reactions. Chom lost her confidence because of her teacher’s action: “…The teacher stared at me, so I lost my confidence.
Then, everything came out very slowly. I’d like them to be friendlier” [Chom/ Female - High WTC/ Class 4]. On the other hand, his teacher’s actions encouraged Golf to speak more: “So when I speak, I will look at my friends and my teacher to see if they are listening or not. If the teacher nods his head, I will feel more confident” [Golf/ Male – Low WTC/ Class 2]. Reactions from peers also affected the participants’ confidence: “When I speak with those who are good, when they said ‘What?’ I would feel so unsure to speak” [Yanee/ Female - Low WTC/ Class 4]. Also, the participants’ confidence depended on the opportunities given: “I will be confident if I’m given opportunities to speak.” [Bua/ Female – High WTC/ Class 1].

Moreover, confidence also depended on experiences the participants had in speaking English, as well as their age: “I think it’s because I can speak, so I have more confidence to do it. Like last time, when I went to join the Work and Travel program, they told me to talk to the customers to build the friendly atmosphere and it makes me become more confident. Before this, I am the only one child so I don’t like socialising much. But after I came back from the US, I felt more confident and get to associate with people easier” [Kim/ Female – High WTC/ Class 2]. When the participants grew older, they were likely to be more confident. “Before this, I was not confident in myself. I was scared of everything. But when I get older, I just thought that I had to be more confident. Just have them know that I can do it” [Pim/ Female - Low WTC/ Class 4].

5.5.5 Goal Orientations

Goal Orientations refer to purposes that participants set in their minds which are related to their choice of speaking English. The goals reported by the participants may be categorised into two main types: mastery and performance goals. The participants who adopted mastery goals tended to practice speaking English in order to achieve their own satisfaction in learning, whereas those who developed performance goals seemed to practice speaking English to outperform their peers and preserve their sense of self-worth. The performance goals seemed to be linked with self-concept.

An example of the participants who adopted mastery goals was given by Belle who had high WTC: “..It’s a self-improvement. If I have to think that my friend would think this and that, I wouldn’t be able to improve. And, it’s wrong for them to think like
that. If they thought so, they wouldn’t have learned. Like in the listening section, some people laughed when other people spoke, it put them off. I think it’s not good. Everybody has an equal right to learn” [Belle/ Female – High WTC/ Class 5]. The statement given by Joy was a good example indicating an adoption of performance goals by a low WTC participant: “Friends surrounding are all good so it made me active at all times in order that I can be as good as they are. I just can’t let them outdo me, I can’t afford to waste my time complaining. I just gotta get improved to be as good as them” [Joy/ Female - Low WTC/ Class 2]. Additionally, some participants adopted multiple goals. For example, Golf expressed: “My first priority is to be good at English, but if I’m good at it, I would also like to get a good grade” [Golf/ Male - Low WTC/ Class 2].

5.5.6 Language Learning Orientations

Language learning orientations refer to the reasons why participants chose to learn English. Most participants said that they could get a better job if they were good at English. They could communicate with anyone using English. They could gain access to a wealth of information, using English. These reasons may be classified into three types of orientations: job-orientation, communication tools, and knowledge seeking. Although the reasons for learning English did not directly affect their WTC, they may influence their WTC indirectly.

The job-orientation and communication tools were reported by both high and low WTC. However, learning English for seeking more knowledge was reported only by low WTC participants. Most participants learned English because of job-related orientations, as seen from responses given by Prim and Kai, who had high and low WTC respectively. Prim said, “I wish I could work in the organization that uses English. I have an advantage if I know English” [Prim/ Female- High WTC/ Class 5]. Kai would like to work in the airline industry: “It’s very important because I’d like to go overseas. I’d like to do the job that I can use English, like air-hostess” [Kai/ Female - Low WTC/ Class 2]. Also, the participants with both high and low WTC learned English as a communication tool. Nuna stated: “I can use it (English) to communicate with anyone. If I’m lost somewhere, I can survive” [Nuna/ Female - High WTC/ Class 3]. Duen said: “It’s a common language which we can use to communicate with people from all over the world” [Duen/ Female - Low WTC/ Class
Interestingly, learning for seeking knowledge came only from the participants with low WTC. For example, Olarn indicated that he chose to study English to acquire more knowledge: “I feel like the more I know English, the better I can get into more information because most sources are in English, like text in the internet. It widens our horizontal” [Olarn/ Male – Low WTC/ Class 5].

5.5.7 Interest

Interest refers to the attention that the participants have towards learning English. The classification of interest reported by the participants was based on two types of interest, as suggested by Hidi (2001), who distinguished between individual and situational interests. The individual interest came from their internal drive, while situational interest derived from external influences. The participants’ interest about learning English was not explicitly associated with their WTC, but it may influence their choice of taking English as a major or a minor subject. It seemed that interest in learning English came from internal forces and were mostly reported by English majors. However, interest in learning English also resulted from external factors and were reported by participants who were English and non-English majors.

Individual interest was usually reported by English majors of both high and low WTC. Prim and Bay were examples of English majors who were personally interested in learning English. Prim, who had high WTC, said: “I like it since I was young. I’d like to study Arts” [Prim/ Female - High WTC/ Class 5]. Bay, who had low WTC, said: “I like English. I took the language program when I was in high school” [Bay/ Female – Low WTC/ Class 1]. Situational interest was reported by both English and non-English majors. Nuna was an example of an English major who was interested in English because of external influences: “…after I felt like the singers and celebs, so I followed my sisters to take extra English classes” [Nuna/ Female – High WTC/ Class 3]. Bua was an example of a non-English major who had changed to like English more when she went into her late secondary school years, because it became necessary for her: “From primary to secondary levels, I didn’t like English. But when I got to late secondary, it became necessary because I took language program. I’ve grown up so I need to be better. I started to review the vocab more, then I got to like it more” [Bua/ Female – High WTC/ Class 1].
5.5.8 Emotions

Emotions refer to how the participants felt before speaking or at the moment while they were speaking. Negative emotions that may decrease the participants’ WTC were feeling bored, tired, unwell, and stressed. Positive emotions that increased the participants’ WTC were having fun and feeling responsible. All the negative emotions and feeling fun were reported by both high and low WTC participants. Feeling responsible in speaking was usually reported by high WTC participants.

Examples of responses indicating the effect of negative emotions on WTC were given by Pim and Aoi, whose WTC were low and high respectively. Pim was wary in class on the day that her timetable was very tight: “I felt bored for classes on Wednesday and Friday because I have so many subjects” [Pim/ Female - Low WTC/ Class 4]. Feeling responsible to speak was mostly reported by high WTC participants. They felt liable to speak in different situations. Some participants felt that they should make contributions for others. Kloy voiced that she felt responsible to ask questions for a better understanding for the class: “If it’s something that people know already, I wouldn’t ask. But if it’s about something that people don’t know, I will ask the teacher, so other people can understand more” [Kloy/ Female - High WTC/ Class 3]. Prim stated that she felt obliged to give a clear understanding about Thai culture when she believed that her native speaker teacher had misinterpreted some culturally related issues: “I felt that I didn’t want him (the native speaker teacher) to think that we all behaved like that. I tried to defend for Thais. Sometimes, I agreed with what he said but for sometimes I couldn’t accept it” [Prim/ Female – High WTC/ Class 5]. Interestingly, Golf, who reported low WTC, showed responsibility to create a good class atmosphere: “I think I have to speak otherwise the atmosphere is not good.” [Golf/ Male - Low WTC/ Class 2].

5.5.9 Summary: Social and Psychological Context

In this social and psychological context, the participants’ WTC depended on the psychological variables functioning at the time when they spoke. The psychological variables affecting the participants’ WTC in this context included language anxiety, self-concept, self-efficacy, self-confidence, goals orientations, language learning orientations, interest, and emotions.
The participants’ choice to speak explicitly depended on their language anxiety, self-concept, self-efficacy, self-confidence, goals orientations, and emotions. Moreover, the participants’ WTC may also have resulted from their attitudes about learning English (Language learning orientations) and their interest in learning English (Interest). Most of the variables in this context seemed to be influenced by cultural factors, characterised as the role of interlocutors (i.e., peers and teachers), except self-efficacy and mastery goals. The culturally related variables seem to diminish students’ WTC more than self-efficacy and mastery goals whose relation to cultural reference was not obvious. Thus, it seems that teachers should focus on improving these two variables to encourage students’ WTC.

5.6 Chapter summary

The variables contributing to WTC that emerged from students’ voices in general and stimulated recall interviews were classified into four main dimensions: Cultural Context, Social and Individual Context, Classroom Context, and Social and Psychological Context. In the cultural context, cultural values embedded in Thai society displayed their role in social interaction norms. The participants were often reluctant to speak English, because they were concerned about the feelings of the others in order to maintain a strong network of relationships. In the social and individual context, role of social influences on the participants’ attitudes towards learning English confirmed the importance of significant others on the participants’ thoughts. In the classroom context, the role of peers and teachers greatly affected the participants’ willingness to communicate. Moreover, the influences of teaching practices which involved how the teacher managed the class and the use of tasks were clearly demonstrated. In the social and psychological context, cultural values also played a significant role in the psychological functioning of the participants. The issue of significant others that affected the participants’ WTC occurred in all contexts of variables affecting the WTC. This result emphasised the power of cultural influences on the participants’ WTC. Moreover, this finding shows the connections between the variables in all contexts. The overlapping influence of the variables in different contexts will be presented in the Discussion Chapter. The influence of teachers’ and
teaching practices’ effects on the participants’ WTC in the classroom context is presented in the next chapter.
CHAPTER 6

Results Part 2: Role of Teaching Practices on Thai Students’ Willingness to Communicate in English

6.1 Introduction

The previous chapter presented the variables contributing to willingness to communicate in English, primarily based on the students’ views which addressed research question 1. This chapter discusses the outcomes of the analysis in an attempt to answer the research questions 2 and 3. Research question 2 focuses on the teachers’ perceptions of how they created their class environment in order to encourage students’ WTC. The findings for this research question will be discussed under two headings: teaching principles and teaching practices. Research question 3 aims to examine the classroom teaching practices which affected the students’ WTC based on a comparison of the synthesis of student and teacher data. The findings for research question 3 will be discussed under the heading: effects of teaching practices on students’ WTC. Findings for both research questions are presented for individual teachers.

Research question 2 is, “How do teachers, in their planning, teaching and use of resources, try to create environments which encourage students in their WTC?”. The goal of this research question is to examine the teachers’ perspectives on how they attempted to promote the students’ WTC through their teaching practices. The answers to this research question are drawn from the teacher interview data which included responses from teacher’s general interviews and stimulated recall interviews. Data from both sources were content analysed for themes. Similar to the analysis process used for research question 1, after the analysis of teachers’ data from both sources, my interpretation based on class observations and interviews was included. Two main categories emerged to identify themes related to how the teachers created their teaching practices to encourage the students’ WTC. These two categories were
teaching principles and teaching practices. An overview of the findings for research question 2 is presented in section 6.2.

Research question 3 is, “How classroom teaching practices affect the students’ WTC?” The goal of this research question is to understand the effect of classroom practice factors on the students’ WTC. A valid understanding of the effect of classroom practices on students’ WTC can be achieved from an analysis of the perceptions from both students and teachers based on my observations of what actually took place in class at the time of observations. By this, I analysed selected activities to see why students chose to speak or did not choose to speak in English and validated my interpretations by a comparison of responses from both students and teachers. Therefore, the answer to research question 3 is derived from the synthesis of the data from students and teachers used to answer the research questions 1 and 2, based on my perceptions from the observations. An overview of the findings for research question 3 is presented in section 6.3.

6.2 Overview: Teaching practices to encourage students’ WTC based on teachers’ perspectives

The findings about the teaching practices employed to encourage students’ WTC were taken from two sources of teacher data: interview responses and stimulated recall responses. Findings about how the teachers created their teaching practices to encourage the students’ WTC were categorised into teaching principles and teaching practices. Teaching principles comprised teacher’s expectations, teacher’s beliefs regarding how speaking skills are developed, and teaching approach or how English is best taught. Teaching practices referred to how teachers articulated their teaching practices to encourage the students, which were derived from their underlying teaching principles. This section serves as an overview of how all five teachers created their class environment to encourage students’ WTC. Table 6.1 illustrates the summary of responses relating to how the teachers created their teaching practices to encourage the students’ WTC.
Table 6.1. Summary of themes identifying the teachers’ attempts to encourage the students’ WTC through teaching practices

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Teaching principles</th>
<th>Teaching practices</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 1 | - **T expectations**: Able to communicate in English confidently, accurately, appropriately, and fluently  
   - **T beliefs**: Learning takes place through plenty of input  
   - **T approach**: Presenting the students with language input and let them use it | - **Task**: Let them talk about their own opinions; Topics relevant to students’ background  
   - **Materials**: Use 50% of the course book as a guideline; supplement the weakness of the book by using authentic materials |
| 2 | - **T expectations**: Able to speak with more confidence  
   - **T beliefs**: Motivation drives learning; increase motivation through activities  
   - **T approach**: Eclectic approach | - **Task**: Topics relevant to students’ background and humorous  
   - **Class management**: Promote familiarity through group work; Give opportunity for students to speak  
   - **Materials**: Use course book as teaching guideline and for exam purpose; arrange the lesson to accommodate students understanding himself |
| 3 | - **T expectations**: Able to speak more frequently; Use correct pronunciation  
   - **T beliefs**: Language is learned through content (Literature-based)  
   - **T approach**: Inductive approach | - **Task**: Relevant topics; Focus on pronunciation practice  
   - **Class management**: Pair/group work; Not equally provided opportunity for students to speak  
   - **Techniques**: Walk around, Call on some students as models  
   - **Materials**: Language unnaturally sounded; Use authentic materials to supplement the formally sounded language |
| 4 | - **T expectations**: Feel comfortable to speak English; Be fluent through drill practice; Be more independent learner; Ready for the test  
   - **T beliefs**: Language is communicative which acquired through pattern practices  
   - **T approach**: i+1 | - **Task**: English is expected in highly structured tasks, but not much in non-structured ones  
   **Class management**: Create comfortable atmosphere through pair works  
   - **Techniques**: leading questions for students with low English competence; Equal chance for everyone to speak, Randomise groups  
   - **Materials**: Use book to reassure students; content appropriate for students |
| 5 | - **T expectations**: Able to speak English with NS  
   - **T beliefs**: Confidence is the key for speaking competence; Focus on grammar as students are English majors; Critical feedback is important  
   - **T approach**: Introducing the language and let students use it | - **Class management**: Provide encouragement not to worry about mistakes; Provide opportunities for students to speak; Facilitate students’ understanding before let them use the language  
   - **Materials**: Not enough useful information; supplement with additional materials. |

As shown in Table 6.1, teachers’ perceptions about the ways they created their teaching practices to encourage students’ WTC in English were categorised into teaching principles and teaching practices. Overall, the teaching principles seemed to
influence how the teachers performed their teaching practices to encourage their students’ WTC.

The teaching principles included teacher’s expectations, teacher’s beliefs, and teaching approach. Teacher’s expectations involved the aims that the teacher expected the students to have. Teacher’s beliefs involved what the teacher believed about how the language is best learned. Teaching approach concerned the way the teachers delivered their instruction which was related to how they believed the language is learned. For teacher’s expectations, all teachers usually followed the course objectives addressed in the course syllabus. Because Classes 1-4 were from the same university (UA), teachers of these classes shared similar goals. Despite sharing the same course objectives, Teachers 1-4 set their own focus. Teacher 1 followed the aims addressed in the course objectives as her primary goals. However, she did not set her expectations too high, because she acknowledged that it was an introductory course. Teacher 2 emphasized that students should be confident in speaking. Teacher 3 expected that the students should speak English frequently and accurately. Teacher 4 focused on developing students’ fluency in speaking English through drill practices. Teacher 5 (from UB), whose class was designed as a foundation course for English major students, expected that students should be able to communicate with anyone who speaks English, not only with Thai people. Therefore, he aimed at promoting students’ awareness of current issues.

Teacher’s beliefs underline how the teachers employed their teaching approach. Teachers 1, 2, 4, and 5 seemed to hold the beliefs that language is learned through exposure to plenty of language input and that students need to practice using the language until they developed skills. Based on these beliefs, they usually employed a similar teaching approach where they emphasised presenting the students with a language input of focused language patterns before letting them practise using the language patterns. In contrast to other teachers, Teacher 3 emphasised using an approach where he usually let the students try using the language in the tasks before telling them the rules and patterns. The use of the this approach seemed to come from his belief that the students acquired the language through self-discovery and his perception that the course book was easy and he did not have to explain the rules and language patterns.
Teaching practices were reported in relation to tasks, class management, techniques employed to encourage students’ WTC, and use of materials. Tasks referred to topic and nature of task. Class management referred to how the teacher organised the class to allow the students to do the tasks. Techniques used referred to methods of activities that the teachers employed in class. Use of materials referred to the way the teachers made use of the teaching materials. Similarities and differences were found for teaching practices across teachers. On the use of tasks, Teachers 1, 2 and 3 emphasised the use of topics that were relevant to students’ backgrounds. Teacher 4 reported that highly structured tasks (closed tasks) enabled students to speak more than loosely structured tasks (open tasks). Regarding class management, Teachers 2, 3, 4 said that they tried to get students to work in pairs or in groups. Teacher 2 contended that group work could create a sense of familiarity among students in class. Teacher 5 deemed that students would feel comfortable to speak in groups or in pairs. Teachers 2 and 5 tried to give opportunities for students to speak. For the techniques used, Teacher 4 used name cards to give an equal chance for all students to speak. He also used leading questions to elicit the answers for students whose English competence was low. Teacher 5 asked students to change groups, so that they could speak with different people. Teacher 3 called on competent students to speak as a model to stimulate other students to speak.

As for the materials, Teachers 1-4 used the books developed by Thai staff, used in the university. Although Classes 1-4 were from the same institution, Teachers 1-3 used the same books (Pibulnakarin & Pokthitiyuk, 2007) and Teacher 4 used a different book (Chatpunnarangsee). For Class 5, Teacher 5 used a commercial textbook (Jones, 2002). Teachers had both positive and negative comments about the book. Teachers 3 and 4 found the book suitable for the students, because it was developed by Thai teachers. Teacher 4 perceived that the book was important for students at this level, because the book served as a comfort zone for the students, where they could refer to the language patterns that they needed to learn. All teachers said the book they used had some weaknesses. As a result, they used alternative materials to supplement the weak points.

In summary, the teaching practices employed by all teachers were influenced by teachers’ principles. It is clear that the teaching approach used by Teacher 3 differed
from other teachers. Teacher 3 emphasised that he let the students do the task before he gave them the rules because he believed that the language that the students were expected to learn was simple enough for the students to try to use it by themselves. On the other hand, other teachers (Teachers 1, 2, 4, and 5) usually gave students the language patterns before they let them do the tasks. Detailed information of the teaching practices that encouraged students’ WTC is presented for individual teachers.

6.3 Overview: Effects of teaching practices on students’ WTC

The effects of teaching practices on students’ WTC were derived from a comparison of findings of perceptions from students and teachers based on my observations. The findings of students’ perceptions about their WTC during the tasks were taken from their responses to stimulated recall interviews presented in the classroom context of variables affecting WTC in chapter 5. The findings about teachers’ perceptions on teaching practices that affected students’ WTC were taken from teachers’ responses to stimulated recall interviews presented in this chapter.

The analysis of stimulated recall responses was made in relation to the activities where the participants made comments. Not every activity in all classes can be used to analyse for students’ WTC in English because all activities did not require the students to speak. Only activities where students were required to speak were selected for the analysis. As witnessed, the participants did not speak English in all speaking class activities. The students’ perceptions about their WTC were then validated by my observations, whether the students spoke English or Thai during the class activities. Also, during the stimulated recall interviews, the teachers and students did not remember their feelings they had about all activities, therefore, the selection of the speaking activities also depended on the responses from students and teachers. Some speaking activities where both student and teacher participants did not give much comment were not selected. Due to the above reasons, the effects of teaching practices on students’ WTC are discussed based on how I saw the teachers using their teaching practices to encourage students to speak English and how I saw the students responding to the teaching, together with a comparison of students’ and teachers’ responses.
From my observations, the participants’ use of English varied in the speaking activities. I summarised the participants’ language use in speaking activities in Table 6.2. A detailed description of the analysis of teaching effects on students’ WTC in relation to the activities is presented in the section called, *effects of teaching practices on students’ WTC* under each teacher.

Table 6.2 Summary of language use in speaking activities selected for the analysis from all five classes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Language Use</th>
<th>Activity: Task Nature</th>
<th>Class management</th>
<th>Minutes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Eng&gt;Thai</td>
<td>A3T1: Open- short/ Role-play A-B</td>
<td>Pair Group Pair Pair</td>
<td>30 28 10 20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A3T2: Open- Long/ Discussion</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A1T5: Closed/ Choice</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A2T5: Open- Short/ No choice</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English only</td>
<td>A1T2: Open- Short/ Survey</td>
<td>Pair</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A2T2: Open- Short/ Survey</td>
<td>Pair</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A1T3: Closed/ Pronunciation</td>
<td>Individual</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A1T4: Closed/ Pattern practice</td>
<td>Pair</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A3T5: Open-Long/ Group Change</td>
<td>Group</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thai&gt;Eng</td>
<td>A1T1: Open- Long/ Judge</td>
<td>Group</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A2T1: Open- Long/ Love</td>
<td>Group</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thai only</td>
<td>A2T3: Open- Long/ Movie</td>
<td>Group</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A3T3: Open- Short/ Dialogue</td>
<td>Pair</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A4T3: Open- Long/ Abby</td>
<td>Group</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A2T4: Open- Long/ Advice</td>
<td>Group</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A = Activity; T = Teacher
As shown in Table 6.1, the language use in different speaking activities in the five classes was grouped in four ways: English used more than Thai, English used only, Thai used more than English, and Thai used only. It appeared that the participants’ use of language varied with the task nature and class management. Task nature was classified in terms of the language production demand described in chapter 5. The participants used English more than Thai or used only English in closed tasks where they had a language structure provided (i.e., pattern practice) compared to open tasks where they were required to produce the language without the language patterns to follow (i.e., group discussion). Open tasks were further divided into two types: open-long and open-short. Open-long task required students to produce the language extensively without patterns to follow. Open-short task required students to speak English without patterns to follow at a limited level. Usually, the participants used English in open-short tasks more than in open-long tasks, except two open-long tasks in classes 2 and 5 (A3T2 and A3T5). Regarding the class management, the participants used English more in pair work than group work, except two group work activities in Classes 2 and 5 (A3T2 and A3T5). My reflections on what I saw of the effects of teaching practices on students’ WTC needed to be validated by the responses from students and teachers. The analysis of teaching practice on students’ WTC based on the triangulation of data from three sources identified that the use of language in different activities varied with Task, Class Management and Interlocutors. An overview of the analysis of findings from students and teachers’ responses is presented below.

Students’ WTC was affected both by the nature and topic of the tasks. For the nature of the task, students were more likely to speak English in closed tasks than in open tasks. This outcome seems to be attributed to the quality of the tasks. Closed tasks provided them with the language patterns that they can follow and the students were not required to produce extensive language as they needed to do in the open tasks, therefore, most students were able to do the closed tasks, whereas the open tasks were successful only with students who have a high level of English competency. This interpretation is supported by the students’ responses and teachers’ responses. However, in Classes 2 and 5, the students used English to discuss among their group members in both closed and open tasks. This outcome can be attributed to the issue of language competency underlying their WTC in English and how the teacher managed
to deliver the task (class management). The effect of the class management is presented below. Another aspect of the task that affected students’ WTC was the lesson topic. My interpretation about the topics was supported by responses from both students and teachers. Topics that were relevant to students’ background knowledge seemed to encourage students to speak more than ones that were distant from their backgrounds. In addition, the topics that had no reference to real world knowledge were likely to reduce students’ concerns about the accuracy of their opinion. Thus, it encouraged students to speak more. For example, the topics about judges giving punishment for crime cases in a fantasy land encouraged more WTC in Class 1.

Class management refers to how the teachers deliver the task and how they assign the students to work. It is clear from the observations that the participants used English more in pair work than group work, except two group work activities in Classes 2 and 5 (A3T2 and A3T5). As I witnessed, the students were provided with language input in these two activities. For the Activity 3 in Class 2 (A3T2), the teacher presented the students with vocabulary and phrases that they would hear from the recordings. After the teacher played the conversation from the disc twice, the students were equipped with the language they could use in the task. Most participants used English in this open task, except Kai who was not competent enough. In the Activity 3 Class 5 (A3T5), the teacher gave plenty of opportunities for the students to get themselves prepared for the language about cultural differences they could use in the task one week before they came to class. At the beginning of the class, he let them recite the dialogue so they could familiarise themselves with the language to be used to discuss cultural differences. During the task, a group change technique was used to keep the students speaking on the same topic to orient the new members about their group topic. The repetition of speaking practice on the topic kept each group talking throughout the whole task period. This interpretation about the reasons for this outcome is validated by both students and teachers’ perceptions.

In relation to the effect of group work on students’ WTC, it appeared that the students’ WTC in English is usually affected by the persons with whom they were speaking (Interlocutors). However, the teachers did not acknowledge the advantage of having students choose their group mates or their partners themselves. In fact, the
teachers were more concerned that the students would not speak about anything irrelevant to the task if they worked with their close friends.

In sum, teaching practices that affected students’ WTC included interlocutors, tasks, and class management. From the students’ responses, students’ WTC was affected by interlocutors, task, and class management. From the teachers’ responses, teachers tried to encourage students to speak English through task and class management. Hence, it is seen that tasks and class management were consistently found from findings from students and teachers. However, the students’ responses about the effect of interlocutors on their choice of speaking were not found in the teachers’ responses. A detailed description of the analysis of effects of teaching practices on students’ WTC in relation to the activities is presented in the section called, *effects of teaching practices on students’ WTC* under each teacher.

**Teacher 1**

Teacher 1 was a Thai female in her early thirties who was an English instructor at UA. She was a former student at UA where she did her B.A. in English literature. After she graduated, she went to the United States to pursue her Master’s degree. She started her teaching career in 2000 after she came back from the US. She had worked at another university in Bangkok for three years before she moved to teach at this university. By the time I interviewed her (March, 2008), she has been teaching at UA for three years. She primarily taught English skill-based courses, for example, Listening and Speaking and was experienced in teaching this course.

**Teaching principles**

The teacher expected that the students should be able to develop their English speaking skill in four main areas: fluency, accuracy, appropriateness, and confidence. She believed that students should be able to speak English if they were presented with plenty of input, so that they would be able to use the input to apply it in communicative situations. In practice, she presented the students with the language input and then let them use the language they learned afterwards. She believed that to motivate students to speak involved cooperation from the students, as well as the teachers’ efforts. Having this principle in mind, when dealing with students who were
unwilling to speak, she would rather encourage them to speak to some extent and stop them if they seemed uncomfortable.

**Teacher’s expectations**

Teacher 1 echoed the four broad goals addressed in the course outline as ultimate goals. Although the students were expected to achieve those goals, the teacher did not expect them to go beyond the level of the course, which was introductory. “I guess being competent in speaking a foreign language is to be able to speak accurately, confidently, fluently and appropriately. That's rather broad but it's an ultimate goal. The four magic words describe the characteristics of a competent L2 learning. Yet, at this level, beginning I should say, those four adverbs should be applied to fit the language context of basic everyday English conversations, meaning that I should not overexpect my students' performance beyond the actual level of the course.”

**Teacher’s beliefs**

Teacher emphasised the important role of language input in learning language. She believed that the students acquired the appropriate usage of the language through digesting the input. The teacher believed that teaching speaking needed cooperation from students, as much as the teacher’s effort, in attempting to motivate them to speak. The teacher preferred to teach students who were motivated to learn even though their English was weak. For students who were unwilling to participate in the activities, she thought that if she pushed them too much, they would feel uncomfortable to speak. For students who were not willing to speak, she encouraged them to speak at some point. She preferred not to pressure them to speak. Moreover, she acknowledged that students needed more time to think before speaking out. She admitted that she was impatient in waiting for students’ responses.

Teacher 1 reported that input was very important. She said: “...I think the input is very important for their acquiring process. Many authentic examples are needed so that students can see how the target forms are used. If there are any cultural awareness related to the usage, I would raise and discuss it with them.” (Interview)

The teacher acknowledged her weakness, that she lacked patience to wait for students’ responses if they took long time to think before speaking. “I have little patience to wait for their answer. Just say, I think so, I don’t think so. It shouldn’t take them that
long. It’s a reflex. It’s an opinion. At least you need to say something. You shouldn’t just sit still and don’t say anything. If they don’t answer, I have to call them. If they still don’t answer, I have to turn to others who have potentials to speak so that I can move on. Sometimes, I think I speak too much. Just finish it so we can move on.” (Stimulated recall)

**Teaching approach**

Teacher 1 employed a teaching approach which seemed to be influenced by her beliefs that students can learn the language through plenty of input. The teacher believed that presenting students with plenty of input was important because they can apply it to use when they encounter similar situations.

To start with, she presented them with the input and then let them use the language patterns with the hope that they would realize the actual usage of certain language functions. She focused on listening more than grammar as shown by the following extract: “To help them achieve the goal, first of all, I have to be clear to myself what language expressions or structures used in the social situations/interactions we want to equip them. I try to present the target forms in meaningful contexts to emphasize the appropriate usage…I don’t stress grammar. I never asked them to send me the script. I focus on listening because I feel that the more we listen, the more we get used to it.” (Interview) After presenting the students with the target forms, she let them practice using the forms in activities. She believed that students would become confident and fluent through engaging in a lot of practice. “After they see the actual form used in contexts, they would do a lot of activities to apply their new knowledge in mock situations, role-play. This is the part I tend to devote most of my class time on because I think the more they practice using the language the more they become confident and fluent.”

**Teaching practices**

Teaching practices that Teacher 1 used to encourage students’ WTC were discussed in two ways: task and materials. For the task, she used the topics that promoted expertise in the answers, as well as tasks that刺激ated students to think. For the materials, she was not satisfied with the textbook because of its presentation and organisation. She used the book as a guideline for the content to be covered and arranged the lesson in
her own way. She supplemented the materials she deemed dull in the book with authentic materials which she believed would interest the students.

**Task**

Teacher 1 believed that tasks may facilitate students to speak English. Her responses about the use of tasks involved the topics and the nature of the task. Regarding the topic of the task, she tried to encourage the students to speak by using topics that promoted their expertise and amusement. Moreover, she emphasised that the use of a task engaged students to think and give reasons without being aware of their use of language.

In her general interview, the teacher talked about using the topic that gives the students expertise, where they did not have to worry about the accuracy of their responses as shown in this extract: “If it’s not in the curriculum, I will go for anything that I think they could be a source of information. This way they will be happy to reply. I’m not going to get them to give me a right or wrong answer. If I wanted them to do that, I would ask them in the exams. But in class, I think that if they feel that they are the authority in the subject chosen then they should feel relaxed and confident. Or I might ask them about their feelings. So sometimes, I just switched and talk about something irrelevant to the lesson to make them feel relaxed in answering.”

Based on the stimulated recall interview, the teacher reported on the topic of the task where students had to discuss their definition of love. She believed that the topic should be enjoyable to the students because she contrasted it with the topic of the death penalty. She said: “It should be something that people would find enjoyable to do, not as boring as something like, the death penalty. I guess that they should be interested in looking at different views on this topic. It’s about relationship and culture. To ask some questions if it’s appropriate in our culture.” (Stimulated recall)

Based on the stimulated recall interview, Teacher 1 recalled the task where the students lived in a fantasy world and had to be judges who gave sentences to each crime case. She said: “I think this is a good activity so I didn’t want to skip it. I think it helps stimulating students to think. I don’t care much about them using the pattern, “in my opinion or I think”. I’d like them to have fun about giving opinion and
reasons. In some classes, this activity can make people think and justify their reasons without any worries that they can’t speak English.” (Stimulated recall)

Materials

The teacher indicated that the topics were appropriate for the students. However, she criticised the course content as being too simple, which made it unlikely that interaction would take place. Also, she did not like the presentation and organisation of the content in the textbook. In resolving this, she reviewed the topics to be covered and she presented the lesson in her own style to make it more interesting for the students. Moreover, she admitted that she did not pay much attention to the textbook. She only used half of it for the purpose of preparing for the exams and to help the students to stay on the right track. To supplement the book, she used additional materials that might be attractive to the students. However, she pointed out that this needed to be done carefully, because some students found it difficult to use authentic materials.

This following excerpt shows the teacher’s assessment of the contents of the textbook. She said: “…I thought the topics were too simple and the students weren’t able to express themselves as much as they should be able to. Students had limited interaction.” (Interview) She did not like the textbook’s presentation and organisation. Regarding the presentation style, she thought that it was not interesting: “To be honest, I don’t like it. I don’t like the presentation. It’s just not interesting.” (Interview) Also, she did not like the organisation of the content. She said: “For example, I looked at the points to be covered for this chapter. I reshuffled them and presented them in my own ways, like I change from simply giving examples to a quiz, changing the materials to make it more interesting. Or sometimes, I will let them hear it and then locate them later in the script. I know that I’m getting away from the book.” (Interview)

The main reason that she used the textbook was for the purpose of the exams. “We need to use the book or pinpoint something in the book is for the exams. The listening exams will concentrate on the language points in the book, closed test that’s why I need to get them to practice listening, multiple choice, taking notes.” (Interview) Moreover, she thought that the book could facilitate the students to stay on the track.
She said: “Sometimes, I have to get back to the book on purpose so that the students will not get lost from the points they will be assessed on.” (Interview)

The teacher used authentic materials to supplement some parts of the lessons in the book that she deemed to be unsuitable. “Commercial texts, and clips from the internet, for example, YouTube. One example I took from YouTube was about hobbies, but it was in a rap style. So I thought the students should be interested in it…” However, she acknowledged that the authentic material can be threatening to the students because they did not know how much they were expected to perform the task from authentic materials. To resolve the problem, she demonstrated what she expected them to do. “From my observations, I think the authentic materials made them nervous because they would worry that they couldn’t comprehend it. And also they didn’t know how much I expect of them. I didn’t expect them to get it all at once. Like today, I asked them to watch VDO clip about London. They had to sit together with their partners, facing each other. One person saw the VDO, the other person didn’t. I asked the person who watched the VDO to explain to their partners what they saw. I thought they might find it too hard. When I first let them try it, they got confused and didn’t know what to do. Then, I had to adjust it a bit. I had to demonstrate to them. ‘There’re many people at the subway station. They’re walking up and down in ties and suits. I think they’re businessmen’. When they said, ‘What should I do?’, I had to demonstrate it to them. I think for people may not be able to click right away. We have to demonstrate to them in details, because they would worry about how much we would expect of them. But in fact, the essence is to get them speaking regardless of how right or wrong their language is. They just have to speak spontaneously.”

Effects of teaching practices on students’ WTC

From my observations, I selected three activities from Class 1 to analyse for their effects on students’ WTC because the students were required to use English to interact with their peers in these activities. The first two activities were of a similar nature in that the students were required to produce extensive language in open interactions in groups, while the third activity concerned closed interactions in pairs. The students used both English and Thai in all three activities. I saw the participants used Thai in the first two activities more than the last one.
In Activity 1 (A1T1), the teacher put students into groups of 4-6 to do group work for 25 minutes. The students were assigned to be a group of judges living in a Fantasyland where they have to give punishment for four criminal cases. This is presented in Figure 5.4 in chapter 5 (p. 106). The teacher explained what the students had to do and pointed out that there were no right or wrong opinions. All judges in each group were to share their opinions among themselves. After the task was finished, the teacher asked each group to report back to class about the sentence they gave for each case, together with their reasons. The students looked relaxed while doing the task. They used both English and Thai to speak with their peers to share ideas and help building English sentences to report to the class. Based on the stimulated recall interview, students’ responses can be grouped in two main ways. First, five out of six participants commented on the effect of group work activity. Bay and Ouan enjoyed sharing ideas with their peers in groups using both Thai and English. However, Makam felt that she did not have to speak because other people were speaking. Bua did not agree with the majority of the group so she did not want to speak. Duen did not speak much because she did not have her close friends in this group. Second, three participants Bay, Makam, and Ouan commented that they found the topic interesting. The teacher commented that this task can stimulate students to think and give reasons for their opinions. She was aware that students used Thai. She thought that it was because they were not familiar with using English with their group members.

In Activity 2 (A2T1), the teacher put students into groups of 4-6 to share opinions about their definition of love for 25 minutes. This is presented in Figure 5.5 in chapter 5 (p. 107). Each group was asked to choose one of the group members to be a moderator. After the task, the teacher asked each group to report their answers to the class. In this activity, students used both Thai and English. They looked comfortable while performing the task, but they did not look as engaged in the conversation as in Activity 1. From the stimulated recall data, the student participants’ responses were classified into: the effect of group work and the topic, similar to the Activity 1. For the effect of group work, Duen and Makam enjoyed talking in group. However, Bua did not want to share her ideas because she did not agree with the majority of the group. For the topic, Kam commented that she liked the topic in the Activity 1 more than Activity 2 because in Activity 2 she needed to have some background to be able
to do this task which inhibited her from speaking. This activity involved some questions for which the students did not know the answer, for example, “How do you feel about relationships where there is an age difference between the man and the woman?” This is different from the Activity 1 where they could speak freely from their imagination. For the teacher, she thought that the students should have enjoyed the topic in this activity because they could give their opinions about relationship and culture. However, she was not aware that the students may not have knowledge to comment about the topic.

In Activity 3 (A3T1), the teacher put students into groups of 2 to 3 and asked them to take turns to complete dialogues taking the roles of A and B (See Figure 6.1). Before the task, the teacher let the students do a listening exercise on the language patterns about agreeing or disagreeing with others’ opinions. After the task, the teacher asked students from different pairs to take the roles of A and B. The whole activity took 30 minutes. During the task, the students were speaking actively in English. The student participants did not give comments about this activity. For the teacher, she thought that this activity involved a range of topics that students could speak about.
From my observations, although the students used both English and Thai to complete all three activities, they seemed to use Thai in the first two activities more than the last one. Based on the analysis of the responses given from both the students and teacher and my observations, this outcome can be attributed to the effect of group work, topic and the nature of task. Students appeared to use English in pair works more than in group works. Participants’ responses about group works were found in two ways. Three participants (Bay, Duen and Ouan) stated that it was fun sharing opinions in groups, while one participant (Bua) said she found it difficult to speak in a group because she had different views to the majority of the group. This is related to the effect of interlocutors with whom the participants spoke. Four participants (Duen, Bay, Bua, and Makam) reported that the familiarity and characteristics of group members affected their WTC. This effect of interlocutors was not found in pair work.
Although the effects of interlocutors were mentioned by the participants, the teacher did not speak about it.

Concerning the effect of the topic of the task, different findings were found from students and teacher’s responses. When comparing the students’ perceptions in both tasks, it seemed that the students were not concerned about the correctness of their opinions in Activity 1, but they were in the Activity 2. Their concern about accuracy when expressing opinions was also mentioned by the teacher. She responded in the general interview that she tried to use the topic that students were the source of information, so that they did not have to worry about being right or wrong. This seemed to be true for Activity 1 because the students could speak freely from their imagination. However, for Activity 2 (Love), the students found it difficult to express their opinion because they were concerned about right or wrong. However, the teacher deemed that the students should find the topic about love enjoyable to speak because it was not as difficult as other topics (e.g., the death penalty). The teacher did not realise that the students did not have enough knowledge to give their opinions. Finally, the effect of nature of the task, it seemed that the first two activities involved an extensive level of interaction among group members. However, for the third activity, the students had guidelines about what to speak with their partners. This type of activity seemed to be appropriate for the students whose English is limited and those who do not have ideas to speak.

Summary: Teacher 1

The teacher set her expectations based on the four broad goals stated in the course syllabus. The goals of the course aimed that the students should be able to communicate in English confidently, accurately, appropriately, and fluently. The teacher believed that presenting students with plenty of input is important because they could apply it to use when they encountered similar situations. This belief influenced how she organised the class activity. She presented the students with the input of the language patterns and then let them use the language patterns with the hope that they would realize the actual usage of certain language functions. She focused on listening more than grammar. Three activities were selected for the analysis of the effects of teaching practices on students’ WTC during the tasks. The participants used Thai in the first two activities more than in the third one. This
outcome of unwillingness to speak English can be attributed to the effect of group work, topic and the nature of task.

**Teacher 2**

Teacher 2 was a Thai male in his late thirties who was an English instructor at UA. He had his B.A. in English from UB. He had lived in the USA for ten years to study for his doctorate. He has been teaching English at this university for ten years and has taught English skill-based courses and seminar courses. He was a very experienced teacher for this course.

**Teaching principles**

Teacher 2 primarily aimed to enable the students to be confident to speak English and to speak it more correctly. He believed that motivation was the key for learning. In his attempt to encourage them to speak, he used a lot of activities. He employed different approaches in different situations. Sometimes, he let the students do the task before explaining the language rule to them, while in other situations, he presented them with the rule before letting them do the task.

**Teacher’s expectations**

This teacher expected that the students should be able to use the language learned in situations in daily life. After they finished the course, they should be more confident in speaking English and speak better as he said: “We expect the students to comprehend the language used in daily life and be able to use it, also to increase their confidence in using English. We all know very well how reluctant Thai students are in speaking English. They tend to be shy and not explicitly express themselves. We have to encourage them to be more confident to speak. Hopefully, from day one until the course finished, they will become more confident to speak English and they can speak better.” (Interview)

**Teacher’s beliefs**

He believed that motivation was very important in language learning. If students were motivated, they were more likely to use the language. He also commented that the teacher needed to help motivate students to speak through the use of speaking tasks. By this, he emphasised the use of activities to get the students engaged in speaking.
As he stated: “Motivation is the key for learning. Motivation guides how much you want to use the language. Motivation is primary, proficiency is secondary. If these two go together, it will be very efficient.” (Interview) He commented that the teacher needed to use a lot of activities to encourage students to speak. He said: “The key is that the instructor needs to get students to participate. So we need to use activities. What we expect them to do is to apply the input we provide them and to use in practice. So we need to do a lot of preparation before teaching.” (Interview)

**Teaching approach**
The teacher used an eclectic approach, where he applied different approaches in his teaching to accommodate students in their learning. In some situations, the students could develop the understanding through practice using the language. While in other situations, they were given the rules before doing the activity. As he expressed: “It’s an eclectic approach. I’d like them to be able to comprehend the language to be used. But still we need to give them the language structure. We need to let them see what language should be used before they do the activity. When they do the activity, they repeatedly use the language patterns. It's a meaningful context. Some students even used their book while doing the task.” (Interview) Also, it was seen from his stimulated recall interview response that the teacher used an inductive approach in his teaching: “It’s for them to try to ask for advice and to give advice. I didn’t expect them to use the language provided, 'should', ‘ought to’, ‘had better’, ‘if I were you’. I just want them to say it. Most of them use ‘should’ rather than ‘if I were you.’ After this, I pointed out about the language. I have to be careful about giving them grammar otherwise they wouldn’t be able to cope with it.” (Stimulated recall)

**Teaching practices**
Teaching practices to promote students’ WTC were discussed in terms of class management, the task, and materials. For class management, the teacher tried to promote a sense of familiarity in the class from the beginning of the semester by having them work in groups. Regarding the task, he used the topics that were relevant to the students’ backgrounds. In terms of the materials, he used the textbook as a guideline and he tried to accommodate students’ understanding of the lesson by structuring the class procedure himself, not following the book. He believed that it was important to remain using the textbook because of the exams.
**Class management**

The teacher tried to establish a sense of familiarity in class by having students do group work. When I observed, I could see that the students enjoyed doing the activities. The teacher also emphasised giving opportunities for students to speak by calling on students who did not usually volunteer to speak.

The teacher built a sense of familiarity through the use of group activities. As he stated in the interview: “At the early stage, group work should help increase familiarity. I know that this class is quite content because we started with games until they felt secure, for example, introducing yourself, introducing others. They can get to know one another. Breaking the Ice. The questions like, What major are you in? What faculty are you from? What we did on the first day is for fun.” (Interview) When having difficulty getting responses from the students who do not usually volunteer to speak, the teacher called on them as found in his stimulated recall response. He said, “Most people who volunteer are the same faces. I’d like many of them to speak so I need to point them out.” (Stimulated recall)

**Task**

Teacher 2 reported on how he used the task to encourage the students to speak. His responses about the use of tasks concerned the choice of topics. He tried to use topics that were relevant to their background knowledge and humorous, because he believed that it would command the students’ attention.

In response to the video of his own teaching, the teacher recalled the topic he asked for students’ opinions about the need for a bathroom for gay men, which was a hot topic in the newspapers that week. He said: “I tried to use the topic that close to their background. Also, I tried to use the hot issues from the news, for example, gay’s room issue. I used this topic because there’re also male students, they could give their opinions. If there’re only females, I wouldn’t do it.” (Stimulated recall) In a survey activity, the teacher motivated students by creating a situation card that matched their characters to amuse the students. As he stated: “I tried to match the card to the character of students. It should make them feel fun. They all used English. I used this activity many times. I felt that it works, especially for weak students. They tried hard
to use the language. They had a lot of fun. They could use the language about giving opinion.” (Stimulated recall)

Materials

The teacher liked the textbook, but he preferred to rearrange the sequence of the lesson structure to present to the students. He constructed his teaching sequence to accommodate students’ understanding to be able to use the language in practice. He stated: “I don’t follow the book. I would plan the sequence of my teaching myself to make it meaningful to the students the most. For example, the lesson on giving opinions, I asked the students to brainstorm their ideas as a warm-up activity. I asked them for their opinions about current issues, like “War of Angels” (A popular Thai TV series). What do you think about this and that? Some students can’t use the language we expect them to use. Then, I give them the language structure to use. What do you think about? What is your opinion of...? Then, I have them listen to examples of the language used in the book. Then, they can practice using it. So it goes from warm-up, giving structure, listening, then they practice using it, in groups and then in pairs.” (Interview)

He emphasised that it was important to remain with the book, because the exams were constructed based on the content of the book as shown in the extract: “I need to use the book even if I brought in some additional materials because the test is based on the content in the book.” (Interview)

Effects of teaching practices on students’ WTC

From my observations, I selected three activities where the students were required to speak English to perform the tasks in different degrees. These three activities were classified as the open tasks. However, they were different in terms of the language production demand. The first two activities represented a restricted-language-demanding task. The third activity was an extensive-language-demanding task. The students used English actively in the first two activities, but not everyone used English actively in the last activity.

The first task type was represented by two survey activities (A1T2 and A2T2). In these two activities, the students were required to speak English at a restricted level. Students were given situation cards, with which they had to go around the class to ask
for their classmates’ opinions. From my three observations, the teacher let students do
the survey activities twice on different days. The students needed to ask for opinions
from their classmates in the first survey and they were to ask for advice from their
classmates in the second survey. Examples of situations on the two surveys were
“What do you think about my nose?” , “I might fail EG 241.”, and “I have bad breath.”
Each student with the situation card given had to go around the class to survey other
people’s opinion. After the task, the teacher asked students to report their answers to
class.

From my observations, I saw the students looked like they enjoyed using English to
ask for opinions and advice from their classmates. All of them used English
throughout the activity. This might be attributed to the nature of the task which
required students to provide achievable language production. All four participants
reported that they enjoyed talking with many of their classmates. Tan said he did not
have to worry about negative evaluation from classmates because no one heard them
speak to each other while they mingled in the centre of the classmates to survey for
opinions. Kai whose English competence was lower than the other three participants
talked actively in English in these two activities and thought that the tasks were easy.
For the teacher, he focused on selection of topic which had to be relevant to students’
background. He wanted the students to have fun. He thought that this kind of activity
worked for weak students. It seemed that students’ perceptions corresponded to that of
the teacher on the nature of task that encouraged students’ WTC.

In the third activity (A3T2) which represented the extensive-language-demanding
task, the students were asked to discuss among their group members for opinions
about the story they heard from a recording. The students were given a choice of
opinions and they had to choose the opinions they would agree upon, together with
the reasons. Three out of four participants in this class (Golf, Tan and Kim), used
English to discuss quite actively among themselves, only Kai did not say anything. In
her interview, Kai said that she did not understand the story, so she did not make any
notes and could not join her group’s conversation. Others in her group whose English
was better than hers said that they enjoyed talking about this topic. They all used
English for discussion in this group. The teacher said that he tried to integrate
listening and speaking practices in this task. His purpose was to have students listen to
the story, identify the key ideas, and express their ideas. From my observations, the teacher provided some vocabulary that the students would hear from the recording and played the disc twice. This showed that he tried to facilitate the students’ understanding about the story.

From my observations, all students in this class used English actively in the first two activities to do the survey with their classmates. However, not everyone used English actively in the last task due to its nature. Obviously, the last activity required a high level of proficiency. Thus, it did not work with low English competency learners. However, in the first two activities, the students of any level of English competency could participate.

**Summary: Teacher 2**

The teacher expected that students were able to use the language learned in class in their speaking practice. After they finished the course, they should be more confident in speaking English and should speak better. The teacher was aware that Thai students are reluctant to speak English, therefore, he used a lot of activities to encourage them to speak. The teacher commented that he used an eclectic teaching approach to accommodate students in their learning. In some situations, the students can develop the understanding through practice using the language, while in other situations they were given the rules before doing the activity. Three activities representing two types of language demanding tasks were selected for analysis of the effects of teaching practices on students’ WTC. The restricted-language demanding tasks (survey tasks) encouraged students of any level of English competency to speak because they were not too difficult for the weak students to participate in the conversation. All students enjoyed talking together. However, the extensive-language demanding tasks could only engage participation of students with a high English competence. Perceptions from both students and teacher were similar.

**Teacher 3**

Teacher 3 was a Thai male in his mid-thirties who was an English instructor at UA. He received his B.A. in English from UB. He finished his Master’s degree in Linguistics from the US. Before working at UA, he had taught English for about ten years. He had taught several classes, including literature, linguistics, and skill-based
classes; he liked teaching literature the most, because he had a strong preference for English literature. At the time of the interview (March, 2008), he had taught at UA for one semester. Thus, he did not have much experience teaching this course at this university.

**Teaching principles**

His primary aim was to enable the students to speak more often. Moreover, he wanted the students to be more aware of the correct pronunciation and actual language used by native speakers. Based on his background in teaching literature, he believed that English was learned through content, for example, learning how the language was used from the literature. However, he did not provide language input for the students before doing the tasks. He perceived that the language provided in the course textbook was easy enough for the students to learn inductively by themselves. Hence, he tended to let the students try out the language before explaining the rules to them.

**Teacher expectations**

While the teacher’s primary aim was to enable the students to speak more, from my observations, it seemed that the teacher did not provide adequate opportunity for the students to speak. It was clearly seen from the observations that the teacher devoted a large amount of class time focusing on pronunciation practice. For example, in day 1, the teacher let students to do pronunciation practices for 20 minutes out of total class time (70 minutes). He reported that the students should be aware of accuracy in their pronunciation, especially certain sounds that resulted in a serious misunderstanding if mispronounced. He also indicated that too much focusing on pronunciation could discourage the students from speaking. His response showed his contradictory views about his focus on pronunciation practice.

The teacher stated his expectation for this class as shown in the extract: “My expectation, regardless of the academic goals, is for them to be able to speak more.” (Interview) Moreover, the teacher also expected that students were aware of correct pronunciation to avoid misinterpretation. He said: “There’s always an element of surprise in class though. Certain things that you expect them to know, well sometimes they don’t. And sometimes they just don’t realize it, either. ... as you know, certain things are sometimes ingrained in their mental grammar. They just couldn’t hear it,
or they probably hear a completely different sound.” (Interview) Although he stressed the importance of pronunciation, he was aware of its negative effect as can be seen from his stimulated recall response: “I can’t help much with the content because this is not a content class. I can only help with their pronunciation, but again this can be tricky because too much focus on pronunciation can be very discouraging and disrupting to their speeches. My goal is that they should be able to communicate well not only with Thai teachers, but others as well. I guess just help them become more communicative.” (Stimulated recall)

**Teacher’s beliefs**

His principle in teaching English speaking was based on his experiences and preferences in teaching literature. He believed that learning English through literature could enable the students to develop their critical thinking, as well as to improve their language skills. He illustrated the value of a frequent use of the target language. He perceived that students became more confident and made fewer mistakes if they were familiar with using the language. However, he did not provide enough opportunity for students to speak. He treated the students as adults. If he found that students were not motivated to learn, he would not pressure them to speak.

The teacher stated that language could be learned through literature: “…I used to teach literature, I really liked it. I feel that if students are interested in literature, there’s no need for them to take listening or speaking courses, because it’s complete in itself. They have a chance to speak and listen to their teachers and peers in class; the subject is not vague, you speak about what you learn and you speak with reasons. You’ve become more critical to the thing you read. Literature helps students develop their critical thinking, they learn to give reasons to the reading and they also have to write a paper, so all the skills are there.” (Interview)

He stated that it was important to give students the chance to use English to increase their confidence: “For some students, they are just not brave enough to speak up because they hardly used English. And when they do, they get nervous. They worry too much about the grammar. However, when they get more chances to speak, I can see their confidence improves. When I ask them to speak in front of the class, I feel that they became more confident and less shy, which might explain the fewer mistakes
they made. Also the students are quite familiar with each other because they come to class with their friends.” (Interview) However, he positioned his role based on students’ motivation. He deemed that it depended on the students if they wanted to participate in class or not because they were adults and he did not want to force them. He said: “Some are quite motivated, really want to improve themselves, some just take it because it’s easy and they can get good grades, perhaps to make up with the bad ones they get from their own faculties...Some of them seem to think of the class as a stage, something unreal, whatever they do in class has no real-world applications, so once they’re out of the classroom door, they go back to their own/old pronunciation. I can’t help them much if they’re not really interested in learning. I’m not worried about English majors because their chance to improve themselves is plenty. It’s another story however for non-English majors...I am not a strict teacher, either. I don’t really like to scold students. They are adults and I want to treat them like ones, which some might take advantage of that. But overall, I’m satisfied with their eagerness to learn.” (Interview)

Teaching approach

The teacher emphasised the prospect of language acquisition through self-construction. He employed an inductive approach in his teaching, where he let the students try out the language pattern before explaining to them the rule and structure. This practice might be attributed to his perception that the language provided in the student book in this course was similar to the language they learned in their high school.

The teacher reported the approach he used. “I don’t usually think much about the approach when I teach...probably an inductive approach. I’d like them to try out by themselves so that they can gradually learn the structure of the language. I will talk about the rule and structure later on, but not too much of course. I don’t want to just give them the rules first, otherwise they won’t want to think.” (Interview) He believed that the content of the class was not different from their previous classes in secondary school. “Most of what we are dealing with in this class is not new. It’s what they’ve already learned in high school.” (Interview)
Teaching practices

Teaching practices to promote students’ WTC were discussed in terms of class management, task, techniques to encourage the use of English and materials. For class management, he tended to place students to do pair work, because they could not avoid speaking in pairs. The teacher realised that he should give an equal chance for students to answer. For the task, he used the topics that were relevant to students’ backgrounds. He focused on pronunciation practice. For techniques used to encourage the use of English, he tried to walk around the class to reduce the use of Thai. Also, he called on some competent students to speak so that they could be models for others. For the teaching materials, he commented on both positive and negative aspects of the book. He found the book suitable for the students, because it was developed by Thai teachers. However, he was not satisfied with the language provided in the book, because there were outmoded expressions. He used authentic current materials to supplement the language that he thought the students were supposed to know.

Class management

The teacher preferred to have students do pair work. He believed that it was unlikely that they would avoid speaking, because pair work involved interaction between two people. Also, he let students work in groups to exchange opinions. Moreover, students could learn from one another while they worked in groups. The teacher acknowledged that he should give an equal chance for students to answer. He was aware of his weaknesses in that he did not give equal chances for everyone to speak; this was because he could not remember every student’s name.

The teacher tried to get students to speak by having them do pair work as can be seen from the following extract of his interview: “Pair work helps because they can’t avoid speaking, which is always the case in group work. Another downside of the group work is that there’s always one or two persons who tend to dominate the group and intimidate other group members, especially the weak ones. I don’t think they mean to show off, it’s just how group work works. The students in the class that you observed, many of them are from the same high schools, so they know who’s good at English. So in group work, they know who they should listen to. Pair work is better because they have to take turns.” (Interview). In the stimulated recall interview, the teacher said he put the students in groups for them exchange their opinions.
“Sometimes, I put them in pairs. But for discussions like this one, I’d rather put them in groups. It depends on the activities, because there are lots of small activities in each chapter. Sometimes I asked them to work in pairs. Each pair can do one item. I feel that they are more confident to work in pairs and also they get to use the language more.” (Stimulated recall) He reported that students could help each other in their group work. “I think at least they can help each other. And I hope that weaker students can learn from their friends who are more competent than them. I find it weird to separate students into sections according to their grades. I think that system works for teachers. It’s easier for the teacher to teach. Students who are already good will still be good regardless of how the teaching is. Also, students don’t only learn from us, they learn from their peers as well.” (Interview) The teacher acknowledged the importance of opportunities for students to speak. “One of my problems is that I am not good at remembering students’ names, something I need to improve. I realize that I don’t always give them equal chances to speak, as I only call on some students whose names I remember.” (Interview)

**Task**

Teacher 3 reported that the topics provided in the textbook were not interesting, so that he had to find the topics from outside sources to motivate students to speak. In terms of the nature of the task, he focused on having students pronounce the sounds correctly.

In response to the video, the teacher stated that the topics were not interesting as can be seen from the following extract:

“So I get them to do the materials from outside because they already have the language pattern. Also I believe that it’s more relevant to them. Sometimes, I try to get them to talk about the controversial issues but they just can’t get around it. Part of it is probably because they don’t like to read newspapers or follow the news on TV. That alone already takes away an important tool that they can contribute to class discussion. So I have to bring more common issues to the classroom like sharing a room in the dormitory, something more relevant to them. When it comes to current affairs, you can’t expect much from students these days. Their current affairs are very much centred around star gossips.” (Stimulated recall)
The following excerpts showed that the teacher focused on pronunciation.

“For example, /t/ and /th/ sounds, I don’t think they did well with these two sounds. Like I said maybe it’s already fossilized. Also the sounds /l/ and /r/ are problematic. Maybe because Thai people are likely to replace the Thai /r/ with /l/, so it gets transferred to English. Funny thing is, if they pronounce them separately, they can get them right.” (Stimulated recall)

“I’d like them to try practicing the sounds. Last week, I got the game that could test their knowledge about Thailand. It’s suitable for chapter 7 because it was about places in our country. They really enjoyed the game but didn’t pay much attention to their pronunciation. They made it sound so Thai.” (Stimulated recall)

**Technique to encourage the use of English**

The teacher was aware that the students always avoided using English when doing group work. Therefore, he tried to walk around the class and monitored them while working in groups to prevent them from using Thai. Occasionally, he called on some competent learners to speak in order to stimulate other students in class to engage in the conversation. He said: “They don’t normally use English when they do group work. They only do it when I’m near. I try to go around the room and talk to every group, so that they won’t use Thai that much. Maybe they think the teacher is Thai, their friends are Thais, they just feel relaxed when working in group using Thai. So I don’t want to give them too much time to do group work, because they would use the time to speak about something else, in Thai. It’s not productive.” (Stimulated recall)

However, in some situations, the teacher let the students speak Thai because he did not want the students to feel deprived from speaking. “If we force them to speak English only, the class would be even quieter. It takes time I think to change their learning behaviours.” (Stimulated recall)

Surprisingly, the teacher acknowledged some benefits to letting the students speak Thai. “At first I didn’t feel good with them using a lot of Thai. But on a flip side, although they speak both Thai and English, they can still work on the context and they can present it to class at the end. Hopefully, they can learn something.” (Stimulated recall)
The teacher sometimes called on some competent students to speak. However, he noted the downside of this approach. “Sometimes, however, I purposely call on the good ones just to get the conversation or discussion going, so that others can follow. However, getting people whose English is good to speak first may intimidate others. So there is both good and bad sides to this approach.” (Interview)

**Materials**

The teacher mainly followed the book structure in his teaching because it was his first semester teaching this subject. The teacher perceived that the course content was appropriate to the ability level of students. He saw both advantages and drawbacks of the textbook. He found the course material useful, because it was written by Thai teachers. It served the students’ needs and it was culturally related. However, he noted some weaknesses about the language presented in the book in that it was too formal and some sounded unusual to native speakers. To supplement the language patterns the students learnt in class, he used authentic materials, for example, movies. In addition, he was surprised by the fact that the students were very familiar with formal language. He also wanted them to be more familiar with language usually used by people in their age group. He used authentic material (e.g., movies) to draw their attention to the language used in real situations.

The teacher reported that he followed the textbook. “I’ve just joined the faculty here and this is my first time teaching this class. I still have a lot to learn. And since this is my first time, I thought that I should follow the book. However, next time around, I should know better whether certain activities work or not, and which should come first and which later. I’m also learning.” (Interview) He stated that the content was appropriate for the students. “I don’t think the content is hard. I think it’s appropriate for first year students as they have just finished their high school. Whatever is in this book is not so different from what they have learned in high school. Conversations are basic.” (Interview) He saw that the language provided in the book was too formal and did not sound natural as he stated: “I’ve just used this book this semester and I can see some of problems mentioned above already. Some chapters are too long. Just impossible for me to cover everything. Also, the language used in conversations is too formal for the topics covered.” (Interview)
He was surprised that the students were familiar with the formal language used in the film as he said: ‘I let them watch the very first part of “The Queen” when Tony Blair was granted his first audience and was surprised that students felt very familiar with the language used in the movie, which is very formal. I think that tells us a lot about the kind of language students learn from the textbook. I just think they should get to know more about the informal language that people their own age use. They’re very much interested in slang and certain phrases employed by their own peers.’” (Interview) When encountering the language used in the movies, he usually brought up in class how people used the language in real life. “...when authentic materials, such as videos, are used, I try to emphasis that English speaking people don’t speak the way you see in the book, because textbooks usually feature only formal and ‘clean’ language or phrases, which is quite different from what they hear in movies. Some English major students know some expressions used in the movies. So apart from the rules, I will add something that people in their age normally use, just to get them to pay more attention.” (Interview)

**Effects of teaching practices on students’ WTC in English**

I selected four activities from this class for the analysis of the effects of teaching practices on students’ WTC. These four activities required different levels of language production. From my observations, the use of English among the participants in this class was very limited. The participants only used English in the tasks that required them to use English in a restricted manner. This seemed to be attributed to the type of task and class management.

In Activity 1 (A1T3), students were expected to correctly pronounce two sounds, /t/ and /th/. Each student who sat in a semi-circle shape was asked to say out loud one word that had either /t/ or /th/ sound. After the teacher went through every student in the class, he then asked them randomly to do the tongue twister exercise of these two sounds. This activity went on for 20 minutes. Kloy who always actively responded to the teacher in English was nervous that she had to pronounce one single word to the class. Nuna who always actively responded to the teacher in English found it boring. For the teacher, he emphasised that he wanted the students to pronounce English sounds correctly.
In Activity 2 (A2T3), the students were asked to work in groups. The teacher showed them some violent scenes from two movies. They were asked to discuss among themselves to decide whether the movie should be shown on air in Thai TV as well as giving the reasons. The participants used Thai to discuss among themselves and they helped each other transferred from Thai into English. Nuna and Joy said they used Thai because their group members used Thai. For the teacher, he admitted that the students used Thai while doing group work and he did not have problem with it. He was contented that they could collaboratively help each other build English sentences.

In Activity 3 (A3T3), the students were asked to work in pairs to create a short and simple dialogue about giving advice. This is presented in Figure 6.2. Each pair was asked to do the role-play for one situation. The students used Thai to make the dialogue in English. Three of the six participants (Nim, Nuna, and Kloy) said they used Thai because their partners used Thai and they were not familiar with their partners so they did not want to speak English with them. For the teacher, he ascribed the use of Thai to the level of English competency that the students had. When asked why students in each pair were asked to do one situation only, he said that he wanted them to try doing one situation as an example.
Activity 12  Pair work

**Directions:** Mark up a dialog for each of the following situations. Use the cues given below.

![Diagram]

**Problems**

1. You have gained some weight.
2. You had a quarrel with your boyfriend/girlfriend.
3. You don’t know where to eat out.
4. You don’t know what to give to your mother on her birthday.
5. You feel homesick.

*Figure 6.2 Example of class activity: Asking/giving advice (Class 3)*


In Activity 4 (A4T3), the students were asked to work in groups of 5-6 people. Students in each group had to act as “Abby” who replied to letters from people seeking her advice. “Abby” is a common by-line for an advice-columnist in many newspaper and magazines. They had to choose two from the three letters. One of the letters is presented in Figure 6.3. The students used Thai to discuss among themselves, then they transferred into English. Three of the six participants did not use English because people in the group used Thai and they were not familiar with them so they did not want to speak English with them. The teacher acknowledged that students used Thai to do the group work and he did not have problem with that because he knew that they were doing the task. Moreover, he maintained that he might consider having them read stories from Thai papers and they could speak about
it in English in class. It seemed that the teacher did not see that it was important for
the students to learn the language input about the task before having them do the task.

Figure 6.3 Example of class activity: Abby answers the letters (Class 3)

*Note.* From English for communication (p. 116), by J., Pibulnakarin, & Y.

From my observations, the participants only used English in the pronunciation
practice task. They almost never used English while they were performing the
discussion tasks. They used English only when they had to report the task outcomes to
the class or when they were called on to give the responses. The participants’
unwillingness to communicate in English seemed to be due to class management and
task. For class management, the student participants said they were not familiar with
using English with their group members. For the teacher, he was aware that the
students used Thai, but he never told them not to use Thai. Without being told to use
English, the students may have taken it for granted that they did not have to use
English while doing the task. Moreover, the students thought that the teacher did not
provide adequate opportunity for the students to speak. However, the teacher was not
aware that he did not give enough opportunity for students to speak. While working in
groups, students’ WTC depended on with whom they spoke. However, the teacher did
not show concern about this issue. For the task, the participants’ unwillingness to use English in performing the tasks may be due to the appropriateness of the task for the level of English competency of some students, for example, Nim.

**Summary: Teacher 3**

The teacher aimed to enable the students to speak more often. Moreover, he wanted the students to be more aware of the correct pronunciation and actual language used by native speakers. He believed that language was learned through exposure of language input (English literature). He did not believe that language could be learned through a skills course. He believed that the language provided in the course textbook was easy enough for the students to learn by themselves. Hence, he tended to let the students try using the language before explaining them the rules or drawing their attention to the language patterns. Although he stated the importance of frequent use of language, he did not give enough opportunity for the students to speak. Rather, he focused on listening exercises, his own talking, and pronunciation practices. Four activities were selected for the analysis of effects of teaching practices on students’ WTC. From my observations, the participants only used English in the closed tasks. For open tasks, they tended to use Thai. The reasons why the participants did not use English in the open tasks were not only because they were not competent to speak English, but were also not encouraged to use English in the group discussion tasks (open tasks). The participants were not familiar with using English to carry out the tasks because they did not realise that they were expected to use English during the task.

**Teacher 4**

Teacher 4 was an American male in his late forties who was an English instructor at UA. He had his M.A. in English literature and a certificate in EFL from the US. He has been working at UA for over 21 years. He has taught at various departments. For the English department, he has taught all the English skill-based courses. He also has taught other subjects at other departments, for example, intercultural communication in business for the graduate program. He was a foreign teacher who had a good understanding about Thai culture and the needs of Thai students. In addition, he had an excellent command of Thai.
Teaching principles
The teacher aimed to enable the students to feel comfortable when speaking English. Also, he wanted them to be fluent in speaking English. He believed that students could become fluent in producing the correct patterns if they exerted enough effort in practising the correct patterns through drills. This was reflected in his teaching practice, because he focused on having them repeat the language patterns. He believed that language was communicative which could only be acquired through practice and performance. Grammar was one aspect of the language, but not the key one. He did not put emphasis on grammar. Often, he stressed with the students that he had no problem with them making mistakes. About the teaching approach, he addressed that he used the “i +1” approach, where he presented the language input which was challenging but not too difficult to keep them motivated in learning.

Teacher expectations
Teacher 4 spelled out that his ultimate goal of this class was to enable the students to feel comfortable to produce English. Moreover, he aimed at promoting their development of fluency. To achieve this aim, he had them practice correct language patterns and keep repeating them in drills. Teacher 4’s aim to promote fluency in language functions through drills seemed to work successfully, because the students were able to use English after they spent time practicing the language with their partners. Also, he expected them to be independent in learning, because he knew that the students had relied on their teachers too much in the past.

In the interview, he indicated his ultimate goal: “To make the students feel more at ease in producing English.” (Interview) He emphasized having the students become fluent in speaking. “Another goal is I explain the meaning of fluency in class, their fluency is ability to speak in situations without much hesitation. So there’s lots of practice they have to do speaking correct pattern lots of I call it “fluency practice”, speaking pattern in different situation. It involves drills. It involves practice of intonation and stress. Practicing lots of functions together, stress, intonation, grammatical patterns. Drill again and again and again in different situations to increase their fluency. The ability to produce correct patterns for the appropriate situations, like “how do you do?” instead of “how are you?” in the right situation, okay?” (Interview)
He stated that the students’ problems came from learning habits, such as Thai students relying too heavily on their teachers. “12 or 13 years they’re waiting for the teachers to tell them. Bird, Nok. That’s not a meaning of the word “bird”. That’s the Thai synonym. So very hard for them to break out of the teacher dependence. But if they’re going to develop their language, they have to learn to become independent learners. But very difficult. Learning because they want to know not because it’s an assignment.” (Interview) He gave the example of a pronunciation problem that came from transmission of mistakes from teachers to students. “Many students don’t trust dictionary in the beginning. They trust their teachers. And, even though the dictionary will show one way to pronounce “photogra’phy”, how difficult for them to say that? Because it doesn’t sound right. They learned it in primary school or high school, this way. Very hard to those fossilize. That’s the only stress on pronunciation. Not a lot.” (Interview) Another problem, which came from dependence on teachers, was that students developed the misunderstanding of “synonym” and “meaning” of words. As he expressed: “If I asked them the meaning of a word, and I told them that a meaning is not a synonym. A meaning is not how you say it in your language. A meaning is an explanation of the word.” (Interview) In order to solve the problem, the teacher believed that the students should be independent. “I want the students to be as self-directed as possible in their learning that’s why I make them bring dictionary to class so that they will start using them...to try to get them to learn how to learn by themselves.” (Interview)

**Teacher’s beliefs**

He considered language as a communicative tool which was developed through practice and performance. With this principle, he did not emphasise grammar. He instead focused on pattern practice. He also believed that the way the students would acquire the language pattern was through making an effort to practice patterns learned in class.

The teacher stressed his beliefs about learning language. “All languages are communicative, but I don’t put great stress on grammar. I don’t teach grammar.... But for speaking, for most courses in learning languages, a little bit of grammar goes a long way. You don’t need it. You don’t need to learn it consciously. You need to be able to produce correct language and that’s only accomplished through the practice, performance. I told my students that learning English is like learning to play musical
instrument, reading a book of theory, but not make music. Grammar is theory and performance is quite a bit different.” (Interview)

He emphasised the importance of pattern practice, because correct patterns developed comprehensibility. He noticed that the common mistakes found in Thai/English came from negligence of patterns. “My concern is comprehensibility and comprehensibility depends upon the correct pattern as a primary. Speech like, “what would you advise me to do?” But not, “What would you suggest me to do?” They’re different. Different advice patterns. Function patterns... Don’t take a word from one and put them on another, which is very commonly done that’s why we get “should to” and “must to” in Thai English.” (Interview)

The teacher believed that students could master the language patterns through making an effort to practise using it. He pointed out one example of the student who had an overseas experience, but could not make much improvement because her effort was minimal. “She has a lot of difficulty producing because she doesn’t produce in class. So even though that she did go to the States and her listening ability is better than most. She doesn’t speak and so she doesn’t improve. She could improve but she doesn’t. She comes to class late frequently and she just sits there. She will do the pair work with other students, but I mean her performance or her effort is minimal in the class. And so her improvement is minimal too. But that’s easy if you’ve gone abroad. It’s easy just to ..to this class without much effort. She will get a B. but she’s not an A student.” (Interview)

**Teaching approach**

He referred to the approach he used as “l+1” which is supposed to be the approach called “i+1” that refers to a teaching method that presented the linguistic input with one level ahead of their language competence. This was done in order to keep the students motivated to learn new things. He said: “Methodology is something very simple. ‘l + 1’ [sic] you keep the pedagogical goal slightly ahead the language competence but not too far ahead. It’s always the question of maintaining a motivation. To keep to learn and learn new thing. Without the motivation, learning will not occur for any subject.” (Interview)
Teaching practices

Teaching practices to promote students’ WTC were discussed in terms of class management, task, techniques to encourage the use of English and materials. In terms of class management, he tried to create a comfortable atmosphere by putting students in pairs so that they would feel relaxed and not worry about errors. Also, he tried to give an equal chance for everyone to speak by using name cards to call students to speak. For the task, he commented that the students used English most often in highly structured tasks, rather than in loosely structured tasks. In terms of the techniques employed to encourage the use of English, for students who were unwilling to speak, he would encourage them to speak by asking leading questions. For materials, Teacher 4 was the only teacher who saw the importance of the textbook and followed the book in order to make the students feel comfortable. He argued that the book was important for the students of this level of English, because it served as their comfort zone which provided them with language references. He commented that the course book developed by Thai teachers was appropriate for the students, because it provided relevant information to students’ background knowledge. Also, it fulfilled the specific needs of Thai students.

Class management

The teacher emphasised creating a comfort zone to help the students to feel comfortable to speak English and not worry too much about errors. By this, he tried to encourage students to feel comfortable about making mistakes. Also, he let them work in pairs and in groups to make them feel relaxed. He also used humour to minimise the tension and pressure that students might feel during class. Furthermore, the teacher used name cards to randomise the students in responding to his questions to keep the student alert, so that anyone had an equal chance to be chosen to answer a question.

The teacher tried to encourage students to feel comfortable about making mistakes as can be seen from this following excerpt: “So I want the students to feel comfortable about making mistakes. I tell them I don’t care about making mistakes. Don’t worry about saying it perfectly. Keep saying the pattern often enough. Keep repeating often enough and you will develop the fluency but you have to say it to be able to learn it...Maybe certain teachers put stress on correctness. I just put the stress on making
the noise. Just make the sounds. Don’t worry about being correct. It will come if you practice enough. There’s a kind of anxiety about the right thing to say. You have to try to diminish that anxiety as much as possible. Go ahead. Making mistake I don’t care. (Stimulated recall)

The teacher had students work in pairs, so that they did not have to worry about a negative evaluation from the class, such as they might experience in a presentation situation. “They’re shy, but once you created a comfortable atmosphere for them and a secure atmosphere. They’re not embarrassed in front of everybody, they can speak in pairs or whatever and you alter the pair frequently so they’re not always speaking to the same person. They’re more than willing to speak. But you have to get them in their comfort zone when they’re not concerned about errors.” (Interview) Apart from pair work, the teacher also used group work to get students to speak. Alternatively, he tried to alter the groups’ members to stimulate the students to speak more. “I tried to randomize who they speak to as much as possible. So they don’t speak to the same people. It’s easy to fall into habits with certain people or friends who let their close friends get lazy. Try to make it as public as possible. Changing partners as much as possible, changing group as much as possible. So they can’t rely on falling into the pattern with their mates because they always sit next to a friend. It’s easy for them go back to their relationship...they might talk about other things but if I put them in a group with people they are not close to. There’s the better chance that they will do the activity.” (Stimulated recall)

Also, he alleviated tension and pressure by using humour. Responding to the stimulated recall interview, the teacher said: “Humorous at times they can joke about. That helps...it’s the question of applying and releasing the certain amount of pressure. You can’t always be stressed. That would be counter-productive for their learning. But it can’t be fun the whole time either they have to learn thing. It’s a matter of trying to balance. And that will vary from class to class. From student to student.” (Stimulated recall)

The teacher also tried to give an equal chance for everyone to speak by using name cards to randomise the students responding to questions. This technique was able to stimulate the students to stay alert about what was going on in the class. “I tried to
randomize the representative again so that everyone should be aware of what's going on...I put the names on cards. Choose the place. I try to randomize as much as possible, all the activity, all the partners, when their names are chosen, so that they will separate the language from any specific task. So randomize them who’s going to answer the questions.” (Stimulated recall)

**Task**

The teacher commented that different tasks compelled the students to use English differently. He deemed that the students used English the most in highly structured activities, while the less structured tasks increased the use of Thai. This corresponded to my observations. The teacher emphasised that he did not focus on grammar in his teaching. Nevertheless, he used one task that concerned the grammar function of passive voice. He explained that he had to let students learn about the grammar patterns, because they would be tested on them in their final exams.

In the stimulated recall interview, the teacher compared the nature of activities shown in the video and commented that students were able to use English in highly structured activities, compared to less structured ones: “Look at the three activities and how sequenced in the book, from highly structured and the patterns were given for them, the second one, it’s less highly structured, but they can bring in the pattern from the previous activity. The third is completely free and see if they learned the pattern or not. They could write a role play. But they couldn’t just speak it. They can collaboratively write a role-play and then perform it instead of just speaking it. So often that you take away the structure, they’re lost. But this is what they have to have. The practice because you don’t structure you don’t plan conversation with strangers so there’s an increase in the use of Thai…” (Stimulated recall)

Also in the stimulated recall interview, the teacher let the students do the task about the passive construction, because the students would be tested on this rule in their final exams: “This is something from another book. Learning to speak a more formal English about places and events. ...It’s a function about place and time. Passive voice verbs. I only did that because it’s on the final exam. It’s not in this book. Because on the final exam, they will be hearing a paragraph about a country and it’s from a written form, it's not spoken English. So this is what you’re going to hear. Grammar.
Passive voice. Where something is located? When something happened? Why somebody did something.” (Stimulated recall)

**Technique to encourage the use of English**

The teacher employed some techniques to promote the use of English in class. For students who were not willing to speak, he tried to ask them leading questions which required information, rather than ‘yes’ or ‘no’ questions: “Suthinee had to speak today an activity in which other students spoke quite a lot. And with her, it was like I struggle to pull out a sentence. Other students can speak quite easier on this topic. But she was very reluctant and I had to ask leading questions frequently and still. So for students like her, you tried to ask leading questions. Not yes or no questions, but leading questions in which you have to put in sentence.” (Stimulated recall)

The teacher monitored the students while doing the tasks to decrease their opportunity to use Thai. “I walked around to get them to speak English. Not let them know where I am over time. It’s just the point that you don’t learn English by speaking Thai. Very simple. That’s the problems that the activity is structured simple enough that they should try to speak in English as much as possible. No deep pedagogy there. If they’re in a group work, I’m more flexible letting them speak Thai.” (Stimulated recall)

Nevertheless, the teacher acknowledged the difficulty the students had to produce the language in the loosely structured activities which resulted in their using Thai to carry out the task: “I can’t be too strict on that. I know why. They’re out of their comfort zone that is highly structured for them. They’re able to produce a dialogue and advice… I can’t force them to speak English a hundred percent at a time. So, as long as they’re able to give some advice at the end. Speaking Thai also is a way to letting off pressure letting off … They can’t keep up the level of intensity the whole time. That’s too much for them. Not a lot, just a few minutes. Yeah I can understand what they’re doing. They’re not talking about going shopping or lunch. They’re talking about the activities. But they’re just doing it in Thai. At least they focus on the activity. They just do the activity. How to say...that’s okay. But if they talking about lunch, boyfriends, music. That’s the problem. But they’re not.” (Stimulated recall)
Materials

The teacher deemed that the textbook was important for students at this level, because it served as the students’ comfort zone. He also pointed out the function that the book served as a guideline for the lesson which provided vocabulary and language patterns. Moreover, he believed that this book was appropriate for the students because it was written by Thai teachers who knew what Thai students needed. Although some structures were very simple, they needed to be included because students were not competent to handle those simple patterns. However, there was no ideal book. Every book had weaknesses. If he found any weaknesses in the book, he would supplement it with other materials. He used supplementary activities, which had the same goals and functions as the original activity.

He gave the following reason why he used the book: “I follow through the activity in the book because they feel comfortable. It’s their comfort zone they have a book. Higher levels are not so book centered, more activity centered, research, situation debate. Something more challenging. But for this level, a book is very comfortable thing for the students to have following the book. But in terms of dynamic methods, the book doesn’t help with that. The book just provides the raw material what we have to learn whether to buy thing, apologizing, or giving direction. Just provide the vocabulary and the patterns. There’s no ideal book. It’s got strengths. It’s got weaknesses, every book. There’s no perfect book. (Interview)

He thought that the book was appropriate for Thai students: “So these books are appropriate, written by Thai teachers who know what Thai students need. Material has to be headed towards the students. It’s interesting. They have English for ten years, but they still cannot do simple introduction. They just haven’t had the practice of doing it of formal and informal introduction. This is simple pattern. “I'd like you to meet”. “May I present..” Repeating the name twice. ..It’s not just linguistics. It’s part of the ceremony in introduction. They’ve never learned that and how difficult it is for them. An entire first chapter introduction seemed very simple, seemed very elementary for some English native speaking teachers who come over here. They said that’s too easy. Thai students have difficulty even doing simple introduction.” (Interview)
He admitted that the book had some weaknesses and he supplemented the weaknesses with additional materials: “If there’re any weaknesses in the book, I’d supplement them with other materials. Some to the activities here I find hopeless. I don’t understand how the teacher can do them... I use other but for the same goal, same functions. Sometimes, I will bring the activity on word stress or on vowels, different activity. How they pronounce the words and they have to use the dictionary to get the answer and to say them to their partners. I’ll have the activity like that for pronunciation...I’ve got supplement activity on vowel sounds, on stress in words, borrowed words. And, don’t use them in English. You can’t tell somebody in a company “don’t be serious” it’s meaningless to a native speaker...Serious never meant stress in English. Lots of Thai English and lots of miscommunication arise because the meanings are changed.” (Interview)

**Effects of teaching practices on students’ WTC**

I selected two different activities from Class 4 to discuss for their effects on students’ WTC. Activity 1 (A1T4) represented a highly structured activity (closed task) whereas Activity 2 (A2T4) represented a loosely structured one (open task). From my observations, most participants used English in the Activity 1, but none of them used English in the Activity 2.

Activity 1 (A1T4) was a pattern practice, with the students having language patterns about problems and advice that they can use. This is presented in Figure 5.2 in chapter 5 (p.103). The teacher let students practice using the language patterns with the book for a while, then he asked them to close the book and let them use the language. The students seemed enjoy using English in both episodes of the activity. Students’ responses were summarized in three main ways. First, three out of six participants (Pim, Apple, and Chom) said the patterns provided had made them feel confident to speak and they had no problem when they had to speak with their partners without the book. Second, these three participants said that they were willing to speak because of their partners. Third, Boom said that the topic was fun and useful. For the teacher, he expected the students to practice using patterns in the language functions. He deemed that there was enough time for them to practice, so that they could develop
automaticity. He also commented that he asked students to close the book to check whether they have learnt the patterns they practised.

The three out of six participants who enjoyed using English in the pattern practice activity seemed to perform at a lower quality in their English speaking than the other three participants. This might be because they were confident in using English in the pattern practice activity where they were not required to produce the language by themselves. The participants who were more proficient in their English did not comment on the use of English in this activity.

In Activity 2 (A2T4), the teacher asked students to work in groups to create some advice for foreign friends about travelling in Thailand (See Figure 6.4). Students were assigned numbers 1-5 and they had to form groups of people who had the same number. The number of people in each group ranged from 4-6. After the task, the teacher selected one person from each group to report back to class for the list of things they thought about. This activity lasted for 55 minutes. During the task, the participants used Thai to discuss among themselves what to advise the tourists to bring. Then, they collaboratively translated the answers in English.
Figure 6.4 Example of class activity: Giving advice for their foreign friends when travelling in Thailand (Class 4)


The participants’ responses about this activity can be grouped in two ways. Three participants concerned about things to say. Apple liked to brainstorm ideas in Thai then transferred into English. However, Aoi found it difficult to transfer their ideas in Thai into English. Boom said she had nothing to say. Another group of students’ responses concerned the effect of interlocutors. Yani did not want to speak much because she did not feel familiar with the members of the group she was put in. For the teacher, he accepted that the students used Thai when doing the group work because they did not have the structure to follow which was different from the first
task. He was aware that students wrote the role-play instead of speaking it. Moreover, the teacher tried to randomise the group so that the students did not talk about anything irrelevant to the task.

From my observations, it seemed to be true that students’ WTC differed according to the nature of task. It seemed that both students and teacher acknowledged this effect of task nature. However, there seemed to be a contradiction between students’ responses and the teacher’s response in relation to the interlocutors with whom the students spoke. For students, they wanted to speak more with their familiar classmates. However, the teacher did not see the advantage of putting familiar classmates in the same group.

**Summary: Teacher 4**

The teacher aimed to enable the students to feel comfortable when speaking English. Also, he wanted them to be fluent in speaking English. He believed that students could become fluent in producing the correct patterns if they exerted enough effort in practising the correct patterns through drills. This was reflected in his teaching practice, because he focused on having them repeat the language patterns. Two tasks were selected for the analysis of the effects of teaching practices on students’ WTC. Students used English to speak more in the closed task than on the open task because they were not competent enough to use English freely without the language pattern to follow. Another reason was due to the arrangement of the members in the group. Different findings were found from students’ and teacher’s responses. The students were willing to speak more if they had to speak with their familiar classmates. For the teacher, he was worried that students would not pay attention to the task if they worked with their familiar friends, so he tried to randomise the group.

**Teacher 5**

Teacher 5 was an American man in his mid-thirties who was an English instructor at UB. He had received his B.A. in English literature and a Cambridge Certificate of English Language Teaching to Adults (CELTA). Before he came to Thailand, he had taught ESL classes at a language school in California for three months. At the time of the interview, he had worked for UB for three years. He was responsible for English skill-based courses and also English for tourist guides. He does not speak Thai.
Teaching principles

The teacher set his aims based on the characteristics of the students in this class who were all English majors. He expected that the students should be able to speak English with people who speak English, not only Thai people. In achieving that expectation, he tried to encourage the students to be aware of the topics that people speak in real life. He believed that the main element of communication was confidence to speak which included non-verbal language. However, he also maintained that grammar was important because the students were English majors. Also, he provided them with critical feedback to allow them to see their weaknesses. He seemed to follow the procedure of teaching that included presenting students with language input before letting them produce it later. He emphasised that it was important to ensure that the students understand the task and the language they were expected to use.

Teacher expectations

Teacher 5 expected that the students should be able to communicate in English with any people who speak English, not only Thai people. Consequently, he tried to encourage the students to be aware of topics that people are interested to talk about. Because the students were English majors, he expected that they should be prepared to work in an English speaking environment. Also, this assumption influenced his choice of topics of speaking, because in the two classes that I observed the students had to speak about cultural differences.

The following excerpts indicated the teacher’s expectations. He aimed to enable the students to be able to speak English with people who speak English as a first language, not only Thai people: “I want the students to be able to have a conversation in English with people who speak English. My expectation therefore I guess was to try to get the students to step outside of their cultural boundary a little bit to realise that if they speak English, they not gonna be speaking with Thai people. And therefore, they don’t have to be restricted by the Thai way of talking.” (Interview)

With this aim in mind, he tried to encourage the students to be aware of topics that people are interested to talk about. He included this kind of topic in his teaching to prepare the students if they encountered these situations later in their life: “I decided what are the things that people talk about the most, they talk about culture, culture
and ethnicity and the world and conflicts. They talk about the law. Who’s been arrested for what crimes? And they talk about things like education. Different schools so I just thought. Let’s try to get each student confident to talk in this area so that maybe five years from now when they’re sitting on Khao San Road (a famous road for tourists in Bangkok) talking to someone from Germany. They may be able to offer something to the conversation because I think that the Thais want to join in that kind of conversation.” (Interview)

As the students were English majors, his expectations were not restricted to only speaking English in classrooms, but to be able to use English to communicate at work: “In fact, in the world you expected, in many places in the world, you expected to say what you think. …So the students need to realise that if they’re English major, obviously that means they’re looking for career where they use English. … I think you’re going to be able to talk to people…. they gotta be able to talk about that with them, what’s happening in Iraq, the election in Russia. This is the thing that people talk about. I wanted the students to get this idea that they should be able to talk about this thing.” (Interview)

Teacher’s beliefs

The teacher believed that grammar was not the crucial component when the students spoke for communicative purposes. However, he still had to focus on grammar, because the students were English majors and would be tested on their grammatical knowledge. Moreover, he emphasised giving critical feedback, because the students need to know their weaknesses in order that they could improve. He believed that it was important that the students comprehended the language input provided for them, because they could use it as a resource to produce the language. The teacher believed that students could learn the language if they made the effort to practice using it.

The following excerpts illustrated the teacher’s beliefs. The teacher did not believe that grammar was the most critical aspect of speaking. In fact, he thought that confidence and communicative ability, including body language and energy, were the key factors: “I stressed grammar with them because they’re English major. They study the language. But I don’t feel grammar is the most important aspect of speaking. I really think confidence and how you can express yourself. Your body language, your
energy, these are the important things when you communicate with people.” (Interview)

He provided critical feedback to point out to the students their weaknesses. He stressed that it was important that the students were aware of their weak points in order that they made more effort, so that they could improve: “They need to know that it’s not good enough and it just can’t always be well hey good try. Sometimes, they need to know. You’re not working hard enough. You obviously not opening this book from Wednesday to Wednesday. You’re not thinking about this subject. ...They’re English major. They’ve chosen to study this language. They need to treat it like a job. And really master it. Otherwise, what’s the point?” (Interview)

The teacher tried to create an understanding and awareness about current events, so that the students learnt to comprehend the reading materials: “So I try to get them to see the bigger picture. I mean religion is one aspect of culture. So they learn what ethnic minority means or ethnic clashes. All of these, if they open up the paper, they can see wow in ...there’s this problem. Ethnic clashes whatever. Oh I understand this. Once you understand something. It becomes more interesting to read.” Moreover, he expected the students to make an effort to practice the language learned from the class. “...as far as the participation goes, they’re participating. But the work they do outside class, I don’t feel they put much effort outside of the classroom and they would think that’s because they know it already, but what they don’t realise is that there’re little grammatical mistakes, they’ll not be able to correct them. Even though I told them okay so and so wow your English is so good. But, try stressing this word, try joining these words together, contractions.”

**Teaching approach**

The teacher employed a teaching approach which corresponded to his teaching beliefs regarding facilitating understanding. He seemed to follow the traditional method of teaching where he introduced the students to the language before letting them practice it. In teaching, he spent some time to prepare students with some vocabulary before letting them do the task in order to accommodate their understanding of the task. “Generally, basically, introducing vocabulary, followed by examples of how those vocabularies used, followed by conversations. The materials like a supplemental
material is sort of set up with that fill in the blank, stuff on the front page ...some kind of reading passage. So I have them in pairs read the passage to each other. They might be a gap fill where I’ll read and they have to listen and try to write the missing words, the phrases, an example of the conversation. Maybe set them off with 4 or 5 different topics. So I try to stick to that.”

**Teaching practices**

Teacher 5 exercised his teaching practices to maximise students’ WTC in English through class management and selection of additional materials. To encourage students to speak through class management, he provided encouragement for the students so that they did not have to worry about the correctness of their answers. Also, he facilitated students’ understanding before letting them speak and provided plenty of opportunities for students to speak. He used the materials to supplement the textbook and to overcome its limitations.

**Class management**

The teacher tried to manage the class practices to assist the students’ WTC in English. The teacher tried to alleviate tensions regarding correctness in language and content of information provided. Also, he emphasised facilitating the students’ understanding by providing them with linguistic resources and promoting familiarity in the classroom procedure by keeping the lesson procedure consistent. Moreover, he employed a technique to maximise the students’ talk by providing them with an opportunity to speak and asking them to rotate to different groups.

The following excerpts showed the teacher’s attempt to encourage the students’ WTC in English through class management. He stressed that being able to communicate was more important than having perfect grammar: “Let them talk and even if the grammar’s not perfect. Pronunciation isn’t perfect. They were still freely expressing themselves. I think that’s important part of the language as important as the proper grammar, maybe more important than proper grammar. American emigrant don’t have very good grammar. They don’t have very good pronunciation. But they can still survive.” (Interview) Also, he encouraged them not to worry about the correctness of their opinions: “…offering a lot of encouragement that there’s no wrong opinion. You just have to be able to support your opinion with real reasons. Encouragement. You
just have to constantly encourage them that it’s okay to say what they think.” (Interview)

He tried to facilitate the students’ understanding before letting them talk: “…I try as much as I could to let them talk, but I try to really spend some time before they talk. These are what these phrases mean. Put them in a sentence.....okay let them go. ...I might spend an half an a half on vocabulary or an hour. It’s pointless if they don’t understand. You can’t ask someone to use vocabulary they don’t understand.” Also, the teacher tried to promote familiarity by establishing a routine for the students to follow. “I think the pattern is pretty consistent. One week of introducing the concept, second week of them, pretty much talking to each other, third week evaluation.” (Interview)

The teacher tried to maximise the students’ talk time: “I’m encouraging them this is speaking class not research class so open your dictionary, talk to each other. What do you think? Oh I think it might be this. This word means this... I want you to talk to each other. I try to get them to speak as much as I can. What we call student talk time, right? Try not to talk too much myself which is hard. That’s my goal. It’s them talking as much as possible.” (Interview) The teacher asked the students to rotate between groups in order to get the students to speak about something different. Also, they could get a chance to speak with different group members. In the stimulated recall interview, the teacher gave the following reason why he asked the students to rotate the groups: “Mainly, I found this is a good way to keep the students talking. Because they may only have a limited amount of things to say on the topics, but changing the groups they can begin the conversation from the beginning, as the idea here was that they are practicing...so repeating their ideas is good for them. Beyond that, moving students around and forcing them to speak with other students (not their friends that they might sit next to) is important in my opinion, as they should interact with as many as possible, and this also keeps them on topic and not discussing going out for Som tun and sticky rice after class, etc.” (Stimulated recall)

Materials
This class used a commercial book as a student textbook. The teacher reported that he did not like the book used for this semester, because it did not provide enough useful
information. He thought that the activities provided in the book were not interesting for the students, because they had done them for many years. Therefore, he only used the book as a guideline for the content to be covered. He preferred to use additional materials to let the students do different activities.

The teacher did not like the book. “This book here. Let’s talk. I barely touched it. I open it a couple of times. I was looking at the unit and I say okay that’s the topic. To me, there’s nothing in the book that’s really useful. So I just went and I got some other materials that related to that topic…I don’t see how the structure can benefit anybody. I just don’t see it. I hate this book with a thousand pictures, charts and graphs. I just think what’s that? It’s all for show. I don’t see any substance.” (Interview) He deemed that the activities provided in the book were boring for the students. “Here we’re talking about how to ask for a shirt in a larger size. Can you give me directions to the bank? This is certainly practical, useful English. But for the students this is the same thing, they have been studying for twelve years. So it just seemed pointless because as important as it is to be able to ask for directions. Also quite important to put together a sentence. A conversational sentence right? So something a little more meaningful.” (Interview)

The teacher reported that he did not follow the book closely. Instead, he used the book as a springboard to introduce the students to a language focus. In the stimulated recall interview, the teacher recalled his purpose that he used the book to introduce the students to the topic of cultural differences: “This is the example where I used the book a little bit as a spring board into the deeper conversation. So my idea here was one of the things you do, warm them up, just to get them talk a little bit with each other practice their English before diving in deeper. So I thought they’ve already done the listening side. So that it’s just be an easy thing for them to share about. And thought that they’re pretty good questions. I was impressed it was talking about culture differences.” (Stimulated recall)

Because of the limitation of the available books, he preferred to self-select his teaching materials which were specifically made for Thai students. “The materials that I used I stole from BitzThailand. They do corporate stuff. They might send teachers to different schools. They have these materials that specifically made for Thai. To me in Thailand, that’s what you should use. Things specifically made for
Thai students. If we had a class of mixed nationalities, we need to find a book that’s not gonna be geared to anyone culture. I just think it’s best, the topic, the questions that they come up with. I just thought that’s relevant to Thai whether my students realised it or not, it did.” (Interview)

**Effects of teaching practices on students’ WTC**

I selected three activities to discuss their effects on students’ WTC. These three activities ranged from highly structured (closed task) to non-structured with extensive language required (open task). All three activities concerned the topic of cultural differences. The participants used English to speak in all three activities, but to a different degree of participation. The participants more actively used English to perform the third activity which was the non-structured task than the first two activities where the language was not so demanding.

In Activity 1 (A1T5) and 2 (A2T5), the students had to work in pairs. In Activity 1, they had to respond to the survey questionnaire by choosing the answer from the available choices and gave reasons for their answers. This is presented in Figure 5.6 in chapter 5 (p.111). After the task, the teacher checked the answers for each question. With the choices provided, three of the eight participants (Oui, Prim and Orn) said that they only read the question and chose the answer. Although they did not speak much, they enjoyed doing it because they had choices. Also they found the topic fun. Three participants (Belle, Prim, and Manuw) had fun talking with their partners because of their characteristics and familiarity. Moreover, Prim and Manauw said that they liked the topic. For the teacher, he used this activity as a warm-up to introduce the topic about cultural difference. He wanted the students to appreciate that different people have different views.

In Activity 2 (A2T5), students had to give advice to their foreign friends who were first-time visitors to Thailand about how to behave properly in different situations. This is presented in Figure 5.9 in chapter 5 (p.117). Most students looked engaged in performing this task. They all used English with their partners. After the task, the teacher called on some students to report their answers. Four of the eight participants (Oui, Prim, Orn, Manauw) found this task more difficult than the previous one, because they did not have choices. However, Belle and Orn said that they enjoyed
talking in this activity more than the first one because they could freely express their opinion, so that they spoke more than in the previous one. Olarn and Belle liked the topic. Kate who always kept quiet in class stated that she was not capable to express her opinions in English. For the teacher, he commented that the students looked less comfortable than the first activity because it was less structured than the first activity.

From my observations, most participants looked more comfortable while they were doing Activity 1 than Activity 2. This is in line with both students’ and teacher’s comment. An inconsistency between the teacher’s and students’ perception was found concerning the issue of interlocutors. The students enjoyed talking with their partners whom they felt familiar with or whom they liked, but the teacher was not concerned about this issue.

In Activity 3 (A3T5), the students had to work in groups to exchange opinions with their other group members about cultural differences. This is presented in Figure 5.3 in chapter 5 (p.105). In the previous class, students were given a list of questions about the topic to prepare themselves about what to speak in this activity. At the beginning of this class before he let them do the task, the teacher had the students sit in pairs and recite the dialogue script about the focused topic. Also, he prepared them with the vocabulary needed in this task. Therefore, the students should be ready to speak in this activity because they learned about the relevant vocabulary and expressions to use to discuss about this topic. Also, they were allowed to prepare themselves about what to speak in this activity. During the task, the students were assigned to sit in groups of five to seven people. There were five groups altogether. Each group was assigned to speak about one of the four questions in the list. Each group was allowed to speak about the question assigned for about seven minutes. Then, the teacher asked two members of each group to change to the group next to them in a clockwise pattern. When two new members joined a new group, the existing members who remained seated in the group had to introduce the topic they had and started sharing the ideas with new people. This process was repeated seven times. This activity lasted for 50 minutes.

From my observations, all students in class looked engaged in the conversations and used English to speak for the whole 50 minutes of this activity. The teacher ascribed the use of English to the effect of the group change technique, in which the students
had to repeat their ideas for the new members. He also deemed that it was good for the students to repeat speaking about the same thing because they could practice. Moreover, it was the technique he used to keep students on the topic, not letting them talk about irrelevant topics. The effect of group changing technique as described by the teacher was relevant to the students’ responses. Six of the eight participants contended that they kept speaking on the topic with different people and they enjoyed exchanging ideas with different people. Kate who did not prepare herself before she came to this class said that she could adjust herself to the topic after she had listened to it for a few times. Although the group changing technique worked well to get students to speak, the issue of interlocutors was also important. Four participants (Teera, Olarn, Belle, and Kate) voiced that they were willing to speak more with their close friends or friends who were friendly. Especially for Kate who was always quiet, she said she was able to speak more when she sat in the group in which she had her close friend. However, the issue of the interlocutors was not found from the teacher’s response.

Five participants talked about the difficulty of the topic. Teera found question one difficult to speak about. This question read, “Cultural differences cause problems. It is better for people to stay in their own countries rather than to migrate to other ones. Do you agree?” Prim and Manauw found question two difficult. This question read, “Government should give regions in their countries more autonomy so that they can protect and enjoy their own cultures rather than serving the centralised policies of the capital city. Do you agree?” For the teacher, he expected that the students should be able to speak about the topic given because they were allowed one week to search for the information to speak about.

Summary: Teacher 5

The teacher set his aims based on the characteristics of the students in this class who were all English majors. He expected that the students should be able to speak English with people who speak English, not only Thai people. In achieving that expectation, he tried to encourage the students to be aware of the topics that people speak in real life. He seemed to follow the procedure of teaching that included presenting students with language input before letting them produce it later. He emphasised that it was important to ensure that the students understand the task and the language they were
expected to use. Three activities were selected for the analysis of the effect of teaching practices on students’ WTC. Two were closed tasks; one was an open task. The participants in this class spoke more actively with the open task than with the closed tasks, which was different from other classes. In the open task, the group changing technique employed by the teacher of this class engaged students to keep speaking about the same thing several times. This issue was consistently found from both teacher and students’ responses. However, different findings between teacher and students were about the issue of interlocutor. The teacher did not see the advantage of having students choose the group of interlocutor by themselves.

6.4 Chapter summary

Teaching practices to encourage students’ WTC as voiced by the teachers seemed to reflect their teaching practices. Having similar beliefs that language is learned through exposure to L2 input and intensive practices of language patterns, Teachers 1, 2, 4, and 5 introduced the language patterns before letting students perform the tasks. Teacher 2 and 5 emphasised providing plenty of opportunity for students to practice using the language patterns. On the contrary, Teacher 3, who believed that the course content was easy enough for the students, let the students perform the tasks and gave them the rules and patterns at the end. Moreover, he deemed that language is learned through subject matter (e.g., literature). Because this course is a skill-based course, therefore, he could not teach them the language through the language content. Thus, he chose to focus on pronunciation practice rather than giving the students chances to practise language patterns. From my observations, the use of English in classroom activities differed in each class. The analysis of the responses given by students and teachers found that students’ choice to use English in the specific activities depended on task, class management, and interlocutors. Findings emphasising the role of task and class management on students’ WTC were consistently found from both students and teachers’ responses. However, the role of interlocutors on students’ WTC was only commented on by the students and not by the teachers.
CHAPTER 7

Discussion and Conclusion

7.1 Introduction

This chapter aims to discuss the major findings corresponding to research questions 1, 2, and 3 with the link to the previous research. Ultimately, it aims to emphasise how the findings from this study make an original contribution to the research in WTC and EFL instruction in Thailand. The current findings of this study offer a model of WTC for Thai EFL learners which can be applied in Thai EFL classrooms. Applications to the language learning classroom are provided based on the current findings. Finally, the chapter discusses some issues which need to be further analysed in future research and comments on the limitations of this study.

This chapter is structured in three main sections. The first section concerns the discussion of the major findings classified by the themes of the research questions. It is divided into two sub-sections: variables contributing to the students’ WTC and the role of teaching practices on students’ WTC. The section on variables contributing to the students’ WTC discusses findings corresponding to research question 1, while the role of teaching practices on students’ WTC discusses the findings for research questions 2 and 3. In both sub-sections, a summary of major findings is presented, followed by discussion of the findings with a higher level of analysis. The differences and similarities based on a comparison of the findings from this study to the previous studies are then discussed. The second main section highlights the original contribution of this study, dealing with the WTC variables that emerged from the qualitative perspectives. It makes recommendations for teachers and students of ways to improve EFL instruction to promote students’ WTC. The final section concludes this thesis discussing both the implications of this study for future research, commenting also on limitations of this study.
7.2 Variables Contributing to WTC in English in the Classrooms of Thai EFL Students

The variables contributing to WTC, which addressed research question 1, were obtained from the outcome of the analysis of students’ interview responses in semi-structured interviews and stimulated recall interviews. The variables contributing to WTC were classified into four main dimensions: Cultural Context, Social and Individual Context, Classroom Context, and Social and Psychological Context. The major aspect of WTC variables arose from students’ testimonies and my observations concerning the persons with whom the participants communicated. The issue about the persons arose in all dimensions of the WTC variables.

In the cultural context, the participants’ WTC in English depended on their cultural orientations, which were classified as kreueng-jai, unity, fear of negative evaluation, and teacher status. All of these cultural orientations reflect the two concepts underlying the norms of Thai social interaction: the desire to establish a network of relationships and to maintain the hierarchical system. These two notions indicated the important role of interlocutors, with whom the participants interact. In the social and individual context, the participants’ WTC was influenced by the role of social influences and also the participants’ personal characteristics and learning experiences. The role of social influences on the participants’ WTC confirmed the important role of significant others on the participants’ perceptions about learning and speaking English. Although, participants’ WTC was not obviously affected by the influences from significant others, social influences affected their attitudes about learning and speaking English which would in turn lead to their choice of speaking in English in class.

In the classroom context, the role of peers and teachers greatly affected the participants’ willingness to communicate. In addition to the role of others on participants’ WTC, the way the teachers managed the class and their use of tasks were also found to affect WTC. In the social and psychological context, the psychological variables (i.e., language anxiety, self-related beliefs, and goals orientations) were also affected by the participants’ concern about how other people think about them. This demonstrates the influence of the cultural values on the psychological functioning of the participants. The role of significant others, that affected the participants’ WTC in all contexts of WTC variables, highlighted the power of cultural influences on the participants’ WTC.
Further analysis of the findings as well as the comparison of the current findings to the previous studies is discussed below.

7.2.1 Agreement of Current Findings with Existing Literature

The current findings emphasised the role of significant others on the participants’ decision to speak English in class. The influence of significant others on participants’ WTC is found in all four WTC contexts. This attests to the power of persons in influencing WTC. The interlocutors with whom individuals communicated would generate among the individuals either affiliation or control motives that operate at different levels throughout the system of WTC process (MacIntyre, 2007). This finding emphasised the interdependence characteristic of relationships which is consistent with the cultural trait known as collectivism (Triandis, 1995). The cultural aspect of WTC in English in class, which emerged clearly from the participants’ responses to my interview questions, corresponds to a conceptualisation of WTC in the Chinese EFL context, as suggested by Wen and Clément (2003), and also the empirical study by Peng (2007).

In the social and individual context, variables grouped under this category involve two aspects of social influences and individual differences. Variables making up these two aspects seemed to be consistent with prior WTC studies. The role of social influences on the participants’ WTC found in this study is similar to that of MacIntyre et al.’s (2001) study. However, it was not as obvious as that noted in MacIntyre et al.’s (2001) in which social support given by teachers and parents was highly related to WTC from questionnaire results. Regarding the aspect of individual differences, students’ WTC depend on their personal characteristics, communicative competence, and language learning experience. The influence of personal characteristics on WTC is consistent with the variable called global personality noted in MacIntyre and Charos (1996). Communicative competence which affected participants’ WTC in this study corresponds to the finding by MacIntyre et al. (1997). The influence of language learning experiences on WTC in this study is consistent with the finding by Yashima (2009). As with the role of social influences, the role of language learning experiences on students’ WTC found in this study were not as obvious. Although there were similarities between findings from this study and previous studies, I noted differences in terms of the level of the relationship of these variables to WTC. The role of social
influences and language learning experiences in this study were found not to be as important as in other studies. The differences might be attributed to the different research methods used. The qualitative methods used in this study allow issues to emerge which may influence students’ WTC through their attitudes, whereas in the quantitative studies these issues were predetermined by the questionnaire items.

In the classroom context, factors affecting the participants’ WTC were classified into three groups: interlocutors, class management, and tasks. The issue of interlocutors is presented in this section. The issues about class management and tasks will be covered in the next section on the effects of teaching practices on students’ WTC. Regarding the influence of interlocutors, the participants’ WTC depended on two types of interlocutors in class: peers and teachers. The influence of teachers on students’ WTC has not been examined in prior WTC studies, hence, it is presented in the section of variables emerging from this study. Similar to Cao and Philp (2006), this study found that the participants’ WTC varied, depending upon how familiar the participants felt with their peers. Moreover, students’ WTC depended on how they perceived their peers’ attitudes and level of English competence which has never been found in previous WTC studies. This finding is also presented in the section of variables emerging from this study.

In the social and psychological context, the factor that has been consistently examined in prior WTC studies is language anxiety. Language anxiety highlighted the students’ concerns over negative evaluations by others about oneself. Language anxiety was found to be negatively correlated with WTC in L2 in previous studies (e.g., MacIntyre et al., 2003; Baker & MacIntyre, 2000). In these studies, anxiety or communication apprehension was found to exert more influence on L2 WTC among advanced learners who attended language immersion programs than among less advanced learners. This may be because immersion students have plenty of opportunity to use the target language, so they may develop a high expectation towards their use of the language. They are likely to be discouraged if they encountered negative experiences which could lead them to be easily worried of negative consequences when they conversed in the target language.
7.2.2 Variables Emerging from This Study

There were findings in this study that have not been noted in previous WTC research. These findings include variables found from the classroom context category and the social and psychological context category. In the classroom context, emerging variables involve role of interlocutors, tasks, and class management. This section focuses the aspect of the role of interlocutors on students’ WTC which has not been evident in prior WTC research. The issues of tasks and class management will be dealt with in the section on role of teaching practices on students’ WTC. In the social and psychological context, variables emerging from this study included self-confidence, self-concept, self-efficacy, and goals orientations.

In the classroom context, the interlocutor variable which has not been found in other WTC research involves the role of peers in the respect of their level of English competency and the role of teachers. Given that the participants were concerned about face-saving, I expected that students who were paired or grouped with their higher achieving classmates would feel uncomfortable conversing in English with them. However, I was surprised by some of the responses which indicated that the participants were content to participate in a conversation with those peers whose English was better than theirs. This finding is supported by the value of near peer modelling, proposed by Murphy and Arao (2001), who argued that near peer role models have a positive impact on students’ attitudes and beliefs. In their quasi-experimental study, they found that after non-English major Japanese students watched the video of four university students talking about English learning, their attitudes and beliefs changed and became more positive. Near peer modelling helps learners develop positive attitudes and beliefs towards language learning (Yashima, 2009). Nevertheless, there were some participants who felt negative about talking in English with higher ability peers, as was predicted.

As for the role of the teachers, the participants’ WTC was greatly affected by how the participants’ perceived their teacher in terms of teacher characteristics and teacher behaviours. The role of the teacher on students’ WTC has not been included in previous WTC research. However, the finding of the role of teacher on students’ WTC is similar to the role of teachers on students’ motivation to interact in class found from previous studies (Hicks, 2008; Tudor, 2001; Chambers, 1999; Dörnyei 1994). Hicks (2008) found that students’ levels of interest, enthusiasm, engagement, and motivation during
EFL instruction were dictated by teacher factors, including teacher’s personal characteristics, their teaching style and their approach, the classroom atmosphere and the classroom set-up, and the delivery of the instruction.

Unlike the concept of self-confidence used in prior research based on ESL context, self-confidence in this study was defined in terms of the classroom context. It differed from that of previous research which was developed in a bilingual context (Clément, 1980). For the prior research in the Canadian context, self-confidence was determined by the frequency and quality of contact of people from different cultural groups. However, in this study, self-confidence is developed from a classroom process, because in Thailand the students have limited opportunity to use English outside class. Only in the EFL classroom do most Thai EFL students use English to communicate. For this study, two of the many factors affecting self-confidence are related to persons, that is, the participants’ interlocutors. These two factors are how well the participants felt familiar with the persons and the reactions of the persons with whom they conversed.

In addition to self-confidence, this study found two additional self-relevant variables: self-concept and self-efficacy. Self-efficacy and self-concept differed from self-confidence. Self-concept concerns students’ perceptions of their own competence in given areas in general, while self-efficacy constitutes perceived their own capability in reference to specific academic tasks and domains (Bong & Skaalvik, 2003). Moreover, this study also found that participants’ WTC depend on goals orientations and emotions which have not been examined in prior WTC research. However, the influence of emotions on the participants’ WTC was rarely noted, compared to other variables.

For goals orientations, both mastery and performance goals were found to be important for students in this study. With respect to cultural references, self-concept and performance goals indicated the influence of others over self, because they highlighted the issue of social comparison. On the other hand, self-efficacy and mastery goals did not show the impact of others’ evaluation on ones’ self. Self-efficacy concerns with how the individual evaluates the knowledge and skills that they have in order to complete specific tasks (Bong & Skaalvik, 2003). Mastery goals concern the goals that individuals adopt when doing the tasks in order to improve themselves, rather than to perform better than others (Ames, 1992). Therefore, these two concepts have no
reference to the effects of persons on their WTC, unlike self-concept and performance goals.

With respect to the influence of self-concept on students’ WTC, I found that the participants’ self-concept derives from how they compare themselves with their own reference group or how they perceive other people’s performance. This finding is consistent with the concept of frame of reference for academic self-concept, proposed by Marsh (1990), who distinguished between internal and external frames of reference. Two types of internal comparisons were found in this study: one is comparison of achievements in different school subjects at a given time; the other is comparison of achievements in the same subject across time. For external comparison, two types of external comparisons were found in this study: one is class average ability; the other one is selected students in class. This further division of frames of reference was relevant to eight possible frames of reference: four for internal comparisons and four for external comparison, identified by Skaalvik and Skaalvik, (2002). Self-concept that was based on external comparisons is closely connected to the issue of face-saving, which has been found to be important especially for Asian students.

Similar to the findings for self-concept, the participants’ adoption of performance goals highlighted the role of persons on their WTC. Performance goals refer to the participants’ goals, which motivate them to learn or speak English in order to outperform their peers. Performance goal orientation is related to the Thai cultural value which emphasised the influence of other people over one’s own actions. The findings from this study demonstrated the role of persons with whom the participants speak in class as a key factor underlying students’ WTC in English in all contexts. The following section, which serves as a summary of the current findings, provides an explanation of the role of cultural reflection on the participants’ WTC, based on the view of culture as a process proposed by Zusho and Pintrich (2003).

**7.2.3 Summary**

The power of persons, which emerged at all levels of the WTC variables, is explained as the product of cultural influences. The overlapping nature of the different variables seemed to be in line with a view of culture as a process, as proposed by Zusho and Pintrich (2003). For a better understanding of the role of culture on students’ WTC, the
model of cultural process, highlighting the overlapping nature of culture on social behaviours, is chosen to examine and interpret the present findings. Figure 7.1 illustrates the view of culture as a process.
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Figure 7.1 The custom complex


Figure 7.1 shows the mutually constitutive relationship between culture and psyche. Zusho and Pintrich (2003) argued that both culture and psyche constitute the shared practices and shared mentalities which interact with one another. A custom complex is the term they used to capture the process of how culture influences motivational behaviours. The custom complex comprises the two elements of culture and psychology. Both components of the custom complex interact with one another. On the culture side, cultural practices represent a broad level of the social system, including the educational system, religious beliefs, home/child-rearing practices, and language. A certain set of practices that are promoted within a certain culture may be called cultural practices. On the psychological side, cultural mentalities are defined by what the individual perceives, believes and values. Being born and raised in a particular culture, one learns how to respond to cultural practices valued by members of society. Participating in cultural practices promoted within a society shapes how individuals develop their mentalities to fit into their environment. Zusho and Pintrich (2003) described this attuning cultural and psychological process as follows: “psychological
functioning is established through the synchronisation of individual responses with cultural practices and meanings (p. 35).” It is important to understand the interactions between the cultural practices and mentalities to see the general patterns of behaviours responding to the promoted practices. Moreover, one needs to be aware of the individual differences varying within the same culture.

7.3 Role of Teaching Practices on Students’ WTC

As discussed in the theoretical background section of this thesis, this study viewed WTC as a contextually interconnected motivational feature - the view of person-in-context relational view proposed by Ushioda (2009). The findings of this present study that were obtained from the aggregation of multiple sources of data strongly supported this contextually-oriented perspective of WTC. The context is the teaching practices that interact with the students’ WTC. Teaching practices which included tasks given by the teachers for the students to complete and class management were derived from teaching principles of individual teachers.

In the present study teaching practices emerged, in both students’ and teachers’ perceptions, as an important aspect influencing students’ WTC. This section discusses the findings related to the importance of teaching practices on students’ WTC which addressed research questions 2 and 3. Findings addressing research questions 2 concerned the teaching practices employed by the teachers to encourage students’ WTC. These findings were based on teachers’ perspectives validated by my interpretations. Findings for research question 3 addressed the effect of teaching practices on students’ WTC, based on an examination of teachers’ and students’ perspectives through my own classroom observations. A summary of the findings, followed by a discussion of the findings for research questions 2 and 3, are presented below.

7.3.1 Teaching Practices to Encourage Students’ WTC: The Influence of Teaching Principles

Teaching practices employed by all the five teachers reflected the teaching principles they have espoused. Their teaching principles involve expectations, beliefs about how language is learned, and teaching approach reflecting how teaching is to be best conducted. The teaching principles had considerable influence on how the teachers
made their decisions to deliver their instruction. The most salient finding concerns the teachers’ beliefs which resulted in the teaching approaches that influenced their teaching practices.

Responses from the five teachers in this study mainly differed in the way they scheduled their classes, which may reflect their beliefs about language teaching and learning. Teachers 1, 2, 4, and 5 all provided students with language features before letting them perform the task, while Teacher 3 asked the students to do the task before explaining the rules to them. From my observations, students in classes 1, 2, 4, and 5 seemed to be more confident in using English to perform the tasks than students in class 3. The reasons that Teacher 3 opted for a teaching approach different from other classes might be attributed to his beliefs developing from his teaching experiences. This teacher, although having taught English for about ten years, was experienced in teaching English literature rather than language skills-based courses. By the time he participated in the study, he had only been teaching the English speaking course at UA for one semester.

Not only did I analyse the participating teachers’ responses, I also examined their profiles in order to identify the reasons behind their teaching principles. These teachers were either native speakers of English or local Thai teachers. As observed, student participants in Classes 1, 2 who were taught by Thai teachers and Classes 4 and 5 taught by native speakers were similarly confident in speaking. Thus, I argue that whether the teachers were native speakers of English or Thai did not make any significant difference in the success of boosting students’ willingness to speak English. Instead, the teaching principles that govern the way teachers organise the class seemed to be the key factors that contributed to the success or failure of encouraging students to speak English. The influence and importance of teachers’ beliefs on their teaching practices has been emphasised by many researchers (e.g., Breen, Hird, Milton, Oliver, & Thwaite, 2001; Pajares, 1992; Richards & Lockhart, 1994; Williams & Burden, 1997).

The teaching principles upheld by the participating teachers seem to reflect the theory in SLA that L2 knowledge is a result of instruction directed by the teachers (Ellis, 1990). Ellis (1990) discussed two types of L2 knowledge: explicit and implicit knowledge. Explicit knowledge refers to the knowledge about the L2 that is consciously learned through declarative teaching, while implicit knowledge refers to the ability to use the L2
which is subconsciously acquired (Ellis, 1990). The key distinction between these two types of knowledge concerns **declarative** (i.e., it involves ‘knowing that’) and **procedural** (i.e., it involves ‘knowing how’) knowledge. Learners usually acquire declarative knowledge and make progress towards the development of procedural knowledge. Errors produced by learners are not the result of a lack of declarative knowledge, rather, it indicates the lack of procedural knowledge.

These two types of knowledge are associated with different kinds of grammar teaching, as outlined in Ellis (1992), which are **practice** and **consciousness-raising** (CR). Practice involves the use of different kinds of practice exercises for learners to acquire the targeted language features through repetition. Such practice comprises mechanical practice, contextualised practice, and communicative practice. Emphasis on practice indicates implicit instruction. As for another type of teaching, consciousness-raising, teachers focus on developing declarative knowledge of specific grammar features by providing students with language input and also explicit rules describing or explaining a language feature. This type of teaching is referred to as explicit instruction. The goal of this kind of grammar teaching is not to emphasise that the learners need to use correct structure, but to help them to ‘know about it’ (Ellis, 1992). Consciousness-raising is “…essentially concept-forming in orientation” (Ellis, 1992, p. 234). It is important to note that this type of instruction is not to promote metalingual knowledge where grammatical terminology is emphasised (Ellis, 1992). This is to ensure that the reader understands I am not advocating a return to a traditional language teaching, a grammar/translation method, where long and elaborate explanations of the grammar intricacies are given (Brown, 2001).

From my observations, it seems that the teachers in Classes 1, 2, 4, 5 began their lessons using the CR method, and then proceeded with the practice method. This indicates the use of explicit instruction. On the other hand, for Class 3, the teacher used a reverse pattern of methods which emphasised the implicit instruction. The current findings indicate that the explicit instruction can encourage students to speak English more than the implicit instruction. This is because students, who generally have limited linguistic resources, will be more confident in speaking English when they are aware of and/or equipped with the language patterns needed for performing specific tasks in explicit instruction.
7.3.2 Effects of Teaching Practices on Students’ WTC: Triangulation of Data from Students, Teachers, and the Researcher’s Observations

The teaching practices influencing students’ WTC, which were classified as *interlocutors, tasks, and class management*, were obtained from the synthesis of the data collected from the students and teachers and my own observations. The factors of *tasks* and *class management* were identified in the students’ and teachers’ data, while *interlocutors* was a factor mentioned only by the students. This implies that the teachers were not aware of the advantage of developing familiarity between students in encouraging oral participation in class. Some of them often randomly grouped students to perform learning tasks. Obviously, they just focused on arranging their instruction (i.e., tasks and class management) as a way to encourage students’ WTC while ignoring the fact that students may be more likely to speak if they are with familiar classmates.

For the variables of *tasks* and *class management*, consistent findings were found for both students and teachers. Two components of the tasks that influenced the participants’ WTC were topics and the nature of tasks. Topics that related to students’ background knowledge and interests increased their enjoyment and confidence, while topics that had no connection to the students’ background knowledge and interests were considered too difficult and diminished their WTC. With regard to the nature of the tasks, closed tasks that did not require a production of extensive language seemed to promote higher WTC for the participants in all classes than did open tasks. However, in Classes 2 and 5, where most students were more competent in English than in other classes, the participants spoke quite actively in open tasks. From this finding, it can be argued that closed tasks are appropriate for the low competency participants, because the students were equipped with the language forms provided, while open tasks are more appropriate for highly competent participants, because they were intellectually and linguistically challenged in the open tasks. Similar findings were found by Kaneko (2008), who examined the influence of task difficulty on oral performance. She found that demanding tasks elicited longer and more syntactically complex sentences from higher level learners, but had no effect on lower level learners. Therefore, the teachers need to equally assign both open and closed tasks to accommodate students of both low and high English competency.
This study also found that students’ WTC was affected by class management, that is, the way teachers organised their class. According to the students and teachers, constructive class management offers ample opportunities for the students to use the language and a supportive classroom atmosphere promoted by successful pair and group work. Although pair work was more successful in increasing the use of English in class than group work, the two group work activities in Classes 2 and 5 were successful in engaging students to speak English spontaneously because the teachers allowed the students to prepare themselves with the language to use in the tasks. The students were provided with plenty of language input and the participants used English in these activities more than other classes.

Particularly in Class 5, the teacher deliberately employed the group change technique where students had to keep talking about their group topic to orient the new members who joined their groups over several changes. Participants appeared confident and used English actively for the whole activity period (55 minutes). This outcome can be attributed to two reasons: provision of language input and opportunity to use the language due to the group change technique. Another aspect that increased the use of English is the opportunity to use English in group work. This is also applied to pair work. It seems that students were more confident and more ready to speak up if they were provided with frequent opportunities to speak. The advantages of group and pair work in language learning have been emphasised by Robert (1997). Likewise, Pica and Doughty (1985) compared input and interaction features in teacher-fronted and group activity situations and found that individual students had more opportunity to use the target language in group activity than in teacher-fronted activities. As grouping appeared to have a significant impact on enhancing students’ motivation to communicate in class, it is important to focus on the development of group processes (Dörnyei & Csizer, 1998; Dörnyei, 2001; Dörnyei & Murphey, 2003).

In relation to the effect of group work on students’ WTC, the students’ WTC in English is usually affected by the persons with whom they were speaking (Interlocutors). However, the teachers did not acknowledge the advantage of having students choose their group mates or their partners themselves. In fact, the teachers were concerned that the students would speak about matters other than those directly related to the task if they worked with their closed friends. From this finding, teachers should consider
occasionally giving students an opportunity to choose their partners or their group mates.

7.3.3 Summary

Findings of the role of teaching practices on students’ WTC in English emphasised the importance of confidence enhancement. In order to maximise the students’ WTC in English, the teachers should focus on how to enhance the students’ confidence in using English. The findings showed that teaching practices employed by teachers depended on their teaching principles. The teaching principles that influence what the teachers do in their teaching practices link to the theory of L2 knowledge as a result of instruction directed by the teachers. Although the data are limited, classes that emphasised explicit instruction may encourage students to speak English more than the class that emphasised implicit instruction, because the students are more confident in speaking English when through explicit instruction they are aware of the language patterns they should use in the tasks.

The analysis of the effects of teaching practices on students’ WTC in the specific activities found that students’ WTC were affected by interlocutors, tasks, and class management based on the synthesis of the data from both students and teachers, based also on my observations. The issue of tasks and class management were found from both students’ and teachers’ data, while the issue about the interlocutors was only mentioned by the students. This finding demonstrates an inconsistent perception between students and teachers in relation to the effect of interlocutors on students’ WTC. Based on my research, the teacher should emphasise giving explicit instruction when designing teaching practices to promote students’ confidence. However, they should not over-emphasise on getting students to make the grammatical forms which is the main feature of grammar translation method. The teachers should also give the students the chance to become familiar with the language patterns to be used in practice. In terms of class management, the advantage of having students choose to work with their familiar classmates should not be underestimated.

7.4 Contributions to Knowledge

The findings obtained through the qualitative methods employed in this study emphasised the important role of cultural value as a salient factor underlying Thai EFL
students’ WTC in English. Cultural practices influence what the students think when they are making a decision to speak. This study argues that students’ WTC results from their psychological functioning, depending on the characteristics of the person with whom the students speak (i.e., cultural orientation). Also, this study found some specific psychological variables that have not been investigated extensively in quantitative studies in this field. These variables are self-confidence, self-efficacy, self-concept, and goal orientations. In addition, it was found that teaching practices, a product of teaching principles, plays an important role in students’ WTC.

The characterisation of Thai culture was observed through the situations where students interacted with different interlocutors. For example, when speaking with their intimate friends, students were not afraid of making mistakes and they were confident in speaking. This shows the role of culture in a psychological domain, as suggested by Zusho and Pintrich (2003). This cultural influence on students’ WTC is relevant to MacIntyre et al.’s (1998) concepts of affiliation and control. However, the cultural evidence, which is clearly seen in this study, was not included in MacIntyre’s model of WTC. The cultural impact on WTC in this study is similar to the WTC model for Chinese ESL learners in China (Wen & Clément, 2003). Variations between variables in this study and those of MacIntyre et al.’s model may be attributed to the different context of the two studies. The discovery of a cultural impact on WTC in this study extends the original model of WTC in L2, proposed by MacIntyre et al. (1998).

The detection of cultural influences on WTC was also an outcome of the use of qualitative methods. The qualitative methods used in this study were interviews, stimulated recall, and classroom observations. The cultural impact on students’ WTC, which is influenced by the persons with whom they speak, was detected in the interviews and stimulated recall data. Also, the effect of teaching practices on students’ WTC, obtained from the stimulated recall data, supplemented the data gained from interviews. The stimulated recall method, which has not been employed in previous studies on WTC, produced findings consistent with those obtained using the interview method. The triangulation of the three methods produced consistent results, confirming the trustworthiness and credibility of this study’s findings. The advantages of the use of the stimulated recall method warranted it being employed in future research to complement the interview method.
In addition to the emergence of cultural influences, the use of qualitative methods also revealed some psychological variables which have not been investigated in quantitative studies of WTC. They are self-efficacy, self-concept, and goal orientations. The different methodological approach employed in this study offers a nuanced difference between the self-evaluation related beliefs – i.e., self-confidence, self-efficacy, and self concept. These variables identified in the current study although not previously noted demonstrate the benefits of applying a qualitative approach to the L2 WTC research.

The findings of this study confirm an involvement of major components underlying WTC in the theoretical framework of this study. They include the cultural influence on the types of motives (affiliation and control) determined by interlocutors, more specific types of psychological variables, and the dynamics of teaching practices. Moreover, other variables were found to play a role in WTC, although they did not demonstrate an obvious relationship to WTC (e.g., social influences and individual differences). Based on the findings of this study, a model of WTC in a second language for Thai EFL learners is proposed in the next section.

7.5 Model of WTC for Thai EFL Learners

The findings obtained from this study may be used to produce a model of WTC for Thai EFL learners (See Figure 7.2). WTC in L2 of Thai EFL students is represented by multiple dimensions of layers making up a pyramid shape, as seen in top view. An illustration of WTC in this figure indicates the dynamics of WTC that are open to change, based on situational contexts in class, as specified by the variables at the immediate and non-immediate levels of the pyramid. The immediate variables are those that immediately affect students' WTC. These are psychological variables (e.g. language anxiety) which vary with interlocutors (who cause affiliation or control motives) or teaching practices (i.e., task, class management). The non-immediate variables involve other variables that may influence students' attitudes about learning English which can affect their WTC, for example, social and individual differences and class atmosphere. The arrangement of the layout of the model is derived from the data from various sources: interviews, stimulated recall, and observations, from both students and teachers. The variables at the immediate level of the pyramid were derived from data consistently found from both interviews and stimulated recalls. The variables arranged
in the non-immediate level are based on data solely found from students’ interviews that may influence students’ WTC through their attitudes about learning English.

Figure 7.2 A proposed model of WTC in a second language for Thai EFL learners

As illustrated in Figure 7.2, the characteristics of the situational context in class that impact on students’ WTC may be classified as: WTC stimulating context on the left, and WTC impeding context on the right. The centre of the pyramid (Layer 1) locates WTC which is the end product of the process during which students are making a decision to speak in a second language in classrooms. The students may end up using English to speak in class or not, depending on the variables in layers below. Layer 2 contains variables affecting WTC at the immediate level in two dimensions: types of motives and teaching practices. This layer involves interactions of psychological variables that are changed according to teaching/learning situations. The variables are language anxiety, self-confidence, self-efficacy, self-concept, and goals. These variables are working in relation to characteristics of situation which is determined by types of motives and the role of teaching practices. Types of motives (Affiliative/Control) depend on characteristics of the interlocutors. In class, students are involved in conversations with their classmates and their teachers. Usually, students are given more
time to speak with their classmates than with their teachers. During the conversations with their classmates, students’ WTC depends on characteristics of their classmates, including familiarity, similarities, and English competency. When conversing with their teachers, students’ WTC is affected by variables, such as teacher’s status, teacher characteristics, and teacher behaviours. Cultural factors, which are characterised by the familiarity of interlocutors and the teacher’s status, influence students’ WTC.

The role of teaching practices in this layer refers to the teaching approach, task, and class management. A teaching approach that emphasised promoting explicit knowledge (explicit instruction) can encourage the participants to speak English more than from implicit instruction. The task nature depends on students’ level of English performance. Closed tasks are appropriate for students with low competency, while open tasks are more appropriate for highly competent ones. Class management refers to the arrangement of class activities in groups or pair work. The participants used English to speak in activities where they were provided with plenty of language input and opportunities were given for students to speak with their peers.

At Layer 3, students’ WTC is affected by the two dimensions of the variables in the non-immediate level. The first dimension involves the social influences and individual differences. Social influences refer to support or pressure that the students received from significant others. Students who experienced social support in the past may have positive attitudes in learning English, which, in turn, leads to use English of their own free volition, while social pressure or negative experiences from significant others may hinder students’ WTC to use English. Individual differences involve individual characteristics, communicative competence, and language learning experiences. Students who are extroverted, friendly, playful, and risk-taking tend to speak English in class more than those who are shy, worried, and reserved. Two components of communicative competence (i.e., grammatical competence and sociolinguistic competence), first proposed by Canale and Swain (1980), were found to operate in this study. Students who lacked either of these two communicative competencies did not want to speak in English. Language learning experiences were classified into formal and informal experiences. Formal experiences refer to experiences derived from involvement in EFL classes in Thailand, while informal experiences refer to experiences the students had using English in real-life situations. Students who have had
informal experiences using English were more likely to communicate in English in class than those who only had formal experiences using English in a classroom. The second dimension in Layer 3 involves students’ perceptions about the characteristics of the class atmosphere. Classes that are fun and relaxing may improve students’ WTC, while classes that are quiet, boring, and large may diminish students’ WTC.

Variables located in both the immediate and non-immediate levels complementarily affected WTC located in the centre of the pyramid plan. However, variables arranged in the immediate level were more influential in students’ WTC. This structure of the WTC process is similar to that of MacIntyre et al. (1998). Because the variables in the immediate level are more influential in their effect on the WTC, they should be emphasised to promote the students’ WTC. In the immediate level, the students’ WTC may be affected by types of motives generated by interlocutors and classroom practices (types of teaching, tasks, and class management). The influence of interlocutor on students’ WTC indicates the impact of Thai culture. It is then important to diminish the influence of culture in order to improve students’ WTC. Because culture interacts with motivation (the psyche), to develop constructive motivational beliefs for students can then alleviate cultural implication and enhance students’ WTC. Another important element affecting students’ WTC is the type of instruction. Explicit instruction that was found to be effective in increasing the use of English should then be considered for teachers when designing their teaching practices. Detailed recommendations for teaching practice based on the current findings are discussed below.

### 7.6 Pedagogical Applications

Based on the WTC model described in Figure 7.2, variation of students’ WTC depends on situations determined by types of motives created by interlocutors (cultural orientation) and classroom teaching practices. Types of motives (affiliation/ control) created by characteristics of interlocutors interactively influence psychological variables to induce WTC. The influence of interlocutors on psychological functioning demonstrates the important role of cultural variables. Because motivation interacts with cultural variables (Zusho & Pintrich, 2003), students’ WTC, which is often blocked by cultural influences, may be modified by implementing motivational strategies. The cultural variables found in this study (i.e., kreng jai, unity, fear of negative evaluation, and teacher status) reflected the two keystones underlying concept of social interaction
in Thailand, which involve the desire to establish a network of relationships and to maintain a hierarchical system. These two cultural practices underlie the role of others over individuals’ actions, which is the principal value of collectivism, a strong cultural value in Asian societies such as Thailand. To diminish the power of others on students’ WTC, students need to be more independent in learning, so that they can focus on using the language to communicate, which is the major goal of language learning.

Taking Zusho and Pintrich’s (2003) process-oriented view of culture that mutually operates with the psyche in the motivational arena, adjusting a language student’s motivation may help adjust the cultural implications. Moreover, WTC is influenced by teaching practices which involve the teaching approach, task, and class management. To promote students’ WTC in a Thai EFL classrooms, teachers should focus on promoting self-regulated learning (SRL), because self-regulation (SR) is a self-initiated capability that relies less on teachers and more on students’ motivational beliefs (Zimmerman, 2004).

Zimmerman (2000, p. 14) defined SR as a process that “…refers to self-generated thoughts, feelings, and actions that are planned and cyclically adapted to the attainment of personal goals”. SR operates in three cyclical phases: forethought, performance and self-reflection (See Figure 7.3). Forethought refers to processes preceding the efforts to act. Performance or volitional control refers to processes occurring while the individuals perform the actions. Self-reflection involves processes occurring after the performance stage.
The forethought phase involves two components: task analysis and self-motivational beliefs. When doing task analysis, students prepare themselves for learning by setting goals and strategies to enhance their learning. This process of task analysis is linked to self-motivation beliefs: self-efficacy, outcome expectations, task interest/valuing, and goal orientation. The performance phase is the phase where learners employ two self-regulatory skills, self-control and self-observation, to enhance their performance. The self-reflection phase occurs after the performance phase, whereby learners perform self-judgements and self-reactions to the efforts they have made. Self-reflection processes cyclically influence the forethought phase for subsequent efforts. Proactive learners are more effectively self-regulated in the forethought phase that positively influences the subsequent phases; however, reactive learners are less effectively regulated and rely heavily on self-reflection. Because the SR process involves motivational beliefs, such as self-efficacy, outcome expectations, task interest or valuing, learning goal orientation, and self-satisfaction, SR is important for improving students’ WTC in English, as motivational beliefs underlie students’ cognition process in their making a decision whether to speak or not in class.

The development of SR may be acquired through the multiple levels of regulations which include observation, emulation, self-control and self-regulation. In the observation level, the learner learns the skills by watching the models. In the emulation
level of skill, the learner emulates the general strategic form of the model. In the self-control level, the learner masters the use of skill without the presence of the models. In the self-regulation level, learners can adapt their performance to changing personal and contextual conditions. The skills in the first two levels are acquired from socially related factors (i.e., modelling and social feedback); while in the third and the fourth levels, skills practice does not rely heavily on social factors. After the fundamental skills are developed, individuals are ready to build up a self-controlled level of self-regulatory skill by using the social model’s standard as a fundamental technique and focusing on self-reinforcement.

Teachers may apply this model of SR development in designing their teaching to enhance students’ WTC. Starting from the observation level, teachers may provide students with examples of how the focused language patterns are used in a practical context. For example, the teacher may let students do role-plays in front of the class. This practice gives the students the opportunity to observe how the language is used. After the students have learned the language used by the model, teachers may draw their attention to the language patterns used by the model to increase their awareness about the language patterns and accommodate their understanding about the language. At the next level, emulation, teachers may allow students to emulate the language patterns. After the teachers see students are comfortable to use language they learned, teachers then move on to the next level, self-control. In the self-control level, teachers may let students do the task where they can marshal the skills they have learned from the first two levels without the guidance from teachers. After students have acquired the skills at these three levels, they should be able to attain the fourth or self-regulated level of task skill. Students should be able to make judgements about their performance and adapt their performance in order to change the outcomes (Zimmerman, 2000). In making the adaptations for the performance at level four, self-efficacy plays an important role. When the students attain this level, they should be more independent in learning, whereby they are not negatively affected by the cultural orientation. Ultimately, they should be more willing to use English to communicate in class.

7.7 Implications for Future Research and Limitations of the Study

In conclusion, the present study makes a theoretical, methodological and empirical contribution to our knowledge of students’ WTC. In addition to the theoretical model
proposed and elaborated on above, the original contribution of this present study is that its findings are grounded in qualitative inquiry from within the classroom context, which has rarely been the case in previous WTC research (MacIntyre, 2007). Moreover, this study employed a stimulated recall method which is new to WTC research. This method allows the investigation of perceptions from both students and teachers in relation to the classroom activities. Qualitative methods employed in this study have been effective in examining both students’ and teachers’ perceptions about the focal issues and producing empirical findings of considerable importance to EFL teachers and teacher educators.

Cultural orientation was the salient factor that demonstrated its influence on students’ WTC in this study. The cultural effect on students’ WTC needs to be examined further in future research. One possible way is to conduct a study to find the effect of a motivational adjustment program on the students’ WTC. In terms of the effect of teaching practices, this study only investigated the effects of teaching practices on students’ WTC for three weeks out of a sixteen-week module. This is a limitation of this study, which would be rectified by undertaking a longer term observational study of EFL students’ WTC over a full semester course or unit. To understand the effects of teaching practices on students’ WTC to a greater extent, a longitudinal study should be conducted, because it allows an in-depth investigation of an individual’s perception through repeated interviews. Moreover, to explore in depth the connections between the variables behind students’ WTC, further research should employ a case study method. Furthermore, the focus of the present study is limited to their non-linguistic behaviours. Future research, then, should further examine the impact of WTC in English on the quality of the interaction between teachers and their students.

It is inevitable that the findings grounded from a qualitative perspective leave some questions about the issue of external validity or generalisability of the findings of this study, which is a critical limitation of qualitative research. However, the issue of generalisability is not the aim of a qualitative study. It was my intention to use qualitative methods to disclose what the students thought made them speak English in class and what they experienced when they were performing the tasks. Also, I intended to investigate what the teachers thought about their teaching practices to encourage the students to speak English in class. Therefore, the value of this study gained from the
insights of what the participants thought and felt, as well as the understanding of what actually happened in five EFL classes, is considered to compensate for the lack of generalisibility of the findings. Although the generalisibility of the study’s findings may be limited, the findings of this study are comparable to other contexts with similar characteristics to the five participating classes in two Thai universities. It remains for future researchers to discover whether the findings of this study may be generalised to other Thai university students, Asian EFL students and Western EFL students’ WTC.
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Appendix A: WTC Questionnaire in English

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Situations</th>
<th>Rating scale</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>Give a short speech in English about yourself with notes.</td>
<td>1 – 2 – 3 – 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>Give a short speech in English about yourself without notes.</td>
<td>1 – 2 – 3 – 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>Greet your teacher in English.</td>
<td>1 – 2 – 3 – 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>Greet your friend in English.</td>
<td>1 – 2 – 3 – 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>Say thank you in English when your friend lends you a pen.</td>
<td>1 – 2 – 3 – 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>Read out two-way dialogue in English from the textbook.</td>
<td>1 – 2 – 3 – 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>Sing a song in English.</td>
<td>1 – 2 – 3 – 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>Ask your teacher in English how to pronounce a word in English.</td>
<td>1 – 2 – 3 – 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.</td>
<td>Ask your friend in English how to pronounce a word in English.</td>
<td>1 – 2 – 3 – 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.</td>
<td>Ask your teacher in English how to say a phrase you know to how say in Thai but not in English.</td>
<td>1 – 2 – 3 – 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.</td>
<td>Ask your friend in English how to say a phrase you know to how say in Thai but not in English.</td>
<td>1 – 2 – 3 – 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.</td>
<td>Ask your teacher in English the meaning of word you do not know.</td>
<td>1 – 2 – 3 – 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.</td>
<td>Ask your friend in English the meaning of word you do not know.</td>
<td>1 – 2 – 3 – 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14.</td>
<td>Ask your teacher in English to repeat what they just said in English because you didn’t understand.</td>
<td>1 – 2 – 3 – 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15.</td>
<td>Ask your friend in English to repeat what they just said in English because you didn’t understand.</td>
<td>1 – 2 – 3 – 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16.</td>
<td>Interview your teacher in English asking questions from the textbook.</td>
<td>1 – 2 – 3 – 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17.</td>
<td>Interview your friend in English asking questions from the textbook.</td>
<td>1 – 2 – 3 – 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18.</td>
<td><strong>Interview your teacher in English asking your own original questions.</strong></td>
<td>1 – 2 – 3 – 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19.</td>
<td><strong>Interview your friend in English asking your own original questions.</strong></td>
<td>1 – 2 – 3 – 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20.</td>
<td><strong>Do a role-play in English at your desk. (e.g. ordering food in a restaurant)</strong></td>
<td>1 – 2 – 3 – 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21.</td>
<td><strong>Do a role-play standing in front of the class in English (e.g. ordering food in a restaurant)</strong></td>
<td>1 – 2 – 3 – 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22.</td>
<td><strong>Tell your teacher in English about the story of a TV show you saw.</strong></td>
<td>1 – 2 – 3 – 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23.</td>
<td><strong>Tell your friend in English about the story of a TV show you saw.</strong></td>
<td>1 – 2 – 3 – 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24.</td>
<td><strong>Give directions to your favourite restaurant in English to your teacher.</strong></td>
<td>1 – 2 – 3 – 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25.</td>
<td><strong>Give directions to your favourite restaurant in English to your friend.</strong></td>
<td>1 – 2 – 3 – 4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix B: Student interviews questions in English

Student interview questions

Q1 What faculty are you from? What major are you in?

Q2 When did you start learning English?

Q3 Tell me about your experience in learning English.
   3.1 Did you only study English in Thailand? If not, where?
   3.2 Why did you choose to study English?
   3.3 (For English major students) Why did you choose to take English
      as a major?
   3.4 Do you enjoy learning English? Why? If not, why not?
   3.5 Are there any classes that impressed you the most? Or are there any classes
      that made you so disappointed?

Q4 How often do you use English?

Q5 How do you evaluate your own English ability?
   5.1 What about your speaking skill?

Q6 How would you describe your personality? How do you think your personality
   affect your speaking?

Q7 How certain do you feel when you use English in this class?

Q8 Have you ever been abroad?

Q9 How important do you think English is?

Q10 How did you feel when you were speaking English in class?
   10.1 Were you confident?
   10.2 Were you afraid of making mistakes?
   10.3 Were you embarrassed when you made mistakes?
   10.4 Were you afraid that your friends would think you were showing off?

Q11 How do you feel when you use English to speak with your teacher in class?
   11.1 How did you feel when your teacher asked you some questions?
   11.2 Did you choose to ask your teacher some questions when you didn’t
      understand something in class?
   11.3 How did you feel when your teacher corrected your English?
   11.4 What did you feel when your teacher was watching you while you were
      speaking?

Q12 How did you feel when you had to use English with your friends in class?
   12.1 Do you feel that your friends outperform you?
   12.2 Were you afraid of your friends laughing at you?
   12.3 Were you afraid that your English was not as good as your friends’?
12.4 Do you have a feeling that your friends are looking at you when you speak English in class?

Q13 In what situation would you speak most, between speaking in pairs or speaking in groups?

Q14 Do you choose to speak English with some particular people only?

Q15 Who do you speak English with most, between your teacher and your friends?

Q16 What are the reasons why you don’t want to speak English?

Stimulated recall questions

1. Do you like this activity? Why? Why not?
2. How did you feel when you were doing this task?
3. Were you confident when you did this task?
4. Were you worried during the task?
5. Do you think you did well in this activity?
6. Do you like working with members in this group?
Appendix B: Student interviews questions in Thai

คำถามสำหรับสัมภาษณ์นักศึกษา

1. คุณเรียนคณะอะไร เอกอะไรคะ
2. คุณเรียนภาษาอังกฤษมาตั้งแต่เมื่อไหร่
3. คุณมีประสบการณ์ในการเรียนภาษาอังกฤษอย่างไร
   3.1 คุณเรียนภาษาอังกฤษเฉพาะในไทยหรือไม่ ถ้าไม่คุณเรียนที่ไหน
   3.2 ท่านไปศึกษาเรียนภาษาอังกฤษ
   3.3 ท่านไปศึกษาเรียนภาษาอังกฤษเป็นเวิร์คชอป (อบรม เอกภาษาอังกฤษ)
   3.4 คุณชอบหรือไม่ชอบเรียนภาษาอังกฤษ ถ้าไม่ชอบ ท่าน
   3.5 เคยเรียนภาษาอังกฤษวิชาไหนที่คุณรู้สึกประทับที่สุด หรือวิชาไหนที่รู้สึกไม่ชอบที่สุด
4. คุณใช้ภาษาอังกฤษบ่อยแค่ไหน
5. คุณคิดว่าระดับภาษาอังกฤษโดยทั่วไปของคุณเป็นแบบไหน แล้วภาษาพูดตะวันออก
6. ช่วยอธิบายลักษณะนิสัยของคุณเอง คิดว่าลักษณะนิสัยของท่านมีผลต่อการพูดภาษาอังกฤษหรือไม่ อย่างไร
7. คุณคิดว่าคุณมีความมั่นใจในการสื่อสารเป็นภาษาอังกฤษในวิชาใดกัน
8. คุณเคยไปเมืองนอกเรียนไม่
9. คุณคิดว่าภาษาอังกฤษสำคัญแค่ไหน
10. คุณรู้สึกอย่างไรที่ต้องพูดภาษาอังกฤษในห้องเรียน
    10.1 มั่นใจไม่
    10.2 กลัวคิดหรือเปล่า
    10.3 อายมั่นใจพูดคิด
    10.4 กลัวหรือไม่กลัวที่คิดว่าคุณไร้ข้อหา
11. คุณรู้สึกอย่างไรเกี่ยวกว่าการพูดภาษาอังกฤษในห้องเรียน
    11.1 คุณรู้สึกอย่างไรเกี่ยวกว่าการพูดภาษาอังกฤษในห้องเรียน
    11.2 คุณรู้สึกอย่างไรเกี่ยวกว่าการพูดภาษาอังกฤษในห้องเรียน
    11.3 คุณรู้สึกอย่างไรเกี่ยวกว่าการพูดภาษาอังกฤษในห้องเรียน
    11.4 คุณรู้สึกอย่างไรเกี่ยวกว่าการพูดภาษาอังกฤษในห้องเรียน
12. คุณรู้สึกอย่างไรที่คุณต้องได้ใช้ภาษาอังกฤษกับเพื่อนๆในห้องเรียน
    12.1 คุณรู้สึกอย่างไรที่คุณต้องได้ใช้ภาษาอังกฤษกับเพื่อนๆในห้องเรียน
    12.2 คุณรู้สึกอย่างไรที่คุณต้องได้ใช้ภาษาอังกฤษกับเพื่อนๆในห้องเรียน
12.3 คุณเป็นกังวลไหมว่าเพื่อนจะคิดอย่างไรเกี่ยวกับภาษาอังกฤษของคุณ ทำไม

13 คุณจะพูดภาษาอังกฤษในสถานการณ์ไหนมากที่สุด ระหว่างพูดเป็นคู่ กับเพื่อนเป็นกลุ่ม

14 คุณเลือกที่จะพูดกับบอยคนเป็นพิเศษมั้ย

15 คุณเลือกที่จะพูดภาษาอังกฤษกับใครมากกว่ากัน ระหว่างเพื่อนกับครู

16 อะไรคือเหตุผลที่คุณไม่อยากพูดภาษาอังกฤษในห้องเรียน

Stimulated recall questions:

1. คุณชอบกิจกรรมนี้มั้ย ทำไม

2. คุณรู้สึกอย่างไรขณะที่ทำกิจกรรมนี้

3. คุณรู้สึกมั่นใจมั้ยเวลาทำกิจกรรมนี้

4. คุณเป็นกังวลขณะทำกิจกรรมนี้มั้ย

5. คุณคิดว่าคุณทำกิจกรรมนี้ได้ดี หรือไม่ ทำไม

6. คุณชอบทำงานร่วมกับเพื่อนในกลุ่มนี้มั้ย ทำไม
Appendix C: Teacher interview questions in English

**Teacher interview questions**

*This interview will focus on how you think about the students’ willingness to communicate in English and how you attempt to encourage them to speak.*

1. How long have you taught here?
2. What subjects have you taught?
3. Can you please tell me about your area of education?
4. How long have you taught this subject for?
5. Can you tell me about how you feel about teaching this subject?
6. What are the goals of this subject?
7. How many classes do you teach for this subject?
8. Have you taught this group of students before?
9. What do you think about the speaking performance of students in this group?
10. What do you think about their willingness to speak?
11. If they are not willing to speak, how do you attempt to encourage them to speak?
12. What do you think about the relationship between their speaking performance and their willingness to speak?
13. What are the teaching approaches that you normally use? What make you feel interested in using them? How do you believe they would encourage the students to speak?
14. Can you tell me about how you normally organise your class?
15. What do you think is the most important aspect of the classroom lesson which you normally put an emphasis on? Why do you think it is important?
16. How much does the book involved in your teaching?
17. What do you think about this book?
18. From the observation I can see that you also use supplementary materials, can you tell me about how you select these materials?
19. Have you done any evaluations with them? What have you evaluated them? How do you plan to evaluate them?
20. What do you think would be the reasons why Thai students are not willing to communicate in English?

**Stimulated Recall Questions**

*Now, I’m going to play the recording of your classes on the days that I have observed. I will play the video and tell you what happened in each course of time to remind you back to each activity. While watching the video, I will stop at some points to ask for your comments. For each activity, I would like you to reflect on the purpose of each activity, how you think it might help students to speak more, and also how you found about the result. If you would like to say anything at any points, you can stop me.*

1. What were covered in the previous class?
2. What are the purposes of this activity?
3. How do you think this activity would encourage students to speak?
4. Do you think they have fulfilled your expectations?
5. Do you think this is how these students do normally? If not, what do they normally do? Why do you think they do like this?

Before we finish, would you like to add any more comments that we haven’t covered in the interview?
ค่าตอบคำถามอาจารย์
การสัมภาษณ์นี้จะเกี่ยวกับความที่อาจารย์ต้องความเต็มใจในการศึกษาภาษาอังกฤษของนักศึกษา และการที่อาจารย์พยายามกระตุ้นให้เด็กพูดคุย

1. อ.สอนเป็นไปในเวลาใด
2. อ.สอนเวลาใดบ้าง
3. อ.สอนสอนภาษาคันไหน
4. อ.สอนภาษา speaking นี้สอนนานเท่าไร
5. อาจารย์คิดว่าความรู้สึกต่อการสอนวิชาหนึ่ง
6. อ.สอนนี้มีวัตถุประสงค์อย่างไร
7. อ.สอนวิชาหนึ่งที่กลุ่ม
8. อ.สอนสอนเด็กกลุ่มมาก่อนหรือไม่
9. อ.สอนคิดว่าเด็กกลุ่มนี้มีความสามารถในการพูดอย่างไร
10. ใบแผนความเต็มใจในการพูดของเด็กกลุ่มนี้อาจารย์เห็นว่าอย่างไร
11. แล้วความกระตือรือร้นในการพูดของเด็กกลุ่มนี้จะยังคงอยู่ในระดับเดิมหรือไม่
12. เกี่ยวกับเรื่องความอยากจะพูดเกี่ยวกับความสามารถทางภาษาอังกฤษ อาจารย์ว่าเกี่ยวกับสิ่งที่ก่อนมีอย่างไร
13. อ.สอนแนวการสอน (teaching approach) แบบไหนคะ ทำไมอาจารย์ต้องใช้วิธีนี้ อาจารย์คิดว่าจะกระตือรือร้นให้เด็กพูดได้อย่างไร
14. อ.สอนให้อาจารย์ขยันเกินถึงการจัดการเรียนสอนโดยว่าให้กลับ
15. บุคคลที่อาจารย์ให้ความสำคัญในการสอนเป็นไปในบทเรียนมากที่สุด ทำไมคะ
16. อ.สอนใช้หนังสือน้อยมากกันคะ
17. อ.สอนต้องการที่จะนำสื่อเรียนต้นมือ
18. หลังจากการสอนมานานเกี่ยวกับการใช้กิจกรรมนอกบทเรียนที่มาเสริมความรู้หรือทักษะการพูดอาจารย์ว่ามีกิจกรรมนอกบทเรียนที่ท่านอย่างไร
19. อ.สอนมีการประเมินผลการเรียนรู้หรือมีการประเมินผลการเรียนรู้หรือไม่ ถ้ามี อาจารย์มีการประเมินผลอย่างไร หรือถ้าไม่มี อาจารย์จะประเมินอย่างไร
20. อ.สอนเห็นผลที่เด็กไม่อยากพูดภาษาอังกฤษในห้องเรียนตามความเห็นของอาจารย์
Stimulated Recall Questions

สำหรับการดูวิดีโอที่มีเป้าหมายเพื่อกระตุ้นให้อาจารย์มองกลับไปถึงการสอนในวันที่มีการสังเกตการสอนครั้ง คัดหรือเป็นวิดีโอหรือข้อมูลเพื่อมองกลับไปถึงการสอนในแต่ละช่วงกิจกรรม ระหว่างที่ดูวิดีโออยากให้อาจารย์ช่วยให้ความเห็นเกี่ยวกับลักษณะของกิจกรรมต่าง ๆ รวมถึงการสังเกตพฤติกรรมการพูดของนักเรียนในช่วงการวิจัยครั้ง คัดหรือเป็นวิดีโอและจะหยุดภาพเมื่อมีสิ่งที่น่าสนใจเกิดขึ้นเพื่อให้อาจารย์ได้แสดงความเห็นนะคะ ถ้ามีช่วงไหนที่อาจารย์ต้องการให้หยุดภาพให้อาจารย์บอกได้เลย

1. อาจารย์ช่วยเล่าความเดิมของคลาสที่แล้วค่ะ
2. กลุ่มมีวัตถุประสงค์อย่างไรคะ
3. อาจารย์คิดว่ากลุ่มนี้สามารถกระตุ้นให้เด็กพูดได้อย่างไร
4. อาจารย์พอใจกับผลของกิจกรรมมั้ยคะ
5. อาจารย์ว่าเป็นกลุ่มพฤติกรรมโดยทั่วไปของเด็กกลุ่มนี้หรือเปล่า ถ้าไม่ปกติจะเป็นแบบไหนคะ

อาจารย์มีอะไรจะเพิ่มเติมเกี่ยวกับเรื่องนี้ นอกเหนือจากสิ่งที่ได้พูดมาแล้วไหมคะ
### Appendix D: Classroom Observation Sheet

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Task</th>
<th>Before task</th>
<th>During task</th>
<th>After task</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>With peers:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>** Webb:**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>** Webb:**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- **Teacher actions:**
  - Volunteer answer
  - Externally respond when T asks
  - Activity: Discuss with peers
  - Activity: Discuss with peers
  - Activity: Discussion
  - Activity: Discussion

- **Skill language focus:**
  - Grammar: Read, write
  - Grammar: Read, write
  - Grammar: Read, write
  - Grammar: Read, write

- **Activity:**
  - Time began
  - Activity
  - Episode
  - Time ended

---

Note: The table is incomplete due to the image resolution.
### Teacher 5 Day 2

Time: 10.35-12.05  
Duration: 1.30 hours  
Date: 05/02/08

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Teacher’s actions</th>
<th>Students’ actions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 10.35-10.50| - Teacher complained about students showing up late. Teacher reviewed how to pronounce words from last class: racial tensions, ethnic groups, dominant culture, autonomy etc.  
Where’s the stress? What’s the autonomy mean?                                                                                                   | - Some replied. All repeated after the teacher.                                                                                                                                                                     |
| 10.50-11.10| - Teacher asked students to look at dialogues given last time and checked students understanding. Teacher gave answered to students’ question.  
- Teacher put students into groups of 4. Teacher asked students to work in pair to read out the dialogue given last time.  
- Teacher gave feedback on pronunciation: utensil, courtesy, opposite, savor, etc. Teacher went through each one and stimulated students to think about the meaning, e.g. savor sth-what does savor sound like? Teacher encouraged students to speak English with emotion for more understanding e.g. I don’t mind at all. Teacher went around the class to pronounce the sentence. | - S1 asked teacher about the expression “tune it out”. Others listened.  
- All read the dialogue actively.  
- Students listened and looked up at the word meaning from the dictionary. Students said words or sentences when teacher pointed to them. |
| 11.10-12.05| - Teacher assigned the question for each group. Teacher explained the direction and checked if students understand. Teacher walked around, listened to students conversation and make notes for the errors. Teacher helped out when students needed.  
- After students in each group talked for some time, teacher asked them to stop for changing two members of each group. Then, teacher allowed students to continue speaking. Each group had to introduce the new members about their topics before sharing ideas. Teacher continued this procedure for seven times.  
- After students had changed their position for seven times, teacher gave feedback from his notes.                                                                 | - Students worked actively with their group members. Most looked relaxed and spoke actively. All students looked engaged in the conversations. All used English to speak with their peers.  
- S7 kept speaking the most in all groups. S5 also spoke the most but for the third group change she dropped her speaking. S2, 4, 7 spoke in an average level. S6 spoke the least.  
- For some students, their speaking varied when students moved to sit in a new group. While some remained speaking in the same level. |
Appendix F: Course Syllabus UA

Department of English
EG 241: English Listening and Speaking I
Course outline: Semester 2/2007
Monday, November 12, 2007 – Friday, February 29, 2008

Section________________Day_____________Time__________________
Classroom_____________Instructor’s name_________________________
Office________________Office hours_____________________________
E-mail address________________________________________________

Coordinators: XXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXX

1. **Course Description**
   Study and practice of spoken English and pronunciation: speaking, practice using language functions under given situations; labwork.

2. **Course Objectives**
   This course will help students to:
   1. Communicate in English with the basic situations of everyday life using language functions and other features of spoken English. Emphasis is on those situations the students may face in Thailand.
   2. Speak English more confidently, fluently, accurately, and appropriately.

3. **Approach:** Communicative approach

4. **Textbooks:** English for Communication by Jitsajee Pibulnakarin & Yupin Pokthipiyuk; Conversation Matters: English Conversation Builder for University Students by Kwanjira Chatpunnarangsee

5. **Tentative schedule:** XXXXXXXX

6. **Evaluation**
   6.1 Class attendance 10%  
   6.2 Participation 50%  
   6.3 Listening Tests 20%  
   6.4 Interviews 20%

6.1 Class attendance (10%)
   6.1.1 Students with more than 6 absences will not be allowed to take exams (both oral and written exams)
   6.1.2 One point from the class attendance score will be deducted for each absence.
   6.1.3 Class attendance will be checked from the first period onwards for those whose names are on the pre-registered class list and the second period onwards for those whose names are added later.
6.1.4 Students should arrive on time. Coming to class more than 15 minutes late is considered “one late” and “three lates” is equal to “one absence”.

6.1.5 The instructor is not required to make up any exams or activities that occur on the day students are absent from class.

6.2 Participation (50%)
Students will be assigned to do various activities throughout the semester. They will be graded on at least 10 activities.

6.3 Midterm and Final Listening Tests (20%)
- Cloze test
- Monologs and Dialogs

6.4 Midterm and Final Interviews (20%)
Students are to be paired up for the interviews for at least 15 minutes. The midterm interview covers the first four units. The final interview covers the whole text. Students will be expected to respond to questions, follow directions/ or carry on conversations involving the language that has already been taught.

7. Grading Criteria
90 up   = A
85-89.99 = B+
80-84.99 = B
75-79.99 = C+
70-74.99 = C
65-69.99 = D+
60-64.99 = D
Below 60 = F
Appendix G: Course syllabus UB

Course Syllabus
English Section, Department of XXXXXXXXXX
Faculty of XXXXXX
Second Semester, Academic Year 2007

1. Course Title: 340 130 Fundamentals of English Listening and Speaking
2. Course credit: 3 credits
3. Status: Required course for English majors and minors, elective course for the other
4. Curriculum & Degree: Liberal Arts / B.A.
   Instructor: XXXXXXXXXXXXXX
5. Period / Week: 4
6. Condition: -
7. Course Description:
   Practice English listening and speaking skills as well as pronunciation. Learn and practice using appropriate vocabulary and expression, stress and intonation pattern for a variety of everyday situations so as to be able to communicate effectively in English.
8. Course Outline:
   8.1 Objectives:
      - Student will develop their listening and speaking skills so as to make an effective oral communication in English.
      - Student will improve their English pronunciation and be able to express themselves with appropriate vocabulary, expression, stress and intonation pattern.
9.2 Summary of Main Topics:
   Week 1: Introduction
   Let’s Talk 3 - Unit 1 Getting acquainted
   First impressions
   Working together
   Headway Pronunciation Pre-intermediate

   Week 2: Let’s Talk 3 – Unit 2 Communication
   Announcements and signs
   Feelings and gestures
   Headway Pronunciation Pre-intermediate
Week 3: Let’s Talk 3 – Unit 3 Breaking the law
Crime and punishment
Solving crimes
Headway Pronunciation Pre-intermediate
Test 1

Week 4: Let’s Talk 3 – Unit 4 Mysteries and surprises
That’s strange!
It’s hard to believe, but…
Headway Pronunciation Pre-intermediate

Week 5: Let’s Talk 3 – Unit 5 Education
Happy days?
Brain power
Headway Pronunciation Pre-intermediate

Week 6: Let’s Talk 3 – Unit 6 Fame and fortune
Famous people
Can money buy happiness?
Headway Pronunciation Pre-intermediate
Test 2

Week 7: Let’s Talk 3 – Unit 7 Around the world
People and languages
When in Rome…
Headway Pronunciation Pre-intermediate

Week 8: Let’s Talk 3 – Unit 8 Technology
Can you explain it?
User-friendly?
Headway Pronunciation Pre-intermediate

Week 9: Let’s Talk 3 – Unit 9 Health and fitness
Staying healthy
Coping with stress?
Headway Pronunciation Pre-intermediate
Test 3

Week 10: Let’s Talk 3 – Unit 10 Natural forces
What awful weather!
The ring of fire
Headway Pronunciation Pre-intermediate

Week 11: Let’s Talk 3 – Unit 11 News and current events
Today’s News
People and the news
Headway Pronunciation Pre-intermediate
9.3. Learning and Teaching Method

1. Classroom activities (2 periods per week)
To develop English speaking skills, students will practice using a number of patterns and expressions in a variety of real life situations. Students will also practice having English conversations with a native speaker.

2. Language lab activities (2 periods per week)
To develop English listening skills and improve pronunciation, students will perform the following tasks:
- Listening comprehension: students will listen to a variety of everyday situations such as dialogues, information on forms, directions, and other forms of real world English. They will learn to listen to both for detail and for general meaning, and to make more sense if what they hear.
- Pronunciation practice: students will practice producing English problem sounds especially those for Thai speakers. They will also practice using other things such as stresses and intonation which affect the oral communication.

9.4. Media: visualizer, cassette tapes, CDs, and a language laboratory
9.5. Evaluation Process:

- 50% - Classroom activities consisting of
  - 10% attendance and class participation
  - 20% mid term oral test
  - 20% final oral test

- 50% - Language lab activities consisting of 5 tests on listening comprehension and sound distinguishing
  - Test 1-4  30%
  - Test 5    20%

9.6. Grading:

- 80% up = A
- 75 – 79% = B+
- 70 – 74% = B
- 65 – 69% = C+
- 60 – 64% = C
- 55 – 59% = D+
- 50 – 54% = D
- below 50% = F

9. Text Books:

For classroom:  Let’s Talk 3
                By Leo Jones

For language lab:  Let’s Talk 3
                   By Leo Jones
                   Headway Pronunciation Pre-intermediate
                   By Bill Bowler/ Sue Parminter
PARTICIPANT INFORMATION SHEET
(Lecturers)
Research Project

Title: Willingness to Communicate in a second language:
Issues affecting Thai EFL learners at tertiary level

What is the study about?
This study aims to examine the factors contributing to willingness to communicate (WTC) in a
second language (L2) of Thai university students who study English as a Foreign Language
(EFL). The findings will be employed to develop a model reflecting the variables underlying
students’ willingness in using English to communicate in EFL classroom for Thai EFL
learners. You are invited to take part in the study which will be conducted over 8 -week
period (Mid of February- Mid of April 2008).

Who is carrying out the study?
The study is being conducted by Ms Kamlaitip Pattapong, a PhD student, under the
supervision of Dr Richard Walker, at the Faculty of Education and Social Work, the
University of Sydney. The result of this study will form the basis for her thesis for a degree of
Doctor of Philosophy in Education which will be submitted to the Faculty of Education and
Social Work, the University of Sydney.

What does the study involve?
Participating in the study involves taking part in classroom observations and interviews.
The classroom observations will be conducted to examine the nature of classroom
teaching practices to see the effect of teaching practices on students’ communication
behaviours. The observations will be conducted for a whole class period on three occasions
by the researcher. There will be no interference to your class. During the observations, the
video-recording will be made for a further investigation in the interview section.

The interview will be conducted to examine how you implement your teaching practices
and your approach in your speaking classes. The interview will be scheduled at your
convenience. Interview questions are divided into two sections. The first section concerns
the questions about how you encourage the students to speak in class. The second section
concerns the questions about the reasons why you decided to use particular strategies for
certain activities. You will be reminded of your own teaching practices in class via the
extracts from video-recording of classroom teaching practices recorded during the classroom
observations. The entire interview will be tape-recorded and will be of approximately 30
minutes.
Can I withdraw from the study?
Being participants in this study is completely voluntary. You are free to withdraw from the research at any time without reasons. All aspects of the study, including results, will be strictly confidential and only the researchers will have access to information on participants.

What if I require further information?
When you have read this information, Ms Kamlaitip Pattapong will discuss it with you further and answer any questions you may have. If you would like to know more at any stage, please feel free to contact Ms Kamlaitip Pattapong, kpat7220@mail.usyd.edu.au, +66 2 427 2811.

What if I have a complaint or concerns?
Any person with concerns or complaints about the conduct of a research study can contact the Senior Ethics Officer, Ethics Administration, University of Sydney on (02) 9351 4811 (Telephone); (02) 9351 6706 (Facsimile) or gpeudy@mail.usyd.edu.au (Email).

*This information sheet is for you to keep.*
Appendix I: Consent Form (Lecturers)

The University of Sydney
Faculty of Education
& Social Work

PARTICIPANT CONSENT FORM
(Lecturers)

I, .................................................................................................., give consent to my participation in the research project.

Name (please print)

TITLE: Willingness to Communicate in a second language: Issues affecting Thai EFL learners at tertiary level

In giving my consent I acknowledge that:

1. The procedures required for the project and the time involved have been explained to me, and any questions I have about the project have been answered to my satisfaction.

2. I have read the Participant Information Sheet and have been given the opportunity to discuss the information and my involvement in the project with the researcher(s).

3. I understand that I can withdraw from the study at any time, without affecting my relationship with the researcher(s) now or in the future.

4. I understand that any involvement is strictly confidential and no information about me will be used in any way that reveals my identity.

Yes  No

I agree to take part in a classroom observation which will be videotaped and I consent to my image.

☐  ☐

I agree to take part in an interview which will be audio-taped.

☐  ☐

Signed: ...........................................................................

Name: ...........................................................................

Date: ...........................................................................

Ms Kamlaiph Paitapong
Telephone +66 2 427 2811
E-mail: kpaitapong@sydney.edu.au
Appendix J: Participant Information Sheet (Students) in English

PARTICIPANT INFORMATION SHEET
(Students)
Research Project

Title: Willingness to Communicate in a second language: Issues affecting Thai EFL learners at tertiary level

What is the study about?
This study aims to examine the factors contributing to willingness to communicate (WTC) in a second language (L2) of Thai university students who study English as a Foreign Language (EFL). The findings will be employed to develop a model reflecting the variables underlying students' willingness in using English to communicate in the classroom for Thai EFL learners. You are invited to take part in the study which will be conducted over 8-week period (Mid of February - Mid of April 2008).

Who is carrying out the study?
The study is being conducted by Ms Kamtaip Pattapong, a PhD student, under the supervision of Dr Richard Walker, at the Faculty of Education and Social Work, The University of Sydney. The result of this study will form the basis for her thesis for a degree of Doctor of Philosophy in Education which will be submitted to the Faculty of Education and Social Work, the University of Sydney.

What does the study involve?
Participating in the study involves taking part in questionnaire, classroom observations, and interviews:

The questionnaire will ask about how you evaluate your willingness to communicate in various classroom situations that you are likely to encounter in class. There are 25 items for you to rate on a 1-4 point scale. The questionnaire will take around 15 minutes to complete. After completing the questionnaire, you may be invited to be one of approximately 30 students to take part in classroom observations and interviews.

The classroom observations will be conducted to examine the nature of teaching practices. It will be conducted for a whole class period for on at least three occasions by the researcher. There will be no interference to your class. During the observations, you will be only be video-taped if you agree to participate in classroom observations.

The interview will be conducted to examine how you feel when using English to communicate in class. It involves two sections. The first section concerns the questions about your perceptions to use English to communicate in classroom situations. The second section concerns the questions about how you feel when participating in specific situations in class. You will be reminded of your own participation in class via the extracts from video-recording of classroom participation recorded during the classroom observations. The entire interview will be of approximately 30 minutes. It will be tape-recorded for the purpose of transcribing the data. The interviews will be conducted in Thai to facilitate participation and to prevent misunderstanding of questions and answers.
Appendix J: Participant Information Sheet (Students) in English

Can I withdraw from the study?
Participation in this study is completely voluntary. You are free to choose to accept or decline the invitation without any bias on your grades and the relationship between you and your teacher. You are free to withdraw from the research at any time without giving any reasons. All aspects of the study, including results, will be strictly confidential and only the researchers will have access to information on participants.

What if I require further information?
When you have read this information, Ms Kamlaitip Pattapong will discuss it with you further and answer any questions you may have. If you would like to know more at any stage, please feel free to contact Ms Kamlaitip Pattapong, kpat7220@mail.usyd.edu.au, +66 2 427 2811.

What if I have a complaint or concerns?
Any person with concerns or complaints about the conduct of a research study can contact the Senior Ethics Officer, Ethics Administration, University of Sydney on +61 2 9351 4811 (Telephone); +61 2 9351 6706 (Facsimile) or ebrkody@mail.usyd.edu.au (Email).

This information sheet is for you to keep.
Appendix J: Participant Information Sheet (Students) in Thai
บทคัดย่อของการลงตัวจากงานวิจัย

การเข้าร่วมการวิจัยนี้เป็นไปโดยความสมัครใจ คุณสมบัติที่ถูกต้องในการเข้าร่วมการวิจัยหรือปฏิรูปสำหรับโครงการงานวิจัยโดยตรงไม่เป็นผลจากสิทธิ์ใดๆที่มีอยู่ก่อนหน้านี้ ในกรณีที่คุณสมบัติที่ถูกต้องในการเข้าร่วมการวิจัย ได้ถูกเปลี่ยนไปในภายหลังที่คุณสมบัติที่ถูกต้องในการเข้าร่วมการวิจัยในส่วนนี้ไม่มีส่วนร่วมใน

บทคัดย่อของการจัดการข้อมูลที่มี

ขณะที่คุณอยู่ในออร์กานิช์ โปรดติดต่อ สำหรับการแจ้งรายละเอียดเพิ่มเติมและตรวจสอบข้อมูลของคุณ หากคุณมีข้อสงสัยต่อเนื่องในนั้น โปรดติดต่อ สำหรับการแจ้งรายละเอียด ได้ที่ lpat7220@mail.usyd.edu.au , +66 2 427 2811.

บทคัดย่อของการรักษาประโยชน์ในการรักษา

บทคัดย่อนี้มีข้อตกลงเรื่องจ้างงานวิจัย คุณสมบัติที่ถูกต้อง เจ้าหน้าที่ Ethics Officer, Ethics Administration, University of Sydney ณ +61 2 9351 4811 (โทรศัพท์), +61 2 9351 6706 (แฟกซิมิล) หรือ ethics@usyd.edu.au (อีเมล).

โปรดเกี่ยวกับข้อมูลนี้ไว้
PARTICIPANT CONSENT FORM
(Student(s))

1. ................................................................., give consent to my participation in the research project
   Name (please print)

TITLE: Willingness to Communicate in a second language: Issues affecting Thai EFL learners at tertiary level

In giving my consent I acknowledge that:

1. The procedures required for the project and the time involved have been explained to me, and any questions I have about the project have been answered to my satisfaction.
2. I have read the Participant Information Sheet and have been given the opportunity to discuss the information and my involvement in the project with the researcher(s).
3. I understand that I can withdraw from the study at any time, without affecting my relationship with the researcher(s) now or in the future.
4. I understand that my involvement is strictly confidential and no information about me will be used in any way that reveals my identity.

   I agree to complete the questionnaire. □ Yes □ No

   I agree to take part in an interview which will be audio-taped. □ Yes □ No

   I agree to take part in a classroom observation. □ Yes □ No

Signed: ____________________________________________

Name: ____________________________________________

Date: ____________________________________________

Ms Kamalitip Pattapong
Telephone: +66 2 377 7811
E-mail: kpt7220@uowd.edu.au
Appendix K: Consent Form (Students) in Thai

The University of Sydney
Faculty of Education
& Social Work

Dr. Richard Walker
Telephone +61 2 9351 6274
Facsimile +61 2 9351 3696
E-mail: r.walker@edfac.usyd.edu.au

หนังสือแสดงความยินยอมของการที่จะร่วมในงานวิจัย
(สำหรับนักศึกษา)

ชื่อผู้จ้าง.................................................................อินเทอร์เน็ตส่วนร่วมในงานวิจัย
ชื่อ (สัญจร)
ที่อยู่.........................................................

ขออนุญาตให้เข้าร่วมในการที่จะร่วมในงานวิจัยและให้สัมมนา
ที่มีกิจกรรมการวิจัยที่เข้าร่วม

1. ขอทำให้ทราบว่าวิจัยนี้ออกมาโดยไม่ได้รับสิทธิ์ของ
นักศึกษาในการมีส่วนร่วมในงานวิจัยและให้รับโทษในการกระทำ
ตามที่กำหนดไว้ในกฎหมายหรือกำหนดอย่างที่เหมาะสม
2. ขอทำให้ยังผลการเข้าร่วมสำหรับผู้มีส่วนร่วมในงานวิจัยและให้รับโทษในการกระทำ
ตามที่กำหนดไว้ในกฎหมายหรือกำหนดอย่างที่เหมาะสม
3. ขอทำให้ทราบว่าการเข้าร่วมโครงการจะมีส่วนร่วมในงานวิจัยได้ตามที่กำหนด
โดยที่จะมีการสัมมนาหรือเข้าร่วมกันด้วยวิธีการที่เหมาะสม
4. ขอทำให้ทราบว่าการมีส่วนร่วมของนักศึกษาจะถูกเก็บเกี่ยวกับความเคลื่อนไหวหรือการมีส่วนร่วม
ในงานวิจัยอย่างที่กำหนดไว้ในกฎหมายหรือกำหนดอย่างที่เหมาะสม

ข้อตกลง.................................................................อินเทอร์เน็ต
ข้อตกลง.................................................................ไม่ยินยอม

รายละเอียด.................................................................

ชื่อ.................................................................

นางสาวกนิษฐา ปิตะเผ่า
โทรศัพท์ +66 2 427 3811
อีเมล์ kpith@edfac.usyd.edu.au
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Appendix L: Example of student interview transcript

Interview with Yanee

Interviewer: What faculty and major are you in?
Yanee: Faculty of Arts, second year. Major in Linguistics.

Interviewer: Why did you take this subject?
Yanee: It’s a compulsory for linguistics students. Even if it wasn’t a compulsory, I would still have taken it because I’m going to take English as a minor.

Interviewer: When did you start learning English?
Yanee: P3. (Grade 3)

Interviewer: What do you think about learning English? Do you like it or not?
Yanee: I didn’t like it at first because it’s not our language. I couldn’t understand it. The more I learned, the worse I got.

Interviewer: What was the teaching like?
Yanee: It was so stressful. They tried to give us what they thought we should be given. But not everyone could get everything they gave us.

Interviewer: What were the teachers like?
Yanee: They’re not as calm as teachers in other subjects. The English teachers thought that they knew English, so they were arrogant. They thought that we should know what they knew. Whatever they gave us, we should be able to understand. But we just learned it. Everybody had different backgrounds. Some had learned it since kindergarten, some learned it in P3. We’re kids. We’re not going to just listen to the teacher.

Interviewer: When did you change your attitude to like it more?
Yanee: I like it more when I got to M5 because I could handle everything they gave us even difficult words. The teacher had a strategy to let us do self-searching. She gave us the topic and our job was to prepare a paragraph to speak for 3 minutes. Then the teacher would ask us some questions. I didn’t realise that I could do it well until the teacher asked me how I could improve my English. I haven’t been this good before. So I felt better. I then tried to make a paragraph and memorise it. She was the first English teacher who made me like English. When I got to university, I thought that I would be in trouble for writing but I got B+ instead. The teacher was so kind, she’s a writer. She based her teaching on her life experience. She made us think freely away from the norm. We didn’t have to worry about grammar. We could correct it later. We felt free to put our thoughts down in writing. So I thought I’m not bad. But when I first studied with Teacher Z, I was stressed. I couldn’t understand what he taught.

Interviewer: Why didn’t you understand?
Yanee: I don’t know why. I don’t understand why I couldn’t understand what he said. When I replied to him, I wasn’t be able to do it smoothly. I was pressured. But when I had a chance to speak with my teacher’s friend from England, I felt better when I spoke with him. He told me that I could speak English well. So I
asked for his email address and I sent him emails. He told me not to worry about the grade. ‘As long as I can understand you that’s enough.’ So I felt delighted, my English is not as bad as I think. I felt inspired.

**Interviewer:** What about Teacher Z made you feel pressured?

**Yanee:** Perhaps, his teacher status that made me pressured. Maybe I couldn’t get it as in the same way as others do. I always think differently. I always thought off the mainstream. I thought that it’s serious that we need to pronounce words correctly. But other people don’t think this way. People who have been abroad are all okay. But I can’t, so I felt pressured. So I had to consult with my Writing teacher, she said that I shouldn’t worry about it. Sometimes, I felt like I couldn’t take it anymore. Sometimes, I thought that I had to fight more.

**Interviewer:** Have you ever been abroad?

**Yanee:** No.

**Interviewer:** How important do you think English is?

**Yanee:** It’s very important especially for work. It’s the only language that we can use anywhere in the world. We can make contacts for business. We learn different perspectives for living. We can meet lots of people. We can get to know more about what we haven’t known.

**Interviewer:** How do you evaluate your own English ability?

**Yanee:** Fair.

**Interviewer:** What about your speaking skill?

**Yanee:** Fair

**Interviewer:** How do you think your personality affects your speaking?

**Yanee:** I’m talkative. I say what I would like to say. I like jobs where I can talk. If I could speak English very well, I would feel more confident to speak.

**Interviewer:** Are you confident to speak English?

**Yanee:** Yes, with some foreigners.

**Interviewer:** How?

**Yanee:** It depends on what they asked us. Like my teacher’s friend, he answered anything you could ask. I felt that he was a good teacher. It’s like he knows how to speak to make us feel good to speak. But, if the teacher gives us a hard time, I will close myself off. But if he approached things softly, I would be very open. I would say anything about anything.

**Interviewer:** How often do you use English?

**Yanee:** Not often. I only speak with foreigners I know.

**Interviewer:** How?

**Yanee:** On MSN.

**Interviewer:** What did you feel when you were studying in this class?

**Yanee:** Regardless of the personal attitudes, I think it goes from basic things actually
used in real life. I then realised how English works in real life. It’s not about using big words. It’s just normal everyday language that everybody uses it in their real life. It’s something we see from foreigners coming to ask us and we understood them. I believe that when we finish this class, we will be able to communicate in actual conversations.

**Interviewer:** What was it that you said about personal attitudes?

**Yanee:** It’s just the reactions from the teacher. Sometimes, he was so forceful. I felt the pressure when I was picked to answer a question and I didn’t know what to answer, what I should do. I felt terrible.

**Interviewer:** His voice, emotions or facial expressions?

**Yanee:** Something like that. I remember once he said he didn’t care. And I felt that he didn’t care. It seemed as if he was so arrogant which perhaps wasn’t true.

**Interviewer:** What made him say “I don’t care”?

**Yanee:** I don’t care about grammar. Sometimes, when I said something and he didn’t seem care. I was like… what? I felt upset. I think it’s pressure that I build my own wall around me.

**Interviewer:** Is it like he didn’t accept your answer?

**Yanee:** I thought so. But perhaps I couldn’t figure out what he actually meant. Perhaps it’s not what he really means. Maybe I got it wrong. Perhaps, he didn’t mean it in a negative way. He might just have wanted to say like I’m wrong. It was probably something like that.

**Interviewer:** How did you feel when you were speaking English in class?

**Yanee:** Sometimes, I felt confident and enjoyed it. Sometimes I felt stressed. I couldn’t think of words to say. I was worried that I would have to speak but I didn’t know how. But if I could prepare for it, I’m sure I could do it well. But if I had no time to prepare, I felt very nervous.

**Interviewer:** You’re confident if you have prepared?

**Yanee:** Yeah. For speaking, I’m not quite so good, but I’m better at writing. If I can prepare what I have to say, when I actually speak I might just slightly change it. But if I had to speak spontaneously, I would feel a bit scared. If I’m scared about anything, I would turn out that way. If I worried that I won’t be able to speak, I then can’t speak. But when I don’t worry about it, it turns out that I’ve got it right.

**Interviewer:** How do you feel when you use English to speak with your teacher in class?

**Yanee:** I almost never spoke to him at first because I had a wall I created with him. I couldn’t get through to him and he couldn’t get through to me. But after I spoke to him, he’s just another foreigner who is friendly. He was okay for any questions even if I couldn’t ask a good question. He’s nice. So I felt more relaxed to speak to him. I felt that I’ve improved one step more because I could get him to understand me. But sometimes, I couldn’t understand him.

**Interviewer:** Do you think it’s because of his accent?

**Yanee:** Maybe because some foreigners speak mutter. There’s one person in the class,
she spoke… I couldn’t hear her. I speak loudly so I can’t get used to listening to people who speak softly. About the teacher’s accent, sometimes, I understand, but sometimes, I don’t. I had no idea what he’s talking about. I still couldn’t handle the sounds from two words combined together.

**Interviewer:** Did you choose to ask your teacher some questions when you didn’t understand something in class?

**Yanee:** I didn’t at first, I was afraid that I would be the most stupid freak in the class, but after that, I just came to ask him one on one. But I wouldn’t ask the teacher during the class, I was afraid that other people would think that I’m a fool. It’s something that I think but other people don’t.

**Interviewer:** How did you feel when your teacher corrected your English?

**Yanee:** Two feelings. One is ‘why I am so terrible’. But after I looked at what I have done I realised that it’s good that he pointed it out so that I know it. Otherwise, I wouldn’t be able to use it right.

**Interviewer:** How did you feel when you had to use English with your friends in class?

**Yanee:** I am very open. Whatever they said I tried to respond. Sometimes, we both got it wrong. But we still kept talking.

**Interviewer:** What if you had to work in a group of people who outperformed you?

**Yanee:** I would feel bad. I would feel pressured as to why I’m not good, but they were. One, I don’t want to pull them down. Two, I don’t want to be embarrassed. They speak correctly, but I don’t.

**Interviewer:** Were you afraid that your English was not as good as your friends’?

**Yanee:** Yes.

**Interviewer:** Do you care about how other people would think about you?

**Yanee:** Something like that. If I’m pressured, I can’t control my face. I wouldn’t speak. I’d rather stay quiet.

**Interviewer:** In what situation would you speak most, between speaking in pairs or speaking in groups?

**Yanee:** Pairs.

**Interviewer:** Do you choose to speak English with some particular people only?

**Yanee:** Anyone, but if I talk with people who are better off, I would think why I couldn’t do it. Will I do something embarrassing? I’m worried that they wouldn’t be able to understand me. When I speak with those who are good, when they said “What?” I would feel very unsure to speak.

**Interviewer:** Who do you speak English with most, between your teacher and your friends?

**Yanee:** For this class, I prefer my friends because I’m not getting along with my teacher. I don’t know what he’s like.
Appendix M: Example of stimulated recall transcript (Students)

Stimulated recall interview: Apple

Day 1

Interviewer: Let’s watch the video. The first day - matching problems and advice, page 104. How did you feel when doing this activity?

Apple: I liked it because it’s not too complicated. Just getting to know words and that’s it. It’s not too difficult.

Interviewer: What about the topic?

Apple: It’s good because we got to know more words.

Interviewer: What do you think about your teaching picking your name from the cards?

Apple: It’s good. It’s not specifically for anyone. Otherwise, the same people would be picked all the time. This is more variation.

Interviewer: There’s an equal chance there for everyone to speak. Then, a pair work, you had to make dialogues about giving advice.

Apple: I paired with Beau. That was good.

Interviewer: Did you speak a lot? Thai or English?

Apple: We used English. We followed the patterns and also we changed it sometimes. I like it when we have the pattern otherwise I’m not sure how to make it right.

Interviewer: Are you and Beau close friends?

Apple: Not really, but we can talk. We have a similar level of English. She could respond quite quickly.

Interviewer: Then, books closed. How did you feel?

Apple: Nothing really. We practised it many times. We got familiar with it.

Interviewer: You were asked to give advice for sunburn problems.

Apple: I got it wrong. I said ointment instead of lotion. I got confused. I only thought about the words provided. When the teacher changed it, I couldn’t do it. I couldn’t think of “lotion”.

Interviewer: Did you feel embarrassed?

Apple: No.

Interviewer: Did you feel confident when you answered?

Apple: I felt confident, I just said it out aloud - I didn’t think carefully. But when the teacher said sunburn, ointment? I could read it from the teacher’s face. I knew that it was wrong.

Interviewer: Listening and writing down the notes for what you heard. Page 105, accept or refuse.
Apple: It was okay. I could manage.

Interviewer: Next, discussing in pairs, page 106. matching. You had to make guesses about the problems each person had in the picture before talking in pairs.

Apple: This one, we had to come up with the guesses. For example, picture 2, we said Fat, but the teacher said it’s not appropriate to say Fat. So we changed it to chubby, but the teacher said it’s not a disease. So he gave us the answer “overweight”. It was fun. We had to use our thinking skills. I paired with Beau, we spoke in both Thai and English. I switched to Thai whenever we couldn’t think of the answer in English. And we would like to do it quickly.

DAY 2

Interviewer: Next day. We had to give advice to foreign friends. Page 107.

Apple: This one, I liked it because we needed to use our knowledge. We needed to know where we should take them. And also what we could get from there. We needed to have lots of knowledge not only English. My group went to BKK. We then talked about the Songkran Festival on Khao San Road. We got to search for a particular place in BKK. We discussed in Thai about where we should take them. Then we did it in English.

Interviewer: How did you find it working in this group?

Apple: With this group, we could get different views. It’s not that we had to think by ourselves. When we said something, they would argue.

Interviewer: Why didn’t you use English while working?

Apple: It was more convenient to use Thai. We could just talk it through. It was quicker.

Interviewer: Next, you did the pair work. You had to make short dialogues page 109.

Apple: That was okay, but we couldn’t think of the answer sometimes. I didn’t know how to advise my partner. I think it was hard. Even if it was in Thai, I wouldn’t even know how to answer. For example, love triangle, it’s complicated. But it’s fun. I just say it out aloud. For example, you are broke because you spent all your salary. I know that I should advise my partner to divide the money into smaller parts for different purposes. I didn’t know if it was okay to use the word “divide”, but I just used it.

DAY 3

Interviewer: The last day. The first activity was the materials from outside.

Apple: It was about the passive form. We had to talk about locations. It was hard and it stressed the passive form. For example, Where is Japan? I know it’s in Asia, but I wasn’t able to specify the exact location. We needed to use geographical knowledge. Although the teacher gave us the pattern to use, it was still hard to relate the specific location. We just said in East Asia and then the teacher asked where East Asia was. We went blank. We didn’t know how to explain. Then the teacher asked where is China? It was like the questions just went on and on.
Interviewer: Were you aware of the language to use?

Apple: What about specific terms like hemisphere, this line, that line. I didn’t know how to answer.

Interviewer: Did you have to speak about that?

Apple: A little. For example, where is ‘central world’? I know that it’s near Siam Square. But I didn’t know the road. I didn’t know how to answer the questions.

Interviewer: Then, you had to make conversation about the exercise you just did. You had to close your book.

Apple: It’s like the ointment where we had to do the matching and then we had to arrange them in the sentences. We had to practice the dialogue before we speak without the script. It’s not hard because we had done it already.

Interviewer: Then, tour guide. Where did you go to?

Apple: Wat Pho. Actually, we've got the information in the sheet. But the teacher wanted us to add more information that we knew about Wat Pho. But we knew nothing so we just presented it as it was.

Interviewer: You speak Thai only?

Apple: Yes.

Interviewer: You've got the information in English.

Apple: We just helped adding things. We put our ideas together.

Interviewer: Thank you very much.
Appendix N: Example of teacher interview and stimulated recall transcript

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Interview with Teacher 1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Interviewer:</strong> How long have you been teaching?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher 1: I started teaching in 2000.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Interviewer:</strong> Is that just here?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher 1: No I taught at Suan Dusit for 3 years and then here at UA for 3 years.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Interviewer:</strong> What subjects did you teach?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher 1: Primarily I teach Listening and speaking. I teach 241 every semester. I also teach reading and writing every other semester, like Reading for Information, Basic Paragraph Writing but normally I teach speaking.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Interviewer:</strong> I’ve heard that courses provided for English major students are mostly for skills. Could you please explain about the course structures provided for these students?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher 1: Here at UA, we have majors in Language, Linguistics and literature. The English major course deals with skills for specific purposes. We conduct skills for beginners as well as year 3 and 4. These would be for specific purposes as well as academic courses such as business writing, English for the secretary, English for Hotel Personnel and English for Tourism.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Interviewer:</strong> You have taught the speaking course for three years...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher 1: I taught speaking every semester because there are many sections (groups), so we need lots of instructors.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Interviewer:</strong> Do you enjoy teaching it?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Teacher 1: At first, I enjoyed it but later on I didn’t really feel that way, because I thought the topics were too simple and the students weren’t able to express themselves as much as they should be able to. Students had limited interaction. First of all, for example the topics are Greetings or Getting to Know You. The drills are so basic, nothing really complicated. Also when merging them with a somewhat limited level of their language, it’s not different from doing the drills then we apply the patterns to the situations which are overly basic and don’t challenge me as a teacher. Second of all, sometimes, I felt frustrated because I don’t know if I should focus on correcting their grammar or focus on accuracy or fluency? When students make so many mistakes I am unsure what they are achieving or what my actual goals should be. I wonder if the course is effective. Also because of the different backgrounds and characteristics of the students, the level of participation is not always active. Sometimes I feel it depends on luck. For some students who are already proactive, it doesn’t matter who teaches them. They will always be proactive and the class is fun. Then we are in luck. But, if I have a quiet class, then I have to start thinking about what I should expect, or how will I adjust, “Will they have fun?”, “Will they lose their confidence if I try to encourage them to speak?,” they might think that this is not for me. So when I get this kind of class repeatedly, I just feel that I need a break. This kind of class depends a lot on the teachers in regards to drawing them in to participate.
in the lesson. If we compare it with the Writing or Reading courses, they are different in nature. We don’t have to be such an entertainer for those courses. We don’t have to find ways to motivate them to speak.

Interviewer: You just mentioned about the goals of the subject. What actually do they expect the students to be able to do?

Teacher 1: The four broad goals in the course outlined are basically looking at the topics that cover English in daily life. Also, a book that contains 8 topics was designed based on a survey of students’ needs – what topics Thai students would like to learn. Generally, what we aim for is that the students should be able to communicate in English confidently, accurately, appropriately, and fluently.

Interviewer: Do you think the goals are too high for the students to achieve?

Teacher 1: No, they are not “too” high. But one weakness is that we don’t place students in classes appropriate to their levels. So in one class, there might be people who are very advanced and fluent as well as some whose English is limited. Most of these students come from poor English learning backgrounds, so they haven’t been exposed to English as much as students from Bangkok. Their English is weaker and less accurate when they have to share their opinions, but they are very motivated. So it’s hard for these people, but not for Jan or Kam. I think ideally it’s better to put people who have a similar level of language proficiency in the same group.

Interviewer: But some students can get an exemption?

Teacher 1: They can. But the students can’t apply for exemptions themselves. Teachers have to refer them for the exemption. And the simple rule that both teachers and students need to know is that if the student takes this course, they will only get an A. The first day I come to class, my job is to find those who are outstanding and whose performances are beyond 241. I have to speak with them using guideline questions until I’m sure that this course is too easy for them. Then, I will send their names to the exemption committee. They will be interviewed by the committee. Three people on the committee comprise both Thai and native speaking teachers. Each teacher in the committee will give their score. The scores given by these three people are final. So it doesn’t mean every student who the teacher sends to the committee will get the exemption. As for Kam, she didn’t speak in the first class. In order to send their names to the committee, I need to do it after the first class. I told her about this in the first class, but she didn’t seem interested. But after the exemption evaluation had finished and we had done some activities in class, I knew that if I had sent her name, she would have been exempted. So I asked her why she wasn’t interested in taking exemption, she told me that she wanted to stay in this course. So that’s fine.

Interviewer: So how many groups do you have for this subject?

Teacher 1: Two.

Interviewer: How do you judge ability between these two groups?

Teacher 1: The Tuesday morning class is far more advanced than this class because I have 80% of English majors. They are more active and more willing to speak. They respond more often. However, I don’t mind teaching weak
students, like Sam or Sun. Although their English is weak, they are more proactive, more relaxed than people from Library Science. These people are quiet. I know that when I have people of this nature that I should try at some stage to get them to speak. But if they still stay quiet, I feel that if I push them they may feel awkward or uncomfortable. So if that happens, I have to step back to have them feel that I’m not aggravating them, and allow them to feel some distance.

Interviewer: How do you mostly encourage them to speak?

Teacher 1: If it’s not in the curriculum, I will go for anything that I think they could use as a source of information. This way they will be happy to reply. I’m not going to get them to give me a right or wrong answer. If I wanted them to give the right or wrong answer, I will ask them in the exams. But in class, I think that if they feel that they are the authority in the subject chosen then they should feel relaxed and confident. Or I might ask them about their feelings. So sometimes, I just switched and talk about something irrelevant to the lesson to make them feel relaxed in answering. But if I asked them, and they still keep quiet, I will rephrase my questions. And if I still don’t get the answer, I’ll switch to yes/no questions. But, if they still don’t speak, I will just answer for them. I’d rather give up…

Interviewer: If we talk about the teaching approaches and methods, what do you normally use?

Teacher 1: I don’t stress grammar. I never ask them to send me a script. I focus on listening because I feel that the more we listen, the more we get used to it. I also get them to give more input. Like today, we watched a video clip about London. I wanted them to speak more so I set up a broad frame for each topic to give me a guide on what I can lead them into. I will give them examples of the expressions they will be using. Then, I’ll find the activities that require them to use those expressions. I will try to follow the same procedures, because I think that they need to know the examples of how the language is used and they also need to know what they are expected to do. Then, they can apply these expressions into new situations that are similar. I hope that they will realise how this kind of language function is used in certain contexts. Of course, there will be some changes, from listening to speaking.

Interviewer: Let’s talk about this book. How long has it been used for?

Teacher 1: I’m not sure how long but we have used this book for as long as I have been here. It has the same content, but not the same look as the one I used when I was a student here. The language, the content, the sequence are quite similar to what we had ten years ago. The examples have been updated.

Interviewer: Do you like it?

Teacher 1: To be honest, I don’t like it. I don’t mind the topics because there is a necessity for them. Getting to know you, talking about likes and dislikes, leisure time activities, entertainment, and so on, but I don’t like the way they are presented. It’s just not interesting. After I have taught it for many semesters, I found myself jaded with the book in terms of the method of presentation and examples. For example, I look at the points to be covered for this chapter. I’ll reshuffle them and present them in my own way, like I change from simply giving examples to a quiz, changing the materials to
make it more interesting. Or sometimes, I will let them hear it and then locate them later in the script. I know that I’m getting away from the book. Especially this semester, I’d say that I use only 50% of the book, not like when I first started when I still didn’t know much. Another reason that we need to use the book or pinpoint some thing in the book is for the exams. The listening exams will concentrate on the language points in the book, closed test that’s why I need to get them to practise listening, multiple choice, taking notes. Sometimes, I have to get back to the book on purpose so that the students will not get lost from the points they will be assessed on. Personally, I don’t like this book much. In some chapters, there is a mix of two topics, which I think should be rearranged. Like chapter 6. It seems there are two topics and the subjects jump all over the place. So when I teach it, I have to tell them that chapter 6 is about social manners and that there are two sub-topics, giving advice and making an apology.

**Interviewer:** Where did you get the supplementary materials from?

**Teacher 1:** Commercial texts, and clips from the internet, for example, YouTube. One example I took from YouTube was about hobbies, but they made it in a rap style. So I thought the students should be interested in it, but in fact, it worked for some groups and not for others.

**Interviewer:** How do you find their responses to excerpts from commercial texts and original materials from internet?

**Teacher 1:** From observation of the group, I think the original materials made them nervous because they would worry that they couldn’t comprehend it. And also they didn’t know how much I expect of them. I didn’t expect them to get it all at once. Like today, I asked them to watch a video clip about London. They had to sit together with their partners, facing each other. One person saw the video, the other person didn’t. I asked the person who watched the video to explain to their partners what they saw. I thought they might find it too hard. When I first let them try it, they got confused and didn’t know what to do. Then, I had to adjust it a bit. I had to demonstrate to them. “There are many people at the subway station. They’re walking up and down in ties and suits. I think they’re businessmen.” When they said: “What should I do?” I had to demonstrate it to them. I think for some people it may not click with them right away. We have to demonstrate to them in detail, because they worry about how much we expect of them. But in fact, the essence is to get them speaking regardless of how right or wrong their language is. They just have to speak spontaneously. One thing that I noticed in doing this kind of activity is that they looked interested in the materials because it’s audiovisual. As for the print materials before you came, I used adverts from the paper. It was during New Year, and the subject was about events held by hotels. So the students could use it to make dialogue and invite their friends. That chapter was about suggestions and negotiations. Although the book uses authentic materials, it looks dry in black and white. I also used the same principle, nothing fancy. But I used the events related to the topics of learning. New Year’s, Valentine’s. The Tuesday class managed to handle it well. They managed to use more correct language.
Interviewer: The first day I came to your class,
Teacher 1: I talked.

Interviewer: What’s the purpose of this activity?
Teacher 1: It’s the topic setting in order to prepare them for the next two weeks. I think it’s my responsibility to get them to know what we are going to cover so that they know what we expect them to do. They can use it as a framework when they make dialogue. They know that they are being trained to use this particular pattern.

Interviewer: After this, the students worked in groups and acted as judges to make decisions for the punishment for cases. What do you think about this activity?
Teacher 1: I think this is a good activity so I didn’t want to skip it. I think it helps in stimulating students to think. I don’t care much about them using “in my opinion or I think”. I’d like them to have fun about giving opinions and reasons. In some classes, this activity can make people think and justify their reasons without any worries that they can’t speak English.

Interviewer: Were you satisfied with what this group did?
Teacher 1: No not really. Other groups have provided more opinions and tried to express their thoughts more – not only just giving answers.

Interviewer: They worked in groups and used both Thai and English.
Teacher 1: I think it’s because they’re not used to it. Maybe they might have been embarrassed. I didn’t find this happened in another group. Even Kam who I think speaks very well still didn’t speak English much when paired with Swiss who can also speak English very well. They looked as if they’re embarrassed because they knew that I was listening to them. Swiss is attentive. She likes anything that’s difficult. She might feel that it’s challenging. But she doesn’t look interested. She doesn’t show that this could be fun, but I’m sure she’s not absent-minded. Tin started off very interested. I knew that she would like to share although her English is not accurate. Not like Kan, her buddy, who speaks very little. Even when I talk to her one on one, she still replies to me word by word. For me, Sammy speaks a lot, so I assumed that she would rate herself as high in the willingness to speak arena. So that’s why I ask, if, we are talking about the same definition of willingness to communicate. I think the situations given in the questionnaire might be too specific. But in general, I think she is willing to speak. Ouan is highly willing? Yeah, I think it’s her character. I felt that I haven’t tried mixing them up with others much. Maybe I should break the Linguists and put them with Library science. Kan doesn’t look attentive to the activity. She’s always been like this. When I see she’s slow, I don’t know if she feels “Kreng Jai” or I’m bored. I don’t keep asking her as I feel she might give me a sign that she doesn’t know how to answer. So when I didn’t do it, it’s like I haven’t pushed her all the way.

Interviewer: Then, you talked about the adjectives and explained the meaning. You asked students about their opinions in relation to the listening
exercise.

**Teacher 1:** I didn’t plan it before I come up with the ideas and talked to them. After the class, I felt like maybe I have to integrate writing into this class for weak students so that they can have some time to prepare. I don’t usually do this because it’s redundant and a waste of time. For example, do you think eating meat is morally wrong? Why? I should have let them write down their answer before I asked them to speak. But I didn’t do it. I have little patience in waiting for their answers. Just say, I think so, I don’t think so. It shouldn’t take them that long. It’s a reflex. It’s an opinion. At least you need to say something. You shouldn’t just sit still and not say anything. If they don’t answer, I have to ask them. If they still don’t answer, I have to turn to others who have the potential to speak so that I can move on. Sometimes, I think I speak too much – just finish it so we can move on.

**Interviewer:** What do you think about the listening activity?

**Teacher 1:** The listening activity might be too easy for them. It’s out of context. No pictures. As I said I don’t dare not to use the book, but I would like to. But it would be weird for the class if we didn’t use any book.

**Interviewer:** This is Friday. You talked about agreeing or disagreeing. Students had to express their opinions, Listening, then, pair work, students need to complete dialogue. You gave them 30 minutes.

**Teacher 1:** I think it’s a lot. If they can speak beyond the sentence that they need to complete, I think it would take some time. So I think it’s substantial in terms of them speaking. There are a range of areas to speak about, social, family, TV. But I didn’t listen to each pair or randomised them to show what they did. Normally, I would have them do it in pair or in groups. Sometimes, for pair work, I would let them change their partner after they finish with one person so that they can get a variety of ideas.

**Interviewer:** Were you satisfied with the result?

**Teacher 1:** No, they didn’t speak as much as I thought they would. I didn’t expect them to repeat what they had spoken to their partners. I just let them speak and I asked more questions.

**Interviewer:** Group work about the definition of love. Why did you ask them to do this?

**Teacher 1:** It should be something that people would find enjoyable to do, not as boring as something like, the death penalty. I guess that they should be interested in looking at different views on this topic. It’s about relationships and culture. To ask some questions if it’s appropriate in our culture.

**Interviewer:** You asked them to select one person to be a moderator?

**Teacher 1:** I thought that there will be one person who started. So it will be quicker.

**Interviewer:** They speak English?

**Teacher 1:** If Jan comes in, people will speak because she speaks. She doesn’t find it awkward to use English to speak with her friends.
Interviewer: When you come near, do they speak English?

Teacher 1: I don’t know why they had to switch to Thai. But at least, it means that they find it interesting and talk about it.

Interviewer: The last day was the presentation.

Teacher 1: I thought that it would be good to have them apply what they learnt outside the class. I’m not worried about the result that they get, but I expected them to complete the process, gather information, organise it, prepare a presentation, and open the talk - more than just talking with me or with their peers in one or two sentences. This is the activity for chapter 5 about surveying opinions. They selected their own topic and get approval from me before surveying. They had to do it in one week.

Interviewer: Were you satisfied?

Teacher 1: No, I know they got little time to prepare. I don’t think that they’re not paying attention. I know that they’re not prepared. One thing that I like was everyone put the conclusion at the end. One of the problems might be that they didn’t rehearse. I felt that it’s like the first time, they saw the script. Maybe because I didn’t give them enough time and also didn’t coach them very much. Although it seemed like a big task, I actually didn’t expect them to do that much. It was just like another form of the role-play. I think in terms of the process they had to go through, they already needed to use a lot of skills. To get them to speak in front of class for 4 or 5 minutes is something already.

Interviewer: There’s some language about statistics that they need to use in the presentation?

Teacher 1: They thought that they had to do this such a thing by themselves because I had them look at the examples of students’ work in previous terms. They saw the slides that those students made so they just thought that this is one of the requirements. But, the subjects are only 20, what’s the point of doing it? They thought that whatever we showed is what we expected them to do, so there was no more room left for them to show their creativity. They might think that I wouldn’t be pleased, but actually it’s not the point. Or maybe they may were not confident to make a judgement of what they should keep in there and what they should leave out. Whatever I mentioned, they would think that it’s what I am looking for. But actually, what I said was just these were the options that they could do. One of the things that I haven’t touched on was pronunciation practice. There’s no session that I keep for training pronunciation. I just gave feedback whenever I heard mispronunciation. Although I felt it’s not fair, I had to take for granted that they already had experienced it before. They are not new in the battle. They have already heard those sounds before but it’s their own habit of saying it the same way.

Interviewer: What aspect would you emphasise for your teaching?

Teacher 1: I had to make sure that they had been through the expressions provided to serve certain language functions. I had to make them do the activities that they could be aware of explicitly. After that I would just let them speak, I would correct them sometimes - not very often. I expect to see them interact naturally and not for so short a time. It’s okay to make mistakes as long as I can still understand it. For pronunciation, I had to tell them
that it’s not new for them so it’s important that they need to know where they should improve. They couldn’t do it - as if they hadn’t learned it before. I hope that their listening skill will improve. The listening activity is something that I had to prepare them for the exams because most listening activities in the book are short but the monologue they will be listening to in the exam is very long. But, they have had the practice kit since the beginning of the semester. They could see what the test would be like. They had to do their own self-study. So, they should know that the test will be long.

Interviewer: Thank you very much.
### 1. Cultural context

| **Kreng-jai** | Value of being considerate to others which may restrain the participants from speaking up in the class because they do not want to cause troubles or discomforts to their classmates. For example, some participants did not want to speak for too long because they did not want to waste the class time. |
| **Unity** | Attitudes that the participants have which reflect their needs to comply with what other people do when they speak. For example, some participants might not want to speak because their classmates did not speak. |
| **Fear of negative evaluation** | Participants’ concern about others’ evaluation on their speaking. This issue is related to ‘face-saving’ value. For example, some participants did not want to speak English because they were worried that they would be negatively evaluated by their classmates/their teachers if they made mistakes. |
| **Teacher status** | Participants’ attitudes towards the persons who they have a conversation with. These attitudes reflect the value that ones’ need to respect and obey the seniors. For example, some participants did not want to debate with the teachers because they thought that it was not appropriate. |

### 2. Social and individual context

| **Social influences** | Effects from community members (e.g., desire and opinions) that can lead to the participants’ attitudes towards learning English or speaking English. For example, some participants might want to be good at English because of the pressure from their parents. |
| **Individual differences** | Individual differences category includes language learning experience, familiarity with English use, personality, and linguistics competence. |
| **Individual characteristics** | Participants’ individual characteristics that contribute to their inclination to speak English in class. For example, the participants who were introvert might not want to speak up. |
| **Communicative competence** | Ability to use English to communicate which comprises four competence areas: linguistic competence, sociolinguistic competence, discourse competence, and strategic competence. Participants who lacked communicative competence did not want to use English. |
| **Language learning experience** | Participants’ experiences in learning English. These include extra curriculum activities, extra classes, and overseas experiences. |

### 3. Classroom context

| **Interlocutors** | Influence of persons whom the participants converse with in English in class that affects their WTC. In class, the participants communicate with teachers and peers. |
| **Comparisons between speaking with peers and teachers** | Responses indicating the participants’ concerns when they had to converse with their peers and their teachers. |
| **Roles of peers in participants’ WTC in English** | Responses indicating the participants’ concerns when they had to converse with their peers. |
| **Roles of teachers in participants’ WTC in English** | Responses indicating the participants’ concerns when they had to converse with their teachers. |
| **Classroom management** | Classroom management category involves responses categorised as communication situations, class atmosphere, and teaching methods. |
| **Communication situations** | Different types of communication situations which affect the participants’ choice to speak. For example, the participants might prefer to speak in pairs than in groups. |
| **Class atmosphere** | Impressions that the participants perceived of the
classroom which derived from teaching practices, teacher, and classmates.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Teaching methods</th>
<th>Different types of teaching methods where participants involved in.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Task</td>
<td>Characteristics of the activities where the participants involved in. Responses involving the role of task on students’ WTC can be classified into topic, nature of task, task difficulty, and time allotted.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Topic</td>
<td>Responses indicating the concerns on what to speak about which can be categorised into real-world related topics and fantasy-world related topics.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nature of task</td>
<td>Responses indicating the characteristic of tasks that affect the participants’ WTC. Task nature was divided into highly-structured and non-structured tasks.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Task difficulty</td>
<td>Responses indicating the effect of task difficulty on the participants’ WTC. Participants who found the topics difficult to speak might not want to communicate.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time allotted</td>
<td>Responses indicating the effect of time allotted for certain tasks that affect the participants’ WTC. Participants might use Thai instead of English if they were not given enough time to complete the task.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**IV. Social and psychological factors**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Language Anxiety</th>
<th>Participants’ worry or negative feelings occur before or during learning or speaking English in class. For example, the participants might feel afraid that they may make mistakes if they spoke up.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Self-Concept</td>
<td>The participants’ evaluation of their competence which is derived from either internal or external comparison. This perception reflects their sense of self-worth. For example, participants who evaluated themselves based on how they perceived others’ competence would think that they were not as good as them.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-Efficacy</td>
<td>The participants’ judgement of their ability in doing specific tasks in specific domains where specific skill is required. This type of perceptions is skill-oriented, context-specific and primarily based on a self-standard. It is more cognitive related and less affective than self-concept. For example, the participants who had low self-efficacy on their skills in pronouncing certain English sounds might not feel bad about themselves and were still eager to speak English.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-Confidence</td>
<td>Levels of confidence the participants reported when they speak English. Responses indicating level of confidence can be classified into three levels: high, medium, and low.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goals Orientations</td>
<td>Purposes that participants set in their minds which relate to their choice of speaking English. There were two types of goals reported: mastery and performance goals. The participants who adopted mastery goals tended to practice speaking English in order to achieve their own satisfactions in learning, whereas those who developed performance goals seemed to practice speaking English to outperform their peers and preserved their sense of self-worth.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Language learning orientation</td>
<td>Reasons why the participants learn English. Responses referring to the reasons for learning English can be classified into three types: job-orientation, communication tools, and knowledge seeking.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interest</td>
<td>The participants’ attention towards learning English which influenced their choice of taking English as a major or a minor subject. The classification of interest reported was based on internal and external influences.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emotions</td>
<td>The participants’ feelings before speaking or at the moment while they were speaking. For example, the participants who felt tired during the class time did not want to participate in speaking activities.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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