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Abstract

Informed by, and seeking to contribute to, discussions about appropriate methodology (e.g. Holliday, 1994), my study as reported in this thesis was concerned with appropriacy of paradigms in TESOL (Teaching English to Speakers of Other Languages). It explored practitioner perspectives in Thai higher education (HE) in this era when English has become ‘the’ main international language for intercultural communication (IC). This linkage between English as an international language (EIL) and IC is evident in the strategy of the Association of South East Asian Nations (ASEAN) – of which Thailand was a founding member in 1967 – for greater economic, cultural and socio-political integration among its members. For practitioners like me, this regional strategic move in conjunction with Thai policies and curricular documentation raises questions about the appropriacy of the established practices of Teaching English as a Foreign Language (TEFL) in Thailand.

My multi-method qualitative case study addressed such questions by exploring the perspectives of three Thai-national teachers of English working in a Thai public university regarding the purposes of, and assumptions underpinning, their teaching of English. As informed by an understanding of their perspectives, I then considered the possible influences which might have shaped these perspectives.

The study identified the teachers’ main purposes to be short-term, instrumental ones – i.e. for academic study and examination preparation purposes. As such, they tended not to attach much value to the teaching of the cultural dimension (i.e. the target culture of native English speakers [NESs], the students’ home cultures and other cultures) or intercultural dimension (i.e. knowledge, skills and mindset needed for engaging people from differing cultural backgrounds). These purposes were underpinned by assumptions they held about the NES linguistic norms as testable norms in TEFL and Teaching English for Academic Purposes (TEAP).

The teachers seemed unfamiliar with alternative paradigms – such as Teaching English as an International Language (TEIL) – that might align top-level policy statements and actual classroom practices. This unfamiliarity suggests the inadequacy of the teachers’ educational and professional development experiences. The influences from their institution such as exams-oriented and English-medium academic agendas also had repercussions for the teachers’ perspectives. Stepping back from the teachers’ perspectives, my study suggested discourse inconsistencies across Thai HE regarding paradigms and purposes of TESOL.

This situation is unhelpful vis-à-vis the ASEAN foregrounding of EIL for IC, and the consequent need, through TESOL, to prepare Thai students to engage in IC with people within and beyond ASEAN. My study has implications for a direction of change for TESOL in the Thai HE and possibly for similar contexts elsewhere. It offers some suggestions about teacher education that can be supportive of reorienting TESOL towards appropriate and purposeful paradigms.
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Introduction to the Thesis

My doctoral study, as reported in this thesis, arose from my personal and professional experience with intercultural communication (IC) in the field of TESOL. By IC, I mean emergent and dynamic interpersonal communication in which ‘the boundaries between one language and culture and another are less clearly delineated’ (Baker, 2011, p. 199). Throughout the thesis, I use the term TESOL (Teaching English to Speakers of Other Languages) as an umbrella term to cover the similar but diverse educational activities captured by other writers who have used terms such as English Language Teaching (ELT), English Language Education (ELE), Teaching English as a Foreign Language (TEFL), Teaching English as a Second Language (TESL), Teaching English as an International Language (TEIL), Teaching English for Specific Purposes (TESP), Teaching English for Academic Purposes (TEAP) among others.

I am a Thai national and have learned English (EFL) for 18 years in Thailand throughout my elementary and secondary school years as well as at the university level. I am also an English language specialist and have been teaching the language (EFL, ESP, EAP) to Thai and international students for seven years at a public university in Thailand. After teaching for about two years, I was awarded a Fulbright Foreign Language Teaching Assistantship (FLTA), a grant for young (i.e. below 30 years of age) English language teachers from many countries around the world to teach their home language as a foreign language and to take courses at a university in the US. In my case, the grant was sponsored by the Thailand – United States Educational Foundation and the US Department of State’s Bureau of Education and Culture Affairs (which also offers exchange programmes for young Americans to teach English and learn ‘Thai culture’ in Thailand). It was through this FLTA opportunity that I first travelled outside Thailand and lived in an English-speaking country. Specifically, I was based at the University of Hawai’i at Mānoa for the 2008-2009 academic year.

Undertaking this FLTA position had a marked influence on my personal and professional perspectives. First, my personal view about the world changed as I realised how much bigger it is than I had previously imagined. While based in the US, I had opportunities to meet new people from other parts of the world and to become friends with many of them. I was, and remain, grateful to everyone who made this opportunity happen for me as I realise that such opportunities do not happen for many people in my country. Second, the experience shaped
me as an English language teacher. After coming back from the US in 2009, I was enthusiastic about sharing the insights about ‘American culture’ that I had gained while living in the US for that FLTA year. Thus, I preferred to use materials related in some way to the US and to refer to famous Americans. For example, I played a Taylor Swift song during a reading activity and used a speech of Barack Obama as material for a critical thinking activity. I thought that it was ‘cool’ to teach students with an American accent, and I expected them to develop an American accent with me as a model. I also hoped that teaching about what I learned from abroad would broaden my students’ views about the world.

It took me quite a while to realise that my teaching and I both might have been ‘Americanised’ from the entirety of my experience in the US. One critical moment in this regard occurred in 2012 when I attended a talk by Professor Sandra Lee McKay on the topic of ‘Teaching English as an International Language’. This talk took place on 17th May 2012 at the university where I was teaching. While having a discussion about taking a compliment in English, I said that I would just say ‘Thank you’. Professor McKay asked me if I was ‘Westernised’ because, generalising broadly, Thai people (as well as people in Asian countries) would probably say something to make it sound not so special. This is for instance, when someone compliments your new shirt, you might say ‘Oh, it’s a cheap one’. I replied that I might have been ‘Americanised’ in the sense that I had learned that some of my American friends would respond to a compliment by saying ‘Thank you’.

In addition to the teaching models (e.g. accent) and content that had become ‘Americanised’, when I looked back, I realised that the majority of my teaching involved the teaching of grammar such as subject-verb agreement, tenses and types of conditional sentences. Many of my students seemed to have low motivation for studying English. Many did not do well in exams, and more importantly, they could not really speak English. Discussions among my colleagues during lunchtime often tended to focus on this low level of English proficiency and on problems related to students’ motivation, responsibility, and other difficulties they had.

These personal and professional experiences inspired me to conduct research into intercultural aspects of TESOL in Thailand. When I decided to pursue a PhD, I reflected on my own teaching and began to realise that what I had been teaching might not have been helping my students to use English in real-world English-medium IC. Many students lacked
motivation to learn English, and they could not use what they had learned (i.e. grammar knowledge) to communicate in English. Moreover, only a few of them would have a chance to actually communicate with native English speakers (NESs) from the US.

In my original PhD proposal written in 2012, I wanted to explore the concept of Intercultural Communication Competence (ICC, e.g. Byram, 1997) in TESOL in Thai universities and to do so from a student perspective. However, as I reflected on my own practices, and as my thinking and understanding about the topic developed, I chose to explore what I have come to see as a key driver of such teaching, namely teacher perspectives on English and the teaching and learning of it.

As an English language user and as an English language teacher, I also have assumptions about English and how to teach it. The assumptions I used to harbour have changed through the course of my PhD study while I have been living in the UK. If my US experience ‘Americanised’ me, my UK experience has challenged my assumptions. First, I learned that English spoken in the UK is different from the English I studied at schools and universities and it even differs from the English I discerned living and working in the US. In the UK, there are not only many regional accents, but also many international accents. Further, the increasing diversity of UK society, especially in cities like Manchester (where I am based), has resulted in a wide assortment of accents and varieties of English being found there. As a consequence of witnessing and experiencing the diversity within the English language first hand, I now question the value of teaching students a single ‘native’ variety. Instead, they need to be made aware of the heterogeneity in English that they may encounter.

Second, I used to think that, in terms of IC in English, NESs had an advantage over those using the language as a foreign or second language. I believed that NESs did not have to overcome any significant English language barriers. However, when I expressed this to my supervisor during the first year of my PhD, he narrowed his eyes (a response I have learned might mean that I have said something wrong or naïve) and told me to re-consider this line of thinking. My assumption was challenged several months later. I had to deal with an energy company over the phone because I had just moved into a new flat. The conversation was between me – an English language teacher teaching English for several years who had lived and taught in the US for a year and was currently doing a PhD about English language education in the UK – and an employee who was, I assumed, a NES because of what
appeared to me to be a northern British accent. In addition to our mutual unfamiliarity with each other’s English accent, he struggled to spell my long Thai names. In addition, I was hampered by my lack of knowledge about the age of my building and of the boiler. Finally, with the communication faltering, he decided to find me an interpreter. This was a strategy which not only had little benefit but which was also deeply disappointing given all I had invested in my English language specialism.

This incident taught me that, whether or not one is a NES, successful communication involves more than just language. English-medium IC requires other attributes (e.g. being willing to communicate, being more patient, being tolerant of different accents, adjusting speed and pronunciation, asking clarifying questions) as well as being aware of other cultural differences that may potentially arise in such communication. These skills, this awareness, and mindset of communicators are necessary to successful English-medium IC.

My view in this regard was also shaped by my part-time work as an associate trainer for a cross-cultural training consultancy in the UK. One day, I received an email message from them asking for my views regarding an incident which had been experienced by a student support manager at a UK university. According to the message:

the Thai students on his programme this year were very close as a group. He said they seemed to be from elite backgrounds and from Bangkok and he found the group almost impenetrable. He has tried to talk to them but just gets a very blank response. They did not seem to want to mix with the other students at all. (Personal email communication, April 2015)

This situation was not totally surprising to me as I had seen something similar while I was in Manchester. I replied to them as follows:

The language might be one of the major factors, but I think that their minimal intercultural experience might be the main reason. Since more students come to study abroad when they are very young and haven’t got much intercultural experience, they might not feel confident enough to be out there on their own. If this is the case, I think they might need more time and at the same time they need to be encouraged to mix

\[\text{1 The term ‘cross-cultural’ is sometimes used interchangeably with the term ‘intercultural’ in TESOL literature and policy discourses. The term ‘cross-cultural’ makes a connection between ‘cultures’ and nations (e.g. between Thai and Japanese) while the latter does not suggest a link to any particular group (Gudykunst, 2003, pp. vii-ix).}\]
with others through activities that help them get to know others and step out of their comfort zone. (Personal email communication, April 2015)

As an English language teacher, this kind of situation, which can happen not only abroad but also in one’s own home country, suggested to me some possible consequences of a lack of skills, awareness and appropriate mindset for IC. It also suggested inadequate preparation of young Thais to use English in what I call this ‘intercultural age’, i.e. the time when the world is becoming more and more interconnected. My PhD study, therefore, focused on how TESOL in Thai universities could be more appropriate and purposeful in preparing Thai undergraduates for the challenges of, and opportunities for, English-medium IC. To this end, my study explored the implicit and explicit perspectives of some TESOL practitioners regarding English and the teaching and learning of it in Thai universities. The research questions which guided my study were:

1) What are the perspectives of some Thai TESOL practitioners at a Thai public university regarding the purposes of their teaching of the English language?
2) What are their paradigm assumptions regarding the teaching and learning of the English language? and
3) What are possible influences that shape the teachers’ perspectives on the purposes of and paradigm assumptions underpinning TESOL in their context?

This thesis is organised in the following way. In Chapter 1, I contextualise my study in political, linguistic, and educational terms. I explain why it is worthwhile to explore the current situation of TESOL in Thai higher education (HE) in relation to its purposes and directions in preparing graduates for the increasingly interconnected ASEAN. In Chapters 2 and 3, I discuss the conceptual framing for my study. In Chapter 4, I provide a description of my research site, i.e. a Thai public university, in terms of its General Education English (GEE) curriculum and implementation. In Chapter 5, I present my overall research design and how I implemented it in the field to explore perspectives of three practitioners teaching and working at the university. In this chapter, I also detailed my approach to data analysis. In Chapter 6, I present the outcome of my analysis. In particular, I present and discuss salient aspects I identified in each participant’s data. These aspects are discussed vis-à-vis my research questions in Chapter 7. Finally, in Chapter 8, I consider what has been learned through the study and what contributions it makes to the overall body of relevant knowledge.
The thesis concludes with a discussion of the implications of my study for TESOL teacher education, policy makers and researchers in Thailand, ASEAN and in similar contexts.
Chapter 1 - Contextual Background

Introduction
This chapter presents the context in which my study was situated and against which it needs to be understood. In Section 1.1, I situate my study vis-à-vis the status and roles of the English language and the teaching of the language at the higher education (HE) level in Thailand. As discussed in Section 1.2, the Thai context is increasingly connected with the Association of South East Nations (ASEAN), of which Thailand is part, as well as with recent developments such as the establishment of the ASEAN Economic Community (AEC) in 2015. The ASEAN and HE sectors in Thailand, as evident through their policy discourses, recognise the IC potential arising from ASEAN integration. They seek to equip people in the region with intercultural understanding together with other skills such as English – the working language of the ASEAN as well as the global lingua franca. In Section 1.3, I discuss how Thai HE responds to this phenomenon as reflected in its policies. Specifically, I focus on what the policy discourse suggests about the purposes and directions of TESOL in Thai universities.

1.1 English and TESOL in Thailand

1.1.1 English in Thailand
Thailand, a country of 67 million people, is often viewed as essentially a monolingual country because there is just one official language – namely, central or standard Thai (or sometimes, Thai Krungthep or Bangkok Thai) – which is the first language of approximately 90% of the population. Although there is a multilingual dimension to Thailand’s true linguistic landscape (see Smalley, 1994), it is against this monolingual perception that the official/legal status and roles of foreign languages, especially English, needs to be understood.

English can be considered as a foreign language\(^2\) in Thailand because it has not been legally or formally given official language status in the country. Unlike some neighbouring countries (e.g. Malaysia, the Philippines and Singapore) Thailand was not formally colonised by an

---

\(^2\) The foreign language status of English and functions of English in different contexts might be understood through Kachru’s model of *Three Concentric Circles* which will be discussed in Chapter 2.
English-speaking Western power such as the British Empire or the USA\(^3\) (Wiriyachitra, 2002). The first significant contact with English speakers in Thailand ‘took place more than a century ago in Thai royal society during the reign of King Nang Klao (1824-1854), when American missionaries were tasked with teaching the language to young children of noble birth’ (Aksornkul, 1980, p. 72, as cited in Rappa and Wee, 2006). According to Foley (2005), English in Thailand has become widely used in the following domains:

- working language of international organizations and conferences;
- international banking, economic affairs and trade;
- advertising for global brands;
- audio-visual products (e.g. film, TV, popular music);
- tourism;
- higher education;
- international safety (e.g. ‘airspeak’, ‘seaspeak’);
- international law;
- relay language in interpretation and translation;
- scientific publications;
- technology transfer and
- internet communication. (p. 226)

In my experience, within this wide array of areas in which English usage has prominence in Thailand, there are two overarching domains where English proficiency is highly prized by Thais. First, English is important for trade, business and work (within and beyond Thailand). Because of this, Thai job applicants who can communicate in English (as mostly demonstrated through their grades in transcripts and performance in job interviews) have greater employability than candidates with lower grades in English. Second, and relatedly, English has a significant function for Thais communicating with the outside world (Rappa and Wee, 2006, p. 121), an externally-oriented function that includes most of Thailand’s neighbours (e.g. those in ASEAN – except for the Lao PDR as Thai and Lao languages are closely related) and the wider global community.

\(^3\) Thailand means ‘the land of the free’.
1.1.2 TESOL in Thailand

English has several roles and functions in Thai society, and it therefore has an important place in Thai education from the basic (i.e. primary and secondary) to higher education levels. The English Language Curriculum for Basic Education (Ministry of Education, 1996) stipulates that English is a compulsory subject for all students beginning in Prathomsuksa Level 1 (i.e. the first year of primary school, for students of seven years of age). The curriculum also provides the majority of Thai students with about 90 hours per year of studying English in schools. This ‘proficiency-based’ curriculum aims to develop students’ English language proficiency in order for them to be able to use English for ‘life-long learning’ and ‘to fulfil a number of purposes: communication, acquisition of knowledge, use of English in academic studies, career advancement as well as appreciation of the language and its culture’ (Wongsorthorn et al., 2002, p. 108). By ‘culture’, the curriculum refers to the development of students’:

knowledge and understanding of ways of life and cultures of those who use English as the mother tongue and of the world community in general, as well as be able to creatively communicate Thai culture to others’ (Sukamolson, 1998, p. 83).

Although ‘the world community in general’ is mentioned, the teaching and learning of ‘cultures’ seems to be more strongly associated with English-speaking or Thai societies as evident in the Basic Education Core B.E. 2551 (A.D. 2008):

Language and Culture: use of foreign languages harmonious with culture of native [English] speakers; relationships, similarities and differences between languages and cultures of native [English] speakers; languages and cultures of native [English] speakers and Thai culture; and appropriate application. (Ministry of Education, 2008b, p. 253)

I discuss the notions of ‘cultures’ and ‘native English speakers’ in Chapters 2 and 3.

By ‘foreign languages’, the Ministry of Education (ibid) refers to English mainly as follows:

The foreign language constituting basic learning content that is prescribed for the entire basic education core curriculum is English, while for other foreign languages, e.g., French, German, Chinese, Japanese, Arabic, Pali and languages of neighbouring countries, it is left to the discretion of educational institutions to prepare courses and provide learning management as appropriate. (p. 252)
English is an entry requirement for most HE institutions (henceforth, universities) and an exit requirement in some as well. English is a required General Education subject (minimum of 12 credits) for most students. Each university has autonomy to develop their own General Education English (GEE) curriculum as they deem appropriate. They can decide how the curriculum will be taught, what teaching methodologies and materials will be used and how courses will be assessed.

There is a total of 156 universities in Thailand, 81 of which are public and 75 of which are private. Many adopted English as the medium of instruction (EMI) as part of the internationalisation process. This is because EMI ‘has permitted a rapid internationalisation of education’ (Graddol, 1997, p. 45), and by becoming ‘international’, universities can attract local as well as foreign students and staff (Feak, 2013, p. 40; Kirkpatrick, 2014, p. 24). However, the term ‘internationalisation’ usually refers to ‘Englishization’ (Kirkpatrick, 2011a, p. 100), and this seems to be the case for Thai HE.

Kanjananiyot (2004, p. 2) provides a definition of ‘internationalisation’ of HE as ‘the process of integrating an international/intercultural dimension into the teacher, research and service functions of the institution’. Nevertheless, in my view, the ‘internationalisation’ of Thai HE tends to refer to the use of English as the medium of instruction. This is evident in the Thai HE discourse such as in a Ministry of Education’s (2008a, p. 8) publication which describes ‘international education’ as ‘provided by using languages other than Thai (generally English) as a medium of instruction’. In addition, the Office of Higher Education Commission (OHEC) reports that in 2015, there were 27 public and 17 private universities which offered 769 undergraduate and postgraduate ‘international programmes using English as the medium of instruction’ (OHEC, 2015, p. vii).

My impression from working in the HE sector is that teaching and assessing of English is mostly linked to the learning of grammar, the passing of exams, and employability-enhancing certification. This is not consistent with the HE sector’s aspirations of becoming ‘international’. In my own institution (discussed in Chapter 4), many teachers (myself included) emphasised grammatical accuracy and therefore spent a large amount of time and energy on teaching, reviewing and testing grammar points. Although there is not complete uniformity in this regard, American English (in terms of pronunciation, accent and vocabulary) seems to be the most popular English variety taught in universities. This is
possibly because of the influence of US media, but also because most native English speaker teachers in Thailand are from the US (as a result, for example, of numerous exchange programmes such as the one I participated in as noted in the Introduction to the Thesis).

Furthermore, many teachers assume that students are learning English to communicate mainly with native English speakers rather than using the language more widely. Consequently, apart from focusing on teaching students to master NES grammatical norms, the teaching of English as a foreign language in Thailand often focuses on what are assumed to be NES cultural insights from English-speaking countries such as the US and Britain. However, this simplistic view does not consider how multilingual and multicultural these countries truly are. Overall, the above detailed foci of teaching raise questions about the appropriacy of current TESOL in Thailand and whether or not that teaching can meet the needs required of Thailand’s externally-oriented function described above.

1.2 The increasingly interconnected ASEAN

The current orientation of TESOL in Thai universities can also be questioned in terms of its appropriacy for this time when English-medium intercultural communication (IC) continues to rise due to the increasing interconnectedness both globally and in particular within the South East Asian region.

1.2.1 What is ASEAN?

Thailand is a member state of the Association of South East Asian Nations (ASEAN), an intergovernmental organization founded in 1967 ‘to establish a firm foundation for common action to promote regional cooperation in South-East Asia in the spirit of equality and partnership and thereby contribute towards peace, progress and prosperity in the region’ (ASEAN, 1967). With five founding members – Indonesia, Malaysia, the Philippines, Singapore and Thailand – ASEAN has grown over the last fifty years so that, presently, there are ten member states, namely: Brunei Darussalam, Cambodia, Indonesia, Laos, Malaysia, Myanmar, Philippines, Singapore, Thailand, and Vietnam. In 2011, Timor Leste (East Timor in English) submitted an application to become the 11th ASEAN member, and the country is being assessed for its readiness to join the association.
1.2.2 The ASEAN’s intercultural aspirations for an ASEAN Community

With reference to the ASEAN’s above mentioned purpose, ASEAN has articulated an intercultural aspiration of building a regional community which is ‘outward looking, living in peace, stability and prosperity, bonded together in partnership in dynamic development and in a community of caring societies’ (ASEAN, 1997).

In 2003, the ASEAN leaders set out to build an ASEAN Community by 2020 and to do so based on three pillars. The first pillar is the ASEAN Political-Security Community (APSC) which aims to:

- ensure that the peoples and Member States of ASEAN live in peace with one another and with the world at large in a just, democratic and harmonious environment. (ASEAN, 2009, p. 5).

The second pillar is the ASEAN Socio-Cultural Community (ASCC), the main goal of which is:

- to contribute to realising an ASEAN Community that is people-centred and socially responsible with a view to achieving enduring solidarity and unity among the nations and peoples of ASEAN by forging a common identity and building a caring and sharing society which is inclusive and harmonious where the well-being, livelihood, and welfare of the peoples are enhanced. (ibid, p. 67)

In this regard, the ASEAN Socio-Cultural Community Blueprint (ASEAN, 2009) outlines a course of action to ‘support the citizens of Member States to become proficient in the English language, so that the citizens of the ASEAN region are able to communicate directly with one another and participate in the broader international community’ (p.69). This statement suggests the importance of developing ASEAN citizens’ English language proficiency so that they can use English as ‘the’ regional and global lingua franca. It also suggests to me a privileged place for English language education within the ASEAN policy discourse because the English language as the only language option specified for ASEAN citizens to ‘communicate directly with one another’. Yet, ASEAN citizens who share similar linguistic backgrounds can use, and have been using, other local languages as lingua franca. For instance, an Indonesian and a Malaysian may use Bahasa (despite the two different varieties of Bahasa: Indonesia and Malaysia), and Chinese descendants in Thailand and Singapore may use Teochew, a variety widely spoken in South East Asia or Mandarin when doing business.
The final pillar is the ASEAN Economic Community (AEC) which:

will establish ASEAN as a single market … accelerating regional integration in the priority sectors; facilitating movement of business persons, skilled labour and talents; and strengthening the institutional mechanisms of ASEAN. (ibid, p. 21)

Among the three pillars of the ASEAN Community, the AEC has received the most attention from ASEAN leaders because of the AEC’s ‘quantitative nature and expected tangible benefits’ (Das, 2016, pp. 1-2). Therefore, in 2007, ASEAN leaders agreed to accelerate the establishment of the AEC to 2015.

### 1.2.3 Some complexities in the ASEAN integration process

Evident in the above discussion of the purposes, vision and characteristics of ASEAN is the aspiration to build a regional community which is united by ASEAN people who are socially responsible, caring and understanding. In pursuit of this, IC among ASEAN people is expected to increase. However, with reference to the ASEAN motto ‘One Vision, One Identity, One Community’ (ASEAN, 2008, Article 36), one of the main complexities facing ASEAN in its integration process seems to be how to deal with countries which differ in many respects, namely: political systems, economic development, and linguistic and cultural diversities.

First, ASEAN countries have different political systems (e.g. the constitutional monarchy in Thailand⁴, the Sultanate of Brunei, and Military-backed government in Myanmar⁵). Second, there is a wide discrepancy in the economic development among ASEAN countries (e.g. lower income countries such as Cambodia, Lao PDR, Myanmar and Vietnam versus the more economically-developed countries like Singapore, Thailand, Malaysia, Indonesia and Brunei). The ASEAN Education Ministers at the Eighth ASEAN Education Ministers Meeting (ASED) in Vientiane, Lao PDR in September 2014 believe that these discrepancies can be reduced by developing key areas, namely: ‘connectivity, mobility, human resource development, IT and English Language training’ (ASEAN, 2014, No. 3). Third, ASEAN nations are diverse in linguistic and cultural composition. This diversity is well recognised

---

⁴ Since 2014 to the time of writing, Thailand has been ruled by a military junta.

⁵ Myanmar (Burma) had its first free and fair election in 2015 with the victory of Aung San Suu Kyi’s party. However, the military still holds much of the power in the government and parliament.
and evident in the constitution of the ASEAN Community, the *ASEAN Charter* (ASEAN, 2008), which states that ASEAN seeks ‘to promote an ASEAN identity through the fostering of greater awareness of the diverse culture and heritage of the region’ (Article 1, paragraph 14). The *ASEAN Charter* also encourages citizens of the member states to ‘respect the different cultures, languages and religions of the peoples of ASEAN, while emphasizing their common values in the spirit of unity in diversity’ (Article 2, paragraph (l)).

A great challenge for the ASEAN organisation in facilitating its integration process and enhancing the interconnectedness of the region is linguistic and cultural diversity within the region. In particular, after the launch of the AEC in 2015, the possibilities for, and expectations of, IC between people from the same region but from diverse linguistic and cultural backgrounds have increased immensely. ASEAN has to consider communication issues involving more than 600 million citizens of the ten member states which collectively involve more than 1,000 languages (Kirkpatrick, 2012).

However, the ASEAN language policy does not seem to be fully consistent with the call to value linguistic and other diversity in the region. The *ASEAN Charter* (ASEAN, 2008) stipulates that ‘the working language of ASEAN shall be English’ (Article 34), and later, from my perspective, this is usually referred to in the media discourse as ‘the official language’ or ‘the international language of the ASEAN’ (Tantiniranat and Fay, 2015). Kirkpatrick (2012, p. 124) observes that the policy ‘gives English a uniquely privileged position among the ASEAN member states, and provides another reason why English is considered so important’. For Wilang and Teo (2012), the recommended use of English as the lingua franca for the region was appropriate because, considering that the ASEAN is comprised of people from distinct origins and cultural backgrounds, the adoption of English will ‘keep the ASEAN from further conundrum on language issues’ (p.2). Nomnian (2014) also comments that the ‘English language will potentially enhance the unification of ASEAN members who will realize that we have something in common in order to create and strengthen ASEAN as our regional community’ (p. 78).

This English-privileging language policy of the ASEAN is questionable in terms of fairness because it means that all the peoples within the ASEAN member states will need to develop English proficiency to a level adequate for IC within and beyond the region. However, the status of English among the countries in the region varies markedly due to differing histories,
experience and impact of colonisation. For instance, English is an official language in Brunei, Malaysia, the Philippines and Singapore, but not in Burma (Myanmar), Cambodia, Indonesia, Lao PDR, Thailand or Vietnam. These latter countries may face greater challenges related to the development of their citizens’ English proficiency, and therefore greater challenges in participating in the English-foregrounded lingua franca communication within and beyond the ASEAN region.

An example of the struggle in terms of English proficiency of the countries with more distant relationships with English can be seen from a recent report of the average TOEFL iBT – Test of English as a Foreign Language, internet-based test – scores of test-takers from countries in the South East Asian region between January and December 2016 (ETS, 2017) as shown in Table 1.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>ASEAN country</th>
<th>Scores / 120</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>Singapore</td>
<td>96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>Malaysia</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>The Philippines</td>
<td>89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>Indonesia</td>
<td>84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>Vietnam</td>
<td>82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>Myanmar</td>
<td>81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>Thailand</td>
<td>78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>Cambodia</td>
<td>71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.</td>
<td>Lao PDR</td>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>Brunei Darussalam$^6$</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1: The average TOEFL iBT scores of test-takers from ASEAN (2016)

Although the test-provider, ETS, cautions that the scores are correct at an individual level but not necessarily representative at the national level, the scores demonstrate a gap in the English proficiency of the citizens of ASEAN member states and illustrate the challenges that graduates in countries like Cambodia, Lao PDR and Thailand will face as the regional integration necessitated by the establishment of the AEC in 2015 progresses.

$^6$ Brunei Darussalam was not included in the report.
In light of what I have interpreted as the intercultural aspirations of ASEAN and the privileged English language policy described above, an important question for the Thai HE sector is whether Thai universities are ready to prepare Thai undergraduates for this phenomenon and the intercultural age in general.

1.3 The purposes and directions of TESOL in Thai universities

The ASEAN strategic development has a number of implications for the practices of TESOL in the region as well as in Thailand. In this section, I discuss how Thai HE, through its English language policy discourse, has responded to the phenomenon. In particular, I focus on what can be said about the purposes and directions of TESOL in Thai universities.

Despite the top-level aspirations for ASEAN citizens to use English as ‘the’ language of communication within the region and to develop graduates with required sets of skills, neither ASEAN nor Thai HE has a specific English language policy. The guidelines for language education are usually embedded in educational policies and are generally vague. For instance, it was only very recently that all Thai public universities were required to consider how to improve the standard of teaching and learning of the language as well as examination-measured achievement levels. In April 2016, the OHEC announced a new policy entitled *Raising English standard in Thai higher education institutions* (OHEC, 2016). This new policy was built upon the Thai interim government’s (The National Council for Peace and Order) policy of March 2016 which sought to reform all levels of Thai education (i.e. basic education, vocational education and higher education) with the aim of better enabling Thais to learn and develop to their full potential. The new policy stipulates that Thai universities should:

1) formulate policies and goals to raise English language education standards within the institution in all curricula and at all levels of education as guidance for developing English language skills of the graduates to be well equipped in terms of academic, professionalism and basic English communication skills (working knowledge [of English]);

2) devise a plan with clear indicators and assessment mechanisms in order to implement the policy;

3) consider improving the teaching and learning of English at the institution in accordance with the determined goals;
4) consider using extracurricular activities, procedures, media and/or environment to provide opportunities for students and motivate them to develop their own English skills;

5) consider administering a standardised test equivalent to the Common European Framework of Reference for Language (CEFR) or other standardised tests to assess students’ English language proficiency; and

6) consider recording these test results on student’s official transcript or certificates.

From my perspective, this new policy is ambiguous in at least two respects. First, it does not provide any details about the national goals of English language education vis-à-vis students’ level of English language proficiency (e.g. the precise CEFR level\(^7\)). It follows that the goals may vary from university to university. Second, while the policy undertakes to develop students to develop students’ basic English communication skills (i.e. ‘working knowledge of English’), it suggests that these skills or knowledge might be assessed through a proficiency test. Although the policy suggests CEFR-equivalent-standardised tests, it is also open to ‘other standardised tests’. It is possible that the goal of students developing a ‘working knowledge of English’ might be translated into what is typically understood in the Thai TESOL context as grammatical knowledge and grammatical accuracy testing rather than developing students’ communicative skills and/or ability to use English in communication. The CEFR also has been criticised because of its assumptions related to the learning of native English varieties and native-like competence in communication (Baker, 2015, p. 135). This is because it was developed in the context of foreign language education (FLE) and does not recognise a lingua franca such as English (Jenkins and Leung, 2016, p. 10). I discuss the notions of native-like competence, FLE and the status of English as a lingua franca in Chapters 2 and 3.

Further, with an implementational focus on testing, the addition of test scores on institutional transcripts and certificates may reinforce the country’s examination culture in TESOL and across education sectors, as well as demotivating less proficient students. Also, in Thailand where students’ ‘future employment opportunities depend on the results of standardized tests which can be enhanced by extra-curricular cramming’ (Prapthal, 2008, pp. 133-134), test

\(^7\) The Ministry of Education has set the proficiency target for students to reach B1 level of the CEFR upon the completion of the basic education curriculum i.e. secondary level, approx. 18 years of age.
results might be seen as ‘a way to select, to motivate, to punish’ (Spolsky, 1995, p. 1, as cited in Pennycook, 2008, p. 174). Therefore, the new policy might exacerbate the situation in which the country is underperforming in terms of developing its citizens’ English language proficiency (discussed in 1.2.3) rather than raising standards as intended.

To respond to the ASEAN Community integration, the OHEC (2010) published *the Strategies of Thai Higher Education for the Preparation for the ASEAN Community in 2015*. In relation to the orientation towards English, the OHEC refers to the status, roles and functions of English as follows:

> The fact that English has been designated by the ASEAN as its *working language* suggests that *learning foreign languages* is essential for today and the future, especially [the learning of] *English*, the language which [is] regarded as the *international language for communication*. (Tantiniranat, 2015a, pp. 161-162, emphasis added)

It is interesting to note the different labels assigned to English in this short extract: the working language (of the ASEAN organisation); a foreign language; and ‘the international language for communication’. This suggests an ambiguous stance concerning how English should be approached and taught in Thai universities.

Regarding the goals of HE, the OHEC states that universities should aim at developing graduates’ employability by equipping them with required skills:

> The future employment in ASEAN will require the graduates to have additional skills apart from their professional skill such as English and other languages used in ASEAN and *inter-cultural skill*. Hence, the [OHEC] strongly encourages higher education institutions to produce the graduates of international quality who equipped with professional skills, language skill and *inter-cultural skill*. (ibid, p. 162, emphasis in the original)

According to the above statement, universities should develop graduates who possess at least three sets of skills: those related to their profession, language and ‘inter-cultural’ skills. The language in this context refers to English and ASEAN languages. Though teaching ASEAN languages has been promoted by the promulgated strategies, and universities have started to teach some ASEAN languages, from my experience, English remains the most popular foreign language in Thailand.
As for ‘inter-cultural’ skills, the OHEC does not discuss what it might mean. From my engagement with some current policies at the ASEAN and Thai levels, the term seems related to the knowledge, skills and mindset essential for interacting effectively and appropriately with people from differing linguistic and cultural backgrounds. These qualities discussed in the ASEAN and Thai HE policy discourse may include, but are not limited to:

- having knowledge about ASEAN;
- having a wide worldview;
- recognising one’s own culture;
- realising/valuing multiple identities and multiculturalism;
- recognising ASEAN citizenship;
- being prepared for changes; and
- being able to work in overseas organizations or abroad (ibid, p. 161).

In summary, a review of the pertinent Thai HE educational policy discourse which has developed in response to the ASEAN integration reflects that English has a significant place within the region and in Thai education. It also suggests a consensus that English language skill is an essential tool for graduates in several regards including academic studies, employability and intercultural communication within and beyond ASEAN. While the OHEC encourages Thai universities to aim to develop graduates in several respects for the ASEAN Community integration including English language and ‘inter-cultural’ skills, there seems to be ambiguities in relation to:

- how English should be approached;
- what the national goals of TESOL in Thai HE are;
- how such goals should be taught and assessed; and
- what ‘inter-cultural’ skills might mean and how they can be developed and assessed.

These ambiguities demonstrate the lack of directions and purposes of TESOL in Thai universities.

**Concluding remarks**

In this chapter, I situated my study in political, linguistic, and educational terms drawing on the background information related to the status and roles of the English language in Thailand
and the teaching of English in Thai universities. I also discussed the increasingly intertwined ASEAN community of nations of which Thailand is a member. Finally, I discussed the purposes and directions of TESOL in Thai universities.

The complexities of the ASEAN region’s diversities, intercultural aspirations to build an interconnected community, and the English-privileging language policy of the ASEAN provide an interesting research context for language educators and, on a broader level, policy makers. An important question is, therefore, whether TESOL in Thai HE is appropriate for the contemporary context and purposeful in preparing Thai graduates for the status, roles and functions of English in this increasingly interconnected region. In the next two chapters, I present and discuss the conceptual frame of my study, my research aims and research questions.
Chapter 2 - Appropriate Methodology and TESOL Paradigms

Introduction
In the previous chapter I contextualised my study in political, linguistic, and educational terms. I did so to explain why an exploration of TESOL in Thai HE was of interest to practitioners and that the current orientation of TESOL in Thai HE might not be appropriate for preparing graduates for the increasingly interconnected ASEAN.

In this chapter and the next, I conceptualise my study with reference to three relevant areas of literature. The first area involves the ongoing discussions in TESOL regarding the appropriacy of the teaching of English in differing contexts. In Section 2.1, I discuss the line of thinking which calls for appropriate (i.e. context-sensitive) methodology. In particular, I explore Holliday’s seminal work in this area and discuss how I extended his concepts to the area of TESOL ‘paradigm’, the second area of literature. In Section 2.2, I discuss TESOL paradigms linked to the contexts where English is used and taught based on Kachru’s (1985; 1992; 1996) model. My discussion of TESOL paradigms continues into the next chapter where I explore the newer TESOL paradigm possibilities. In that chapter, I also discuss the third related area of literature – namely, that concerning the cultural and intercultural dimensions in foreign language education – and I conclude with the research aims and research questions.

2.1 Appropriate methodology
My study contributes to the discussions within TESOL about appropriate methodology with a concern for how TESOL would be appropriate for Thai HE in this intercultural age. Below, I map out the areas of appropriate methodology with a focus on Holliday’s seminal contributions to appropriate methodology and parts of his theorising which I used in my study.

2.1.1 The call for context-sensitivity
Discussions of appropriate methodology in TESOL date from the 1980s, and a key moment in this regard was the discussion between Roger Bowers and Henry Widdowson at the 1986 Dunford House Seminar (Holliday, 2005, p. 140). Bowers argued that the ‘appropriacy’ of methodologies should be ‘directed by contextual variables’ such as the local expertise and
available resources (Bowers and Widdowson, 1986, in Abbott and Beaumont, 1997, p. 141). For Widdowson (ibid, p. 145), ‘appropriate methodology is not new in terms of learning-goals; what is new in our considerations of methodology is the socio-cultural context in which language teaching takes place’. In the same vein, Coleman (1990 in Abbott and Beaumont, 1997, p. 158) explored the appropriacy (or not) of adopting objectives and methodologies developed in other contexts. He emphasised ‘context-sensitive’ methodological innovation. Specifically, teachers should ‘derive methodologies from within their contexts rather than attempt to modify imported ideas’ (ibid, p. 157).

The concern for appropriate methodology seems to be in line with the concerns raised through what Kumaravadivelu (1994; 2006b) terms the ‘postmethod condition’. It is a key shift in the TESOL profession since the 1990s during which the previous abiding belief that there is ‘one best method’ was critiqued. For Kumaravadivelu, language teaching ‘must be sensitive to a particular group of teachers teaching particular group of learners pursuing a particular set of goals within a particular institutional context embedded in a particular social milieu’ (2001, p. 538). Influential to this discussion is Prabhu (1990) who argues that ‘there is no best method therefore means that no single method is best for everyone, as there are important variations in the context that influence what is best’ (p. 162). Similarly, Bax (2003) proposes a Context Approach in which the context and methodological elements are both considered:

Any training course [for teachers] should therefore make it a priority to teach not only methodology but also a heightened awareness of contextual factors, and an ability to deal with them – in fact, to put consideration of the context first and only then consider the teaching approach. (p. 283)

The argument for appropriate methodology, or in reverse, the argument against the search for the best method, is now widely seen as having been fully made. Thus, for Nunan (2001 cited in Bax, 2003, p. 284) ‘the ‘methods’ movement – the search for the one best method, would seem to be well and truly dead’.
2.1.2 Holliday’s framework

The thinking of appropriate methodology has been developed further by Holliday, particularly in his work of *Appropriate methodology and social context* (1994). As discussed below, his seminal work provided me a framework for understanding appropriacy in TESOL and a heuristic tool to explore possible shaping influences in my educational context.

Holliday argues that ‘to be appropriate, a methodology must be sensitive to the prevailing cultures surrounding any given classroom’ (p. 161). His arguments were framed by the particular methodological discussion prevalent at the time of his research. Thus, he problematised the way in which the Communicative Language Teaching (CLT) approach was promoted and imported in many other contexts around the globe with mixed results – for example, see the following discussions: South Korea (Li, 1998); Thailand (Khamkhien, 2010; Jarvis and Atsilarat, 2005); and Vietnam, (Van Canh and Barnard, 2009). Hence, adopting the CLT approach without learning about the actual classroom may lead, in Holliday’s analogy, to ‘tissue rejection’ by which he means that a curriculum innovation ‘does not become an effectively functioning part of the system’ (Hoyle, 1970, p. 2 as cited in Holliday, 1992, p. 403).

A number of authors support Holliday’s concept of appropriate methodology and apply the concept to explore diverse areas in TESOL. For instance, Kramsch and Sullivan (1996) advocate the consideration of ‘appropriate language’ instead of ‘authentic’ language as promoted by the CLT approach by arguing that ‘what is authentic in one context might need to be made appropriate to another’ (p. 199). They suggest TESOL practitioners take into account the needs of their students both in the local and global sphere to develop appropriate pedagogy (p. 200). Bax (1995; 1997; 2002) explores the context-sensitive approach to teacher education. Fay and his colleagues apply appropriate methodology to the area of distance learning (e.g. Fay and Hill, 2003), foreign language education (Androulakis and Fay, 2011), and Content and Language Integrated Learning (CLIL) (Fay, 2012). I used components of Holliday’s concept of appropriate methodology, namely: ‘Host Culture Complex’, a ‘small culture’ approach and ‘deep action’, to conceptualise my study as discussed below.
2.1.2.1 Host Culture Complex

In order to develop methodology which is appropriate for a particular context, Holliday suggests that the teacher should become an ethnographer of their own teaching situation because:

the process of learning what happens between people in a particular classroom should be largely in the hands of the teacher, just as the act of teaching is in the hands of the teacher. The teacher is there, in the prime position for seeing what is going on and knowing about the relevant backgrounds of the parties concerned. (p. 161)

The teachers’ ethnographic action might be framed by the complex web of influences shaping the classroom culture. As shown in Figure 1, Holliday’s (1994), Host Culture Complex (HCC) is a heuristic enabling of the mapping of these potential interrelated influences.

Figure 1: Host Culture Complex (adapted from Holliday, 1994, p. 29)

Every classroom is situated within the complex set of overlapping influences in the wider environment:

a system of cultures which are not mutually exclusive, with cultures overlapping, containing and being contained by other cultures. Relations between cultures can be both vertical, through hierarchies of cultures and subcultures, or horizontal, between cultures in different systems. (ibid, p. 28)

To begin with, a classroom is located in a host institution (e.g. in a school, a university or a private language school). The host institution belongs to a host educational environment.
which is influenced by parents, employers, market forces, peers and reference groups (e.g. professional associations). Further, the host institutional environment is also shaped by the larger political and bureaucratic institutions which determine and provide the resources for the institution.

2.1.2.2 Small culture

Holliday (1999), uses the term ‘small culture’ to focus on the way in which a classroom culture emerges through the shared business of teaching and learning. Small culture ‘attaches “culture” to small social groupings or activities wherever there is cohesive behavior’ (p.237). The terms ‘small culture’ and ‘large culture’ contrast, but this contrast is not a matter of size but a matter of the starting point of the analysis of each. A large culture approach to understanding classrooms begins with the readily-available national stereotypes of learner identity (e.g. Thai students) – an approach which easily falls into the trap of what Holiday terms ‘culturism’. On the contrary, a small culture approach begins with the observable and emerging patterns of shared behaviour and values in a particular class as it develops over time. In this section, I use the term ‘culture’ in this small culture sense whereas in Section 2.2, the large culture sense is more evident as I refer to the work of others for whom the risks of culturism are not foregrounded.

2.1.2.3 Deep action

In addition to the Host Culture Complex, Holliday discusses the significance of understanding ‘deep action’ within a host institution. Based on Coleman’s (1988) concept of ‘informal order’, Holliday coined the term ‘deep action’ to explain why an EFL project might fail due to the lack of understanding of the local small cultures (Holliday, 1992; 1994, Chapter 8). For Holliday, the ‘real world’ of an institution ‘exists at a deep, tacit, opaque level of the local cultures’ (Holliday, 1994, p. 129) and involves the following elements:

- *psycho cultural*: ‘classroom cultural features’, e.g. ‘hidden communication, tacit protocols governing classroom instructions’;
- *micro-politics*: ‘internal politics of schools and departments’ or ‘normal human endeavour to achieve natural aspirations, rights and allegiances within the confines of the work of the people involved’, e.g. ‘self-image’, ‘personal characteristics’ and ‘relationship with colleagues’ (Kelly, 1980, pp. 71-72, cited in Holliday, 1994, p. 87, emphasis in the original); and
informal orders: ‘what actually happens’ (Swales, 1980, p. 64, as cited in Holliday, 1992, p. 406, emphasis in the original), e.g. ‘official claims to English medium lecturers, whereas in reality English was rarely used (Andrews, 1984); books and syllabuses actually in use completely different from those stated in official documents (Cooke and Holliday 1982, pp. 22,27); teachers teaching fewer hours than timetabled’. (Holliday, 1994, p. 131)

Bringing the three parts of his theorising of appropriate methodology together, I used this framework to conceptualise my study. Instead of learning about a classroom, I used my understanding regarding the HCC as a heuristic tool to map a possible web of influences surrounding TESOL practitioners in their host educational environment (at both the surface and deep action levels, e.g. students, curriculum, university policies, work culture, personal and professional experience of the practitioners, and national, supranational policies).

In a similar way to using my understanding of the HCC, a small culture approach and the deep action of the host institution, while the central thrust of the appropriate methodology discussion is concerned with methodology or approach (e.g. the appropriacy of CLT), I extended the issue of contextual appropriacy to explore the appropriacy of TESOL paradigms (see, also, Kramsch and Sullivan, 1996, Alptekin, 2002 and Le, 2004).

2.2 TESOL paradigm possibilities

Scholars such as Canagarajah (2006b) have been proposing suggestions on how English should be purposefully taught and learned:

Having lost the innocence of teaching English for instrumental purposes, we should now encourage students to represent their voices and identities. While mastering the system of the language, students should also appropriate the system to serve their interests on their own terms. (p. 27)

Nevertheless, in many contexts (including my home and educational context), TESOL often seems to lack a clear purpose. Several acronyms have been used to describe this state of purposeless TESOL such as ‘TENAR’ (‘Teaching English for No Apparent Reason’), ‘TENOP’ (‘Teaching English for No Obvious Purpose’), and ‘TENOR’\(^8\) (‘Teaching English

---

\(^8\) The term TENOR was coined by Abbot (1981).
for No Obvious Reason’) (McKay and Bokhorst-Heng, 2008, p. 46). In the spirit of appropriate methodology thinking, I explored what could be appropriate and purposeful ways to teach English in Thai HE. In this section, I present the current discussion regarding teaching and learning ‘paradigms’.

I encountered the term ‘paradigm’ in the literature discussing ‘paradigm shift’ in TESOL, for instance, in the discussion of World Englishes movement (e.g. Saraceni, 2009, p. 176), and English as an International Language (Wang and Hill, 2011; Kumaravadivelu, 2012, p. 14). Following Kuhn’s (1970) work on ‘paradigm shift’ in sciences, these authors discuss a ‘shift’ or a move away from the dominant assumptions in the teaching of English.

Breen (1987) provides a detailed explanation of the term ‘paradigm’ below:

Thomas Kuhn (1970) proposed the notion of a ‘paradigm’ as that frame of reference which a community of specialists will share at a particular moment in history. For Kuhn, a paradigm is not merely a commonly accepted theory. It is a ‘disciplinary matrix’ wherein the ideas, the problems, and the actual mode of undertaking work will reveal shared and consistent assumptions, beliefs, values and ways of interpreting experience (Kuhn, 1970, pp. 182-210). In other words, a paradigm is both a particular unity of theory, research and practice and the prevailing manner in which a community of specialists construct theories, interpret research, and actually proceed with their work. (p. 83)

Phillipson (2009, p. 88) discusses paradigms as capture ‘trends in the analysis of English in the modern world, and norms for teaching the language’. Similarly, for Sharifian (2009), a paradigm is ‘for thinking, research and practice’ (p.2). Thus, a paradigm is holistic in that it involves interrelated ideological construct, research and practice.

In my study, following Fay (e.g. Fay, 2008), I use the term ‘TESOL paradigms’ to refer to the sets of ideological assumptions underpinning the teaching and learning of English. These assumptions are beyond the methodological level (e.g. Communicative Language Teaching, Content and Language Integrated Learning, Problem-Based Learning) and are codified using terms (and related acronyms), for instance, Teaching English for Academic Purposes (TEAP), Teaching English as a Foreign Language (TEFL), Teaching English as a Second Language (TESL), Teaching English as a Lingua Franca (TELF), Teaching English as an International Language (TEIL) and Multicultural Awareness Through English (MATE).
In my study, I looked at practitioner perspectives in relation to the ‘paradigm possibilities’ – the term used by Sifakis and Fay (2011) – with particular regard for their assumptions on how English is used and expected to be used by their students. In this sense, TESOL paradigms may be understood from three different frames:

1) paradigms as linked to the purpose lying behind the language learning and intended use – e.g. Teaching English for Academic Purposes (TEAP) and/or for Specific Purposes (TESP);

2) paradigms as linked to the contexts where English is used and taught based on Kachru’s model – e.g. Teaching English as a Mother Tongue (TEMT), Teaching English as a Second Language (TESL) and Teaching English as a Foreign Language (TEFL); and

3) paradigms emerged from the global English phenomenon in which English is regarded as ‘the’ global, international lingua franca – e.g. Teaching English as a Lingua Franca (TELF) and Teaching English as an International Language (TEIL).

I discuss TEAP in Chapter 4 in relation to my research site. In the following sub-sections, I discuss TESOL paradigms according to Kachru’s model while those in the last one will be considered in Chapter 3.

2.2.1 Kachru’s Three Concentric Circles

Although more recently problematised (Graddol, 1997, p. 10; Jenkins, 2009, p. 200; Dewey and Leung, 2010, p. 2), Kachru’s (1992; 1996) *Three Concentric Circles* is, perhaps, the most widely known and used model for mapping how English language is used and taught in the world. According to the model, English in the world may be categorised, somewhat simplistically, in geographical terms as follows: the Inner Circle, the Outer Circle, and the Expanding Circle. The full model is presented in Figure 2. As discussed in the next sub-sections, Kachru’s model links these circles of English language use to particular teaching and learning paradigms. My focus will be on the Expanding Circle in which my home and educational context belongs.
2.2.1.1 English (and its teaching) in the Inner Circle

To begin with, the Inner Circle refers to what are considered to be English-speaking countries – such as US, UK, Canada, Australia and New Zealand. These countries are also seen as norm-providing because the English language norms (adopted by many foreign language learners of English) originate in standardised forms of the language associated with these countries. The dominant teaching and learning paradigm in these Inner Circle countries has traditionally been seen in terms of the mother-tongue or first language teaching of English, Teaching English as a Mother Tongue (TEMT) or Teaching English as the first language. Note that Kachru’s view of the Inner Circle countries tends to disregard the significant multilingual resources evidence in the countries historically and now.

![Figure 2: Three Concentric Circles](adapted from Kachru, 1996, p. 137)

In addition to the above paradigms, Davison and Cummins (2007, p. xxi) identify some additional teaching and learning paradigms in the Inner Circle countries including Teaching English as a second language (TESL) and Teaching English as an additional language (TEAL). Both paradigms aim at the teaching of English to those living in the country for
whom a language other than English is their first language. While the term TEAL is more common in the UK, TESL is widely used in Australia and North America (Scott and Erduran, 2004, p. 409).

In the Inner Circle countries, there is also a substantial TEFL-related provision (e.g. for short-stay language students) given the high status attached to the ways in which native English speakers (NESs) use the language. Also, given the high status of HE in these countries, there are a significant amount of Teaching English for Academic Purposes (TEAP) and Teaching English for Specific Purposes (TESP) activities (e.g. as provided by university language centres for international students).

The TEAL and TESL paradigms have been critiqued. To begin with, the term ‘second language’ falls short of recognising the fact that those learning English might already use more than one language. Further, the term ‘additional language’ tends to view the learners as having a language deficit in English which might be overcome through special educational treatment. This path can all too easily lead to a perception of these learners as having Special Education Needs (SEN). The TESL and the TEAL paradigms are beyond the scope of my study. However, these paradigms demonstrate that terminology can carry ideologies and complexities which can be problematic.

2.2.1.2 English (and its teaching) in the Outer Circle

The Outer Circle refers to countries which are mostly former British colonies in South Asia, South East Asia, South West, and East Africa. English, in addition to the mother tongue, national language, regional lingua franca, has legal and/or official status in these countries (Bolton, 2006, pp. 242-243; Kirkpatrick, 2010, pp. 19-42).

Kachru (1996) describes how English was brought to these countries, and how the language became ‘nativised’ outside the NES contexts (pp. 136-137). These countries have been developing their own norms for English language beyond those imposed during the colonisation period, and hence, are also known as the norm-developing circle (Bolton, 2006, p. 242). New English varieties have emerged, for instance, African English, Indian English, and Nigerian English. With regard to ASEAN, Brunei, Malaysia, the Philippines, and Singapore can be seen as being part of this Outer Circle. They have developed their own
varieties such as Filipino English or ‘Taglish’ (i.e. Tagalog and English), Malaysian English, Singaporean English, and Brunei English) (Kirkpatrick, 2010, pp. 19-42).

The TESOL paradigm in this circle of countries can be seen as Teaching English as a Second Language (TESL). This type of TESL does not exclusively aim at teaching and learning a standardised variety of English as the TESL in the Inner Circle countries does. This is because the countries of the Outer Circle tend to be multilingual and multicultural, partly because of their colonisation history. While which English should be taught in the Outer Circle is still debatable, Baumgardner (2006) remarks that ‘the form that is taught (at least orally) by default is often a localized or dialectally influenced variety, since teachers are sometimes unaware that what they use (and are inadvertently modeling) is not international Standard English’ (p. 667).

Given the multilingual characteristic, an alternative paradigm in this circle of English usage is World Englishes (WE), a term coined by Kachru (1985) to refer to a paradigm which challenges the monolingual view of English (as discussed in 2.2.2). Although WE has emerged as an alternative paradigm to teaching English which is based on English as used in the Inner Circle, I do not include WE in the newer paradigm possibilities discussed in the next chapter as my study focused on TESOL in Expanding Circle (discussed in the next subsection). Although it is now difficult to draw a line between the Outer and Inner Circles due to factors such as a change in language policy (Bolton, 2006, p. 243), I use the term WE (or WEs) in a broader sense to refer to English in the world regardless of the circles of usage (e.g. Jenkins, 2006a; Sharifian, 2009).

2.2.1.3 English (and its teaching) in the Expanding Circle

The third circle of countries in Kachru’s model is the Expanding Circle which includes countries such as China, Egypt, Japan and Thailand. In the Expanding Circle, English does not have either legal or official status, nor do these countries have their own varieties of English. Therefore, they are also known as norm-depending as they depend on the language norms created and provided by NESs in the Inner Circle countries.

The dominant paradigm of teaching English in the Expanding Circle countries seems to be Teaching English as a Foreign Language (TEFL). Below, I discus the TEFL paradigm in terms of its underlying assumptions, particularly those related to the concept of NESs and
how these assumptions have influenced the linguistic, cultural, and intercultural dimensions of TESOL.

2.2.2 Teaching English as a Foreign Language (TEFL) paradigm

In TEFL:

the language is taught as something that is explicitly associated with the UK, the USA, or other countries traditionally perceived as English-speaking. As such the name refers both to a teaching standard (based on native-speaker models), and a function (English learned as a cultural sampler with no immediate expectation of daily instrumental use, and instead associated with scenarios such as the tourist encounter). (Seargeant, 2010, p.103, emphasis added)

In the above description, there is an indication of an association between TEFL and the concept of NESs which is, perhaps, the most central to many dominant understandings about the teaching and learning of English.

2.2.2.1 The concept of native English speakers in TEFL paradigm

When a language is taught as a foreign language, students are immediately positioned as ‘failed native speakers’ of EFL (Jenkins, 2011, p. 284), ‘outsiders’, ‘foreigners’ or ‘linguistic tourists’ who are learning the mother tongue of the target community. Hence, students tend to lack the ownership of the language, and they need to respect the authority of NESs (Graddol, 2006, pp. 82-83). In the case of English, the ‘owners’ are assumed to be NESs from the Inner Circle countries. Therefore, students need to learn to use English appropriately according to the NES norms.

These assumptions regarding the ownership and NES norms might be understood from the monolingual perspective in which NESs are the ‘vital linguistic primitive’ whose ‘mother tongue’ is crucial in communication (Kachru, 1996, p. 141). Canagarajah (2013) explains that the monolingual orientation to communication assumes that all successful and sufficient communication must conform to ‘a common language with shared norms’ (p. 1).

9 The word native speaker (in Thai, ‘เจ้าของภาษา’) can be translated as ‘owner of the language’ (see also Methitham, 2009, p. 94).
He further explains this monolingual orientation using the ‘Herderian triad’ – i.e. the notion that a language is tied to a community and a place. Each (unique) language belongs to one (bounded, separate, homogeneous and pure) community. The community, then, is the owner of the language, and those who are not from this particular community are seen as interlopers of the language whose language ability is deficient and inauthentic. Language forms a bounded identity for a community; hence, the language needs to be standardised, purified or coded. Canagarajah concludes that, according to the Herderian triad, a person is assumed to have a single native language (or a variety) which entitles him or her to be a native speaker with the authority to determine the ways the language is used (p. 22). Widdowson (1994) discusses the role of standard English as ‘an entry condition’ and ‘the gatekeepers’, and maintains that ‘You can, of course, persist in your nonstandard ways if you choose, but then do not be surprised to find yourself marginalized, perpetually kept out on the periphery’ (Widdowson, 1994 p.381).

These understandings and assumptions regarding the notion of NESs are deeply rooted in TESOL (Holliday, 2005, p. 9), and have underpinned the teaching of English in several ways. For instance, it determines the models of English to learn, the goal of linguistic competence to achieve, the materials (i.e. textbooks) to be used, the views towards native English-speaking teachers (NESTs) and non-native English-speaking teachers (NNESTs) as well as the cultural contents to include in textbooks (see Kumaravadivelu, 2012, p. 15 for other areas). These topics have been a part of the ongoing TESOL debates. In the following subsections, I discuss the influences of the concept of NESs on the teaching of the linguistic, cultural, and intercultural dimensions of English.

2.2.2.2 Teaching the linguistic dimension of EFL

The notion of NESs has defined the models of language to be learned and the goals of competence to be achieved. This orientation towards the notion of NESs also impacts TESOL perspectives and practice as discussed below.

Models of English

First, it assumes that students should learn NES models of English – i.e. NES mother tongue or standardised NES varieties such as British or American pronunciation and accents (rather than a dialect). This assumption of NESs as the owners of the language, although recently
questioned, persists among TESOL practitioners, educators and linguists (Jenkins, 2006a, p. 171), and could have influences on both students and teachers of English.

For students, it could influence what they perceive as their goals in learning the English language. For instance, Methitham and Chamcharatsri (2011) observe that ‘Thai students are initially imposed and, later on, internalize a heavy burden in the demand that they try to make themselves sound native-like among those particular speakers from the English-speaking West’ (p. 64). Further, students might adopt negative perspectives towards non-native English speakers (NNESs) and ASEAN English varieties and the preference of standard English varieties from their teachers (Jindapitak, 2013).

Many teachers also usually aim at teaching NES-framed grammatical accuracy (e.g. Sifakis, 2008; D’Angelo, 2016) and tend to focus less on communicative competence (Zhou, 2011). Hiep (2005) describes this as a situation in which teachers have to choose between two approaches: to teach grammar or to teach communication. Along with grammatical accuracy, ‘accurate pronunciation is all too often viewed as a primary goal in classroom’ (Pica, 1994, pp. 72-73). In the Thai context, teachers generally expect students to pronounce words correctly according to a NES model (Kongkerd, 2013, p. 7). Methitham (2009) reports ‘a strong desire’ of teachers in his study to develop native-like pronunciation in students, i.e. ‘to push them to sound like the owner of the language unless it is beyond their abilities’ (p. 126). This assumption of teachers is on the basis of ‘social image and prestige’ (ibid). Previous studies have identified that teachers in many EFL contexts do not have positive attitudes towards teaching NNES models of pronunciation and accents. For instance, Jenkins (2007) explores attitudes of non-native English-speaking teachers (NNESTs) from various Expanding Circle countries and found that most of the teachers identify accents which are different from NES accents as ‘problems’ (p. 184). In China, university teachers demonstrate a stigma towards ‘Chinglish’ (Wang, 2015) and in Japan, student teachers are reported to have negative attitudes towards Japanese-English (Shibata, 2009). In a European context, Murray (2003) found that Swiss school English teachers in her study are reluctant to include non-native English varieties, in particular, Euro-English varieties, in teaching materials. In the same vein, Melchien (2016) found that German speakers of English participating in his study report that they judge people’s accents based on NES ideologies (p. 29).
Assumptions about pronunciation can reveal broader issues in TESOL (Sifakis and Sougari, 2005, p. 482, citing Bernstein, 1996 and Bourdieu, 1991). This is in line with Derwing and Munro’s (2005) remark that ‘[h]ow we view pronunciation determines how we approach it and how we decide who is qualified to teach it’ (p. 483), and it might lead to a discrimination of English users with accented speech (Derwing and Munro, 2009, p. 486).

The assumption about NES models could also intensify the pride and place of NESs in many aspects of the teaching and learning of English (Graddol, 2006, p. 19; Holliday, 2006, p. 386; Llurda, 2009, pp. 122-123), and at the same time, marginalises NNESTs. It could also contribute to self-criticality, as Seidlhofer (1996) observes that NNESTs:

are highly insecure and self-critical in comparison with teachers of other subjects such as, say, physics or geography. … Countless EFL teachers tend to think, at least at times, that they are somehow deficient in comparison with native speakers, who are often regarded as role models, aspired to but never reached. (p. 64)

NNESTs usually regard NESs and NESTs as ‘a symbol of perfection in language use’ (Llurda, 2009, p. 129), the ‘yardstick for intelligibility’ (Golombek and Jordan, 2005, pp. 519-520) or ‘source of authority’ (Tsui and Bunton, 2000, p. 294 as cited in Llurda, 2009, p. 127). NESTs are generally regarded in Thailand as the reference for the language (Methitham, 2009), and NESTs ‘provide a “better” model of English’ (Todd, 2006, p. 1). This ‘native speakerism ideology’ in Thai society has been created and sustained through the use of native speaker methods and the promotion of NESTs over Thai teachers (Boriboon, 2011, p. 47).

**Native-like competence**

Second, teaching with an orientation towards the notion of NESs assumes ‘native-like’ or ‘near native’ competence as an ultimate goal (McKay, 2003, p. 5; Jenkins, 2006b, p. 139). The native-like competence is common in language teaching theories, for instance, according to Stern (1983), a goal of language teaching is proficiency which varies from zero to native-like. Such native-like competence is ‘an ideal goal to keep in mind’, and it ‘is a necessary point of reference for the second language proficiency concept used in language teaching theory’ (p. 341). This ‘ideal goal’ is controversial because students’ competence is usually measured against what NESs can do with the language according to NES norms – i.e. the appropriacy and accuracy in using language forms, expressions, and writing norms as
generally accepted by NESs (see Kachru, 1983 for a detailed discussion of the terms ‘model’ and ‘norms’). NESs are assumed to be ‘the benchmark of perfection, and therefore it is axiomatic that this should be the long-term goal’ (Timmis, 2002, p. 243).

**Teaching for exam preparation**

The assumptions discussed above regarding NES norms and the ‘ideal’ and testable goal of native-like competence are potential reasons why, in EFL Expanding Circle settings, teaching for examination preparation purposes is dominant (Sifakis and Fay, 2011, p. 288). These assumptions have underpinned how English should be taught and assessed (McDonough et al., 2013, p. 160). They have also shaped TESOL into ‘high-stakes examination contexts’ (Sifakis, 2014, p. 128) and have done so in two primary ways.

Firstly, students’ success is usually measured by examination results. Passing exams is synonymous with achieving the final and desired outcome of learning (e.g. Han, 2010, p. 227). EFL students are expected ‘to be specifically trained to sit and pass certain, purpose driven, proficiency exams and they are generally trained to pass exams’ (Sifakis, 2014, p. 128). Previous studies have reflected on this theme. For instance, foreign language teachers, including those of EFL, in Denmark and England in Byram and Risager’s (1999) study regarded examination results as the indicator of students’ success (p. 54). The finding is consistent with a study investigating perspectives of EFL teachers in different locations including China, South Korea, Taiwan, Thailand and Turkey conducted by Young and Walsh (2010) and a study examining perspectives of EFL teachers in a Chinese university (Liyanage et al., 2014).

Secondly, by viewing examination performance as the ultimate goal of teaching, teachers would orient their teaching to achieve this goal and focus on preparing their students to perform well on exams (Wood, 1996, as cited in Borg, 2003, p. 95; Spratt, 2005, p. 12; Sifakis, 2008, p. 233; Han, 2010, p. 227; Fitzpatrick, 2011). The result is that teaching of the linguistic aspect of English would be prioritised over others such as the cultural and intercultural dimensions because typical traditional examinations measure students’ linguistic proficiency. These linguistic-based examinations heavily contribute to the focus of teaching and learning (Nguyen et al., 2016, p. 176). This situation is evident in Thailand as examinations are usually based on ‘simplistic, non-transferable knowledge especially of

This orientation of teaching and testing could lead to what Prodromou (1995) terms as ‘abuse of testing’ which ‘occurs when tests invade essential teaching space, when they are not the final stage of a process of learning but become the beginning, middle, and end of the whole process’ (p. 14). This phenomenon is referred to as a ‘washback’ or ‘backwash’ effect’ (see Alderson and Wall, 1993) which can be found ‘both in general education and in teaching English as a second/foreign language (ESL/EFL), from kindergarten to … the tertiary level (Cheng et al., 2004, p. xiii).

The examination washback effect also means that teachers have to sacrifice teaching for other purposes such as for (intercultural) communication. Hiep (2005) observes that many EFL teachers in Vietnam:

are conflicted, feeling that their circumstances oppose, or at least, militate against attempts to use communicative practices. For example, they have to prepare students for a grammar-based examination … They may have classes of 60 students, many of whom are more concerned about the immediate goal – to pass exams, to get a degree, rather than the long term goal – to develop communicative competence. It is thus uncommon for teachers to take a binary approach to teaching: it is to be teaching grammar or teaching communication; one thing has to be done at the expense of the other. (p. 337)

Nguyen (2013) also explores perspectives of EFL teachers in a Vietnamese university regarding the teaching of culture and consistently reports that teachers voiced that the priority was to develop linguistic competence to meet students’ demands of assessment. As such, the teachers did not regard the teaching of culture as important as linguistic knowledge and skills (pp. 135-136). Similarly, Onalan (2005) reports that Turkish EFL teachers prioritised linguistic objectives and might not regard the teaching of culture as ‘a separate objective to achieve’ (p. 229).

**Students as deficient language learners**

The ideal goal of native-like competence, as usually measured through examinations, could also result in labelling students as deficient language learners. This is because TEFL usually classifies students ‘in terms of what they are not, or at least not yet’ (Kramsch, 1998, p. 28, emphasis in the original). For students who do not have English as their first language, this
goal is unrealistic (Jenkins, 2002). It is nearly impossible for them to master the native-like proficiency in classroom instructions because ‘in the literal sense, it is impossible for an L2 user to become a native speaker, since by definition you cannot be a native speaker of anything other than your first language’ (Cook, 2007, p. 240). This view of students is ‘uncontroversial’ in TEFL (Jenkins, 2006b, p.139). The discourses of students as deficient i.e. – ‘the poor, the wilful, the disabled, the non-English speaking, the slow, the bottom 10%’ – have been persistent in generations of teachers, and the discourses are ‘counter-productive’ (Comber and Kamler, 2004, p. 293). Le and Phan (2013) report that students are usually regarded as ‘deficient, passive, error-prone and preconceived with stable norms and ideology in language teaching’ (p. 259).

2.2.2.3 Teaching the cultural and intercultural dimensions of EFL

As previously mentioned, I use the term ‘culture’ in this thesis in two senses following Holliday (1994; 1999). The term ‘culture’ here as well as throughout this section is used in the sense of ethnic and/or national culture (Holliday, 1999, p. 237).

In my study, the ‘cultural dimension’ refers to knowledge of and engagement with the target culture of NESs, students’ home culture and other cultures while the ‘intercultural dimension’ refers to the knowledge, skills and mindset needed to engage people from differing cultural backgrounds (e.g. Sifakis, 2004, p. 242; Baker, 2012, p. 66).

To begin with the cultural dimension, given that the concept of NESs is central to the TEFL paradigm, the teaching of this dimension is usually based on NES cultures. In foreign language education (FLE), including TEFL, it is generally assumed that language cannot be taught without culture (Byram, 1989; Kramsch, 1991). According to Cortazzi and Jin (1999):

learning a foreign language is not simply mastering an object of academic study but is more appropriately focused on learning a means of communication. Communication in real situations is never out of contexts, and because culture is part of most contexts, communication is rarely culture-free. Thus, it is now increasingly recognized that language learning about cultures cannot realistically be separated. (p. 197)

Considering this ‘inseparable’ relationship between language and culture, a national language is bound with a national culture (Risager, 2005). This ‘foreign-cultural’ approach (Risager, 1998) of FLE is ‘based on the concept of the single culture, associated with a specific people, a specific language, and normally with a specific territory’ (p. 243). The teaching and
learning of a ‘target language’ and a ‘target culture’, therefore, are essential in learning a foreign language (Stewart, 1982, as cited in Alptekin, 1993, p. 139). According to Hinkel (2012), the link between the target language and culture is based on a strand of studies which investigates ‘specific cultures’ (e.g. Brazilian, Chinese, or Japanese). It describes appropriate behaviours, i.e. ‘ways of doing, speaking, and behaving’ in particular societies ‘without necessarily undertaking to identify commonalities and differences among various cultures’ (p. 883). These related concepts in FLE explain why a dominant assumption in language teaching involves a goal ‘to imitate a native speaker both in linguistic competence, in knowledge of what is appropriate language, and in knowledge about a country and its culture’ (Byram et al., 2002, p. 5, emphasis in the original).

The teaching of the target language as linked with a target culture is common in TEFL practices in Expanding Circle contexts (McKay, 2002, p. 88), including Thailand (e.g. Wongsothorn et al., 2002; Vibulphol, 2004; Boriboon, 2008; Methitham, 2009). The majority of EFL textbooks are ‘Anglo-centric’ (Prodromou, 1988, p. 76), and are written by NESs because of their ‘face validity’ in TESOL enterprise (Alptekin, 1993). These NES authors ‘consciously or unconsciously transmit the views, values, beliefs, attitudes, and feelings of their own English-speaking society’ (ibid, p. 138). The cultural content in these textbooks usually features the Inner Circle countries and NES ways of life (McKay, 2002, p. 82; Kumaravadivelu, 2006c, p. 208; Baker, 2016b, p. 72) which could be irrelevant, uninteresting or even confusing to students (Corbett, 2003, p. 27; McKay, 2003, p. 10). The content could also be remote for local, NNESTs who are required to teach content alien to them. As a result, they might feel ‘insecure’ because they lack specific knowledge about particular target cultures’ (McKay, 2003, p. 10).

In terms of the intercultural dimension, it might be said that it is not prevalent in the TEFL paradigm. This is because TEFL assumes that students (i.e. NNESs) will use, and wish to use, English to communicate with NESs (Widdowson, 1997, p. 145; Jenkins, 2006b, p. 137; Jenkins et al., 2011, p. 488; Sifakis and Fay, 2011, p. 290) the way it is used by NESs (Alptekin, 2002, p. 59).

The above discussion explained that the TEFL paradigm, the one dominant in Expanding Circle of English usage including Thailand, has raised questions about its appropriacy for the teaching and learning of English. TEFL is based on assumptions related to the notion of
NESs, their linguistic, cultural norms and the notion of native-like competence. TEFL does not seem to be appropriate for my home and educational context. As Thailand is now facing the challenges of, and opportunities for, regional, English-medium IC foregrounded by the ASEAN integration, it is evident that the notion of NESs, norms and competence are becoming less relevant.

**Concluding remarks**

This chapter provided part of the conceptualisation of my study developed through my engagement with relevant literature. I discussed the first area of literature which is in relation to appropriate methodology, a line of thinking I extended to explore the concept of TESOL paradigms. I also discussed the categorisation of paradigms which is based on how English is used and taught in three differing circles of English usage. In particular, I discussed the TESOL paradigm and some of its assumptions which underpin and dominate how English should be taught, learned and assessed in EFL, Expanding Circle contexts.

In the spirit of appropriate methodology, I argue that the dominant TEFL paradigm is becoming less relevant because it is mostly linked to the natively-framed and exams-driven teaching of the English language. TEFL does not correspond to Thailand’s need to develop graduates prepared for this intercultural age, and in particular, amid the contemporary ASEAN strategic development for an increasingly interconnected region. In the next chapter, therefore, I explore further into TESOL paradigm possibilities focusing on how the teaching and learning of English could be more appropriate and purposeful.
Chapter 3 - Teaching English as an International Language for Intercultural Communication Purposes

Introduction

In the previous chapter I explored two areas of literature that I used to conceptualise my study, namely: appropriate methodology and TESOL paradigms. For the latter, I discussed well-established paradigms, particularly Teaching English as a Foreign Language (TEFL). The TEFL paradigm has underpinned how I was taught and how my colleagues and I tend to teach. However, it entails assumptions concerning the goals of teaching and learning native English speaker (NES) norms and achieving native-like competence as measured through tests and exams. Therefore, the TEFL paradigm might not provide the ideal means for addressing Thailand’s need to prepare graduates to use English to communicate with their fellow ASEAN citizens and internationally.

In this chapter, I consider which TESOL paradigms might be appropriate for TESOL in Thai HE. In Section 3.1, in recognition that the dominant TESOL paradigm in Thailand remains ‘foreign’ in orientation (i.e. TEFL), I explore how the Foreign Language Education (FLE) literature deals with the teaching of both the cultural and the intercultural dimensions of languages (the third area of literature which framed my study). The literature addressing the cultural and the intercultural dimensions has flourished particularly regarding languages other than English. In many ways, however, English is unlike other languages as it has become, and will continue to be (for the foreseeable future), ‘the’ global language. The insights from the FLE literature, therefore, might be of less relevance in the teaching of English. Consequently, my next step is an exploration of how the TESOL literature discusses the cultural and intercultural dimensions of English at a time when people around the world use English as a lingua franca and as a vehicle for intercultural communication (IC). In Section 3.2, I discuss the global English phenomenon which has implications for a reconceptualisation of the teaching of English. In Section 3.3, I discuss Teaching English as an International Language (TEIL), a paradigm which has emerged from the global English phenomenon. In Section 3.4, informed by the contextual understandings presented in Chapter 1 and the conceptual insights presented here and in the previous chapter, I present the research aims and research questions which guided my study.
3.1 The cultural and intercultural dimensions of FLE

In the previous chapter I problematised target culture learning (i.e. the learning of specific cultural information of the target society) underpinning the cultural dimension of TEFL. I also argued that the intercultural dimension of TEFL tends to assume that, as EFL students are learning English to communicate primarily with NESs, they need competence for this NES-NNES communication. Recognising that these concepts are located in the Foreign Language Education (FLE), I explore further literature in FLE on the cultural and intercultural dimensions of language education in this section.

The area of literature is extensive, especially in Europe, and it is substantially driven by the impetus towards regional economic and political integration (Risager, 1998; Corbett, 2003, pp. 25-26). This is evident in the Council of Europe’s policy statements such as the White Paper on Intercultural Dialogue: ‘Living Together As Equals in Dignity’ (Council of Europe, 2008) which recognises that languages can be a ‘barrier to conducting intercultural conversations’ (p. 29). Learning languages can help students ‘to avoid stereotyping individuals, to develop curiosity and openness to otherness and to discover other cultures … to see that interaction with individuals with different social identities and cultures is an enriching experience’ (ibid). I discuss FLE’s concern with ‘otherness’ later in this section.

One of the key figures leading the discussion on the cultural and intercultural dimensions of FLE in Europe, and beyond, is Byram. In the following sub-sections, I present an overview of his work. Although his thinking about the cultural and intercultural dimensions of language education has developed from Cultural Studies (e.g. Byram, 1988; 1989), to Intercultural (Communicative) Competence (e.g. Byram, 1997), and, more recently, Intercultural Citizenship (e.g. Alred et al., 2006; Byram, 2008; see also Byram, 2014 for his own overview article), I chose to discuss the first two areas as they are more relevant to my study (the concept of Intercultural Citizenship has yet to become a topic for debate in ASEAN).

3.1.1 The Cultural Studies approach

Byram’s earlier works, as grounded in Cultural Studies (1988; 1989), proposed that cultural learning be an integral part of FLE. Byram’s embrace of CS was a reaction to the ‘background studies’ approach in which teachers supply information about the country associated with the language that students are learning when ‘there is time and opportunity’ (Byram, 1988, p. 17). For Byram, learning a language is key to experiencing ‘a different
culture’ and ‘otherness’ (p. 20). Note that the term ‘culture’ here is in the singular which could suggest that ‘a language’ is associated with ‘a culture’, and that, vice versa, one culture (often understood to be one society or one country), is associated with just one language. The usage of the singular form of the terms ‘language’ and ‘culture’ seems to embody an understanding of languages and cultures which predates current discussions of the multilingual and multicultural nature of societies (Byram, 2014, p. 211).

Cultural Studies aims at developing students’ critical, educational and political understandings of culture. For students ‘to understand a culture from the inside and eschew the tourist-consumer viewpoint which is currently dominant, they must use the language as it is used by native speakers not merely in grammatical but more importantly in semantic terms’ (Byram, 1988, p. 22). Byram questions ‘tourist-consumer’ competence (ibid, p. 17, citing Kramer, 1976, pp. 142-143) as the outcome of teaching which prepares students ‘to be consumers, tourists or receivers of foreign tourists as if language teaching could, in the names of pragmatism and consumerism, be neutral’. Instead of ‘tourist-consumer’ competence, a Cultural Studies approach to FLE aims at developing students’ ‘intercultural competence’ and students’ ability to compare their ‘own and foreign cultural meanings’ (Byram, 1988, p. 29).

In his 1988 model of Interrelated dimensions of language and culture teaching, the relationship between language and culture is crucial (as discussed in Chapter 2). As students develop ‘language awareness’ through language acquisition, they also develop ‘cultural awareness’ through their experience of foreign culture and comparative analysis. Note that the above statement – and especially the phrase ‘they must use the language as it is used by native speakers not merely in grammatical but more importantly in semantic terms’ – indicates that native speakers are the benchmark for how the language being learned should be appropriately used (in terms of grammar and cultural meanings) in the target society.

### 3.1.2 Intercultural (Communicative) Competence

Byram’s (1997) later model of Intercultural Communicative Competence (ICC) shifts the focus away from CS and towards students’ intercultural competence (Byram, 2014, p. 211) and how to assess it. Central to this model is the aspiration that students become ‘intercultural speakers’, a term coined by Byram and Zarate (1996) to define the competence essential for
language students in Europe (p. 239). Intercultural speakers are aware that there are factors in IC. These factors are reflected in Figure 3. below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Skills</th>
<th>Knowledge</th>
<th>Education</th>
<th>Attitudes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>interpret and relate</td>
<td>of self and other; of interaction: individual and societal</td>
<td>political education critical cultural awareness</td>
<td>relativising self valuing other</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(savoir comprendre)</td>
<td>(savoir être)</td>
<td>(savoir s'engager)</td>
<td>(savoir être)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skills</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>discover and/or interact</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(savoir apprendrefaire)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Figure 3: Factors in intercultural communication (Byram, 1997, p. 34)**

These factors could be formulated into objectives for assessing students’ ‘performance’ of ICC, i.e. ‘knowledge and abilities’ they use ‘which might be an application of what has been learnt. Since this kind of evidence is complex and can seldom be quantified in terms of component parts, it is usually assessed against descriptions of what is satisfactory performance (criterion-referenced)” (Byram, 1997, p. 105).

In Byram’s model, the analysis of the differences and similarities between one’s own culture and other cultures remain significant. The ‘best’ foreign language teacher, therefore, is the person who can help students to ‘see relationships between their own and other cultures, can help them acquire interest in and curiosity about “otherness”, and awareness of themselves and their own cultures seen from other people’s perspectives’ (Byram et al., 2002, p. 6).

Intercultural speakers differ from native speakers (see also Kramsch, 1998) in that intercultural speakers establish relationships, handle dysfunctions and mediate ‘between people of different origins and identities’ (Byram, 1997, p. 38). The objective of developing intercultural speakers through the FLE curriculum, thus, emphasises ‘the differences from the cultural competences of a native speaker’ (Byram, 2009, p. 327). For Byram et al. (2002):

language teaching with an intercultural dimension continues to help learners to acquire **the linguistic competence** needed to communicate in speaking or writing, to formulate what they want to say/write in correct and appropriate ways. But it also develops their **intercultural competence** i.e. their ability to ensure a shared
understanding by people of different social identities, and their ability to interact with people as complex human beings with multiple identities and their own individuality. (p. 5, emphasis in the original).

The cultural and intercultural literature from the FLE perspective (e.g. Byram, 1997, among others) has called for an integration of the cultural and intercultural dimensions into language education, including English (e.g. Laopongharn and Sercombe, 2009; Sun, 2014, pp. 9-10; 2016, pp. 50-51; Chang and Kang, 2015; Chao, 2015). Nevertheless, drawing from the above discussion, the teaching of the cultural and intercultural dimensions in FLE (EFL included) might not be appropriate in all TESOL settings. This is because FLE entails the learning about ‘otherness’. While it is ‘at the centre’ of FLE concerns (Byram, 1997, p. 3), there is a risk of ‘an essentialist view of culture’ in which ‘cultures’ are coincidental with countries, religions, and continents’ (Holliday, 2005, p. 17).

Byram’s model has also been critiqued by language scholars such as Risager (2007, p. 138) who points out that the knowledge component of the model is based on a national paradigm. Byram (1997) defines knowledge as below:

The knowledge individuals bring to an interaction with someone from another country can be described in two broad categories: knowledge about social groups and their cultures in one’s own country, and similar knowledge of the interlocutor’s country. (p. 35)

Risager (2007, pp. 1-2) urges that language teaching should depart from this national paradigm towards a ‘transnational paradigm’ in language and culture pedagogy. This is a paradigm that recognises the complexities between language and culture as a consequence of the ‘global process’ of ‘transnational communication and migration, transnational cooperation of many types and at many levels, etc.’

Baker (2011) points out that Byram’s model, as well as some others ICC models in FLE literature, links the language being learned with particular communities and does not discuss ‘the relationships between cultures and language and the way intercultural competence may operate in intercultural communication in global lingua franca contexts’ (p. 201). In this regard, he proposes a model of *intercultural awareness* (ICA) which I discuss later in this chapter.
This assumed relationship between language, culture and nation, therefore, suggests that models of ICC developed in FLE might not serve the purpose of teaching cultural and intercultural dimensions of English given that, unlike other foreign languages, English has become the global language. In addition, Byram’s model was developed with foreign language learners in Europe in mind, hence, it might not be suitable for other contexts such as in Asia (Baker, 2008, p. 141).

3.2 English as an International Language

The global status of English has implications for how English should be approached. In this section, I discuss the global English phenomenon and a call for a reconceptualisation of English and how it should and could be taught.

3.2.1 The global English phenomenon

English started to become a lingua franca with the rise of the British Empire in the late sixteenth century (Jenkins et al., 2011, p. 281). This provided a ‘diasporic base’ for English to spread as English speakers settled in many parts of the world (Graddol, 1997, p. 14). After the decline of the British Empire, the English language continued to spread throughout the world in the twentieth century mainly because the US became the world’s major superpower. This phenomenon influenced major international domains of English such as the working language of international organisations and conferences, scientific publications, international banking, economic affairs and trade, international tourism, advertising for global brands, audio-visual cultural products (e.g. film, TV, popular music), international tourism, tertiary education, international safety, international law, technology transfer and internet communication, and as a relay language in interpretation and translation (ibid, p. 8).

English continues to be recognised in the global term. In many countries, English is an official language and/or a primary medium of instruction in education system, for instance, countries in ASEAN such as Brunei, Malaysia, the Philippines and Singapore (as discussed in Chapter 1). In countries such as Thailand where English has no official status, English has been prioritised as the first foreign language (Crystal, 2003, pp. 4-5). As a result, the number of English speakers is growing, and NESs are now outnumbered by NNESs. Graddol (2006) comments that English is more widely used on a daily basis between NNES ↔ NNES than between NES ↔ NES and between NES ↔ NNES. The ‘centre of gravity’, therefore, in
determining how English is used has shifted from L1 speakers to L2 and EFL speakers, a shift in which NESs should no longer be seen as the norm-providers as conceptualised in Kachru’s model (Graddol, 1997, p. 10). Graddol proposes a revised model (see Figure 4).

![Figure 4: The three overlapping circles of English (adapted from Graddol, 1997, p. 10)](image)

English-medium communication in the present involve users, from any community regardless of their first language and culture, who use English in different ways to achieve different purposes (McKay, 2002). In addition to categorising English users into different groups such as L1, L2 and, EFL speakers as seen in the previous models, Fay et al. (2016) go further by arguing that English-medium interactions can take place intranationally, internationally, and beyond. English as a lingua franca is used in the ‘International Forum’ – ‘anywhere in our transnational world of cultural flows of people, products, and ideas as mediated through English’ (p. 58).

3.2.2 A reconceptualisation of English and its teaching

The global English phenomenon has called for a reconceptualisation of English and how it should and could be taught. In the 1970s, Smith explored the status of English and the teaching implications of this globalised language and argued that none of the terminology in teaching English accurately reflects the current situation of English in the world. For instance, the terms ESOL (English for Speakers of Other Languages) usually covers only EFL (English as a Foreign Language) and ESL (English as a Second Language) (Smith, 1976, pp. 38-39). Hence, he coined the term ‘English as an International Auxiliary Language’ (EIAL). By ‘auxiliary language’, he means ‘a language, other than the first language, which is used by nationals of a country for international communication’ while ‘international
language’ refers to a language ‘which is used by people of different nations to communicate with one another’ (ibid, p. 38). In 1978, Smith suggested that a new term, ‘English as an international language’ (EIL) is the ‘most accurate term for how English language is being used in most of the world’ (1978, p. 5, as cited in Kachru, 2008, p. 294).

There are related and overlapping terms to EIL such as English as a Lingua Franca (ELF), English as a Global Language (EGL), and World English (WE). Seidlhofer (2005) describes the variety of terms related to the EIL phenomenon as follows:

ELF is part of the more general phenomenon of ‘English as an international language’ (EIL) or ‘World Englishes’ … EIL, along with ‘English as a global language’ …, ‘English as a world language’ … and ‘World English’ … have for some time been used as general cover terms for uses of English spanning Inner Circle, Outer Circle, and Expanding Circle contexts … The traditional meaning of EIL thus comprises uses of English within and across Kachru’s ‘Circles’, for intranational as well as international communication. However, when English is chosen as the means of communication among people from different first language backgrounds, across linguacultural boundaries, the preferred term is ‘English as a lingua franca’ (House 1999; Seidlhofer 2001), although the terms ‘English as a medium of intercultural communication’ (Meierkord 1996), and, in this more specific and more recent meaning, ‘English as an international language’ (Jenkins 2000), are also used. (p. 339, emphasis added)

Similarly, for Jenkins (2009):

ELF is sometimes known as EIL (English as an international language). However, to avoid confusion with other uses of the word ‘international’ (e.g. ‘International English’ is sometimes equated with North American English), most researchers prefer ‘ELF’. This is also generally preferred to the term ‘lingua franca English’, as the latter implies the existence of one single lingua franca variety of English, which is most certainly not the case. (p. 206, emphasis added)

More recently, McKay (2011) described her use of the term English as an International Lingual Franca (EILF) as:

as an umbrella term [used] to characterize the use of English between any two L2 speakers of English, whether sharing the same culture or not, as well as between L2 and L1 speakers of English. Although it is valuable to define the features of local varieties of English as is done in the World Englishes and ELF paradigm, it is essential to describe the local linguistic ecology of interactions, as well as the social dimensions of particular interactions. (p. 127)
In my study, it was not my purpose to delineate unique features of each differing term/paradigm presented above. Instead, I wanted to focus on what insights they have to offer TESOL. Following Jenkins (2000), Holliday (2005), Sharifian (2009), Young and Walsh (2010), Sifakis and Fay (2011), among others, I use the term ‘English as an International Language’ (EIL) to recognise English as a tool for IC (Sharifian, 2009, p. 2). EIL, therefore, refers to the function of English (see e.g. Seidlhofer, 2011, p. 7) rather than the forms of the language (ibid, p. 171, cf. Pennycook, 2010; Canagarajah, 2013, p. 62; and O’Regan, 2014 for criticisms of new TESOL paradigms such as ELF in this regard). I also use the term ‘Teaching English as an International Language’ (TEIL) to refer to teaching and learning paradigms with a set of coherent assumptions about such global function of English.

Simultaneous with an understanding of EIL users is the need to view English language students in a new light. For instance, instead of being ‘outsiders’, ‘foreigners’ or ‘linguistic tourists’ (Graddol, 2006, pp. 82-83), linguistic resources of students should be recognised as they are ‘bilingual users of English’ who use English as a second language alongside one or more other languages they speak’ (McKay, 2002, p. 27). TESOL should aim to develop ‘effective language users who can use English as lingua franca, not just learners who mimic the “inner-circle” countries’ language and cultures’ (Sun, 2014, p. 10, emphasis in the original). According to Cook (1999), ‘students should aim at being proficient L2 users’ instead of trying to achieve impossible NES-based goals (p. 182).

Further, Jenkins et al. (2011) suggests that students should not be regarded as ‘learners’ because they will automatically fall into the standard of NES norms, accuracy and competence. Instead, students should be viewed as:

highly skilled communicators who make use of their multilingual resources in ways not available to monolingual [NESs], and who are found to prioritize successful communication over narrow notions of ‘correctness’ in ways that [NESs], with their stronger attachment to their native English, may find more challenging. (p. 284)

In the same vein, for Liddicoat and Scarino (2013), ‘learners’ should be regarded as ‘legitimate language users’ who are engaged in communicative acts and are capable of negotiating ‘the linguistic and cultural demands of communication between and across languages and cultures’ (p. 53).
From the above discussion, the concept of a NES seems less relevant in EIL (than in EFL), and thus, native-like competence should cease to be ‘the’ purpose of TESOL.

3.3 TEIL for IC purposes

While students might have their personal goal to acquire native-like competence (e.g. Jindapitak and Teo, 2013, p. 202) or to speak with a native-like accent (e.g. Richards, 2002, p. 4; Cogo, 2012, p. 104), TEIL scholars (e.g. McKay, 2003; Llurda, 2009; Kirkpatrick, 2012, p. 131; Renandya, 2013, p. 28) suggest that developing students’ competence to use English in intercultural settings should be the purpose of the teaching of the English language. Furthermore, Holliday (1994) suggests that ‘the purpose of education is primarily not only to teach language skills according to the learners’ sociolinguistic needs, but also to take students or pupils through a complex process in preparation for life in their society’ (p. 94, emphasis in the original). These comments of TEIL scholars suggest that the purposes of TESOL should extend beyond developing students’ linguistic proficiency. In this section, I discuss how English could be taught and assessed, from the TEIL perspective, in terms of the linguistic, cultural and intercultural dimensions.

3.3.1 Teaching the linguistic dimension of EIL

While TEFL is based on NES norms and accuracy, features of English as an international language can be different. Thus, rather than learning the prescribed forms of the English language, ‘our students’ language should be internationally comprehensible and acceptable in the global community’ (Renandya, 2013, p. 28).

3.3.1.1 Intelligibility

Intelligibility is an important requirement for effective EIL communication, spoken or written. McKay (2002, p. 52) explains that the term is generally used to cover two other relevant terms, namely: ‘comprehensibility’ (‘knowing the meaning of the expression’) and ‘interpretability’ (‘knowing what the expression signifies in a particular sociocultural context’).

According to Kirkpatrick (2010), ‘[i]ntelligibility overrides form, especially when curriculum time is necessarily limited’, and students should be able to differentiate intelligible language from linguistic features which may lead to unintelligibility (p. 175). An example of a change in language which does not affect (grammatical) intelligibility is the pluralisation of words.
such as ‘equipment’ and ‘evidence’ discussed in McKay (2002, p. 127). She emphasises that this kind of change in language occurs naturally when English is used as an international language (ibid).

Kirkpatrick’s (2011b, p. 217) examples of English spoken by ASEAN officials below are illustrative of intelligibility over form in an ASEAN context:

- the flexible use of definite and indefinite articles, e.g. *I know when we touch money issue it can be very controversial*;
- absence of plural marking on nouns of measurement, e.g. *One three time or four time a years* (and note the use of the non-standard -s on years);
- morpheme-final consonant cluster deletion, e.g. *I check’ the placard*;
- non-marking of past tense forms, e.g. *I couldn’t see, that’s why I just sit and take a rest*;
- use of prepositions in different contexts, e.g. *and the second purpose is to seek for a discussion; and*
- copula absence or deletion, e.g. *once this blueprint adopted*.

The above linguistic features exemplify how English is commonly used in ASEAN or in Kirkpatrick’s term ‘multilingual’ settings. Hence, he suggests that English should be taught ‘as it is used in social contexts within the region’. He refers to this as the *multilingual model* which adopts ‘a lingua franca approach to the teaching of English’ (Kirkpatrick, 2010, p. 177).

In terms of phonology, similarly, intelligibility should be the goal of teaching English pronunciation instead of relying on teaching a NES model such as British Received Pronunciation (Jenkins, 2000). Informed by corpus data about the emergent features of language in ELF interactions, Jenkins (ibid) proposes the value of the Lingua Franca Core (LFC) which incorporates the features of English, as used by fluent bilinguals, which are central to phonological intelligibility (ibid, p. 226). For instance, when a Japanese speaker replaces the sound /θ/ in the word ‘birthplace’ with /s/, it does not cause a problem while the replacement of the vowel /ɜː/ with /ɑː/ in the same word would cause an intelligibility problem as the intended word becomes ‘bathplace’ (Jenkins, 2002, p. 88). The influential
work of Jenkins provides implications for how pronunciation should be taught as well as how to prepare teachers to teach pronunciation (e.g. Sifakis and Sougari, 2003; Sifakis, 2014).

Regarding English in ASEAN, Deterding and Kirkpatrick (2006, as cited in Kirkpatrick, 2011b, p. 218) study and present phonological features of ASEAN speakers as exemplified in Table 2.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FEATURE</th>
<th>EXAMPLE(S)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>reduction of consonant clusters</td>
<td>first – firs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dental fricative / θ / as [t]</td>
<td>many thing [tɪŋ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>merging of long and short vowel sounds</td>
<td>[iː] and [ɪ] to [ɪ]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2: Examples of phonological features of ASEAN speakers

Similar to grammatical intelligibility, the above examples demonstrate phonological features which are less likely to cause intelligibility problems among ASEAN speakers.

3.3.1.2 Variations of EIL

Another point to consider to improve intelligibility is knowledge and awareness that English, especially spoken English, is used differently in the world. Thus, it is important for students to be exposed to a range of English accents and to know how to use various forms of language appropriately and intelligibly when using English to communicate with speakers from different backgrounds (Jenkins, 2000, pp. 166, 182-183; 2006a, p. 161). Students should be made aware of the diversity of English, and they should be offered a choice depending on their desire to speak English like a NES or as an ELF user (Cogo, 2012, p. 104). Thus, ‘variant dialects of native and non-native Englishes can and should be used as models in English language teaching’ (Brown, 2012, p. 152). This is in line with Sifakis and Sougari (2005, p. 481), Matsuda (2003, p. 723) and Seidlhofer (2011) who advocate developing students’ awareness of various ways that fluent English speakers from around the world speak English.

From a Thai higher education perspective, Jindapitak and Teo (2013) advocate the building of students’ awareness of various EIL accents because:
Without EIL knowledge, learners may develop the idea that varieties of English including their own, which phonologically or structurally differ from the inner-circle varieties, are linguistically-ill versions of English and are unacceptable when international communication is involved. (pp. 201-202)

Nevertheless, while ‘it is unwise to define proficiency based on a single variety’, it is also ‘impossible to teach or measure proficiency in many varieties simultaneously’ (Canagarajah, 2006a, p. 229). As noted by Seidlhofer (2011), prescribing forms in TESOL would be ‘pedagogically pointless’:

what is crucial is not so much what language is presented as input but what learners make of it, and how they make use of it to develop the capability for languaging’ [i.e. to make use of the linguistic resources available to them to achieve their communicative goals] (p. 198)

Therefore, students also need communication skills which will enable them to communicate interculturally. I discuss this set of skills and possible assessment methods for the linguistic dimension later in this section.

3.3.2 Teaching the cultural dimension of EIL

The traditional view of teaching the cultural dimension in TESOL is usually associated with NESs in Inner Circle countries (i.e. the ‘large culture’, Holliday, 1999). From the TEIL perspective, the teaching of ‘culture’ does not focus exclusively on the target culture. As TEIL recognises the use of English as an international language in and across multicultural societies, it aims at helping students to use EIL to communicate across cultures (McKay, 2002, p. 82). Culture teaching should enable students to use EIL to discuss their own culture with other people (ibid, p. 88). Thus, students need adequate linguistic proficiency to talk about and have opportunities to reflect upon their own culture in light of that of others (ibid, p. 81).

An aspect of teaching student’s local culture is discussed in Fay et al.’s (2010) work of ‘Multicultural Awareness through English’ (MATE). That term refers to a teaching and learning paradigm which foregrounds the awareness and cultural diversity experience in students’ own multicultural society (e.g. some schools in Greece which now have significant numbers of migrant pupils) as objectives in teaching English. From MATE perspective, each student brings ‘languacultural resources’ into interactions with others as part of their cultural
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learning and identity formation. The term ‘languacultural resources’ refers to ‘the complexity of individual identity … linked to [their] unique, developing set of linguistic and cultural resources’ (p. 586, citing Agar, 1994). Fay et al. consider ‘identity as a process in which individuals select certain elements of their languacultural resources’ and ‘craft identity claims for presentation to others. Therefore, ‘these individualised languacultural resources need to be both valued and activated as part of the MATE paradigm’s contribution to pupils’ developing multicultural awareness’ (pp. 586-587).

In addition to developing the ability to communicate about their local cultures and identities, TEIL also aims to help students become ‘global speakers of English’, i.e. ‘to feel at home in both international and national cultures’ (Kramsch and Sullivan, 1996, p. 211). Following Holliday (1994), Kramsch and Sullivan use the metaphor of ‘market places’ to illustrate that students should be able to use English in ways that enable them to fulfil their global needs e.g. to communicate with NESs and NNES at the global level to achieve their purposes while having control over the language and retaining their local culture and values (i.e. local needs) in their language use. Moreover, Matsuda (2012) suggests the teaching of global issues ‘that cut across national boundaries and are relevant to the global society as a whole … such as world peace and environment conservation … as they help foster the sense of global citizenship among students’ (p. 176).

Another category of culture is the international culture which involves ‘a wide variety of cultures set in English-speaking countries or in other countries where English is not first or second language, but is used as an international language’ (Cortazzi and Jin, 1999). However, English is used by people from differing linguistic and cultural backgrounds, hence, it is impossible to teach students the specific culture of every country in the world (Matsuda, 2012, p. 176). Therefore, teaching about cultures from different parts of the world will demonstrate the spread of English and the different functions of English in international communities (ibid).

Concerning ASEAN, ‘rather than a course in American or British culture, the TESOL curriculum can provide a course in regional cultures. So, in the ASEAN context, learners can study the cultures of ASEAN through English, including the study of pragmatic norms’ (Kirkpatrick, 2011, p. 221). Regarding the NES cultures, ‘if they are of interest and relevance to learners, … they need to be approached in an equally complex and critical manner rather
than simplified stereotypes and “celebrity snapshots” (Baker, 2015, p. 134, citing Gray 2012, emphasis in the original).

Despite the value of teaching cultures as discussed above, few studies (e.g. Tran and Dang, 2014) have reported the willingness of English language teachers to teach the cultural dimension of English. On the contrary, several studies have shown that English language teachers usually do not regard the teaching of this dimension as a priority. For instance, Young and Sachdev (2011) report that, to EFL teachers from the UK, US and France, the teaching of this dimension ‘seems to be neglected, or even actively avoided’ (p. 95). This is in line with Nguyen et al. (2016) who found that Vietnamese EFL university teachers in their study ‘explicitly denied the role of teaching culture or saw it as someone else’s responsibility’ (p. 172). In Japan, many EFL university teachers are ‘unconvinced that it is the teacher’s job to introduce cultural elements into their language classes’ while some view that students should ‘discover both their own culture or the target language’s culture by themselves’ (Stapleton, 2000, p. 301). Further, Onalan (2005, p. 229) concludes that EFL teachers in four Turkish universities regard cultural content as a tool for contextualising the teaching the linguistic dimension, and thus they are not priorities in their teaching.

A recurrent theme in the literature on teachers’ perspectives is the inconsistency between teachers’ positive attitudes towards incorporating the cultural dimension and their classroom practices. For instance, Castro et al. (2004) reports that secondary school English language teachers in Spain, although supportive of integrating the cultural dimension in the teaching of English, feel that they have to prioritise the teaching of the linguistic dimension of English.

Studies have reported the reasons why teachers might not be interested in integrating the cultural dimension in their teaching. For instance, some Moroccan secondary school teachers in Adaskou et al. (1990) voiced that cultural content in English language learning materials might not be relevant to students’ lives in Morocco (p. 7). Stapleton (2000) reports that EFL teachers in universities in Japan are not satisfied with how textbooks present culture of particular countries such as the US. They are concerned about a possible bias resulting from presenting ‘a distorted or one-sided view’ of the language and the speakers of the language (p. 30). A group of Turkish EFL teachers also reported having no motivation to integrate cultural information in the teaching of English because they think that their students would
not be interested in learning the target culture (Bayyurt, 2006, p. 241). Also, teachers may need to teach to the assessment as previously discussed in Section 2.2.2.

3.3.3 Interculturally-oriented approach to TEIL

While the teaching of the cultural dimension of EIL could develop students’ cultural knowledge and awareness (i.e. of local culture, other cultures and the global/international cultures), it might not be sufficient to prepare students for the ‘fluid and emergent’ IC (Baker, 2011, p. 202). Intercultural interactions take place in the ‘third space’ (Bhabha, 1994), i.e. the space where the interactants create and negotiate norms to achieve their communicative purposes (Kramsch, 1993). These norms can be ‘different’ from NES norms and are not regarded as ‘wrong’ (Jenkins, 2006b, p. 155). EIL users, regardless of being NESs or NNESs, have to learn how to use English in the ‘third place’ or the ‘third space’ (Seidlhofer, 2012, p. 397). This perspective has, therefore, blurred the distinction between NES and NNES and has suggested that they can both have an equal membership in an interaction (Matsumoto, 2011, p. 99).

The intercultural dimension of English as a lingua franca is discussed in a volume edited by Holmes and Dervin (2016). In that volume, Fay et al. argue that there is an intercultural dimension in any English-medium interaction in an international setting. Baker (2016b) in the same volume, also argues that ELF, IC and ELT (English language teaching) share an interest in ‘successful communication and the competencies needed to achieve this’ (p. 70). Therefore, the teaching of the intercultural dimension is crucial if students’ ability to communicate interculturally is a purpose of the teaching of English.

TESOL scholars have called for the development of students’ intercultural (communicative) competence. To this end, they have called for an interculturally-oriented approach to teaching English. For instance, Alptekin (2002) calls for a pedagogy which considers the status of English as an international language and aims to prepare students to be able to use EIL in IC. He suggests that a new pedagogic model of teaching English as an international language should endeavour to develop students to become ‘[s]uccessful bilinguals with intercultural insights and knowledge’ (p. 63). Hence, materials should contain cultural content covering both local and international contexts, and this content must be relevant to students’ lives. The materials should also contain an appropriate number of discourse samples of interactions.
between NES ↔ NNES and NNES ↔ NNES (Alptekin, 2002, p. 63). EIL students should be equipped with ‘linguistic and cultural behaviour which will enable them to communicate effectively with others’ and they should also be equipped with ‘an awareness of difference, and with strategies for coping with such difference’ (Hyde, 1998, cited in Alptekin, 2002, p. 63).

The discussion of intercultural (communicative) competence is not a new topic in TESOL. An earlier work advocating the incorporation of an intercultural dimension into the teaching of English was that of Baxter in 1983 (Fay et al., 2016). Baxter argues that ‘speaking English “perfectly” is not enough and that linguistic fluency in English does not ensure effective intercultural communication’ (Baxter, 1983, p. 290, emphasis in the original). He points out a gap in TEIL as having no guideline on how to teach students to speak English ‘interculturally’ (ibid, p. 306) and proposes the *English for Intercultural Communication* (EIC) approach. EIC foregrounds the teaching of communication before the teaching of language, i.e. teaching and learning English for ‘intercultural communication’ purposes (ibid, pp. 312-313, emphasis in the original).

Following Baxter, Sifakis (2004) also argues that TESOL should focus on communication (p. 246). In his approach, *Teaching English as an intercultural language* (TEIcL), Sifakis characterises English as an ‘intercultural’ rather than ‘international’ language. As such, it focuses on ‘interlocutors’ ability to handle all sorts of communicative situations, as well as their attitudes to and beliefs about English’ (p. 242). TEIcL focuses on the ‘communication, comprehensibility and culture’ (in his term ‘C-bound’ as opposed to ‘N-bound’ or norms). These three key elements, i.e. communication, comprehensibility and culture, are significant for a successful IC. What matters when English is considered from a C-bound perspective is ‘intelligible or comprehensible’ communication (p. 240). In this communication, speakers share ‘the ability to process each other’s performance to account for the needs of the specific situation and of one another’ (pp. 240-241). Therefore, students’ linguistic dimension (i.e. intelligibility, variations of EIL), communication skills (e.g. accommodation skills) and mindset (e.g. intercultural awareness) need to be developed as essential elements of intercultural interaction.
Sifakis points out the scarcity of C-bound materials (e.g. textbooks and assessment guidelines) when compared to those of the N-bound perspective. Thus, for teachers who wish to orient their teaching towards this approach, they should consider:

1) learning about students’ attitudes and whether they are N-bound or C-bound;
2) creating a multilingual and multicultural learning environment;
3) raising students’ ‘awareness of the C-bound perspective’; and
4) creating a syllabus with input from students while being critical of the existing textbooks. (pp. 245-248).

3.3.3.1 Accommodation skills
Possessing knowledge and skill with several varieties of English does not seem to be adequate to achieve intelligibility. English usage in the real world is beyond any descriptive norms, whether they are defined in standardised varieties (e.g. English used in the Inner Circle), localised varieties (e.g. English used in the Outer Circle) or a norm shared by English users from differing linguistic backgrounds (e.g. Jenkins’ Lingua Franca Core) (Canagarajah, 2014, p. 770). Rather than depending on any specific norm, interactants of English negotiate norms in each particular interaction to achieve intelligibility (ibid, p. 767).

Limitations of the LFC in this regard were discussed by Jenkins (2000). She explains that every interaction is unique and there are factors that influence intelligibility. Thus, the teaching of prescribed linguistic features (including the LFC) in a hope that students will be able to use the new knowledge in EIL communication is not always useful. In an interaction, speakers may also need to have communicative skills ‘to make themselves more understandable to their interlocutors’ (Cogo, 2012, p. 99). For instance, speakers need to be able to adjust their pronunciation to be appropriate for the listeners and for the communication circumstance. The listeners also need to tolerate different accents, monitor their expectations to accommodate the speakers and the particular environment of the interaction, give signals and cope with features of the speakers’ L1. Other scholars advocating the teaching of accommodation skills are, for instance, Seidlhofer (2004, p. 222; 2011) and Cogo and Dewey (2006, p. 70).

The TEIL literature as discussed above suggests that TESOL practitioners should not overemphasise the teaching of NES-norm based grammar and grammatical accuracy. This,
however, does not mean a shift from TEFL to a new model (Sifakis and Fay, 2011) or abandoning grammar and accuracy in an English classroom as students need to have adequate linguistic proficiency for communicating their ideas (Baker, 2011, p. 211; Renandya, 2013). Students still need to learn grammar consistent with NES norms as ‘a part of the pattern in the carpet’ so that they can participate in diverse EIL situations (Prodromou, 2007, p. 52). Similarly, in terms of phonology, native-like pronunciation should not ‘completely be marginalised’ (Jindapitak, 2015, p. 273). Native-like pronunciation is useful for students who aim to function in NES communities. Students can use it ‘as points of reference and models for guidance’ and it is their choice ‘to approximate to them more or less according to the demands of a specific situation’ (Jenkins, 1998, p. 124). Thus, teachers need to consider students’ specific learning goals (Kumaravadivelu, 2001, p. 538). However, this also means that a coherent assessment system should be in place. While ‘the what of assessment’ (e.g. Standard English or ELF/EIL as described by Jenkins and other) is still debatable (Elder and Davies, 2006, p. 287), there seems to be a consensus that assessment should focus on students’ performance in using EIL for IC. This may include, for instance, ‘the effectiveness of the use of communicative strategies for negotiation of meaning’ (Sharifian and Clyne, 2008, p. 36.8) which might be tested through ‘role play, oral presentation, poster session, or portfolio’. Using these forms of assessment ‘may encourage students to focus on language functions that include but go beyond grammatical accuracy’ (Matsuda, 2003, pp. 723-724).

With the purpose of using EIL for IC in mind, scholars such as Fay and Andrews (2000), Canagarajah (2006a, pp. 238-240), Elder and Davies (2006), Jenkins (2007) and Elder and Harding (2008) discuss assessing students’ oral communicative performance through pair or group oral interactions. An example of such assessment is the Cambridge First Certificate of English (FCE). Fay and Andrews (2000) maintain that ‘[i]n the paired oral exam, an interactionist, emergent small culture is being created, and the exam is a facework site for interpersonal communication across cultures’ (p. 179).

3.3.3.2 Intercultural awareness (ICA)

Baker (2011) proposes intercultural awareness (ICA), a model which ‘may enable users of English to successfully negotiate the complexities of intercultural communication in which there are less likely to be a priori defined cultural groupings or contexts by which to construct shared meaning and communicative practices’ (p. 202). He defines ICA as:
a conscious understanding of the role culturally based forms, practices and frames of
reference can have in intercultural communication, and an ability to put these
conceptions into practice in a flexible and context specific manner in real time
communication. (ibid)

Baker’s ICA model differs from Byram’s (1997) model of ICC in that Byram’s model is built
upon the concept of ‘critical cultural awareness’ which aims at students learning about their
own (national) culture and comparing it with that of others. In addition, Byram’s model is
based on the teaching of foreign languages. Baker’s ICA, on the contrary, originated in the
field of TESOL in recognition of English as a lingua franca for IC. Baker’s ICA model,
therefore, does not assume a relationship between language and culture (Baker, 2011, p. 212).

To succeed in IC, students need to have knowledge and attitudes about cultural differences
and be able to ‘articulate these attitudes and knowledge’ (i.e. conceptual ICA) (pp. 202-204).
Further, they need skills to apply these attitudes in an IC. Baker divides intercultural
competence into three levels, namely:

- Level 1- Basic cultural awareness (CA);
- Level 2- Advanced cultural awareness; and
- Level 3- Intercultural awareness. (p. 203)

While Level 1 may still involve the concept of culture as attached to national culture, Level 2
moves away from such ‘essentialist positions’ towards awareness of possible communication
issues arising out of cultural differences (i.e. ‘previous conceptions of intercultural
competence’ e.g. Byram’s ICC) (p. 205). The third level is ICA which:

requires an engagement of many of the previous elements simultaneously, including
the ability to mediate and negotiate between different cultural frames of reference and
communication modes as they occur in specific examples of intercultural
communication. While comparison and mediation were also a feature of level 2, at
this level the ability to mediate and negotiate is combined with an awareness of the
emergent nature of cultural forms, references and practices in intercultural
communication. (ibid)

In assessment terms, while Byram’s model discusses how ICC might be assessed, Baker does
not explain how this could and should be done in the ICA model. In his 2013 article on
developing an e-learning course for teaching ICA to Thai students, he discusses the ‘non-
assessed’ nature of the course as one of its limitations (Baker, 2013, p. 294). Nevertheless, in
his 2015 article, citing Tomalin, 2008, he discusses the risk of teaching the cultural and intercultural dimensions as the ‘fifth skill’ (i.e. in addition to the traditional four skills). For Baker, ‘ICA involves knowledge, attitudes AND skills. Most importantly though, culture is a central part of intercultural communication and intercultural competence and cannot be dealt with in isolation from other aspects of communication’ (Baker, 2015, p. 135).

Corbett (2003) proposes forms of assessment as drawn on from Byram’s (1997) model of ICC. Although Corbett’s notion of IC teaching and testing tends to rely on learning about the target culture and gaining specific cultural knowledge, his stance on assessment seems to have relevance to the Thai TESOL where examination results are highly prized. Corbett opines that assessment:

> does have an institutional and individual use: state educational systems demand assessment to measure the performance of schools and the individuals who attend them. Teachers and learners also demand assessment as a means of measuring their progress, charting future needs, and diagnosing problems. In addition, recognition by an institution that a subject like culture is worth assessing can act as a stimulus for teachers and students to take it seriously. (p. 192)

Experienced and practicing NESTs and NNESTs from the UK, USA and France in a study conducted by Young and Sachdev (2011) report that they were ‘unable or unwilling’ to apply Byram’s model of Intercultural Communicative Competence (ICC) to their practices. They expressed this in spite of the teachers’ feeling that their employers had prioritised ICC as a general aim of their EFL programmes. An important reason for this was ‘a lack of ICC testing’ (p. 95). This might mean that if developing students’ intercultural communicative competence is the main purpose of TESOL, how to meaningfully assess this dimension should be considered.

Up to this point, the TEIL literature as discussed above offers alternative perspectives on how English might be taught in ways which correspond to how people around the world use EIL. What is evident is that, to be able to communicate interculturally, students require more than native-like linguistic competence. While they still need to learn grammar, they also need to become aware of how English is used in EIL settings. In addition, they need communication skills and cultural and intercultural awareness in order to use EIL for IC purposes. Although these suggestions are useful for TESOL practitioners, none of these models can be prescribed as ‘the best’ way to teach EIL. TESOL practitioners in each context might choose to adopt
(some of) these suggestions into their existing English language programmes or develop their own curriculum the way they deem appropriate.

### 3.3.4 Moving away from TEFL towards TEIL for IC purposes

The teaching of the linguistic, cultural and intercultural dimensions suggested by TEIL scholars seems fit for Thailand as the country needs to prepare graduates to have a sufficient level of English proficiency, skills and awareness essential for IC within ASEAN and beyond (Todd, 2006, p. 3; Jindapitak and Teo, 2013; Jindapitak, 2015). Nevertheless, in an EFL, Expanding Circle country like Thailand, reorienting TESOL away from the dominant TEFL paradigm can be challenging.

In order for change to take place, it requires extensive support from TESOL practitioners (Jenkins, 2005, p. 150). Previous studies tend to highlight teachers’ adherence to NES norms in teaching the linguistic dimension of English, for instance, in teaching pronunciation (e.g. Timmis, 2002; Jenkins, 2005; Sifakis and Sougari, 2005; Lim, 2016) and grammatical norms (e.g. Timmis, 2002; Luo, 2016) for examination (e.g. Hiep, 2005; Nguyen, 2013; Nguyen et al., 2016). Regarding the cultural dimension of English, studies have shown the prevalence of target culture teaching (e.g. Adaskou et al., 1990, p. 7; Bayyurt, 2006, p. 241; Gandana and Parr, 2013) and teachers’ scepticism about cultural teaching in English classrooms (e.g. Stapleton, 2000, p. 301; Nguyen et al., 2016, p. 172). In terms of the intercultural dimension, a theme in the literature is teachers’ reluctance to integrate this dimension of English into their teaching. Young and Sachdev (2011), for instance, report that teachers in their study voiced inadequate institutional support for them to teach and assess ‘interculturality’ – i.e. ‘a dynamic process by which people not only draw on and use the resources and processes of cultures with which they are familiar but also those they may not typically be associated with in their interactions with others (Young and Sercombe, 2010)’ (Young and Sachdev, 2011, p. 81).

Exploring what teachers think about English, why and how to teach it, therefore, could add to an understanding of why they might or might not welcome newer paradigms into their practice (Jenkins, 2005, p. 150; Young and Sachdev, 2011, p. 84; Dewey, 2012, p. 143) despite experts’ suggestions and the lead from the policy discourse (discussed in Chapter 1). Nevertheless, in Thai TESOL, apart from Methitham (2009), there is a general lack of
empirical study into the perspectives of in-service English language teachers in Thai universities in this regard.

3.4 Research aims and research questions

Drawing from my contextual understanding presented in Chapter 1 and the conceptual insights presented in Chapter 2 as well as in this chapter, my study contributes to the dialogue about the appropriate methodology in TESOL (e.g. Holliday, 1994). It explored the perspectives of TESOL practitioners which are complex and embedded in a particular professional community (ibid, p. 5) in which there exists a web of influences within, as well as beyond, the institution (e.g. students, curriculum, university policies, work culture, personal and professional experience of the practitioners, and national, supranational policies).

Bearing in mind those aims, research in the field of language teacher cognition (e.g. Borg, 2003; 2006) has relevance to my study in two respects. First, it has provided empirical evidence regarding the influences of what teachers think about their classroom practices and thus, on students’ learning (Phipps and Borg, 2009). Second, it offers implications for teacher education in different domains as has been detailed in Section 3.3 (e.g. Atay, 2009; Castro et al., 2010; Chen and Goh, 2011; Nguyen, 2013; Lim, 2016; Luo, 2016; Nguyen et al., 2016).

Nevertheless, in teacher cognition studies as exemplified by those referenced above, what teachers think has been referred to in a plethora of ways such as ‘attitudes, values, judgments, axioms, opinions, ideology, perceptions, conceptions, conceptual systems, preconceptions, dispositions, implicit theories, explicit theories, personal theories, internal mental processes, action strategies, rules of practice, practical principles, perspectives, repertoires of understanding, and social strategies’ (Pajares, 1992, p. 309). While there seems to be no consensus on the choice of terminology, I used the term ‘perspectives’ as a lay term to refer to what Borg (2003) has defined as ‘the unobservable cognitive dimension of teaching – what teachers know, believe and think’ (p.81). The ‘lay’ approach to teacher cognition is appropriate to address the main purpose of my study which sought to contribute to the body of literature in TESOL rather than the specific literature on teacher cognition.
My research questions were:

1) What are the perspectives of some Thai TESOL practitioners at a Thai public university regarding the purposes of their teaching of the English language?
2) What are their paradigm assumptions regarding the teaching and learning of the English language? and
3) What are possible influences that shape the teachers’ perspectives on the purposes of and paradigm assumptions underpinning TESOL in their context?

**Concluding remarks**

As I explored the main underlying assumptions of TEFL in terms of the linguistic and cultural dimensions of English in the previous chapter, in this chapter, I explored alternative paradigms for teaching English in this intercultural age. The literature from FLE and TESOL perspectives suggest that there is an array of possibilities of how English might be taught which could be more appropriate for many EFL and Expanding Circle contexts, including Thailand.

In order to move away from the dominant TEFL paradigm towards more appropriate paradigms such as TEIL, it is important to understand what practitioners on the ground think, especially regarding the purposes of, and their assumptions about, the teaching of the English language. This information will enable a better understanding of the potential of embracing TEIL in the TESOL in Thai universities. In the next chapter, I provide a description of the research site in which I conducted my study (i.e. a university in Thailand) and discuss the TESOL paradigms underpinning the teaching and learning of English at the university.
Chapter 4 - Green Park University

Introduction
In the previous chapters, I discussed how English has become less the language of native English speakers (NESs) which non-native English speakers (NNESs) learn as a foreign language (i.e. EFL) and more of an international language (i.e. EIL) used for intercultural communication (IC) purposes. As such, the native speaker anchoring of the TEFL (Teaching English as a Foreign Language) paradigm may be less relevant. I also explained that exploring practitioners’ perspectives regarding the purposes of their practices and their paradigm assumptions could shed light on why they might or might not embrace newer paradigm possibilities.

Bearing in mind the web of possible influences on practitioners (Holliday, 1994; 1999), in this chapter, I present a detailed description of the research site I chose for my study. This description will be useful in subsequent chapters of this thesis. In Section 4.1, I begin by briefly introducing Green Park University (GPU, a pseudonym), a public higher education institution in Thailand. In Section 4.2, I describe GPU’s General Education English (GEE) curriculum and how it was implemented. Finally, in Section 4.3, I offer my commentary on the GPU’s curriculum and its implementation in terms of TESOL purposes and paradigms.

4.1 Green Park University
GPU was established in the 1990s. According to the First Long Range Plan for Higher Education (1990-2004), new public higher education institutions (henceforth, ‘universities’) established after the plan’s inception in 1990 were to be classified as autonomous universities (Kirtikara, 2002; 2004). Being an autonomous public university meant that GPU had ‘flexibility’ in its ‘own administrative structure and budgeting system for self-governance and full autonomy, allowing decision making on administrative and management matters of the university to be handled by the university itself’ (OHEC, 2013, p. 3). For instance, GPU had autonomy in admissions policy. Working there, I witnessed GPU consider itself as a ‘university of opportunities’. This was an unpublished, internal classification, presented by the President of the university on several occasions internally in staff meetings and during

---

10 The rationale for research site and participant selection is discussed in Chapter 5.
student orientation. The ‘opportunities’ refers to two areas: firstly, for students from economically deprived backgrounds to be financially supported to study at the university; and secondly, for students of heterogeneous competence to study at the university. The latter is more relevant to my study because it has implications for the teaching and learning of English (discussed in the next section).

English is the main medium of instruction (EMI) at GPU. As discussed in Chapter 1, EMI has a link with the internationalisation of HE institutions, and from my previous experience of interviewing prospective students, this ‘international’ position of GPU attracted both Thai and international students to study at GPU. English has been promoted not only in classrooms, but staff and students are encouraged to use English outside the classroom. Figure 5 is a picture of a sign illustrating this directive from the university.

![Figure 5: ‘English only’ sign](image)
4.2 GPU’s General Education English curriculum

Most of GPU undergraduate students are required to complete English courses as part of their General Education course requirements. Other language requirements include: Thai (three credits) and Chinese (three credits).

The 1/2014 GEE curriculum was comprised of the following courses:

- Intensive English (IE) or Intensive English Special (IESP) (0 credits, Lecture: six hours);
- English 1 (three credits, Lecture: three hours);
- English 2 (three credits, Lecture: three hours);
- English 3 (three credits, Lecture: three hours); and
- English 4 (three credits, Lecture: three hours).

The majority of students were required to take IE, English 1, 2 and 3. Only students majoring in some fields of study, for instance, Teaching Chinese Language, Tourism management, and Business Chinese, were required to take English 4. Hence, I did not include the teaching of this course in my study.

In relation to the implementation of the curriculum, a characteristic of the GEE programme at GPU was ‘team-teaching’. The School of Liberal Arts served a large number of students. Consequently, it required a number of teachers to teach the same course (with around 45 students in one class). In Semester 1/2014, for example, 88 sections of IE were established to handle the volume of students required to study that course.

Each course was coordinated by a team with one teacher as the main coordinator (also known as the ‘team leader’). The team was responsible for selecting and/or producing the course’s teaching materials (e.g. textbooks, audio-visual materials) as well as designing assessments for each course such as quizzes and exams. They also had to make sure that all sections followed a uniform teaching standard – i.e. all teachers followed the same sequence of lesson plans, used the teaching materials that were provided and applied the same evaluation criteria. Another important task for the course-coordinating team was to assess each teacher in the team at the end of each semester. This assessment was part of each teacher’s professional evaluation which could impact their salary in the following year.
GPU advertised on its website the promotion of a Problem-Based Learning (PBL) approach. The current Head of the English Department informed me during our interview\textsuperscript{11} that GPU has promoted PBL since 2008, mainly through its collaboration – e.g. trainings and staff exchange programmes – with a Scandinavian university. For GEE courses, a pioneering project involved a small number of teachers who adopted PBL in their English courses (Interview with the Head of the English Department, 3\textsuperscript{rd} November 2014). None of these teachers participated in my study. However, in general, the teaching methods at GPU were largely governed by the designated materials and teacher’s manual of each GEE course. Below, I present a description and the objectives of each course as outlined in the syllabuses I gathered during my fieldwork\textsuperscript{12}.

\textbf{4.2.1 Intensive English and Intensive English (Special)}

This was a remedial English course in which most GPU students in all fields of study (except for English Majors) were required to enrol in their first year of their programme of study. Students could be exempted from the course if they: a) were considered to be native English speakers; b) had previous formal education in an English-speaking country; or c) obtained satisfactory scores on a standardised English test such as IELTS/TOEFL, the university’s placement test or on the Ordinary National Education Test (O-NET\textsuperscript{13}).

While the course had no credits, students were required to obtain an overall score of at least 50% on the course evaluation to pass. Mindful that GPU’s admission policy (i.e. a ‘university of opportunities’) resulted in the admission of freshmen with different levels of English ability the failure rate of students in this course was high (approximately 40% each semester). This situation is not unique to the university as EMI education potentially creates the ‘barriers’ for students who have insufficient language ability (Feak, 2013, p. 40, see also D'Angelo, 2016, p. 247, for an example from a university in Japan).

\textsuperscript{11} The method is discussed in Chapter 5.
\textsuperscript{12} The method is discussed in Chapter 5.
\textsuperscript{13} O-NET is a requirement for Thai universities entrance. Upper secondary school students are required to take sit in the exam in their final year of study. The O-NET tests students’ knowledge of the Basic Education Core Curriculum B.E 2551 (A.D. 2008).
GPU students who failed had to repeat it until they met the minimum passing score. Unfortunately, many students had to repeat the course more than once. For this reason, the university started to offer a ‘special’ version of the IE course in 2014. The course is widely known as ‘Intensive English Special’ (IESP).

The two versions of IE (i.e. the ‘normal’ and ‘special’ IE) were similar in many respects, i.e. they shared the same name, course code, description and objectives (Figure 6). Note that the syllabuses shown in this thesis are presented in the language (i.e. English) in which they were originally produced. The emphases in the subsequent section are mine.

---

**Course Description:**

Foundations of contextualized English grammar, structures and vocabulary essential to general and academic purposes; intensive practice of everyday, social and academic use of English; preparation of study skills for effective pursuit of English-medium studies; and introduction to and encouragement of independent learning through on-going practice of learning strategies.

**Course Objectives**

After the completion of this course, students will be able to:
1. correctly and appropriately use ordinary and academic vocabulary;
2. communicate in different situations in intermediate spoken and written English with grammatical and structure [structural] correctness;
3. identify main ideas, specific information, facts and opinions in reading passages;
4. write complete sentences using various and appropriate syntactic structures;
5. apply learning strategies according to their own learning styles and multiple intelligences.

---

**Figure 6: Intensive English course description and objectives**

However, the two versions were different in their implementation in three ways. First, while students studied the ‘normal’ version for six hours per week, those in the ‘special’ version spent only three hours. Second, ‘normal’ IE employed the entire textbook entitled *American Headway* (Soars and Soars, 2009) whereas in ‘special’ IE, only selected content from the textbook was used. This included grammar points, vocabulary, and reading and writing lessons. Third, while the evaluation criteria of ‘normal’ IE contained writing tests, independent study, external reading, term projects (oral presentation), and midterm and final exams, 90% of the ‘special’ course’s assessment was based on students’ midterm and final exams results.

In addition to the development of the two different versions of the course, another related alteration was the course’s status as a prerequisite for higher-level courses in the curriculum. Initially, students were required to pass IE before they could commence a higher-level
course. However, due to the consistently high rate of failure, from academic year 2013 onwards, students were allowed to enrol in a higher-level course while repeating the remedial course. Hence, the School of Liberal Arts offered the IESP course in the evening (i.e. from 4 to 7 p.m.), and the teachers who taught this ‘special’ course were invited to act as ‘tutors’ and adopt a ‘cram school’ style teaching method in order to help students pass exams and the course.

4.2.2 English 1
English 1 was a continuation of IE/IESP, but it was the first course in the General Education English curriculum in which students would receive grades and credits. The main material for English 1 was a locally-written textbook entitled English 1 produced by a team of teachers at GPU\(^{14}\). The book featured four ASEAN countries as the overall theme of the book. Figure 7 shows the course description and objectives of English 1.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course Description:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Development of English language skills necessary for daily life. Integration of four-skills through a wide range of content topics. Practice of learning strategies, self-directed learning skills, communication skill, problem-solving, and basic thinking skills. Developing awareness and understanding of diverse cultures.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Course Objectives

**Communication skills:** Students will learn about word stress and the standard pronunciation of English. They will be able to communicate by using English language accurately and appropriately in composing expository and opinion paragraphs together with discussion and presentation with regards to intonation, body language, creating Power Points, and pronunciation.

**Content skills:** Students will be able to comprehend and reflect their understanding of the contents from different sources of information.

**Cognition:** Students will be able to develop basic thinking skills.

**Culture:** Students will be able to develop intercultural awareness in using English as an international language as well as cross-cultural awareness. They will develop a greater understanding of the ASEAN region with regards to culture, geography, economies, cuisine, education, and travel.

**Figure 7: English 1 course description and objectives**

4.2.3 English 2
English 2 was the continuation of English 1. From my experience in the field (as discussed in the following chapter), this was generally known among the teachers as an essay writing course; the primary assessment (at least 30%) was based on essay writing. The main material

\(^{14}\) To maintain the university’s anonymity (as discussed in Chapter 5), the reference of the locally-produced materials is not included here.
of the course was a textbook containing lessons adapted from different sources and compiled by the English 2 course-coordinating team. Figure 8 shows the course description and objectives of English 2.

**Course Description:**
General English for communication and basic academic English development through various informative content topics. Practice of learning strategies, communication skill, problem-solving and critical thinking skills. Development of an awareness and respect of diverse cultures and social responsibilities.

**Course Objectives**
1. **Communication skills:** Students will be able to communicate by using English language accurately and appropriately in various contexts;
2. **Content skills:** Students will be able to comprehend and gain knowledge about various academic disciplines;
3. **Cognition:** Students will be able to develop critical thinking skills;
4. **Culture:** Students will be able to develop intercultural awareness in using English as an international language as well as awareness of culture of disciplines.

**Figure 8: English 2 course description and objectives**

### 4.2.4 English 3

English 3 was the last course in the GEE curriculum that the majority of GPU students were required to complete. It was generally known by the teachers and students as a research writing course because the end-product of the course was a mini-research report. Similar to English 2, the main material of this course was a textbook containing lessons from different sources adapted and compiled by the English 3 course-coordinating team. Figure 9 shows the course description and objectives of English 3.

**Course Description:**
- Development of advanced academic English through the engagement in informative content topics
- Practice of academic English for communication focusing on researching and discussion skills
- Develop public awareness, self-reflection, higher-order thinking skill and self-reliant learning

**Course Objectives**
1. **Communication skills:** Students will be able to communicate by using English language accurately and appropriately in various contexts;
2. **Content skills:** Students will be able to comprehend and gain knowledge about various academic disciplines; and express their viewpoints about the content topics;
3. **Cognition:** Students will be able to develop higher-order thinking skills such as analyzing, evaluating, problem solving and criticizing skills;
4. **Culture:** Students will be able to develop team work skills across academic disciplines as well as an awareness of communicative English in inter-cultural contexts. They will also develop team work understanding and respect for work ethics.

**Figure 9: English 3 course description and objectives**
4.3 Paradigmatic/pedagogic influences

The above descriptions of GPU and its GEE curriculum demonstrate influences from interrelated paradigms, purposes and terms. I discuss three main areas of influence in this section.

4.3.1 CLIL, EMI, and EAP

The objectives of the GEE courses shared a four-domain format: Communication skills, Content skills, Cognition, and Culture. These four Cs are the same as those in the Content and Language Integrated Learning (CLIL) approach (I provide a definition of CLIL shortly) which, as outlined in email communication with the former Head of the English Department, influenced curriculum design:

Yes, the objectives of these courses came from CLIL framework because I think that our curricula aim at teaching English to be the foundation of studying contents according to students’ fields of study … I designed the curriculum and content to match with the problems and the specific needs of [GPU]. (The former Head of the English Department, personal communication, 2nd September 2015, my translation)

Also from the above excerpt, from my perspective, ‘the specific needs of GPU’ possibly refers to the development of students’ ability to study in an EMI setting. In this regard, within the TESOL provision of GPU, there were possible influences from CLIL, EMI as well as EAP (English for Academic Purposes) as illustrated in the following statements taken from the above syllabuses:

- ‘Preparation of study skills for effective pursuit of English-medium studies’ (EMI);
- ‘Foundations of contextualized English grammar, structures and vocabulary essential to general and academic purposes’ (EAP);
- ‘basic academic English development through various informative content topics’ (EAP and CLIL); and
- ‘Practice of academic English for communication focusing on researching and discussion skills’ (EAP).
EMI/CLIL/EAP represent the plethora of terms used in the ‘Language Education scene’ (Johnstone, 2010, p. 17). Although authors such as Morton (2016, pp. 254 and 261) distinguish the specific remit of each term, it is not my purpose to delineate their boundaries but rather, as illustrated in the following definitions of CLIL and EAP, to show that these terms are interrelated:

- ‘The focus of **CLIL** was on the adoption of English as a medium of instruction for subjects other than the language itself’ (Keyuravong, 2010, p. 79, emphasis added); and
- ‘**English for Academic Purposes (EAP)**, the concept is very well developed, particularly for students studying their own specialism through the medium of English where a mastery of a large number of academic-related skills is very important’ (McDonough et al., 2013, p. 4, emphasis added).

While EAP might involve teaching students to master various academic skills, from my experience teaching at GPU and my fieldwork observations\(^\text{15}\), EAP at the university tended to be predominantly based on writing skills with an emphasis on NES grammatical norms, accuracy and writing patterns. According to Raimes (1991), this ‘form-dominant approach’ to teaching:

> has led to compensatory exercises that offer training in recognizing and using topic sentences, examples, and illustrations. These exercises often stress imitation of paragraph or essay form, using writing from an outline, paragraph completion, identification of topic and support, and scrambled paragraphs to reorder. (p. 409)

In addition to EMI, CLIL and EAP, Problem-Based Learning (PBL) was also promoted at GPU, but it had not been adopted extensively in the university TESOL provision during my fieldwork period. Nevertheless, PBL – as well as other methods or paradigms – could have implications on teachers’ perspectives if they choose to adopt them (e.g. Park and Ertmer, 2007, pp. 249-250).

\(^{15}\) The method is discussed in Chapter 5.
4.3.2 EIL and EFL

The syllabuses did not explicitly specify which paradigm(s) was/were in play at GPU. However, as shown below, the syllabuses mentioned ‘English as an international language’ as part of the course objectives of two courses:

- ‘Students will be able to develop intercultural awareness in using English as an international language as well as cross-cultural awareness’ (English 1); and
- ‘Students will be able to develop intercultural awareness in using English as an international language’ (English 2).

I discuss the ‘intercultural awareness’ and ‘cross-cultural awareness’ in the following subsection.

While there was no mention of other paradigms such as TEFL, the objectives of several courses reflect a focus on and concern for NES norms and accuracy:

- ‘communicate in different situations in intermediate spoken and written English with grammatical and [structural] correctness’ (IE);
- ‘Students will learn about word stress and the standard pronunciation of English’ (English 1);
- ‘They will be able to communicate by using English language accurately and appropriately in composing expository and opinion paragraphs together with discussion and presentation with regards to intonation, body language, creating Power Points, and pronunciation’ (English 1); and
- ‘Students will be able to communicate by using English language accurately and appropriately in various contexts’ (English 2 and English 3).

The ‘standard’ of ‘correctness’ and ‘appropriateness’ in the written and spoken communication mentioned above most likely refers to NES norms, native-like accuracy and competence as is dominant in the TEFL paradigm.
4.3.3 English for intercultural communication purposes

English 1-3 incorporated objectives related to the development of students’ ‘intercultural awareness’ and ‘cross-cultural awareness’ as well as an understanding of the ASEAN region as demonstrated below:

- ‘Developing awareness and understanding of diverse cultures’ (English 1);
- ‘Students will be able to develop intercultural awareness in using English as an international language as well as cross-cultural awareness. They will develop a greater understanding of the ASEAN region with regards to culture, geography, economies, cuisine, education, and travel’ (English 1);
- ‘Development of an awareness and respect of diverse cultures and social responsibilities’ (English 2);
- ‘Students will be able to develop intercultural awareness in using English as an international language’ (English 2); and
- ‘Students will be able to develop … an awareness of communicative English in inter-cultural contexts’ (English 3).

These objectives are in keeping with the top-down, ASEAN and Thai intercultural aspirations and reflect the use of EIL for IC. Moreover, the syllabuses demonstrate a downplaying of NESs and their cultures since they are not mentioned. Still, the main textbook of IE was American Headway, and ‘more than half of its content’ featured cultural content related to Inner Circle countries such as the US and the UK (Shin et al., 2011, p. 261).

In relation to the teaching of intercultural awareness and understanding as well as ASEAN awareness, GPU students had other opportunities to develop their ‘intercultural skills’. GPU offered a three-credit, social science course in the General Education category entitled ASEAN Studies. It was a compulsory course for students in all majors and was described as:

An inter-disciplinary analysis of economic, political and socio-cultural aspects of ASEAN nations; success and failure of ASEAN in addressing and responding to regional and international issues through a wide range of content topics; problem-based learning and project-based learning strategies with creative and critical thinking and self-directed learning skill; awareness of the concept of peaceful coexistence and understanding diverse cultures in South East Asia. (ASEAN Studies course description)
Apart from this required GE course, there were no other courses in the university’s undergraduate curriculum which were directly related to the study of ASEAN or the development of students’ awareness of cultural diversity. The exception was a course entitled Cross-Cultural-Communication (three credits) which only by students majoring in English were required to take. It was described as:

Overview of culture and communication; relationship between culture and communication; various cultural dimensions and their impact on communication; importance of cultural diversity and cultural diversity as a communication barrier; and influence of globalisation on cross-cultural communication. (Cross-Cultural-Communication course description)

Therefore, the opportunities for foregrounding the development of students’ knowledge, skills and mindset essential for IC were most immediately available at GPU through the provision of TESOL. This is not surprising bearing in mind that English is ‘the’ global lingua franca for IC (e.g. Baxter, 1983; Sharifian, 2009). Therefore, English as a subject seems to have a closer relationship with IC than other subjects such as mathematics and science or other foreign languages.

In a summary, through the above descriptions of the provision of TESOL at GPU, I can identify the following set of TESOL paradigms:

- Teaching English as a Foreign Language (TEFL);
- Teaching English as an International Language (TEIL); and
- Teaching English for Academic Purposes (TEAP) (focused on writing).

In GPU’s TEFL discourse, as reflected in the syllabuses, the teaching of NES cultures was downplayed, but NES linguistic norms were promoted.

In addition to the above set of paradigms, the curriculum was partly shaped by concepts represented by other terms/acronyms such as:

- English as the medium of instruction (EMI);
- Content and Language Integrated Learning (CLIL); and
- Problem-Based Learning (PBL).
Based on the above discussion, the GEE curriculum had different purposes, including teaching English for:

- examination preparation;
- IC;
- ASEAN studies; and
- academic purposes.

Also, underpinning GPU’s GEE curriculum and the implementation of EMI/CLIL was in furtherance of the university’s aspiration of becoming an ‘international’ university.

This set of paradigms, terms and purposes reflects the complexities of the curriculum, and perhaps, ambiguity regarding which direction English language teachers should take. Thus, this may have implications on their perspectives regarding the purposes of, and paradigm assumptions about, the teaching of English at GPU.

**Concluding remarks**

The descriptions of GPU, its GEE curriculum and how the curriculum was implemented reflect the particularities of the chosen research site. Moreover, they illustrate the complexities of a provision of TESOL as shaped by different paradigms, purposes and aspirations. The understanding of these particularities as well as complexities will be useful for understanding my participants’ practices and perspectives that I present and discuss in the later chapters of my thesis. In the following chapter, I present the rationale for the site and participant selection, the design of my study, the methods and steps I used to operationalise the design and how I interpreted and analysed the data.
Chapter 5 - Researching Practitioner Perspectives: Plan and Implementation

Introduction

In the previous chapters, I provided the contextual and conceptual foundation for my study. I also presented a detailed description of the research site at which I chose to conduct my study. In this chapter, I present the rationale for my research plan and provide an account of its implementation. These were the research questions with which my study was engaged:

1) What are the perspectives of some Thai TESOL practitioners at a Thai public university regarding the purposes of their teaching of the English language?
2) What are their paradigm assumptions regarding the teaching and learning of the English language? and
3) What are possible influences that shape the teachers’ perspectives on the purposes of and paradigm assumptions underpinning TESOL in their context?

This chapter is organised as follows. First, I present the overall research design of my study (Section 5.1). Then, I provide a detailed account of how I implemented the design in my fieldwork. This involved different processes including the selection of my specific research site (Section 5.2) and my participants (Section 5.3). In Section 5.4, I outline the methods of data generation\(^{16}\) used in this study. In Section 5.5, I detail the process of data generation and an overview of the data generated. In Section 5.6, I present my analysis approach and a detailed account of the process of that analysis. Throughout this chapter, I discuss the ethical and methodological issues that might have arisen during my fieldwork. I summarise my response to these ethical potentialities in Section 5.7. In Section 5.8, I discuss the trustworthiness of my research process and concomitant data.

\(^{16}\) The term ‘data generation’ here (as opposed to ‘data collection’) signals my acknowledgement of my role as a researcher who engaged co-constructively in the data generation and meaning-making processes of the study (Garnham, 2008, p. 192).
5.1 Overall research design

I adopted a qualitative case study approach to explore my research questions. ‘Case study’ has been used as an umbrella term to cover ‘a methodology, a type of design in qualitative research, or an object of study, as well as a product of the inquiry’ (Creswell, 2007, p. 73). Most definitions of ‘case study’ highlight: the ‘bounded’ and ‘singular’ nature of a case; the multiplicity of information or perspectives; and the importance of context (Duff, 2008, pp. 22-23). Below, I discuss each characteristic of case study as a research design (Baxter and Jack, 2008, p. 544) in its own right and then in relation to my study.

5.1.1 The ‘bounded’ and ‘singular’ nature of a case

In much of the literature on research methods, a case – ‘a choice of what is to be studied’ (Stake, 2005, p. 443) – is usually described as a singular, bounded system (e.g. Merriam, 1998, p. 28; Creswell, 2007, p. 73). This bounded system can be ‘a specific, a complex, functioning thing’ (Stake, 1995, p. 2) such as a child, a classroom, a school, a group of teachers, or an educational programme. By focusing on ‘an intensive, holistic description and analysis of a single entity, phenomenon, or social unit’ (Merriam, 1988, p. 21 as cited in Merriam, 1998, p. 27), a case study allows researchers to conduct a study in great depth.

5.1.2 The multiplicity of information or perspectives

Second, case study attends to a multiplicity of information or perspectives. Case study data is derived from ‘multiple sources of information rich in context’ (Creswell, 2007, p. 73). Such data enables triangulation across different sources (Duff, 2008, p. 43) which can provide alternative interpretations of the social situation in question. To obtain data from multiple sources, Gillham (2000) suggests that researchers ‘should look for different kinds of evidence: what people say, what you see them doing, what they make or produce, what documents and records show’ (p. 20, emphasis in the original).

5.1.3 The importance of context

Case study recognises the importance of the context. Duff (2008) suggests that the contexts ‘tend to be naturally occurring ones’ such as ‘language testing sessions, classrooms, courtrooms, or job interviews’. Importantly, these contexts are not ‘arranged for research purposes alone; they are part of people’s regular activities’ (p. 30). A case in question is situated in a context, and there is no clear distinction between the case and the context (Stake,
Hence, a case cannot be examined as a stand-alone entity. Since a case is complex and dynamic, a purpose of case study is ‘to discover systematic connections among experiences, behaviors, and relevant features of the context’ (Johnson, 1992, p. 84).

5.1.4 My study as a case study

Case study research, therefore, was appropriate for my study which was framed by my understanding of Holliday’s concept of appropriate methodology. As discussed in Chapter 2, this framework concentrates on context-sensitive TESOL methodology (Holliday, 1994) and focuses on the emerging and cohesive behaviours of ‘small social groupings’ (Holliday, 1999, p. 237) at both the surface and deep levels. Drawing from the case study literature discussed in this chapter and the conceptual framing of my study, Figure 10 illustrates the overall design of my study as adapted from Yin (2003, p. 40).

![Figure 10: The design of this study (adapted from Yin, 2003, p. 40)](image)

The ‘case’ in my study was practitioners’ perspectives regarding the purposes of TESOL and their paradigm assumptions. My study focused on three participants as a set of individual cases (Robson, 2011, p. 138). This would allow me to explore perspectives in depth during the course of my fieldwork (one academic term or 15 weeks of instructions) rather than in breadth with a larger cross-section of teachers. The teachers in question would be teaching in
a General Education English (GEE) programme at a public Thai university during the semester 1/2014 (the ‘bounded system’). My decision to focus on the teaching of GEE was informed by a pilot study I undertook (Tantiniranat, 2013) at a public university in Thailand in which I interviewed three teachers who were primarily teaching English to students majoring in English. Their responses, perhaps unsurprisingly given their (English Major) students’ primary learning purposes (in mastering English), tended to focus on linguistic accuracy and pronunciation. In addition, the teaching of GEE subjects offered to students in majors other than English represents the majority type of the TESOL in Thai universities. In the same vein, Thai public universities are in the majority among higher education (HE) institutions in Thailand. I use the term ‘public universities’ to refer to HE institutions which are fully or partly funded by the Thai government as opposed to ‘private universities’ which receive no government funding. The dotted lines suggest the interactive relationship between the teachers and the professional context, i.e. the host institutional environment (Holliday, 1994). This relationship, which could shape the teachers’ perspectives, would also be considered in my study.

5.2 Research site selection

For practical considerations including ease of access and travel arrangements, I chose to conduct my study at the university at which I had previously worked. Since it was the most accessible among some Thai universities with which I have an affiliation, it provided me with an opportunity to learn the most about the case (Merriam, 1998, p. 61; Stake, 2005, p. 451).

5.2.1 Insider relationships with the university

The decision to conduct my study at a university with which I had a former professional affiliation meant that I was, in many ways, an ‘insider’ at that institution. This status afforded me some privileges in terms of access, and my background knowledge about the TESOL at the university enabled me to identify and connect to sources of information (e.g. course-coordinators and the Head of the English Department) that proved to be helpful to an in-depth understanding of the context.

The insider status also had important ethical implications. I discuss these in Section 5.7. There were also some procedural consequences to being an insider. For instance, although I was a former member of the professional staff, I was aware that things might have changed
since I had left GPU about two years prior to returning to conduct my fieldwork. My participants sometimes assumed a shared knowledge about the university and left things unsaid during the interviews. For example, they often said ‘You know what I mean’ or, ‘You used to teach here, so you must know [about something]’. When, such situations occurred, I asked them to clarify and I probed deeper.

5.3 Participant recruitment

After obtaining permission from the School of Liberal Arts (henceforth, ‘the school’), in August 2014, I sent out (via email) an advertisement in the Thai language (see Appendix A.1 for the email and its English translation) to 48 Thai-national, English teachers at GPU using a mailing list I acquired from the school’s secretary. In the email, I briefly introduced myself and my PhD project as a study which aimed to explore what Thai TESOL teachers think about their practice in Thai universities.

I asked the teachers who were interested in taking part to follow the link (provided in the email message) to a web-based questionnaire. At the beginning of the questionnaire, I provided an electronic Participant Information Sheet (PIS) and Consent Form in the Thai language (see Appendix A.2 for the documents and their translation). These forms provided potential participants with an overview of my research including my contact details, the title and aim of the research, and information about what those willing to be involved would need to do if they wished to respond to the survey.

The email advertisement and web-based questionnaire were practical in that I could, at no cost, start recruiting my participants in Thailand while I was still in the UK. Eleven teachers showed interest in taking part in the study. As informed by their teaching schedules, I chose as participants those who, during my fieldwork, would be teaching at least two different courses in the GEE curriculum. This decision was based on a desire to observe their teaching from several starting points and through discussion with them learn more about their perspectives. I also considered the participants’ teaching experience in hopes of having participants with differing levels of professional experience. I believed this could add depth to my understanding about the perspectives of TESOL practitioners in Thai universities. I accepted four teachers – rather than just three – as a safeguard against participant withdrawal.
I provide a brief description of each participant below excluding that of the teacher who withdrew from the study (as discussed in Section 5.5).

When I arrived in Thailand to begin my fieldwork, I contacted all my potential participants and asked them for the most convenient time for them to work with me. I sent a copy of the PIS and Consent Form (in Thai and English, see Appendix A.3) to each of them via email in advance. The PIS, at this stage, provided more details of my research, the expected level of involvement of the participants, the participant’s right of withdrawal, their rights to access the data (i.e. transcript and accounts used in the thesis), the use of the data, how anonymity would be maintained and other details.

My three main participants were Thai-national English language teachers at GPU, all of whom were female of between 25 and 49 years of age. Each of them held a Master’s degree and had varying degrees of teaching experience ranging from one semester to 29 years. The participants were based in the English Department of the School of Liberal Arts of GPU. I present brief profiles of each in Chapter 6.

5.4 Methods of data generation

I planned to generate data enabling me to gain insight into the participants’ perspectives regarding the purposes of TESOL and their underlying paradigm assumptions (i.e. ‘the main data’) and to a better understanding of the complexities of their professional context (i.e. ‘the supporting data’). In the following sub-section, I provide an account of my methods. The implementation of these methods will be discussed in Section 5.5.

5.4.1 Methods for generating the main set of data

The main data refers to the participants’ accounts which I hoped would provide clues into ‘the unobservable psychological context of language teaching’ (Borg, 2003, p. 106). Other studies concerned with teacher perspectives have used different methods or a combination of methods, for instance, questionnaire, interviewing, video-based stimulated recall and classroom observations to generate such data. A common combination of methods used in TESOL research is that of classroom observations and interviews. Researchers have used methods to investigate teachers’ perspectives in various topic areas including teaching culture
(e.g. Atay, 2005; Nguyen, 2013; Ding and Teo, 2014) and teaching IC (e.g. Gandana and Parr, 2013). Using the two methods together enables researchers to understand:

> a social context in an interactive way…The interviews provide leads for the researcher’s observation. Observations suggest probes for interviews. The interaction of the two sources of data not only enriches them both, but also provides a basis for analysis that would be impossible with only one source. (Erlandson et al., 1993, p. 99)

The data generated from multiple methods provides different perspectives on a similar issue (Garnham, 2008, p. 193) and allows researchers to explore the phenomenon being studied in-depth. For instance, an issue raised in a classroom observation ‘may be confirmed, clarified, refined or rejected’ (Barnard, 2013, p. 185) in the subsequent interview. This possibility was attractive to me, and I therefore adopted classroom observations and semi-structured interviews as methods to generate the main data of my study.

### 5.4.1.1 Classroom observation

Classroom observation has been widely used in teacher perspectives. A possible reason is that by observing teachers’ practice in their classrooms (Borg, 2003, p. 98), researchers are able to learn about ‘the teachers in action (i.e. actual teaching)’ (Fang, 1996, p. 53). For my study, the purposes of classroom observation were twofold: to learn about my participants’ practices; and to produce video stimuli to discuss with individual teachers in our weekly interviews.

**Observation form**

I designed an observation form (as shown in Figure 12 and in Appendix B) to be used during my classroom observations. I piloted the form by watching English language lesson videos available on YouTube.com. The lessons (e.g. about grammar and pronunciation) were taught by some Thai-national student teachers of a TEFL programme offered by a public university in Thailand. The lessons helped me anticipate possible events in class which could be related to my study.

The form has three columns: *Time, Description of what happened, and Points for discussion*. The *Time* column was designed to record the actual class time and the time in the video for ease in locating specific points in the video. The *Description of what happened* column, was intended for recording a summary of the main teaching activities as well as particular events
which suggested to me the participants’ purposes of, and assumptions underlying, their
teaching of English. On the furthest column on the right, the Points for discussion column
was for recording any interesting issues that I observed and issues to probe further into in
subsequent weekly interviews. In addition to the three columns, the end of the form provided
a space for me to provide an Observation summary of noteworthy events and issues I
observed in the classroom.

5.4.1.2 Semi-structured interview
Interviews are ‘the most commonly used method in qualitative research’ (Mason, 2002, p.
62). This method is also common in research that explores English language teacher
perspectives (e.g. Bayyurt, 2006; Chen and Goh, 2011; Lim, 2016; Nguyen et al. 2016).
Interviews vary in terms of the degree of structure as they can be characterised as a
‘structured’, ‘semi-structured’ or ‘unstructured’ interview.

Mason (2002) argues that qualitative interviewing – or ‘semi-structured interviewing’ –
involves ‘the construction or reconstruction of knowledge more than the excavation of it’
(Mason, 2002, p. 63). In my study, I use the term ‘semi-structured interviews’ (as opposed to
‘structured interviews’) in recognition of the interactions between the researcher (i.e. me) and
the participants (i.e. my three teachers) as well as the possible influences I might have had on
the participants’ responses (Garnham, 2008, p.192).

Video-based stimulated recall
To facilitate the elicitation of the participants’ accounts, I incorporated stimulated recalls
(SRs) into the interviews. An SR is ‘an introspection procedure in which (normally)
videotaped passages of behaviour are replayed to individuals to stimulate recall of their
concurrent cognitive activity’ (Lyle, 2003, p.861). In my study, I did not endeavour to know
what the participants were thinking at a particular moment of teaching, but I aimed at using
the video-based SRs (generated during classroom observations) to elicit the participants’
219). This is because the accounts generated via SR do not only suggest the participants’
‘standpoint’, but also ‘those matters of interest to them’ (Theobald, 2008, p. 2).
5.4.2 Methods for generating the supporting data

In addition to the participants’ accounts which constituted the main data, I planned to generate supporting data which would shed light on the participants’ professional context. I employed the following methods: interviews with persons in charge, gathering printed documents, and fieldwork observations (including taking photographs).

5.4.2.1 Interviews with persons in charge

Learning from persons in charge of an institution could lead to better understanding of the case. These persons are knowledgeable about the case and can provide ‘secondhand observations that the researchers cannot see for themselves’ (Stake, 1995, 67). In my study, I aimed to obtain data from those who oversaw the English Department at the university such as the Head of the English Department, course-coordinators, and administrators such as the Dean of the School of Liberal Arts and the President of the university.

5.4.2.2 Reviewing related documents

Printed documents are a source of information for case study research (Baxter and Jack, 2008, p. 554) and are common in studies exploring teacher perspectives (e.g. Wood, 1996). Documents are ‘substitutes for records of activity that the researchers could not observe directly’ and ‘can be key repositories’ for the case (Stake, 1995, p. 68). In my study, I planned to gather documents related to the provision of TESOL at GPU such as syllabuses, teaching materials, and the university’s undergraduate prospectus.

5.4.2.3 Fieldwork observation

An additional method of data generation was my general observations in the field. According to Stake (1995), researchers should let ‘the occasion tell its story, the situation, the problem, resolution, or irresolution of the problem’ (Stake, 1995, p. 62). The observation should be recorded ‘to provide a relatively incontestable description for further analysis and ultimate reporting’ (ibid, emphasis in the original). The elements in the field I planned to observe, as suggested by Merriam (1998, pp 97-98) included, but were not limited to: related topics or issues, the physical environment of the university and the development of my researcher’s thinking, my reflections of the research activities and my role as the researcher (i.e. reflexivity e.g. Lincoln et al., 2011, p. 124; Finlay, 2002, p. 532; Holliday, 2002, p. 146; Stelma and Fay, 2014).
5.5. Implementation of the methods

My fieldwork took place between September and December 2014. I worked with each participant separately in order to focus on their individual perspectives and practices and to probe in greater depth into any topic arising from my time with them. In this section, I provide a detailed account of my data generation process.

5.5.1 Generating the main set of data

The classroom observations and interviews with each participant were undertaken over a period of four consecutive weeks (see Appendix C for the fieldwork calendar). Figure 11 shows the methods used with each participant, the frequency and sequence of their use, the relationships between the use of each of these methods, and the types and amount of data generated.

5.5.1.1 Classroom observations

In the classroom, my role was that of an ‘observer as participant’ (Merriam, 1998, p. 101; Robson, 2011, pp. 323-324) which meant that my presence as a researcher was known to my participants and students, but I did not take part in any teaching and learning activities which

I recorded my observations on the observation form, and after each I wrote a summary on the form or in my journal and typed the summary into a Word document. Figures 12 and 13 reflect a partially completed form and observation summary of the same class.

**Observation form**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Description of what happened</th>
<th>Points for discussion</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.15 p.m.</td>
<td>- Name e.g. John</td>
<td>- Why an English name?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.23</td>
<td>- full stop &amp; period</td>
<td>- Why do you use both?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.40</td>
<td>- Vocabulary and pronunciation /th/, /chill/ instead of /chiw/</td>
<td>- purpose?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.15</td>
<td>- showing a tourism vdo of the Philippines</td>
<td>why?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.38</td>
<td>- reading about tourism destinations in the Philippines</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- transport in the Philippines (pictures / clips)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Figure 12: A sample of a completed observation form**

**Observation summary:**
I observed Teacher 1’s ‘English 1’ class for the first time on Monday, September 8th, 2014. The class covered mini lessons about punctuation (using capitalization), new vocabulary, reading and paragraph writing. These lessons contained reading passages, images and video clips about the Philippines such as the ‘malling’ (how shopping is so popular in the Philippines), tourist destinations, and transport in the Philippines.

All the materials the teacher used in class e.g. the textbook, PowerPoint slides and video clips were prepared by the course-coordinators. Hence, the teacher followed the sequence of the teaching activities laid out by the textbook (and teacher’s manual).

The main language of instruction is English, but the teacher switched to Thai sometimes to check the student’s understanding, for instance, asking the Thai meaning of some English words and if the students were confused with what she had explained. The teacher herself speaks English with Thai accent.

**Figure 13: An example of an observation summary**
**Video-recording process**

During the observation, I video-recorded my participants’ teaching in order to capture their practices in front of the class. I placed the video camera at the back of the classroom and for it to be focused on the teacher at the front rather than on the students. I understood that the presence of the video camera could be somewhat threatening to my participant; it might make them feel uncomfortable in the moment, and they might then feel awkward seeing themselves on the screen during the stimulated recall interviews (as discussed in the following subsection). I hoped that the trust-based relationship between my participants and me and the amount of time I spent in their classrooms (i.e. two classes per week, four weeks altogether) might help minimise their possible negative feelings about the camera and the recordings. I also emphasised to the participants that the main purpose of the video recording was for them to reflect upon certain points of their own teaching. I decided not to seek the informed consent of the students because I did not consider them as my participants. However, before starting the first observation, I introduced myself to them and explained my purposes for being in their classroom. I then asked for their verbal permission to video-record the activities taking place at the front of the classroom and further explained that their teachers were the focus of the camera.

Nevertheless, one of my participants (Siri) decided to withdraw from the study after the first week I worked with her. She told me that she felt that her students did not feel comfortable having me in the class with the camera. Although it was impossible to know for certain whether this unease was from the students, the participant herself or both, it suggested to me that, as a researcher, I might not have done enough to establish trust and rapport with her (and possibly with her students) before my observation. Her withdrawal did not affect my study as I had decided on the number of teachers I would work with and planned for the possibility of withdrawals. However, given that I had that experience of being in her classes and could not ‘un-have’ it, and given that this classroom experience could be additional contextualising data, I asked for and gained Siri’s permission to use the data I obtained from observing her classrooms and conducting interviews with her.

From each of the classroom observation, I generated one completed observation form, one observation summary with fieldnotes (as explained below), and one digital file of the teaching video. The data generated from the observations would be used in the following data generation activity.
5.5.1.2 Semi-structured interviews

I conducted a series of weekly semi-structured interviews with each participant at their most convenient time. These were completed soon after the classroom observations each week to avoid significant memory decay (Gass and Mackey, 2000; Lyle, 2003). The weekly interviews involved three different stages: 1) a stimulated recall protocol; 2) a follow-up question-and-answer session; and 3) a general question-and-answer session.

For the stimulated recall protocol, I demonstrated the process of SR to the participant at our first interview (see Appendix D for the detailed procedure) and used the following prompt:

Please watch a video recording of your own teaching. You can pause at any point in the video that is related to what you wanted to achieve in that lesson.

What I would like you to do is to tell me:
- what you were doing;
- the purposes of doing that activity; and
- why.

If I have a question about any part of the video, I will also ask you to talk about it. Thank you.

Given that the participant could select to talk about any point from the video, the topic arising during the SRs were primarily raised by the participants in relation to what was happening in the videos.

During an SR, while listening to the participant, I gave supportive backchannel cues (e.g. saying ‘yes’, ‘okay’ or nodding) instead of response (Gass and Mackey, 2000, p.58) to encourage the participants to carry on their talking. I sometimes asked for clarification such as when the participants used the pronouns ‘they’ or ‘we’, or ‘this point’ or other terms such as ‘the traditional method’ or ‘to be able to use the language’. In addition, there were times when I asked follow-up questions during the SRs because I felt that it was better to ask the question while it was happening rather than later. These questions were related to what the participants said, for instance, the reason(s) behind a certain activity as the participants sometimes gave description of the activities but not the rationale behind them (Lyle, 2003, p. 870). The interviews were, therefore, co-constructed by my participants and me at a specific ‘social context, time and place’ (Walford, 2001, p. 95). Thus, in the following chapter, instead of attempting to minimise possible ‘bias’ (Mason, 2002, p. 65) in the presentation of
my data analysis, I include my questions and/or comments in sample excerpts to make the totality of my involvement in the interviews clear (Corden and Sainsbury, 2006, p. 11). I also provided an annotation identifying the specific situation in which the data was generated (Holliday, 2002, p. 101; Pomerantz, 2005, p. 112).

As shown in the prompt above, the participants could pause at, or fast-forward to, any point they wished. Therefore, the length of the SRs varied from interview to interview. The number of SRs also varied depending on the main activities in each class. For instance, I chose not to video-record students’ presentations in Maya’s class because doing so might affect the students’ performance. Instead, I took notes on interesting points and used them as prompts for the participant to reflect upon. However, Ploy requested a video-recording of her students’ presentations to use it to provide feedback to her students. I agreed to do so.

During the second stage of the interview, after each participant had finished talking through her video, I asked them questions that arose out of the SR. In the final stage of the interview, I asked questions derived from their teaching video, my classroom observations and my general observations in the field. The entire interview was audio-recorded. I wrote a summary of the interview and took notes on topics which I found worth probing further.

After completing all the classroom observations and four weekly interviews with each participant, I conducted a final interview to further investigate topics I found relevant to my study. In addition, since most of the data generated from the observations and interviews were primarily about classroom practices and TESOL in general, in the final interview, I aimed to learn more about each participant’s personal and professional experiences. These experiences could inform their perspectives and practices (Freeman, 1993, p. 459; Bailey et al., 1996, pp. 11-29).

In my original research proposal, I planned to learn about my participants’ background at an initial interview (i.e. before observing their practices). I also designed an interview guide consisting of a set of questions to be used in the interview. The questions were not only focused on their educational and professional experiences, but also their perspectives towards English and TESOL in general (e.g. the roles of English and teaching methodologies). However, before I started my fieldwork, I realised that asking direct questions might restrict what I could learn about the participants’ perspectives. Further, my questions might suggest
or mislead them regarding the purposes of my study. Therefore, I decided to wait until after
the completion of classroom observations and interviews with each of them. In addition,
instead of asking them questions about their background, I used the following prompt:
‘Please tell me anything or any incident that has shaped you as a university English teacher
today’. Jovchelovitch and Bauer (2000, p. 59) explain that a prompt ‘encourages and
stimulates an interviewee … to tell a story about some significant event in their life and social
context’. Hence, the participants’ accounts might suggest what they considered important in
their professional lives. The participants’ responses to the prompt generally took between
seven and 15 minutes. The topics they brought up included their experience as learners of
English, academic backgrounds, and views on what they wanted their students to achieve. As
well as using it as the main data, I used the information to present a brief profile of each
participant in Chapter 6. The final interview ended with follow-up questions that arose out of
the narrative interview and from my fieldwork observations.

5.5.2 Generating supporting data
While I was in the field, I generated supporting data from other sources as described below.

5.5.2.1 Interviews with persons in charge
I interviewed or had conversations (face-to-face or via email) with 16 persons in charge. This
included the Head and the former Head of the English Department, course-coordinators, the
Dean of the School of Liberal Arts, a Vice-president and the President of the university. All
of them received the PIS either prior to or after our conversation and I obtained their written
consent (see Appendix A.4 for the documents and their translation).

The interviews were semi-structured to enable the interviewees to talk freely about the
current situations of the TESOL in their institution from their perspectives and experience
(Robson, 2011). Some interviews and conversations were voice recorded. I did not transcribe
them but took notes on topics related to points arising out of the main data. The majority of
these interviews and conversations took place in Thai with the exception of the one
conducted in English with a course-coordinator who is Australian-American.
5.5.2.2 *Document review*

I gathered printed documents related to the provision of TESOL at GPU. These documents (in both Thai and/or English) included syllabuses, teaching materials such as textbooks, handouts, quizzes and exercises used by the participants during the period of observation, and the university’s publications and other information available on GPU’s website. In addition to the institutional documentation, as discussed in Chapter 1, I reviewed some Thai HE and ASEAN policy documents.

5.5.2.3 *Fieldwork observations*

My observations were interwoven with other methods of data generation throughout the course of the fieldwork. I paid attention to topics that arose in conversations with other teachers such as during our lunchtime. In addition to this verbal information and data, I noted the physical environment of GPU (e.g. classrooms, announcement board and posters) and captured them in the form of photographs.

I recorded the details of my research activities (an aide-memoire), my reflections on the methods used, my thoughts about the topics of my study and the possible influences I may have on the data generated (i.e. reflexivity). All these were recorded in the form of fieldnotes in my research journal (see Appendix E for an example of an entry illustrating my reflective and reflexive account). In my presentation of the data in the subsequent chapters, I integrated some of these fieldnotes in my discussion in order to explain the context in which the data was generated and my thought processes.

5.5.3 *The generated data*

All the research activities I presented above yielded the data presented in Table 3. The detailed data log (main data) can be found in Appendix F.

5.6 *Data analysis approach and process*

Data analysis is a procedure which:

helps [researchers] to set out different kinds of data in piles on a table. … [Researchers] move from one form of evidence to another, reading, studying and thinking. What you are looking for, in particular, are different kinds of evidence bearing on the same issues in your research. (Gillham, 2000, p. 95, emphasis in the original)
In searching for evidence that would shed light on my participants’ perspectives regarding the purposes and paradigm assumptions and in an effort to make sense of the evidence, I adopted the data analysis strategies and followed the process of data analysis described in the following sub-sections.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Types of data generated</th>
<th>Amount of data generated</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Main data</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Completed observation forms</td>
<td>24 (8 classes x 3 participants)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Audio-recorded interviews and the transcripts</td>
<td>25 digital files, approx. 12 hour-long 25 transcripts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teaching videos</td>
<td>20 digital files (not transcribed and analysed)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fieldnotes</td>
<td>At least 22,769 words of the typed classroom observation summaries and notes, interview notes and my reflective/reflexive accounts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Supporting data</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Audio-recorded interviews (related persons): 7 digital files, not transcribed, some photographs, instructional materials and university’s publications</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Table 3: The types and amount of data generated from all methods**

### 5.6.1 Stake’s data analysis strategies

To make sense of the data, I adopted categorical aggregation and direct interpretation strategies as suggested by Stake (1995; 2005). By categorical aggregation, I looked for ‘the repetition of phenomena’, i.e. the instances which interrelated to each other in ways which support or contradict each other (Stake, 1995, p.76). These instances not only supported or confirmed other incidents but could also conflict with other incidents as well. While categorical strategy required a number of corroborating/contradicting instances, a direct interpretation of a single instance is possible. In my study, I applied categorical aggregation after the fieldwork and during the coding process (which I will discuss shortly) to identify patterns in the data. Direct interpretation took place throughout the study.
5.6.2 The data analysis process

As Stake (1995) notes, ‘there is no particular moment when data analysis begins’ (p. 71). Data analysis occurred during the course of my study as illustrated in Figure 14 and discussed in the subsequent sub-sections.

Figure 14: Data analysis process

5.6.2.1 Making meaning of events in the field

I took notes and kept a research journal to record my general observations of events in the field. These notes were written in Thai and/or English in my journal or in the margin of the observation summaries or interview notes to give meaning to particular experience in the field (i.e. direct interpretation) (see Figure 15).

Figure 15: Sample fieldnotes with my direct interpretation of an instance
5.6.2.2 Preparing the data for analysis

After I completed the fieldwork, I transferred the teaching videos from the video camera and the interview audio files from the voice recorder to folders on my password-protected laptop computer before deleting the original files from the recording devices. I digitised many of my hand-written notes and printed documents into image files or PDF documents.

I only transcribed the interviews with my main participants (i.e. the main data), in the original language, and only translated the Thai-medium data into English for the purposes of English-medium supervisory and thesis report. I adopted the denaturalised approach (Bucholtz, 2000) for my transcriptions which meant that I represented the participants’ oral response in mostly written language with minimal oral discourse features (p. 1461). This is opposed to the naturalised approach which aims to capture the oral discourse as mostly used in conversation analysis (ibid). My study aimed to explore ‘what’ the participants said rather than ‘how’ they said it. Thus, in my transcriptions, I focused on the content of the talks rather than the linguistic features (e.g. length of pauses or speed) which were not analysed in this study. Some exceptions included laughter and sighs which indicated my participants’ particular emotions, or their use of emphases which suggested that what was being said was important to them.

The transcripts from the weekly interviews consisted of the SR (i.e. the participants’ accounts) and the follow-up session (i.e. question and answer). The analysis of both parts was, however, integrated since the content of a follow-up session could not be separated from the SR (Swain and Lapkin, 1998). A full sample transcript can be found in Appendix G. I familiarised myself with the data during the transcribing process (Riessman, 1993, as cited in Braun and Clarke, 2006, p. 87). While transcribing an interview, I inserted time stamps on the transcript so that I could listen to specific parts of any interview. I also wrote memos (i.e. my analytic annotation of part of the data) on any point I wished to focus on later. Figure 16 shows a partial transcript which contains time stamps and a memo. The colour bars on the left are code names (as discussed in the following sub-section).
5.6.2.3 The coding process

Once the interviews were transcribed, the next stage in my data analysis was coding. Coding might be defined as ‘a data condensation task that enables you to retrieve the most meaningful material, to assemble chunks of data that go together, and to further condense the bulk into readily analyzable units’, and codes are ‘prompts or triggers for deeper reflection on the data’s meanings’ (Miles et al., 2014, p. 73, emphasis in the original). Therefore, it is a ‘heuristic’ process which enables further sense-making of the data (Saldaña, 2009, p. 8). I used the coding procedure to assign meanings to segments of the data (e.g. a word, a phrase or a paragraph) relevant to my study. In so doing, coding allowed me to identify corroborating or conflicting instances in my data and later identify emergent themes. Coding also could prompt me to assign meaning to particular instances. Bearing in mind the influences on the teachers such as lessons and exams that were predetermined and the nature of each course, when coding, I focused on their opinions about these topics rather than how often they talked about the topics.

I utilised a qualitative data analysis software package (MAXQDA version 11) to assist my coding. I uploaded the interview transcripts, related documents and my fieldnotes into a project I created on MAXQDA. To implement the coding, I read the transcripts (and listened to the audio files) and coded the data chunks I thought could shed light on my study. The benefits of using a software package are at least twofold. First, I could store data from different sources in one place. Second, I was able to retrieve coded segments of data and record and review my memos over the course of the analysis (Creswell, 2014, p. 195). Nevertheless, the software was not a magic tool that ‘analysed’ the data for me. It enabled me to be organised and systematic while I was performing the ‘interpretive act’ of aspects of the case (Stenhouse, 1988, p. 52 as cited in Bassey, 1999, p. 88).
I did not use a pre-determined coding scheme when I started coding because I wanted to explore the data without being restricted by a fixed coding scheme. Nevertheless, I recognised that my thinking was informed by relevant literature, especially that which framed my study. After I finished coding the first participant’s transcripts, I became familiar with the data. I started to develop my coding scheme by writing the description of each code to ensure that they were unified in terms of concept and structure (Miles et al., 2014, p. 82). Then I went on to code the transcripts of the second and the third teachers respectively.

Coding was a cyclical process (Saldaña, 2009, p. 8), i.e. I constantly reviewed the coding as the study proceeded. Some codes were broken down into sub-codes (level 1 and level 2) in order to capture the precise meaning they held. Throughout my analysis, I kept and reviewed my fieldnotes as well as consulted related literature. Thus, the coding was driven by the data and informed by relevant literature as well as shaped by the development of my understanding about my topics (Stake, 1995, p. 76). As such, my assignment of meanings to the data could be different from that of other researchers (Erlandson et al. 1993, p.118), and hence, it should be seen as one possible way of constructing reality (Lincoln and Guba, 1985). I grouped related codes together under the same categories, i.e. Purposes, Assumptions and Shaping influences. The final coding scheme is shown in Table 4. The description of codes and a summary of the codes assigned to each participant’s data can be found in Appendix H and Appendix I respectively.

My coding process and products were managed and captured in English and, more specifically, I developed an English term for each code and theme. Reflecting on my experience of qualitative data analysis training and pilot studies, I feel more confident as a researcher when thinking in English even when coding Thai-medium. I believe that it is more efficient for me to work multilingually. I analysed Thai data in English rather working monolingually (i.e. solely in Thai) thereby requiring translation of key parts of my study (i.e. codes and themes) from Thai to English at the end of my study. In addition, my academic-researcher identity is developing in an English-medium environment and, as a result, I am used to working (as an academic-researcher) in English. I discuss ‘research multilingually’ (Holmes et al., 2013) further in Chapter 6.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Categories</th>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Sub-code</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I. Purposes</td>
<td>1. Accuracy</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. Examination</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3. Linguistic dimension</td>
<td>Grammar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Oral communication</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Written communication</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4. Other skills and qualities</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5. World knowledge</td>
<td>Intercultural awareness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Culture specific</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II. Assumptions</td>
<td>6. Diversity of Englishes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7. English-medium interactions</td>
<td>NNESs as users</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NNES (\rightarrow) NSE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>8. NESs provide models</td>
<td>Language of academia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>9. Roles of English</td>
<td>Language of international</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>communication</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Knowledge seeking tool</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Future careers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>10. Roles of Thai language</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>11. Student culture</td>
<td>Students as deficient</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>language users</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>L1 interference</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III. Shaping</td>
<td>12. ASEAN</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>influences</td>
<td>13. Host institution culture</td>
<td>Curriculum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Policy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Pressure on practitioners</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Work culture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>15. Personal and professional</td>
<td>Education and training</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>experiences</td>
<td>Experience as English learners</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Experience of what works</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4: The final coding scheme

5.6.2.4 Synthesising the data

After the coding process, I synthesised the insights I gained from coding by identifying themes within each participant’s data and across all the participants (Braun and Clarke, 2006, p. 89; Miles et al., 2014, pp. 86-87). A theme can be described as ‘something important about the data in relation to the research question, and represents some level of patterned response or meaning within the data set’ (Braun and Clarke, 2006, p. 82, emphasis added). Based on this definition, I used the following criteria to identify themes within each participant’s data: salience, relevance and frequency. By salience, I mean the topics which seemed to me, as
based on the emphasis my participants gave to them, to be important for them. I paid attention to both verbal and nonverbal communication of the participants during interviews. This included features such as the length of time they spent talking about, and their emphases (e.g. loudness, pitch) on, a particular topic. The second criterion is relevance by which I mean the topics relevant to my research aims and research questions. These are, for instance, the topics about influences on the teachers’ perspectives and the teaching of ‘culture’ and IC. Finally, frequency refers to the frequently occurring topics in my coding of each participant data as reflected in Table 5. In this regard, I also explored the distribution of codes throughout the interview corpus of each participant (i.e. the patterns).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Participants</th>
<th>Codes</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Kamala</td>
<td>1. Grammar</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. Accuracy</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3. Examination</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maya</td>
<td>1. Grammar</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. Examination</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ploy</td>
<td>1. Grammar</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. Examination</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3. Accuracy</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5: The most frequent codes assigned to participants’ data (Purpose category)

Next, I wrote analytic accounts of each participant’s themes (as discussed in Chapter 6) and drew the insights gained from each participant in order to understand their perspectives as a set of individual cases. To address my RQ1 and RQ2, I drew overarching themes (Miles et al., 2014, p. 103) which shed light on the participants’ perspectives regarding the purposes of their teaching and their paradigm assumptions. These themes were prevalent not only within each participant’s data but across all the participants’ data sets (Braun and Clarke, 2006, p. 82). Figure 17 illustrates the process of deriving an overarching theme from the data, and Table 6 demonstrates this process.
Figure 17: The process of identifying overarching themes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Data</th>
<th>Codes</th>
<th>Themes</th>
<th>Overarching themes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>‘Chill’ because … there was a group [of students] who said /chiw/, like what they typically do, but that is wrong and they have done it repeatedly so they do not know that it is wrong. I always tell the kids that we do not have to be farangs, but we can pronounce words correctly.</td>
<td>Pronunciation; Accuracy</td>
<td>Teaching for (pronunciation) accuracy</td>
<td>Native-like pronunciation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>the words ‘kra-dae’ [meaning to exaggerate one’s acting] and ‘dudjarit’, [meaning to pretend]. I said that because I wanted the kids to feel amused, but they will remember well that it means they have to speak with a/an [native-like] accent. They have to stress [on some syllables], use intonation when speaking English, not speak monotonously like Tinglish [Thai-English], but to have rising and falling intonation. It is a trick. When I say ‘kra-dae’ and ‘dudjarit’, it is mutually understood that we [students] have to change to sound like farangs, not Thai way.</td>
<td>Pronunciation; Accent; NESs provide models; and L1 interference</td>
<td>Teaching native-like accent</td>
<td>Non-native pronunciation and accents</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 6: An example of the process of identifying overarching themes
In order to explore influences on my participants’ perspectives (RQ3), I did not draw an overarching theme from the data. Instead, I adopted an analytical framework informed by Holliday (as discussed in Chapter 2). The framework consisted of three elements, namely: a small culture approach (Holliday, 1999); Host Culture Complex (Holliday, 1994); and deep action (ibid). Bringing all these together in my analysis, I was mindful of the particularities of my participants’ professional community. I then considered a web of influences surrounding them, not only within their institution (e.g. syllabuses, textbooks and policies) but also broader influences (e.g. Thai educational policies and regional strategic development).

Further, I explored the host institution culture which manifested itself at both the surface and deep levels. Therefore, while my analysis of RQ1 and RQ2 was primarily based on the main data which I coded, my analysis of RQ3 was based on the main data, the supporting data, my personal/professional/insider reflections and my experience in the field.

5.7 Ethical considerations

Throughout this chapter, I have discussed the following ethical considerations that might have arisen during the course of my study.

Firstly, I obtained written consent from the participants, and I made it clear that the participation would be voluntary and that they would be free to withdraw at any time without giving a reason.

Secondly, as with my choice of university and the process of gaining research access to it, it is important for my study that I be transparent about the type relationship I had with each of my participants (i.e. as a friend, a former colleague, and/or a teacher), and that I recognise that my status as an insider greatly assisted me in recruiting participants and in gaining their trust regarding my study and their involvement in it.

Thirdly, throughout my study and especially my fieldwork, I attempted to treat all those involved in my study with respect. I explicitly informed them that I was not in the position to evaluate or judge their practices, nor was it a purpose of my study to do so. Rather, I considered myself a fellow practitioner who was seeking their help and insights. I was embarking on a research project for not only my own professional development but also for
theirs as my study aimed at contributing to how TESOL could be made more appropriate in this increasingly interconnected world.

Fourthly, being an insider also had important ethical implications regarding privacy protection. While the university’s and participants’ privacy was considered when reporting this study, since I was an insider, readers may be able to identify the university and my participants (e.g. through an Internet search). Therefore, I used pseudonyms for the university and my participants. I obscured some additional identifying details with the hopes of safeguarding their reputation should any aspect of my work unintentionally cast them in a critical light (Trowler, 2011).

Finally, considering my insider status and my relationship with my prospective participants, the email advertisement and a web-based questionnaire I used during the recruitment process minimised any possible coerciveness in the recruitment process; completing the questionnaire without me being present gave the respondents the freedom, with minimal pressure, to decide if they wished to take part in the study.

5.8 Trustworthiness
As discussed throughout this chapter, I ensured the trustworthiness (Lincoln and Guba, 1985) or the quality of the entire research process and my interpretations. I considered two main relevant issues, namely biases and transparency and adopted a number of strategies suggested by qualitative research authors.

5.8.1 Managing biases
Miles et al. (2014, pp. 96-99) identify two possible sources of biases in qualitative research: ‘the effects of the researcher on the case’ and ‘the effects of the case on the researcher’. To deal with the former, I considered potential effects of myself as the researcher on the data starting from the participant recruitment process. I purposefully did not reveal the specific focus of my study as I did not want to influence the teachers’ thinking about my topic. Certainly, whatever they said to me would be, in part, shaped by my researcher status and agenda (as presented by me and as perceived by them), but I wanted to provide them with significant latitude to say what they wanted about the broad topic without leading them directly to my more narrowly defined interests.
Considering my role as an insider, my prior experience of, knowledge about and point of view towards the TESOL at GPU could also influence the data generated as well as how I interpreted that data (Garnham, 2008, p. 192). Therefore, during my fieldwork and analysis, I tried to view ‘the familiar as strange’ (Holliday, 2002, p. 93). For Holliday (ibid), researchers, regardless of being an ‘insider’ or ‘outsider’, should ‘step out of [their] normal role’ and ‘attain a critical awareness, so that [they] can stand aside from, suspend and “bracket” [their] normal view of the world’ (emphasis in the original). To illustrate this, as I noted in the Introduction to this thesis, a common topic during teachers’ lunchtime at GPU concerned students’ deficiencies in learning English. During my fieldwork, I could have joined such conversations with my former colleagues (i.e. ‘going native’, Miles et al., 2014, p. 294), but instead I tried to listen to what they were saying and be critical about what it might mean for my study. In this regard, being critical helped me consider the possibility that a relationship existed between teachers’ assumptions about their students and the purposes of their teaching (as discussed in Chapters 6 and 7). Additionally, I prolonged engagement in the field (Lincoln and Guba, 1985) and included data generated from unobtrusive methods such as document review and taking photographs (Miles et al., 2014, p. 297).

Concerning the latter type of biases, I adopted the triangulation of data sources (ibid, pp. 298-300, see also Garnham, 2008, p. 193; Barnard, 2013, p. 185) to generate the data from different perspectives. This included opinions of different persons in charge such as the current and former Head of the English Department and course-coordinators. I also kept and reviewed reflective/reflexive accounts of the research process and shared it with my supervisors in our supervision meetings. In addition, I documented the research process and provided empirical evidence throughout this thesis to create an audit trail (Lincoln and Guba, 1985; Miles et al., 2014, p. 317).

I also considered alternative interpretations of my data by looking for alternative accounts or exceptions (ibid, p. 301). Further, I wrote analytic memos during the data analysis process to monitor my researcher’s thinking and the quality of my interpretations. I discussed insights I gained through data analysis with my supervisors and my colleagues (ibid, p. 296). I also presented preliminary findings and my interpretations at conferences to seek multiple perspectives (Stake, 2005, pp. 459-460).
5.8.2 Maintaining transparency

I provided detailed descriptions of the site, the data generation and analysis processes of my study (Lincoln and Guba, 1985). In presenting the data (Chapter 6), I provided the original texts in Thai along with the English translation in a hope that the readers, especially bilingual readers who are interested in TESOL in Thai universities ‘could make their own judgements about the fairness and accuracy of the analysis’ (Corden and Sainsbury, 2006, p. 12). The conclusions I drew were supported by the data displayed (Miles et al., 2014, p. 312). Finally, when discussing conclusions, I also made explicit if my arguments were informed by my personal, professional, and/or insider experience.

Concluding remarks

I began this chapter by presenting my overall research design, and then provided detailed descriptions of the different research methods I used to implement the design. Firstly, it discussed the rationale for, and processes of, the research site selection and participant recruitment. Secondly, it provided a detailed account of the rationale for each research method I used, the data generation process and an overview of the data. Finally, it outlined the data analysis approach and the steps I took to make sense of the data. The ethical and methodological considerations were also discussed.

An exploration of TESOL practitioner perspectives regarding the purposes of, and their assumptions about, the teaching of English might lead to additional understanding of the issues related to paradigm appropriacy. For instance, it may lead to further understanding of why they might or might not embrace newer TESOL paradigms. In addition, since, practitioner perspectives are complex and interactive within their professional context, identifying possible influences on these perspectives might be used to inform changes if a re-orientation of TESOL is considered. In the next chapter, I present the outcomes of my data analysis. Specifically, I discuss the insights I gained from each participant’s data.
Chapter 6 - Insights Gained from Each Teacher

Introduction
In the previous chapter, I presented the overall research design for my exploration of the perspectives of three Thai-national English language teachers teaching and working at Green Park University (GPU). I also provided a detailed account of the methods and the steps I took to operationalise the design in the field and outlined my plan for analysing the data generated through this study.

In this chapter, I present the outcomes of that analysis. In particular, I present the themes I identified in each teacher’s data set as follows: Kamala (Section 6.1); Maya (Section 6.2); and Ploy (Section 6.3). As discussed in Chapter 5, these themes represented the topics which frequently occurred in my coding, those I considered as important to the teachers and those relevant to my research aims and research questions. An in-depth understanding of the individual teachers provides the basis for my discussion in the subsequent chapter.

Notes on data presentation
Each section begins with a brief profile of the teacher in question. This is followed by the most recurring topic (code) in their data under the Purpose category (i.e. teaching grammar) which I used as a starting point for my discussion. Then, I discuss other related themes in order to present my insights in a meaningful and coherent way rather than ‘an administrative, blow-by-blow account of findings’ (Holliday, 2002, p. 107).

Each aspect is accompanied by at least one supporting and/or disconfirming excerpt (Creswell and Miller, 2000, p. 127) which serve as evidence of my arguments (Holliday, 2002, pp. 110-122). The excerpts are indented and numbered for referencing in the discussion here and in Chapter 7. One excerpt may be used to illustrate different issues; I selected ‘rich’ data which contained as many topics as possible in a short space (Holliday, 2002, p. 119). As such, many excerpts show the relationship between two or more different issues (Corden and Sainsbury, 2006, pp. 14-15). The source of each excerpt and the code(s) I assigned to segments of each are presented at the end of the translation. The three dots (…) indicate that words or phrases have been omitted. I also use the following abbreviations: I = Interviewer, K = Kamala, M = Maya, and P = Ploy.
Notes on the language

The excerpts are in Thai, each followed by my English translation. Showing the excerpts in the original language allows the teachers ‘to speak for themselves ... and to express their feelings or beliefs in the way they themselves perceived [them]’ (Corden and Sainsbury, 2006, p.13, see also Timmis, 2002, p. 241). In so doing, I hope that it is not only the teachers’ voice but also their language (as well as mine) that I prioritised. In this regard, I followed TESOL and intercultural communication scholars such as Holmes et al. (2013) who urge that researchers should become aware of the possibilities of (as well as the challenges for) ‘researching multilingually’ (i.e. involving more than one language in research) and to ‘account for the research spaces and the relationships these spaces engender’ (p. 285). I also intended to preserve the original meaning of the text to maintain transparency (Corden and Sainsbury, 2006, p. 12).

There are some unique features in the excerpts that are a reflection of the idiosyncrasies of the Thai language. For instance, several excerpts in Thai contain some English words or phrases because all the teachers (proficient bilinguals TESOL professionals) code-switched during the interviews. I chose to transcribe these words or phrases in English to maintain this feature. The other attribute that I maintained relates to Thai people (acquaintance, friends, colleagues and family) often calling each other by their names (or nicknames) rather than using the pronoun ‘you’. Many Thais also address themselves by their nickname instead of using the pronoun ‘I’ (e.g. ‘Khwan thinks that’ instead of ‘I think that’). Hence, the teachers’ initials (i.e. K, M and P) are found in most of the excerpts presented in this chapter.

6.1. Kamala

At the time of my fieldwork, Kamala had obtained a BA in English and an MA in English Literature from different public universities in Thailand. After obtaining her MA, she had an internship in the UK for four months. She had been teaching English as a Foreign Language for approximately six years, all at GPU. The courses she had been teaching were either part of the English Major curriculum (e.g. English Literature) or the GEE curriculum. Apart from her teaching, she was involved in coordinating several courses and had roles on the General Education English Department committee and also the textbook production committee.
I observed eight of Kamala’s classes (4 x Intensive English Special (IESP) and 4 x English 1) and conducted five weekly interviews with her. The total time of the interviews was approximately four hours. From my analysis, I identified the following themes in her data:

1. teaching grammar;
2. teaching for exam preparation;
3. teaching for accuracy;
4. students’ learning and performance;
5. diversity of English;
6. teaching the cultural and intercultural dimensions; and
7. ASEAN.

6.1.1 Teaching grammar

Much of Kamala’s teaching time, especially in IESP lessons that I observed involved the teaching of grammar. For instance, in one class, she taught a series of micro-grammar lessons through different activities, such as an ‘alphabet shopping’ game, the presentation of count/non-count nouns, plural/singular, much/many, some/any, a lot of, lots of, few and a few. Each of these micro-lessons was followed by a grammar exercise. She explained to me that those activities aimed at teaching students count/non-count nouns. I then probed further about her teaching method decision-making.

Excerpt 1

I: ทีมได้บอกกันว่าจะสอนหรือทำอะไรก่อนและทำอย่างไรได้ตามที่ทีมเลือก
K: คิดว่าอย่างนี้จะเหมาะสมกว่าหลักเกณฑ์ดังกล่าวให้พยายาม follow grammar point ที่มีอยู่ในหนังสือเพราะว่าสุดท้ายเนื้อเรื่อง เหล่านี้ต้องมา integrate ทั้งหมดเพราะเด็กต้องเอาไปใช้ในเรื่องใน English 1 ทำให้เด็กมีโอกาสที่จะมาเข้าใจว่าเด็กจะต้องเอาไปใช้ในเรื่องจริง ๆ โดยที่ไม่ได้มีการผสมผสานที่ดีกับกิจกรรมอื่นที่มีอยู่ในหนังสือ แต่เด็กต้องมีการเข้าใจกิจกรรมเหล่านี้จริง ๆ เราต้องเข้าใจว่ามันมีความลงตัว แต่ก็ไม่มีโอกาสที่จะมาเข้าใจว่าเด็กจะต้องทำอะไร แต่เราต้องทำให้เด็กเข้าใจว่ามันจะช่วยให้เขาเรียนรู้ต่อไปมากกว่ากิจกรรมที่มันมีอยู่ในหนังสือ

I: What did the team inform you [about what to teach and how to teach it] at the beginning [of the semester], or does each teacher have freedom to choose [their own methods]?
K: I think so, but mainly they told us to try to cover grammar points in the book because, at the end, the kids have to integrate [all grammar points] and apply them to English 1. Hence, we have to cover all of them ... We do not have opportunities to waste time doing trifling activities which can be entertaining. Actually, I think these activities are motivating, but when we have limited time, we can only select things that would help students. (Int.6K, Grammar; Examination; and Team-teaching)
Kamala seemed committed to cover all the grammar points in the book so that her students could use them in the higher-level course. She further explained a consequence of teaching only grammar which I will discuss below shortly.

6.1.2 Teaching for exam preparation

The teaching of grammar tended to be interrelated with the teaching for exam preparation. For instance, in the above excerpt, Kamala said that she could not ‘waste time doing trifling activities which can be entertaining’. Discussing cultural content in the textbook was a ‘trifling activity’. She added that when the time was limited, she could ‘only select things that would help students’. In this regard, she was most likely referring to teaching grammar points so that students could use what they learned in exams and to proceed to English 1.

The interrelationship between the teaching of grammar and the teaching for exam preparation is recurrent in Kamala’s data. For instance, in the following excerpt I followed-up on her comment regarding the decision by the course-coordinating team (henceforth ‘the team’) to include only grammar lessons and reading activities in the teaching of the IESP course. She put it as below:

Excerpt 2

K: คือเค้าเคยเรียนแบบที่มันมีปกติมาแล้วด้วยเวลาอันจากัดคือจาก 6 ชั่วโมงต่อสัปดาห์กลายมาเป็น 3 ชั่วโมงต่อสัปดาห์ แล้วก็เนื้อหาในข้อสอบที่มันจะมีกำหนดอยู่นั่นเอง เท่าที่จะต้องสอนกลายเป็นอย่างไรให้ต้องลงด่าน ให้เด็กได้ฝึกตาม เรียนมาด้วยว่า K ว่า course objective มันเหมือนกับ IE ปกติทุกอย่างแต่ว่าเด็กกลุ่มนี้คือเด็กที่ต้องการที่จะสอบให้ผ่านเพราะว่า IE พิเศษหลังจากนี้จะเป็นแค่ติวที่จะเป็นแค่ที่จะลงติวเตรียมสอบคือ IE พิเศษเนื้อเรื่องปกติเกมธาตุรูปแบบมากกลด้วยเรื่องคือเป็นแบบของทุกสิ่งทั้งหมดเป็น class ถือเป็นตัวสอบ

K: They have studied the normal IE course before, and with limited class meeting time, which is three hours now instead of six hours per week and with the predetermined content to be tested, we have to select certain things for them to study and to review. I think the course objectives are exactly the same as those of the normal IE, but the kids in this group want to pass the exams because the IESP after this semester will be taught in a cram [school] style. There will be class meetings only before exams. The format of this course, IESP, has been changed several times. At first, the class met weekly for a tutorial with 100 students per class to prepare them for exams. (Int.4K, Grammar; Examination; and Curriculum)

Kamala mentioned that due to the ‘limited class meeting time’ and the ‘predetermined content to be tested’ (by the team), she and other IESP teachers had to ‘select certain things’ for students ‘to study and to review’. Again, these ‘certain things’ were most likely referring to grammar points and other areas of linguistic competence such as vocabulary, reading skills...
and writing skills. It is my experience that these items are common in English language
testing at GPU. In addition, she mentioned the changes in the way the course would be taught
in the subsequent semester, i.e. ‘cram [school] style’, and explicitly stated that her students in
that particular group ‘want to pass the exams’.

6.1.3 Teaching for accuracy

A salient theme in Kamala’s data is related to teaching for grammar and pronunciation
accuracy. The teaching of the ‘correct’ use of grammatical structures is evident in her
repetition of the words ‘correct’ and ‘wrong’ in our interviews as reflected in the following
excerpt.

Excerpt 3

K: After … the present simple and present continuous, I gave them an exercise to show them
which sentences were correct; in terms of meaning which ones were correct and which ones
were wrong. It was like doing the exercises together in the class … Mostly, the kids are rather
passive. … in this exercise, if there is someone to tell them where to look, they can do it. But
once they have to work on their own, there would be some obstacles. They would start to feel
uncomfortable. So, I wanted them to be able to do it [composing sentences] by themselves.
(Int.2K, Grammar exercises; Accuracy; and Students as deficient language users)

Note that the second part of the excerpt is related to students’ learning and performance
which will be discussed in the next sub-section.

After observing two of her IESP classes, I noticed that she told the students a couple times to
be careful when using grammar, to pay attention not to make mistakes and to try to use the
grammar correctly as the following statements indicate:

- ‘ตั้งใจอย่าให้มันผิดเรียนมาเกือบ 500 รอบจำให้เกี่ยวกับ’
  Pay attention. You have studied [the present tense] 500 times. Memorise and use it correctly.

- ‘ครูอยากให้หนูระมัดระวังทุกครั้งเวลาแต่งประโยคเพราะว่าเรามีเวลาเราเติม-
  es หรือ -s ได้เวลาที่ทำแบบฝึกหัด
  or that in exercises to be careful.’
  I want you to be careful when you write sentences because we have time. We can recheck
  the sentences if they need an -s or -es. Be careful when doing exercises or exams.
• ‘We are go. We are go’.
• ‘We are go’. Minus 25 points. ‘We are go’. Wrong. Wrong. Wrong. ‘We are go’. Minus 25 points.] (Observation summary, 11th September 2014)

When asked to comment on my observation above, she put it this way:

Excerpt 4

K: It is something they have studied many times. If you ask them, they will say that they know about it; but it is because of their inattentiveness and carelessness in use. They always make mistakes such as [not] adding -s or -es when learning about the [present] simple tense. This has been repeated again and again despite the fact that they know it. When I pointed out that something was wrong and asked them ‘Why?’, they would say ‘Oh, I forgot to add the -s’. They know it, but they do not use what they know. (Int.2K, Grammar; Accuracy; and Students as deficient language users)

She told me that she would not mind if her students made mistakes when communicating orally. However, in writing, the students had to try to be ‘correct’ as the written text remained, whereas in speaking, students just needed to make their ideas comprehensible to others. Nevertheless, from my observations, the teaching of written communication (e.g. sentences, paragraphs and essays) was far more dominant at GPU than the teaching of speaking. This means that the teaching of the ‘correct’ use of language tended to be emphasised at GPU.

This ‘correctness’ is related to farangs (i.e. white people, generally assumed by Thai people to refer to native English speakers [NESs]). This is reflected in her comment on my observation regarding the use of farang names in grammar exercises:

Excerpt 5

K: Students will see that when farang use English, they use correct English, and if the students want to speak English like farangs, it has to be correct like these [farangs]. (Int.2K, NESs provide models; Grammar; and Accuracy)
The second area of ‘correctness’ relates to the teaching of pronunciation. Kamala frequently stated that students needed to speak English with ‘correct’ pronunciation and that ‘mispronunciation’ could have consequences. For example, in a lesson she corrected some of the students’ pronunciation of the word ‘relax’. In our interview, I asked her the reasons for doing so:

Excerpt 6

K: Because they cannot pronounce the /r/ sound. The /r/ and /l/ are problems in Thai students’ pronunciation. They sounded as if they were speaking Thai; they would say /li:læk/… All as /l/, but I wanted them to know the difference. When they communicate and mispronounce words, it causes a communication breakdown despite knowing the words. The listener will not get what they are saying. (Int.2K, Pronunciation and accent; Accuracy; and L1 interference)

She discussed a common pronunciation problem of Thai students in producing the /r/ sound. In general, many Thais substitute the /l/ sound for the /r/ because they cannot produce the /r/ sound in English. Hence, some of her students said /li: læk/ as they normally also replace the /r/ with the /l/ sound when they speak Thai. She pointed out that pronouncing words incorrectly ‘causes a communication breakdown’. Another consequence of ‘mispronunciation’ can also be seen in the following excerpt:

Excerpt 7

I: I like it when you pronounced the world ‘chill’.
K: ‘chill’ because when asked to pronounce /chill/ there was a group [of students] who said /chiw/, like what the y typically do, but that is wrong and they have done it repeatedly so they do not know that it is wrong. I always tell the kids that we do not have to be farangs, but we
can pronounce words correctly. Many times, we cannot get our messages across when communicating with *farangs* because, although we are saying this word, *farangs* do not get it because it is wrong. It is mispronounced. I really want to change this attitude. Don't be shy. Students feel too shy to pronounce words correctly, to sound different from friends who are not brave enough to pronounce words correctly.

I: What do you mean by ‘pronouncing words correctly’?
K: To know how to pronounce a word according to phonetic principles or IPA. In short, to pronounce correctly like NESs do, but we do not have to have a [native] accent. (Int.1K, Pronunciation; Accuracy; NNES → NES; and NESs provide models)

She pointed out another pronunciation problem where many Thai fail to produce the final consonant sound of words. In the Thai language, the final consonant sounds are not pronounced but swallowed. Therefore, in similar fashion, many Thais do not produce the ending sound of words when they speak English. Not producing the /l/ at the end of the word ‘chill’ is an example.

Again, Kamala stated the words ‘correct’, ‘correctly’, ‘wrong’ and ‘mispronounced’ several times. When I asked what she meant by ‘pronouncing words correctly’, she referred to the phonetic principles or the IPA (International Phonetic Alphabets) by which I think she meant the standardised pronunciation of English. Despite her statement of ‘we do not have to be *farangs*’ in terms of accent, the two excerpts above suggested to me that the ‘correctness’ in pronunciation as based on the standardised English pronunciation was crucial in oral communication in Kamala’s view. Furthermore, based on her statement of ‘although we are saying this word, *farangs* do not get it because it is wrong’, she might assume that her students were learning English to communicate mainly with NESs.

When asked about the ideal English to be used in teaching materials, she put it this way:

Excerpt 8

K: คือด้วยเด็กที่เป็น level นี้ เข้าใจ objective ขอให้เกิดบางตัวของการให้เป็นภาษาอังกฤษที่จริงๆที่หลากหลาย...แต่ว่าด้วย level ของเด็กแต่บางทีเนื้อหาด้วยที่มันเยอะ แล้วมันเป็นเรื่องยากด้วย บางทีพอมันเป็นภาษาที่มันไม่ใช่ native นั่นก็เลย ทำให้คิดชักใช่ไหม บางทีมันอาจจะต้องเริ่มจาก level นี้ native speaker ที่มันจะให้มัน clear คือไม่ต้องลงเอง accent มาเป็น barrier แล้วคิดเกิดจากนั่นเป็น barrier แล้วมันต้องเป็นภาษาด้วย accent ตัวมันจะกลาย
I: accent หมายถึงของใคร
K: accent ที่เป็น non-native ต่ะ
I: อย่างเช่น Philippines ใช้มั้ย
K: ใช่ K ก็อาจจะเลือกนั่นเป็น native speaker ต่อนั่นก็ได้ reduce speed ลองตั้งชื่อ Tarsier K คิดว่า okay
I: แล้วถ้าเป็นอาจารย์ไทยไปพูด
K: With the kids in this level, I understand that their [team] objective is to use real English which is diverse... but with the kids’ level and the overloaded content about difficult topics, sometimes with the English from non-native [English] speakers [NNSs], it is hard for the kids to understand. Sometimes, it might have to begin with native speakers [NESs] speaking in a clear manner, meaning that there is no issue of a language barrier. The language is a barrier, so if there are language and accent [issues], it will be too much.

I: Whose accent?
K: The non-native ones.
I: Like that of the Filipinos?
K: Yes, I would choose a NES [narration] and reduce the speed, just like the one in Tarsiers [a video-clip about Tarsier recorded and dubbed by a course-coordinator who is an Australian-American]. I think that is okay.
I: What about a Thai English speaker [speaking in audio-visual texts]?
K: Thai teachers will do, but I think a benefit of having a NES narrating [in a text] is that the kids will learn and imitate the correct way of pronunciation. Thai teachers like us, we are sometimes wrong or not sure. We might have to look it up to be sure how a word is pronounced before recording. That is acceptable. (Int.3K, Pronunciation and accent; Accuracy; and NESs provide models)

The above instance demonstrates Kamala’s awareness of the diversity of ‘real English’ in terms of accents and pronunciation. Nevertheless, she said that she preferred audio-visual teaching materials presented by NESs who can be models for ‘the correct way of pronunciation’ for students to ‘learn and imitate’. When asked about Thai teachers being the narrators in such audio-visual teaching materials, she said non-native English speakers (NNESs) including Thai teachers could be ‘wrong or not sure’ and that ‘English from NNES’ in the materials may be ‘hard for the kids to understand’ and create a ‘language barrier’, i.e. creating obstacles to the students’ understanding English and the content they are learning.

6.1.4 Students’ learning and performance

Topics related to students’ learning and performance occurred frequently in my analysis of Kamala’s data. These topics, as exemplified in the excerpts above, were students being ‘passive’ (Excerpt 3); being inattentive and careless (Excerpt 4); students that ‘always make mistakes’ (Excerpt 4); and that ‘feel too shy’ (Excerpt 7). In addition to these, Kamala raised an issue regarding students’ confidence as demonstrated in the two excerpts below:

Excerpt 9

K: ครั้งนี้จะมีเด็กปีหนึ่งด้วยก็จะเห็นว่า class มันก็จะ active มาถึงเวลาที่เราถามก็จะมี response มาถึงเวลาที่ถามเลยเค้าก็จะไม่ตอบ
K: This class also contains freshmen, so it is more active. When I asked questions, there would be more responses. Older students [i.e. students in upper years who failed the course previously] who have lost their confidence would rather not answer anything. (Int.1K, Grammar exercises; and Student culture)

Excerpt 10

K: ให้ช่วยพวกฉันว่า collaboration นั้นจะช่วยได้สำหรับคนที่ขาดความมั่นใจเริกว่าแต่เดิมกลุ่มนี้ไม่มีความมั่นใจในการใช้ภาษาเพราะมีหลายครั้งที่บางคนผ่าน English 1 แล้วแต่ไม่ได้ผ่านต่อมา English 2 ค่ะ

K: I asked them to help each other to think because I think collaboration will help those who lack confidence. I know that this group of kids lacks confidence in using the language because they have failed [this course] so many times. Some of them have passed English 1, but they are not confident enough to continue in English 2 [because they still have to pass the IE course]. (Int.2K, Students as deficient language users)

Her comments above regarding the confidence of freshmen compared with students in upper years were intriguing to me. She implied that freshmen were more ‘active’ because the latter group had failed the course (IE) ‘so many times’ causing them to lose confidence. Thus, for her, the goal of learning English for this group of students (i.e. freshmen and upper classmen alike who had all failed the course previously) was to pass the exams and ultimately the course (Excerpt 2).

Another characteristic of students she mentioned is their low level of English proficiency. This is evident in her account related to using grammar exercises:

Excerpt 11

K: แบบฝึกหัด grammar ส่วนมากกลุ่มนี้จะเป็นลักษณะแบบนี้คือเค้าเห็น ‘three times a week’ รู้แล้วมันเป็น routine เค้าก็เติมอยู่แต่ถามว่าถ้าเกิดเราให้เค้าแต่งประโยคแบบนี้ได้มั้ย ไม่ได้คือแบบฝึกหัดแบบนี้มันใช้สำหรับเด็กที่ basic มากกว่านี้ basic มากกว่านี้ ค่ะ

I: ต่าง beginner
K: แต่เค้าไม่ได้ต่ำไปกันกว่าเค้าจะยอมกลับไปเริ่มต้นแบบนี้ค่ะ เพราะว่าเค้าจะต้องเรียนให้กัน บางคนเรียน English 1 พร้อมกัน IE อยู่ด้วยค่ะ

K: Most grammar exercises, the students will see, ‘three times a week’. They will know that it is a routine and can answer it right away. But if we ask them to write their own sentences, they cannot do it. These exercises are for those whose English is at a much [emphasis] lower level.

I: Yes. Beginners?
K: But they are not. They have come too far to be beginners again because they have to rush [to catch up with their original study plan]. Some students are even taking IE together with English 1. (Int.2K, Students as deficient language users).
Despite stating that most grammar exercises were appropriate ‘for those whose English is at much lower level’ (i.e. beginners), she said that her students still could not complete the exercises by themselves.

6.1.5 Diversity of English

A salient theme unique to Kamala is her view regarding the diversity of English. This is reflected in her response to my question regarding reading texts in the English 1 textbook about how Vietnamese or Filipinos speak English:

Excerpt 12

K: In terms of content, the kids will know that there are not only [NESs], but there is diversity in use, pronunciation and accents. They will know that they can speak English with a Thai accent, but, [emphasis] regarding the pronunciation, we have to try to pronounce words correctly. You can have a Thai accent just like Filipinos have their accent. This unit is good because it addresses characteristics of the Filipino language which are similar to those of Thai. When Filipinos pronounce English words, they will stress each word like the way Thais do. I think the writers of the book have good intentions to show the kids the diversity of English in a way that users of English do not have to be [NESs], but anyone. Maybe the textbook writers wanted the kids to see that they can use English correctly in their own way which does not have to be like [NESs]. They can be fluent, but do not have to be exactly like [NESs]. (Int.5K, Pronunciation and accent; Accuracy; NNESs as users, and Diversity of Englishes)

Kamala responded positively about the texts. For instance, she said that ‘the writers of the book have good intentions’, and further provided her views regarding diversity of English. First, users of English are comprised of not only NESs, ‘but anyone’. Second, English is diverse in terms of ‘pronunciation and accents’. Therefore, students ‘can speak English with a Thai accent’, ‘they can use English correctly in their own way which does not have to be like NESs. They can be fluent, but do not have to be exactly like [NESs]’. Yet, she emphasised that ‘we have to try to pronounce words correctly’.
6.1.6 Teaching the cultural and intercultural dimensions

A salient theme in Kamala’s data is related to the cultural and intercultural dimensions of English. First, Kamala seemed to be open to teaching a cultural aspect. This is evident in her comments concerning her teaching of a lesson about the Philippines. In that lesson, she showed some pictures of the types of transportation in the Philippines and asked the class if any type was similar to transportation in Thailand. After that, she played a video for the class. After watching the video, students had to compose sentences depicting what they saw. She commented on her students’ reaction towards this activity:

Excerpt 13

K: The students could answer it quite well. Then, there was a video clip for them to watch ... and to compose some simple, compound complex sentences after watching it, but they could not write anything [laugh]. So, I continued playing the clip to the end. The students seemed amused and excited about things which were, actually, near to them, from a neighbouring country, but were unfamiliar to them or were things they never saw before. (Int.1K, World knowledge).

While saying that most of her students could not complete the task, she also laughed which might mean that she was not upset about it. Instead, I felt that she was positive and enthusiastic about teaching topics ‘which were, actually, near to them, from a neighbouring country, but were unfamiliar to them or were things they never saw before’.

In addition to teaching about ASEAN countries (as designated in the textbook), she taught an English expression to say when someone sneezes. In our follow-up session, I asked her to comment on this:

Excerpt 14

K: ‘Bless you’… It’s a culture, something trivial, but they should know it. Actually, after they graduate, I believe that 80% of them will not use English for academic purposes but will use English in their daily life. And this aspect is very small; it is not covered in the textbook, but
This example illustrates that Kamala advocated the teaching of ‘culture’. She voiced that it is usually ‘trivial’ or ‘small’, but students ‘should know it’.

Kamala expressed her belief that the majority of her students would not use English ‘for academic purposes’ but would do so in their ‘daily life’. This suggested that she viewed the students’ future use of English beyond the classroom. Nevertheless, her teaching of the expression ‘Bless you’ suggested to me that she might associate the students’ future use of English with communication with NESs or farangs in general because the expression is common in Inner-Circle countries (and in other Western societies with variants in different languages e.g. Spanish).

In addition to teaching cultural knowledge, Kamala was the only teacher in my study who discussed teaching the awareness or the understanding of cultural differences (i.e. the intercultural dimension). When I asked her to comment on statements in a grammar exercise that she used, she replied:

Excerpt 15

K: I do like it given that my background is (English) literature which involves social and historical backgrounds that are different from ours or from what we have seen. This aspect enables us to learn about, or see ourselves from observing others. … They should see that the word is used differently, see that other people are different, and learn the similarities and differences in order to live with others. (Int.8K, Intercultural awareness; and Education and training)

Despite her positive attitudes towards teaching beyond the linguistic dimensions, there were some occasions in her teaching when the cultural and intercultural dimensions were ignored or not even discussed. For instance, during a speaking activity in an IESP class, she asked the students to match lines of conversations as exemplified below and then practice the conversations with a partner.
A: What nice weather we’re having!
B: Yes, wonderful, isn’t it?
C: Just like summer.

In Thailand, summer might not be considered as the best time of year for most people because the temperature can exceed 40 degrees Celsius. Thus, the idea of ‘wonderful’ summer weather is not an idea originating in or common to Thailand. On this point, Kamala commented that the purpose of this activity was for students to ‘speak’ English, while ignoring the potential cultural dimension of the material:

Excerpt 16
K: I did not translate it or explain the meaning of each [statement] because in the normal IE these [activities] are linked to a reading text or other exercises, but the students do not have the textbook.
I: So, this was a standalone activity with an aim to have students practice speaking English?
K: Yes, to make them feel that ‘I can speak English’. ‘I am speaking English’. (Int.2K, Confidence)

Similarly, Kamala used a reading text as an example of an expository paragraph in an English 1 lesson. The text (as shown in Figure 18) was about how English is spoken in Vietnam. It compared the Vietnamese and Thai ways of speaking English as influenced by their respective native languages (i.e. Vietnamese and Thai). She told the class not to worry about their understanding of the text at that moment, but to focus on the structure of the paragraph. Although later she explained what some sentences meant, I think the main purpose of the reading was for the students to be able to identify the elements of a paragraph while not being concerned about comprehending the text (Observation summary, 22nd September 2014). In our interview, Kamala described what she did and stated that she wanted the students to learn about the structure of a paragraph. I followed-up by inviting her to comment on my observation. She explained that:

Excerpt 17
K: อืม [pause] จริงๆพอสอนเสร็จก็ [นึกได้ว่า] อืมไป ... ด้วยการที่ K มัวแต่ rush อยากให้เค้าข้ามไปถึงตอนที่มันเป็น exercise ก็ถือว่าอันนี้คือเป็น review ก็ลองถามเค้าถามเกี่ยวกับเนื้อหา ... ต้องการที่ K ควรจะถามเค้าว่าเนื้อหาเป็นยังไง ตลอดเวลา
จะต้องบอกว่าไม่ต้องกังวลให้กับ structure เสร็จแล้ว K จะต้องถามเนื้อหาเพราะการว่าถูกต้องนั้นไปเลย ถึงจะได้แต่เรื่อง structure หาข้อผิดพลาดก่อนมันก็ยังมีนัยยะสำคัญทางเรื่องวัฒนธรรมทางเรื่องการใช้ภาษาที่เนื้อหาของบทอ่าน ฉันจะรู้สึกตื่นเต้น
I: แต่จริงๆ อยากอธิบาย
K: ใช่ค่ะ

K: Umm [pause]. Actually, when I finished teaching I [realised that] I forgot ... because I wanted to rush to the exercise. I used the text to review [the structure of a paragraph] but forgot to ask about the content. I wanted to tell the class that they didn’t have to worry [about understanding the text] but to know the structure first. But, I forgot to discuss the content [of the text] and only did the structural part. This reading text, therefore, did not have any significance in terms of culture, language use, and content. I: But you wanted to explain it.
K: Yes. (Int.5K, Models of writing)

She said that the point I raised made her realise that she forgot to discuss the meaning which was the cultural dimension of the text. At that moment, I was aware that she could have felt that I was criticising her teaching. However, she did not show any sign of frustration as she laughed and said that she really forgot to ask the class some questions after reading.

Kamala explained that she ‘wanted to rush to the exercise’ and thus, the lesson ultimately ‘did not have any significance in terms of culture, language use and content’. This reflects a pressure she might have felt to ensure that all the content that would be assessed would be covered on time. This also reflects that she might prioritise the teaching of paragraph writing over the teaching of the cultural dimension. (Memo: Focusing on forms and disregard the content, 11th October 2015)

6.1.7 ASEAN
Kamala was the only teacher who mentioned ASEAN and the possible impact of the ASEAN integration on Thai students. For instance, when I asked her to comment on the topics related to some of Thailand’s neighbouring countries that are featured in the English 1 textbook, she explained that:

Excerpt 18

K: เข้าใจกับผลลัพธ์... ว่าถ้าเป็นเรื่องของ AASEAN แล้วเรื่องที่เข้าถึงมากมายเป็นประเทศที่มีอิทธิพลต่อระบบเศรษฐกิจสังคมของ AASEAN แล้วต้องการจะมีปฏิสัมพันธ์ไม่ว่าจะไปทำงานหรือชุมชนของต้องที่ประเทศนั้นๆก็จะเข้ามาอยู่นับถือกับชีวิตของศึกษาเป็นเรื่องๆ ฉันก็รู้สึกว่า... สิ่งเหล่านี้กับแนวคิดเป็นเรื่องที่สำคัญ🤢 แต่เรื่องนี้ไม่ใช่เรื่องจุ่งแจ้งๆที่มันเป็น ประเทศเพื่อนบ้าน แต่เราต้องมองจากมุมมองของประเทศ ของ Europe ของ America ผู้เข้าใจว่าไม่เคยมีประเทศอย่างๆ ซึ่งเริ่มมีการใช้ภาษาอังกฤษได้ จนพัฒนามีส่วนที่เราไม่เคยรู้เลยนะ
K: They [the team] said … that it was because of the ASEAN trend. The four countries they selected to include in the book influence the socio-economic landscape of ASEAN, and the kids will have interactions with [people from] these countries in the forms of work or business. These four countries will have more and more influence on students’ lives which makes sense to me. … It seems like they are faraway topics, but they actually are very close to us. They are our neighbours, but we keep looking at Europe, America, and Japan. We have never looked at countries near us, countries which are capable of using English well, are well developed, and have many things that we do not yet know. (Int.1K, ASEAN; Course material; and World knowledge)

For Kamala, these topics are not ‘faraway’ but ‘are very close to’ Thai students. Thus, they can also learn from Thailand’s neighbouring countries as well as they can from world-power (English-speaking) countries. Kamala mentioned ASEAN again as reflected in the following excerpt:

Excerpt 19

K: I feel fortunate to have chosen to be an English major. In the past, I chose to study English because, at that time I knew that it was an international language, but now I think that English is something you cannot afford not to know. If we want to live, to work in the international forum, or seek knowledge which is tremendous these days … when we know English, we receive information faster and more accurately. I think English has quite an important role, especially when we have the [integrated] ASEAN where English will be the main language of communication. If we need opportunities, English equals more opportunities. For this moment, for me, English equals opportunities for careers, for education, for knowledge seeking, opportunities in professions and everything. English as a second language might not be sufficient now. We need the third, fourth and fifth languages. (Int.10K, ASEAN; Knowledge seeking tool; Language of international communication; Language of Academia; and Future careers)

For Kamala, English is ‘an international language’ and ‘the main language of communication’ in ASEAN. Further, English is the language that people ‘cannot afford not to know’ because it has importance in several domains. Finally, she noted that knowing only English ‘might not be sufficient’ and that knowing additional languages might provide many more opportunities.
2.3 – Listening: Vietnamese English

Let’s have look at how English is spoken in Vietnam.

The Vietnamese language has many similarities to the Thai language. The words are different, of course, but like Thai, Vietnamese is a tonal language, and most words are just one syllable. Also, there are no consonant clusters (groups of consonants) at the end of words. Another similarity that Vietnamese shares with Thai is the words don’t change for tense or plurals etc. For these reasons, when Vietnamese people speak English, their accent is similar to the Thai English accent. Verb tense and plural errors are common in Vietnamese English, and their rhythm tends to be choppy. English is not spoken by most people in Vietnam, but in tourist areas people will speak English.

2.4 – Writing: Expository Paragraph

**Instructions:** Please write an outline for an expository paragraph about one of the popular tourist sites in Vietnam or the Philippines. Try to use as many of the vocabulary words as you can.

**Outlining**

Topic sentence: ____________________________________________________________

Major detail 1: ____________________________________________________________

Minor details: ____________________________________________________________

Major detail 2: ____________________________________________________________

Minor details: ____________________________________________________________

Major detail 3: ____________________________________________________________

Minor details: ____________________________________________________________

Concluding sentence: ______________________________________________________

*Figure 18: Reading and writing activities in English 1 textbook*
Summary of Kamala’s perspectives

Kamala’s interests tended to lie in the teaching of grammar, helping students to pass exams, or to study in higher-level courses. She emphasised that students should use correct written English and speak English with correct pronunciation, and the standard of ‘correctness’ for both tended to be based on how NESs use English.

She commented on some of the characteristics of her students in learning English. One of them was that many of them had lost their confidence as they progressed through their English studies. This paradox occurred when the students failed a course; many of her students failed more than once. For Kamala, this group’s goal for learning English was simply to pass the exams in order to ultimately pass the course. Considering the students’ passivity and low level of proficiency, Kamala tended to use grammatical exercises and go through the exercises with the students. She believed this was a method that would help them achieve their goals.

In addition to all the above, her data suggested that she was also interested in teaching ‘cultures’ (i.e., knowledge of and engagement with the target culture, students’ home culture and other cultures) and the intercultural dimension (i.e. the awareness of cultural differences). She is the only teacher in my study who talked about ASEAN. Nevertheless, her teaching of the cultural and intercultural dimensions and the teaching about ASEAN were minimal when compared to the teaching of the linguistic dimension for exam preparation purpose.

6.2 Maya

At the time of my fieldwork, Maya was a relatively young (the youngest participant of this study) and new teacher at GPU. She had just obtained an MA in TESOL from a British university and just started her teaching career the semester before I began my fieldwork. She obtained her BA in English from GPU, and she was one of my former students. When she was a secondary school student, she participated in an exchange programme and went abroad to the US for a year. Apart from her teaching, Maya was involved in coordinating and planning two GEE courses.
I observed eight of Maya’s classes (4 x Intensive English Special (IESP) and 4 x English 3) and conducted four weekly interviews with her. The total time of the interviews was approximately four hours. I identified seven themes in her data:

1. teaching grammar;
2. teaching for examination;
3. students’ learning and performance;
4. teaching writing for academic purposes;
5. policy and curriculum;
6. teaching the cultural and intercultural dimensions; and
7. English as linked to future careers.

6.2.1 Teaching grammar

The most recurring theme in Maya’s data is the teaching of grammar. From the lessons that I observed and in our interviews, her teaching of grammar usually involved memorising grammatical patterns as she explained in the two excerpts below:

Excerpt 20


M: This grammar point, in the last class, I introduced the Past continuous. We would memorise an example situation such as the one with ‘John’. I would ask the kids if they think of [the past] continuous, who they would think of. They would say ‘John’. ‘What was John doing?’ ‘He was showering’. They will be able to answer it. Sometimes, I have a situation for them, so that when they sit in an exam, they will compare it with ‘John was showering, then his girlfriend called’. It must be applicable for them [in exams]. (Int.11M, Grammar; and Examination)

Excerpt 21


M: I have found that this group will remember well the blocks as their examples. So, my teaching method from the beginning is to find many examples [of sentences] and to have the class memorise what is followed by what. Mostly I asked the class questions like ‘Is it
The teaching of ‘the blocks’, i.e. grammatical pattern, is unique to Maya. She said that it presumably helped her students in examinations:

Excerpt 22

M: course IESP เค้าบอกว่าให้ดึง grammar จากด้านหลัง ... คือ week นี้เองแต่ unit ใหม่แล้วครับก็ cover ทั้งหน้าหนึ่งดี ... mock exam ... เป็นตัวอย่างที่ดีตลอดครับ ... M สอนแต่ไปที่นี่ๆ ก็ต้องว่าตัวเองจะเอาไป apply ได้หรือ แปลงก็คือตัวสามารถเก็บข้อมูลเอาไปใช้ได้ เพราะว่าจะสอนก่อนเป็น block, block, block ว่า adjective หนึ่งหลัง อะไรคือไม่ต้อง verb to be แล้วติเตียน -ing ได้หรือไม่แล้ว ... เด็กจะรู้ว่าตัวเองในตัวครับที่ M คือพวกวิธีแบบนี้เด็กๆ สำหรับ level เด็กที่นี้ใช้ได้ดีกว่า

M: They [the IESP team] informed us to use the grammar lessons from the back of the textbook [American Headway], ... one unit each week, and I have covered them just in time. The mock exam … is quite good … I have taught the class exactly the same [topics in the mock exam], and I am still not sure if they are going to be able to apply [the grammatical knowledge]. But I have found that students have begun to pick it up and use it because I have taught them as block, block, block, such as an adjective will follow so and so. If students cannot find a verb to be, can they use [verb]-ing? … They will discover that it is wrong. So, I found that the traditional method works well with the kids in this level. (Int.13M, Team-teaching, Grammar; Accuracy; Examination; Students as deficient language users; and Experience of what works)

This method, according to Maya, was related to ‘the traditional method’ which she described as:

Excerpt 23

M: คือ grammar-translation คือจะต้องล่าจับเป็น pattern เปลี่ยน block สมดับ subject + verb + object, verb -s, -es ถ้าประธานเป็นอะไรก็จะรู้ทันทีให้ดึงตัวแบบนี้แล้วจะได้ว่าคือที่เขียน Intensive ตอน summer มาหนึ่งห้องด้วยกันง่ายขึ้น passive voice ถ้าเขียน นั่นก็คือ continuous นั่นก็คือ be + verb -ing, be ที่เป็น present เมื่อจะเริ่มได้ ถ้าจะเริ่มให้ตัวครับ passive voice จะได้ว่าจะใช้ด้วยสัมภาระที่ถูกต้องเป็นแบบ structure เป็น block, block’ เด็กบอก contagiousมากกว่าไม่ใช้ว่าให้น้อย text แล้วดูครับ No. เด็กติดไม่ได้เราต้องบอกไปเลย M … ก็ต่อถึงในหน้าเลือกมาเพื่อฝึกด่างมาก เมื่อตัวผู้สอนจากข้อสอบ midterm มีแล้วติดเราไม่ได้เรียน อย่างที่ได้ไม่ fair

M: It is grammar-translation [method]. Students have to memorise patterns in blocks. For instance, subject + verb + object; an -s or -es will be added to the verb to agree with the subject. They will know it right away if they memorise it that way, from my experience of teaching one group of the IE last summer. For instance, the passive voice, I will write: ‘Thinking of continuous, be + verb -ing’. ‘What are the forms of ‘be’ in the present?’ Students will be able to answer it. ‘If [the students] think of the passive voice, what comes first or second?’ ‘Try to shuffle the structure in block, block’. The students said they
understood it more than reading a text and circle [to identify the structure]. They cannot think; we have to tell them straight away. … I typed [the grammar lessons] from the textbook because if the midterm exam contains these [grammar points], but our students have not studied them, it would not be fair. (Int.13M, Grammar; Examination; Students as deficient language users; and Experience of what works)

Similar to Kamala, Maya mentioned that the midterm exam would contain grammar points, thus she had to cover all of them and teach in ways which would help students in the exam. Maya mentioned the ‘blocks’ again in the following excerpt and compared her ‘traditional method’ with ‘Communicative Language Teaching’:

Excerpt 24

M:  ในเมื่อคูๆครับว่า block นี้ใช้งานได้จะเอาไปปรับใช้ได้ คือถ้าเข้าสิ่งเดิมๆที่คุกับมันจะได้ผลกว่า Communicative [Language Teaching] ในปัจจุบันการที่เราส่งให้คุย discus ซึ่งด้วย level ค่อยเดินค่อยจะไม่ถูกการ discuss หรือว่าพูดอะไรที่คุณไม่รู้ตัดขาด แต่ทำให้เกิดขึ้นที่โน่นขยับกันแล้วคงช่วยด้วยไม่เจ้าที่สามารถอธิบายได้

M: When they [students] can explain how to use this block, they will be able to apply it. It is a traditional method that I think it works, better than the Communicative [Language Teaching] in the present. When we ask them to discuss, with their level, there will be no discussion [in English] or saying anything that they are not certain of, but whatever that has been emphasised, it makes them confident and able to talk about it. (Int.11M, Examination; Grammar; and Students as deficient language users; and Experience of what works)

This theme in Maya’s data was interrelated with teaching for exam preparation and students’ learning and performance discussed below.

6.2.2 Teaching for exam preparation

Similar to Kamala’s case, the themes of teaching grammar and teaching for exam preparation frequently co-occurred in Maya’s data. For instance, when asked about a reading activity she used in an IESP lesson, she said that she did not focus on teaching reading because:

Excerpt 25

M: วิชานี้ผู้ประสานงานคุก้บอกว่าให้ทำเหมือนเราเป็น tutor ให้ติวยังไงให้เด็กสอบได้ มีเกิดโทษ
I: แล้วติ้งถึงเรื่องโจทย์ที่จะต้องทำให้เด็กสอนก่อนถึงลำดับที่ต้องเป็น tutor

M: คิดว่าอย่างนี้ถ้าทำให้ประเมินตัวเอง ทุกสิ่งทุกอย่างที่เด็กเรียนมาจะไปอยู่ในข้อสอบ M จะย้ำมาก ถูกกว่าด้วยอย่างนี้ถ้าไม่ถูกใจคุณ Our students are very confident and able to talk about it.

6.2.2 Teaching for exam preparation

Similar to Kamala’s case, the themes of teaching grammar and teaching for exam preparation frequently co-occurred in Maya’s data. For instance, when asked about a reading activity she used in an IESP lesson, she said that she did not focus on teaching reading because:

Excerpt 25

M: วิชานี้ผู้ประสานงานคุก้บอกว่าให้ทำเหมือนเราเป็น tutor ให้ติวยังไงให้เด็กสอบได้ มีเกิดโทษ
I: แล้วติ้งถึงเรื่องโจทย์ที่จะต้องทำให้เด็กสอนก่อนถึงลำดับที่ต้องเป็น tutor
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input คำว่า input เป็นเรื่องราวที่เก่าก่อนที่จะมีการเปลี่ยนชื่อสารพันธุ์โดยไม่ได้ถูกตรวจสอบคุณสมบัติของคำว่า grammar point หรือเนื้อเรื่องที่มีการเปลี่ยนแปลงที่ผ่านมา

M: The course-coordinators told us [IESP teachers] to act like ‘tutors’; to do what we can to help the kids pass exams. This is a mission.
I: What do you think about such mission of helping students pass exams and being a tutor?
M: I think at least students will get to evaluate themselves. Everything that they have studied will be in the exams. I always emphasise that everyone can do it, so do not look down upon your own ability. I have to encourage them because they have failed the course more than three to four times. ... I have told them that, if they do not want to do it all over again, everything is on this piece of paper. I always emphasise this so that everyone will pay attention...because they know that it will be in their exams. The mock exam ... came from the exercises that every section has. So, if they can do the exercises, they will be able to do the exam questions. For the mission of being a tutor, it does not mean that we expose the students to the exam questions, but if they understand the grammar points that I printed out for them [grammar overview], they will be able do the exams because we will assess them on what we taught. Sometimes, we changed only the names [in the exam questions but the structure remained the same], students could not answer it. That’s my feeling. But I think that if the students know all grammar points in the textbook, they will be able to apply [their knowledge]. (Int.11M, Examination; Grammar exercises; and Students as deficient language users)

The word ‘tutor’ is a Thai-English term which refers to teachers in cram schools wherein teachers use cram school style teaching. According to Maya, this suggestion came from the team. However, from my experience of teaching at GPU, the decision was possibly made by the university’s administrators and handed down to the School of Liberal Arts and the team respectively. Nevertheless, based on the efforts she put in preparing students for the exams, she seemed committed to the mission. She mentioned the situation where a lot of students failed the IE course ‘more than three to four times’ (similar to Kamala’s comment above). To help these students, Maya frequently emphasised in her class that they needed to pay attention to the lessons. These lessons focused on preparing students for the exams as they involved the revision of grammar points, the use of grammar exercises and mock-exam questions. The mock exam (as appeared above and in Excerpt 22) was prepared by a teacher in the team. It contained 70 questions, presumably similar to the questions that would appear in the subsequent midterm exam. Maya reviewed these questions with her class by going through each question and analysing each alternative of the multiple-choice answer. Maya often said to her students that they just needed to obtain a minimum passing score. She responded to my observation that:
Excerpt 26

M: I want the kids to just pass the exam. That will be enough. If they pass, I am satisfied. Really. There will be no teachers next semester teaching this course and the kids will have to study from sheets and pay 2,000 baht [approx. 50 pounds] to sit in the exam. This is the real objective which is to help them pass the exams so that instead of having negative feelings and not wanting to come to class, they will go like ‘I have passed!’ (Int.13M, Examination; Policy)

Thus, she expected ‘the kids to just pass the exam’. She viewed ‘the real objective’ of the course, and probably of her teaching of English in general, was ‘to help [students] pass the exams’. This objective is also reflected in the following excerpt:

Excerpt 27

M: My goal is, at least, the kids must pass the exams and what they would achieve is the knowledge of 10 grammar points. If they can tell me how present simple is used, that is satisfactory for me. My goal has been met. ... because that is the input we give them; we cannot expect more from them. I think that I will achieve the goal and be able to help them. The exam results will tell. If they pass, that is okay. (Int.11M, Grammar; and Examination)

Maya tended to be preoccupied with teaching grammar for exam preparation. I noticed that other areas of competence such as reading, speaking and the non-linguistic aspects of English were not covered much in her teaching.

6.2.3 Students’ learning and performance

Maya implicitly and explicitly remarked about her students’ learning and performance several times in our interviews. These topics, as exemplified in the excerpts above, concerned students’ low level of English proficiency (Excerpt 24); being unable to ‘discuss’ in English (i.e. to speak English) (Excerpt 24); and being unable to think (Excerpt 23).

These views of students tended to relate to her teaching methods which emphasised rote learning, i.e. memorising grammar structure or ‘the blocks’ and doing a lot of grammar exercises (Excerpts 21-24). She said that from her experience using these methods, she
‘found that students have begun to pick it up and use it’ (Excerpt 22). This suggests that, for Maya, these methods were appropriate for her students.

Also, her view of students tended to have a relationship with what she desired her students to achieve as indicated in the following statements:

- ‘I want the kids to just pass the exam. That will be enough. If they pass, I am satisfied. Really’ (Excerpt 26); and
- ‘If they can tell me how present simple is used, that is satisfactory for me ... I will achieve the goal and be able to help them. The exam results will tell. If they pass, that is okay’ (Excerpt 27).

6.2.4 Teaching writing for academic purposes

This theme emerged from the data in relation to Maya’s teaching of English 3, a course which focused on English for Academic Purposes (EAP). Although the obvious purpose of teaching EAP might significantly impact Maya’s perspectives, her data in this regard shed light on EAP as an important element of the GEE curriculum at the university and provided additional insights into her teaching from a different viewpoint.

Maya’s teaching of English 3 reflected the dominance of the teaching of writing-focused EAP at GPU (as discussed in Chapter 4). Her teaching was based on the lessons in the textbook. These lessons involved the presentation of writing models (i.e. an academic study report) and patterns. When I invited Maya to comment on this, she put it this way:

Excerpt 28

M: การให้ pattern ขึ้นอยู่กับ level ของ student ด้วยจะถ้าเป็นเด็ก advanced, intermediate ไม่ต้องมี model ... เมื่อต้องการให้เขียนวิชา GEE ถึงตรงจุดว่าการที่เราตั้งจุดหมายไว้อย่างนี้เรามาเรียนรู้อย่างนี้ เพื่อให้เด็กได้เขียนและเขียนได้ถูกต้อง มี grammar ดูความเข้าใจตั้งแต่ต้นก็พอแล้ว ว่า English 3 เท่าที่ receive ข้อมูลมาต้องมีมันอย่างนี้ด้วยความที่อาจารย์แต่ละคนมีความหมายไม่เหมือนกัน การที่มี model คือการ control ให้ทุก class ไปทางเดียวกัน แต่ถ้าเราข้อมูลต้องตั้งขึ้นว่า model จะเอาตัวจาก model แล้วแต่เรากำหนดไปใน English 1 ให้เขียน paragraph มี topic sentence, reasons, concluding sentence

M: It depends on the students’ levels [of proficiency]; advanced or intermediate students do not need a model. ... Since the course is a GEE course, I think when we have such a goal [a model or pattern of report writing], we can evaluate if the kids have achieved it. If we let them write anything, how could we know where to aim at or if students can write apart from
checking grammar and comprehension? Just that. However, English 3 [previous curriculum], according to the information I received, it was far too difficult before because each teacher interpreted the [aim of the] course differently. Having a model controls every group to stay on the same path, but the con is that the kids will just change some words in the models. In English 1 as well, there is a model for students to write a topic sentence, reasons, [and] a concluding sentence. (Int.16M, Model of writing; and Team-teaching)

For Maya, the models exemplified the ‘goal’ for students and teachers who were teaching different groups of students. This suggested to me that the report (with correct format according to the models) was seen as the main desired outcome of students’ learning rather than the process of conducting a research study and using English for academic purposes. However, Maya remarked that a downside of using models was that many students would just fill in the gaps. She also referred to a lesson in English 1 textbook (Figure 19) to illustrate her point.

Maya also commented on this basis of teaching in another interview. As she had recently graduated from a British university, I asked her to apply what she learned during her MA studies and describe what she found most useful to teaching English 3. She responded this way:

Excerpt 29

M: Actually, in England [the UK], it was totally different from here. They required us to think, analyse and add our ideas supported by sources [literature]. Mostly, we had to contribute our opinions as linked to the sources and our experience to proof an issue. This is a British style. For an American style, like in our university, you must know it because you used to teach here, we focus on [using connectors] ‘first’, ‘second’, ‘third’. That’s it. This author stated that blah blah. Some kids just put texts from the first, the second, the third, the fourth authors together without any analytical thinking which, in fact, cannot be used [in the real world]. How can we make them think more? In the UK, I was suffering because of this difference, but I learned different styles of writing. Sometimes, we tell students to remember the blocks, ‘first’, ‘second’, ‘third’ like that in the textbook which works only in the IELTS/TOEFL tests. When I used it in the UK, they [tutors] said ‘Nobody uses it anymore, and it’s unnatural.’ (Int.13M, Experience as English learner)
Her response was striking to me. She indicated that from her own ‘suffering’ experience as a student abroad, writing which does not demonstrate the writers’ ‘analytical thinking’ ‘cannot be used’ in the real world, cannot be used outside GPU English classrooms or beyond standardised tests such as IELTS/TOEFL. However, she seemed committed to the way of teaching as described above (and in conformity with the textbook). These lessons tended to focus on rigid patterns or models of writing rather than developing students’ ‘analytical thinking’.

In addition to a focus on academic writing, in fact, English 3 was described as ‘academic English for communication’ and ‘researching and discussion skills’ (English 3 course syllabus). Nevertheless, from my observations, the course (as well as English 2, the preceding course in the GEE curriculum) primarily involved the teaching of written academic English rather than ‘academic English for [oral] communication’. In Maya’s lessons, most discussion activities relied on memorising speech. She told me that she instructed her students to practice the ‘discussion’ several weeks prior to presenting it in front of the class. She
explained that it was because the students were not trained (in the previous courses) to engage in academic discussions (Int.13M).

6.2.5 Policy and curriculum
This theme is unique to Maya’s data as she often referred to the university’s (actual or perceived) policies and curriculum when talking about her goals in teaching. For instance, she discussed the school’s decision regarding the instruction of IESP in the subsequent semester:

Excerpt 30
M: แต่ว่าเทอมหน้าเค้าจะไม่มีคนสอนแล้ว
I: IESP นี่เหรอ
M: เค้าจะเป็นการว่าให้เด็กเรียนผ่าน sheet ที่ post ให้ใน e-learning แล้วก็สรุปให้ผ่าน เพราะฉะนั้นจุดประสงค์มุมมองของ M ก็เลยเปลี่ยนไป ว่าจริงๆ อยากให้เด็กได้อะไรร้อยละให้เด็กสอบผ่าน

M: But next semester, there will be no instructors.
I: IESP?
M: They [the university/the school] will have students study from sheets [materials] uploaded on the e-learning, and the kids must take and pass the exams. So, my view regarding the objectives has changed in terms of what exactly I want the kids to achieve. I want the kids to pass the exams. (Int.11M, Examination; and Policy)

Above as well as in Excerpt 26, Maya explicitly stated that her view regarding the objectives of teaching IESP was shaped by the school’s decision. This probably applied to her teaching of English more broadly as well. In the same vein, as demonstrated in the following excerpt, I told Maya that I observed that she often talked about grammar and vocabulary when talking about exams, and I was wondering how other areas of competence or content would be evaluated. Again, she explicitly expressed her thoughts regarding objectives:

Excerpt 31
M: ไม่มีเพราะไม่ใช่ objective ของ course นี้ อันนี้ถือให้เด็กสอบผ่าน

M: None, because it is not an objective. The objective of this course is for the kids to pass exams. (Int.14M, Examination; and Curriculum)

I found her response above intriguing because when she referred to ‘objectives’, she did not refer to those stated in the syllabuses. Instead, she referred to the information she received
from the school, the team, from the teaching material as well as from her own understanding of the course.

6.2.6 Teaching the cultural and intercultural dimensions

Maya rarely talked about the cultural and intercultural dimensions in her teaching or in our interviews, but as the cultural and intercultural dimensions were related to my research aims, I asked her questions dictated by what I observed. Her responses provided interesting insights. For instance, in an IESP lesson, she used a grammar exercise which contained statements about other countries. One of them was about the weather in Canada. I asked her to comment on such statements:

Excerpt 32

I: ข้อความข้อมูลเกี่ยวกับต่างประเทศเช่น ‘In Canada, January is [blank] than March’. คิดว่าเด็กตอบได้หรือไม่ได้
M: คิดว่าตอบได้นะ ถ้าแปล M จะเดินไปข้อมูลไปตำแหน่งต่อมาปรากฏว่า ว่าเด็กนั้นมี bad อาจจะได้มั้ยเจน ไว้ก่อน high ดูแล้วไม่มีติดที่
I: แต่ละฟ้า Canada นี่ปกติหนวดใกล้กันCfgานนี้อย่าง ประเทศ Australia
M: เราต้องอธิบายให้เด็กเข้าใจแน่นอน บางคนอย่างข้อนี้ถ้าไม่ได้ติด choice อาจจะตอบได้หลายอย่างถ้าไม่มั่นใจจะบอกคำติขั้นไปก่อน
I: บางคำตอบได้มากกว่าหนึ่งคำ
M: ใช่ครับ คิดว่าแบบฝึกหัดก็ช่วยเด็กกลุ่มนี้ได้มากครับ ครับ  kesabakanของเด็กยอมต้องไม่ก่อให้เกิดกระทวย ที่นี่ week 2 เก็บมีแบบฝึกหัดอย่างมากจากด้านหลังซึ่งหมายความว่าจะต้องทำซ้ำ structure ความหมายหนึ่งเก็บเป็นหน้าที่เพื่อที่จะต้องไปต้นครั้งแรก structure มันช่วยลดการระบายเนื้อ

I: There were statements or information about foreign countries like ‘In Canada, January is [blank] than March’. Do you think the kids were able to answer it?
M: I think they did. I pointed to it and translated it into Thai. ‘In Canada, January is ... than March’. Is the word ‘bad’ possible? Leave it there first. Is ‘higher’ possible? [If not, I cut out the choices].
I: Canada is in the northern hemisphere, so it’s normal. What about Australia?
M: I will have to explain it, but I asked them to skip it first. Like this one, if they did not cut out the less possible choices, there would be more than one answers. I would tell them to skip it first.
I: Some items had more than one answer.
M: Yes. I think exercises have helped this group a lot. The first time I taught, I only explained [about grammar points], but it did not work. In week 2, I started to use exercises from the back of the book which are helpful for students to compare the structure. The meanings [of the statements in exercises] are the students’ job to study on their own, but exercises have helped them to a certain level. (Int.16M, Grammar exercises; and Experience of what works)

After the interview, I realised that the way I asked Maya in the above interview potentially shaped her response. Nevertheless, based on the above excerpt, she tended to be more
interested in discussing the utility of grammar exercises to review students’ knowledge about grammar points than answering in ways which would please me. For instance, she said that using grammar exercises ‘have helped’ this group of students ‘to compare the structure’, but it is ‘the students’ job to study on their own’ the (cultural) meaning of the texts.

For me, the most interesting response from Maya in relation to the teaching of these dimensions arose from her teaching of a reading text entitled ‘London: The World in One City’. I noticed that the text was about different communities of people from different nationalities who live in London (and hence it has cultural and/or intercultural dimensions which could have been discussed further). While reading about a Cypriot community, Maya explained to the class that Cyprus is comprised of Greek-Cypriots and Turkish Cypriots. When they came across a section about ‘soccer’, Maya told the class that ‘soccer’ is an American English word for ‘football’ (football is a loan word in Thai), and that the word ‘football’ in the US referred to American football. When they finished reading together, Maya told the class that they needed to understand every word in the text because some of them may appear in the final exam (Observation summary, 5th November 2014). I invited her to comment on the use of the reading text in her teaching:

Excerpt 33

I: The text is about communities in London. It is about foreign countries and people in other countries. What do you think about teaching such text?
M: It’s not our country. I view that it is a type of knowledge, but actually the goal is not to teach the students what they have in London, right? But our goal is to teach English, not ‘London is the world with diverse culture’. No. ... For example, ‘train station’. Thailand does not have trains. I myself have never got on a train but what I had studied since my primary and secondary schools was ‘At the train station’. Maybe they did not want to teach about how to catch a train or how to buy tickets, but ‘at’ must be followed by ‘the train station’, a place, for example. (Int.14M, Grammar)
Maya said that the goal of using such text was ‘to teach English’ by which I interpreted to mean linguistics such as grammar and sentence structure. In addition, for her, the content of the reading text was there simply to facilitate students learning the language (Tantiniranat, 2015b). I reminded her that she talked about Cyprus in the class. She explained that:

Excerpt 34

M: If I do not know about it, I will not talk about it. For instance, about Provence [a city in France], I do not know it. ... but when I asked them about Cyprus, … I know about the topic. ... It was like an addition [to the lesson], but they did not have to memorise it. It was like sharing my experience outside the classroom.
I: Because you once lived in the UK, your experience.
M: I have been there [Greece], so I can teach it without feeling strange. ... But if it is about movies such as James Bond [as in a unit of the textbook], I do not know who he is because I do not watch movies. I would feel spontaneously that it is not interesting, the same way the students feel. But the important thing is which adjectives we will use to describe the movie, perhaps. (Int.14M, Personal experience; and Grammar)

Despite her emphasis on teaching the linguistic dimension, the above excerpt demonstrates her desire to share her experience with the students. Nevertheless, she would do so with the topics she was knowledgeable about and might not want to teach those she found uninteresting. For instance, while commenting on the English 1 (ASEAN-themed) textbook, she said that:

Excerpt 35

M: [There was] nothing new or different because of the vocabulary. We are learning about the Philippines, but we are not learning about what we should know. For instance, in the ‘Fun facts’ part, the textbook writer intended it to be a highlight before the chapter, but the kids did not listen to it and did not pay attention. The instructor [herself] did not want to teach it. This is a negative feeling towards the texts because some points are not ‘fun facts’. For instance,
‘Vietnamese [do not] take a shower [every day]’. Is that fun? It is not for some people. Should we teach that or is that only a suggested activity? (Int.16M, no code assigned)

This view of Maya regarding the value of teaching this content was different from that of Kamala. During my fieldwork, I was disappointed that I did not receive the responses I had expected from Maya (as a young teacher who received her postgraduate education abroad); I had assumed that she would have had a lot to say about these dimensions. However, after my fieldwork, while reading the interview transcripts, I noticed that although she rarely mentioned such teaching, she did raise an important point. After engaging the data such as that presented in Excerpts 33 and 34 above, I started to see the reasons why she was not interested in teaching them.

Maya said that ‘Thailand does not have train’ (Excerpt 33). This is, in fact, not accurate for Thailand has had a railway system since the 1900s, but I think she said that because she had never travelled by train in Thailand. She told me that she would not talk about the topics which she did not know, for instance, about Provence in France or James Bond (Excerpt 34). These two examples demonstrate that she might not feel comfortable to teach or discuss content which she regarded as irrelevant to her and probably to her students or the content about which she was not familiar.

6.2.7 English as linked to future careers

Another salient theme which is unique to Maya’s data is about a link she made between students’ English language learning and their future careers. This is reflected in the following statement concerning some of her English 3 Aviation Business majors.

Excerpt 36

M: เพราะต้องมีภาษาอังกฤษในการใช้ในชีวิตในอนาคต เขาจึงต้องเรียนภาษาอังกฤษ เขาจึงต้อง pay attention เข็งนี้ให้ความสำคัญกับเรื่องนี้อยู่แล้ว

M: Because the students will use English in life, in their future careers. They are Aviation Business [major], so they need to use English, and pay attention in learning English. (Int.13M, Future careers; and Student culture)

Her statement above suggests that students whose field of study involved more opportunity to use English would ‘pay attention in learning English’ because ‘they need to use English’. On the contrary, for students whose future careers did not seem to require a high level of English
proficiency or skills – e.g. according to Maya, those majoring in Business Chinese, Physical Therapy or other majors in the School of Health Science – need to just learn English to complete the requirements of the curriculum. The relationship between students’ goals or needs in learning English and students’ future careers occurred again when I asked about her views regarding IESP students’ purposes of learning which are reflected in the following excerpt:

Excerpt 37

I: As you have taught for a while, especially for this course, in your opinion, what are their [the students’] learning goals?
M: [inhales] To pass [the course], to be honest, because it is not their subject.
I: What do you mean by ‘not their subject’?
M: It is not a subject in their major; it is a subject that the university requires them to take and to pass. Are they [students] serious [about taking the course]? No, because there is no grade. If they pass, fine. But if they do not, never mind [high pitch]. The grade [GPA] stays the same. They can take it again and pay [for the registration] again. Some students come from well-to-do families, so they are not serious about this anyway. (Int.11M, Student culture; Examination; and Curriculum)

Maya mentioned the idea of English as a requirement again in an interview which took place three weeks later:

Excerpt 38

M: Sometimes, our aims in life are different. I will ask students to think about what they want to achieve in the end. If you want to be a sports coach, come to class and do what I tell you. Low scores? Never mind. But I know what jobs they will do. For instance, Section 85, I did not mean that because you [students] are not going to use English in the end, you do not need to do it, no. Everyone has to take English as a requirement, but I do not want them to be serious [stressed] because ‘I did not get an A.’, ‘I got a Dog [D] or an F.’ (Int.16M, Future careers; and Curriculum)
This example suggests that Maya viewed that students were learning English to complete the university requirement. In addition, she possibly perceived that the teaching and learning of English at GPU was not taken seriously. In one class, Maya was surveying opinions of her students regarding the cancellation of the IE’s prerequisite status which resulted in a situation where students who failed the course were allowed by the university to enrol in the higher-level course (English 1) while repeating (the ‘special’) IE. She said to the class that deans of other schools thought that English would not be used in students’ future professions. In our following-up session, Maya elaborated on this point:

Excerpt 39

M: Because of the Nursing School. Last term, in English 1, ajarn [teacher] x, as I have heard, failed one of the Nursing students, and I am not sure if it was their teacher or Dean who came to tell ajarn x to adjust the grade for the student. They accused ajarn x of being inaccurate or too strict. Fortunately, ajarn x had kept all the records and proved that the student really failed the course. The Dean or the teacher then asked ajarn x to adjust the grade to D because if the student did not pass the course, their study plan will be messy. So, they [the Nursing teacher or Dean] did not really care if their students have learned [English] or not. Just let the students pass. This is a problem that phuuyai do not accord with [students failing the course and thus have to repeat it in the following semester]. When I was a student here, IE was a pre-requisite before other courses, but now the kids have to take it [IE] together with the other course because phuuyai do not accord with [students repeating the course and being unable to enrol in the next level course]. Some students in section 85 said ‘I did not want to take the course [i.e. English 1 with IE at the same time]. Why did they have to enrol it for me?’ The GEE team said they have tried to voice it several times, but it didn’t work. So, there are a lot of problems this semester. (Int.14M, Work culture; Future careers; and Phuuyai)

Maya is the only teacher who used the word phuuyai (in Thai ‘ผู้ใหญ่’) which could be literally translated as ‘an elderly person or a senior’. In this context, the word means a superior or a chief which I think referred to the university, schools, people who were in charge of the teaching of English, including senior lecturers. Thus, the example suggests that what influential people in the institution did could influence teachers’ view regarding the importance of the teaching and learning English at the institution, as exemplified by Maya’s case.
Summary of Maya’s perspectives

Maya was primarily focused on teaching grammar. She clearly advocated the ‘grammar-translation’ or ‘the traditional method’ with an emphasis on teaching students to memorise ‘the block’ (i.e. structure). For her, these grammar-focused methods were suitable for her students because she believed that grammatical knowledge could help them in the exams. Similarly, her teaching of discussion skills involved teaching students to memorise the speech. In terms of teaching writing for academic purposes, she believed writing models would help her students to complete their tasks.

She explicitly stated that her main goal of teaching was to help students (who usually had low level of English proficiency) pass exams. She believed that that was their main goal of learning English. Further, she tended to associate students’ goals or needs in learning English with their future careers. This means that, for students with low proficiency, and if they were majoring in a field of study which she thought would not need much English ability, she would just expect that they obtain the minimum scores to pass the course.

The teaching of the cultural and intercultural dimensions was not one of her priorities. Although she occasionally shared her experience abroad with her students, she viewed it as students’ job to learn about the cultural element of a text. Maya provided two reasons why she was not interested in teaching the cultural and intercultural dimensions: the cultural content in the course materials was unfamiliar to her, and she regarded some topics as uninteresting to her and to her students.

Maya’s views regarding the purposes of teaching and learning English tended to be influenced by the (actual or perceived) university’s policies, especially the one which changed the way the remedial English course was and would be taught.

6.3 Ploy

At the time of my fieldwork, Ploy had a BA and an MA in English from two different public universities in Thailand. She started her teaching career at a secondary public school. While teaching there, she participated in an exchange programme and went to Japan for a year. She started teaching at the HE level at GPU in 2005. Altogether, Ploy had taught English as a foreign language for about 29 years. During my fieldwork, Ploy was also studying for her PhD in English.
I observed eight of Ploy’s classes (4 x Intensive English\(^{17}\) and 4 x English 1) and conducted five weekly interviews with her. The total time of the interviews was approximately four hours. I identified the following themes in Ploy’s data:

1. teaching grammar;
2. teaching writing for academic purposes;
3. teaching for accuracy;
4. teaching for exam preparation;
5. students’ learning and performance;
6. teaching a native-like accent; and
7. teaching the cultural and intercultural dimensions.

**6.3.1 Teaching grammar**

The most recurring theme in Ploy’s data is teaching grammar which was similar to Kamala and Ploy. She spent a considerable amount of time teaching grammar lessons in class as she described in our interviews as illustrated below:

**Excerpt 40**

P: ฉันก็จะบอกว่าเป็น ตรICK อย่างนี้ที่จะให้เด็กจำวิธีการใช้ verb to be, verb to have, verb to do ในการใช้ประโยคคำถามปฏิเสธแล้วก็บอกเล่าให้เด็กๆเข้าใจโดยใช้ verb to have, verb to be ไม่ต้องใช้ verb to do เช่น ประโยค ‘verb to have ไม่มี verb to be’ ไม่ต้องใช้ verb to do เช่น ‘verb to be’

P: This is a trick to help students memorise how to use the verbs to be, to have and to do in question, negative and statement sentences. It says, ‘[w]hen the verb to have is absent, and the verb to be is not present, then use the verb to do’. This will enable students to see the picture before giving them some examples. It is a review, to a certain degree. (Int.17P, Grammar and Experience as a learner)

She told me that she learned this ‘trick’ from a teacher when she was a secondary school student. It helped her and her students to ‘memorise how to use’ auxiliary verbs. In the same interview, she described her teaching of sentence structure:

\(^{17}\) The ‘normal’ IE (as opposed to the IESP taught by Kamala and Maya).
Excerpt 41

P: I use this method, subject, verb and tell students that this part is a compliment. This is the subject; this is the predicate. I tell my students to do that all the time to check if they have a subject and a verb and other components that they have learned in composing a sentence. Apart from writing simple sentences like this, we will move on to compound and complex [sentences composing]. (Int.17P, Grammar; and Writing)

Ploy also described a technique she developed for teaching types of sentences such as simple, compound or complex sentences. In an IE lesson, she told the students to read a text and identify the main verb of each sentence. After that, she presented the structure of each sentence type. When she was explaining compound sentences, she used her hands (fists) to demonstrate the sentence structure; each fist represented a clause, and the two clauses (fists) were connected with a conjunction which was represented by a microphone holder (Observation summary, 24th November 2014).

For Ploy, grammatical knowledge tended to be significant for students’ future use of English. In our final interview, bearing in mind her professional background, I asked about her goals in teaching English at both the HE and secondary levels. As part of her response, she said that she wanted her students to think that they could use English in the future. I asked her to elaborate on that point:

Excerpt 42

I: You said you wanted students to think that they could use English in the future. In which ways?

P: For instance, regarding grammar, in their near future, if I am teaching IE now, I know what students will study in English 1, so I will teach the related content and the same for English 2. When the students have passed to those courses, they will not get shocked. ... and if the students have to take any [standardised] tests [e.g. for postgraduate studies] ... to use English in office [for work], I will just guide them ... and give them some examples. That is what I mean by using English in the future. (Int.25P, Grammar; Examination; and Curriculum)
Ploy’s first example of how students would use English in the future concerned grammar. This suggests her desire for students to be able to use grammatical knowledge in their higher-level courses. Although she also gave examples of students’ use of English in their future studies and in their ‘office’, by which I think she meant using English in their careers, she did not elaborate further.

6.3.2 Teaching writing for academic purposes

I personally know Ploy and I know that she was keen on teaching writing composition. This was also evident in my observations of her IE and English 1 lessons as well as in our interviews. For instance, she described another technique she developed for teaching paragraph writing. This technique involved using colour codes to identify elements in a paragraph. In an English 1 lesson, she told the students to underline or highlight a paragraph in the textbook with three different colours; green, yellow and red. Each colour represented an element of a paragraph; green represented the topic sentence, yellow was used to identify major details, and red highlighted the minor details (Observation summary, 19th November 2014). Ploy described the purpose of this technique:

Excerpt 43

P: จุดนี้ก็คือเพื่อจะชี้ให้เห็นว่าการจะเขียน opinion paragraph ต้องขึ้นต้นด้วยอะไรซึ่ง week ถือได้ว่าเป็นส่วนสำคัญ ถ้าเรามอง topic sentence ตัวที่เป็น pattern จะมี idea ที่เป็น subject จะมี conclusion ที่เป็น verb สำหรับ 2 reasons ถ้าไม่ได้ชี้ให้เห็นจะทำให้เด็กๆ ไม่เข้าใจว่าทำไมถึงมี reason ที่มาจะทำให้เด็กๆเข้าใจว่า 2 reasons มีส่วนสำคัญมาก较高 แต่เด็กจะเข้าใจหรือไม่ เราจึงมีการใช้สีเข้าไปในกระบวนการ

P: This is to point out what is needed in the beginning of an opinion paragraph. Last week we learned about how to write a good topic sentence, the pattern of a good topic and the pattern of idea, the pattern of a good conclusion ... I asked them to find two reasons which I think ‘The first reason is...’ and ‘The second reason is...’ should be familiar [to them], but the kids did not understand that they need to support their reasons, so I used the colours to explain this matter. (Int.18P, Models of writing)

Ploy’s technique emphasised the recognition and identification of the ‘the patterns’ or the required elements of a paragraph. From my experience as a former teacher at GPU and my observations during my fieldwork, this method of teaching writing/composition was common at the university as previously seen in Maya’s data pertaining to the teaching of writing models. Another example of Ploy’s focus on teaching is reflected in the following excerpt:
Excerpt 44

P: ถ้าจะเอาในหนังสือเนื้อหามันเยอะกิจกรรมมันนั่นก็จริง แต่พอเราสอนเด็กที่โตขึ้นเราอยากจะรู้สึกว่าเราอยากจะ focus ไปที่ทักษะที่ต้องการให้เด็กเป็นจริงๆ เพราะเราต้องสอนว่าเรียนหรือเรียนวิชาตรงนี้เพื่อจะไปใส่ในวิชาต่อไป เราจะกังวลว่าเราจะให้วิชาต่อไปไม่ได้ไม่แล้วจะสังเกตว่าเราไม่ได้ focus มาตลอดในการ practice conversation ไม่มี แต่เราจะ focus ไปที่การเขียนเพราะแม้ว่าเด็กจะเขียนไม่ได้ก็ได้แล้วก็จะมีความสุขกับการเรียนวิชานี้เลยเพราะเด็กรู้สึกว่าเด็กเขียน paragraph ไม่ได้

I: ใครบ่น
P: คุณครูก็บ่นค่ะแล้วเด็กก็กังวลว่าเค้าเขียนไม่ได้ แต่เค้าก็กังวลไม่ได้ความสุขกับการเรียนวิชานี้เลยเพราะเค้ารู้สึกว่าเค้าเขียน paragraph ไม่ได้

P: Although the book has [a wide variety of content and] activities, when I teach more matured kids, I feel that I want to focus on the skills I want them to have because we always say that we [students] are learning this course for the next course. So, I feel worried about doing so. You might have noticed that we have not focused on practicing speaking or conversations, but we are focusing on writing because they always complain that students cannot write.
I: Who?
P: Teachers also complain, and students are also worried that they cannot write and are not happy when studying this course. They feel that they cannot write a paragraph. (Int.20P, Team-teaching; Curriculum; Written communication; Student culture; and Pressure on practitioners)

Ploy was concerned about students’ ability to write. Thus, she believed that by focusing on teaching writing, students would be able to use what they learned in the higher-level courses. Her view regarding the teaching to prepare for the higher-level courses tended to be consistent with her view of teaching grammar.

In relation to other areas of competence, Ploy said that she did not concentrate on teaching ‘speaking or conversations’. This corresponded to what I previously observed in Kamala’s and Maya’s teaching (Excerpts 4 and 31 respectively). Yet, Ploy voiced that IE could have focused more on teaching speaking such as the teaching of oral presentation skills. When I invited her to comment on the overall picture of the GEE curriculum, she put it this way:

Excerpt 45

P: ที่ทราบก็คือที่สอนที่จะสอน Intensive เพื่อให้รู้ basic grammar ดังนั้นจะสอนก็จะสอน Intensive ถึง grammar พอขึ้น English 1 ก็จะเริ่มเขียนเป็น paragraph พอ English 2 ก็จะเขียนเป็น essay พอ English 3 ก็จะเขียนเป็น research ที่มีการรู้เรื่องราวในเรื่องราวที่เสนอมาทางวางแผนที่จะให้มันก่อ link ไปยังวิชาต่อไปได้ด้วยต่อไปเพื่อให้การเขียนดีที่จะไป

P: As far as I know, they [the GEE committee] have planned to teach basic grammar in IE, so you will have noticed that we emphasise on grammar. For English 1, it is paragraph writing. English 2 is essay writing and English 3 will be research. When I knew about these...
I have tried to plan for making a link to other subjects, to prepare the kids for the next courses. (Int.20P; Curriculum; and Examinations)

Ploy discussed what she perceived as the main goal of each GEE course as set out by the GEE committee. Her accounts above and in the preceding excerpt suggest her commitment to teaching to achieve such goal. Thus, I interpreted her overall purpose was to prepare students to study in the higher-level courses.

For Ploy, the main goal of each course concerned a type of writing students were required to produce. From my experience of working at GPU, this view was commonly shared among English teachers there. This was primarily because of the EMI policy and the EAP agenda of the university (as discussed in Chapter 4 and in Maya’ section). The EMI policy entailed students’ ability to use English in their academic studies, especially in completing written assignments and answering exam questions. Therefore, the teaching of writing for academic purposes tended to be regarded as an important goal at GPU as evident in all of my participants’ data.

6.3.3 Teaching for accuracy
A salient theme in Ploy’s data is related to teaching students to use accurate English in both oral and written communication. This is reflected in her comments regarding her goals for teaching English:

Excerpt 46
P: โดยส่วนตัวจริงๆมันต้องยึด course syllabus ... แต่สิ่งที่เราอยากได้คือให้เด็กมีความสามารถในการใช้ภาษาอังกฤษใน การสื่อสาร ไม่ว่าจะเป็นการเขียนประโยคที่ถูกต้องหรือการพูดประโยคที่ถูกต้อง

P: I personally think it depends on the course syllabus ... but what I want is that the kids can use English in communication which includes writing correct sentences and speaking correct sentences. (Int.25P, Policy and syllabus; Accuracy; Oral communication; and Written communication)

The focus on accuracy is evident in her teaching of IE. In one class, she was projecting an example from a student’s paragraph writing assignment on the screen. She read the following sentence aloud: ‘I follow my father go to school that have child’ and described the sentence as mia chao (in Thai, ‘เมียเช่า’, i.e. ‘hired wives’) language. When I asked her to reflect on the point, she described it as follows:
Excerpt 47

P: It is our special term. I did not mean to offend anyone, but I wanted students to know that we do not use this kind of language because it is the language of someone who has not been 100% educated like us. It is like using the language the way they understand it. So, I told the class the history of ‘hired wives’. The story was that in the old days some American soldiers visited Pattaya, and many Thai women helped ‘taking care’ of them. These women used English just to communicate, but for us, as university students who have been taught intensively, we should not use this kind of language. We should write complete sentences. That is the origin of the word mia chao.

I: It is a language which [unfinished]

P: Incomplete thoughts.

I: But it is communicable.

P: Yes, communicable, but it is ungrammatical. (Int.21P, Grammar; Accuracy; and World knowledge)

She mentioned this term again when I invited her to comment on another sentence written by one of her students:

Excerpt 48

I: แล้วก็กลุ่มเด็กที่เขียนประโยค It can will be show on screen.

P: อันนั้นก็กลุ่มเด็กที่เขียนประโยคถูกต้องแล้วว่า อันนั้นก็ถูกต้อง แต่ที่แปลไทยแล้วกัน แต่ที่ไม่ใช่ที่แปลถูกต้อง มันอาจจะไม่สามารถเราได้ เพราะอะไรถึงยังเป็น ถ้าเราคิดดูอย่างจริงๆ ไม่จำเป็นไปไม่ล้าหลอกไม่ได้ไปในประโยค careless ตลอดเวลา อันนี้อย่างที่เขียนที่ถูกต้องที่กว่าเกิดได้จริง มันคือตัวเด็กที่อยู่ในวัยก่อน คือเราตัวการเข้าเป็นพวกแต่ๆที่ไม่ได้เลย แต่เผลอเขาทำเลยเนี่ย แต่เห็นตัวตัวเด็กที่มีความรู้สึกว่า จะทำให้เราพูดอะไรที่ไม่ถูกต้องที่เกิดอะไรกันที่ แต่เข้ากัน

I: One group wrote ‘It can will be show on screen’.

P: That is another mia chao language. I would tell the kids that it is mia chao language, but I was puzzled. But I am not blaming them. They might have not used English often enough. I also make mistakes. The kids neither remember nor observe. They do not pay attention and are always careless. What can I do to solve this problem? It depends on the students or not? I have often emphasised it [grammar], but the results are the same every time. I have been stressed out since [having seen] students put a comma before ‘because’. I always tell them, but they still do it. I wonder if what I have said ever get through to them. I am quite concerned. (Int.21P, Grammar; Accuracy; and Students as deficient language users)
In the two excerpts above, *mia chao language* is the term she used to refer to broken, incomplete or ungrammatical English i.e. ‘the language of someone who has not been 100% educated’ such as escort women. The term was originated in 1960s when American troop based in Thailand started to use the Pattaya area for the ‘rest and relaxation’ purposes. Thus, the term is derogatory in the Thai context.

In addition to the use of the term, Ploy showed her ‘concerns’ over ‘the problem’ of students making errors because they ‘neither remember nor observe’ and ‘do not pay attention and are always careless’ when using grammar. This was despite it being emphasised and taught repeatedly. Ploy’s perspectives towards accuracy in oral communication are reflected in the following excerpt. In a lesson, she instructed the class to form a circle in front of the classroom. Students then had to respond to questions. She commented on this activity as follows:

Excerpt 49

P: ปกติก็จะเล่นเกมค่อนข้างบ่อย เป็นลักษณะของการ *practice speaking* ซึ่งมันอาจจะไม่ได้ทุกคน ... ไม่ได้ตั้งใจจะต้อง ผิดถูก เพราะว่าให้เค้าพูดมาให้เค้ากล้าพูดก็พอแล้ว หลังจากนั้นเราก็ถูกเกี่ยวก็ให้เค้า

P: I usually use games in class. This one was for speaking practice although not everyone had a chance [to speak]. ... I did not expect them to be right or wrong, just let them speak, to be confident and we could correct them later. (Int.17P, Confidence)

Despite stating that she did not mind if students would be ‘right or wrong’ and that she wanted students to be ‘confident’, she still mentioned the correction. Therefore, the notion of accuracy tended to remain important to her while teaching oral communication.

6.3.4 *Teaching for exam preparation*

Similar to Kamala and Maya, Ploy tended to focus on preparing students for examinations. This theme was interrelated with teaching grammar as reflected in her description of preparing her students for a quiz:

Excerpt 50

P: เนื่องจากว่าวันพฤหัสจะมีสอบ *complex sentence* ก็เลยจะทดสอบความรู้ด้านที่เราสอนเมื่อต้นเทอม เราสอนไปแล้ว ครบสาม อันคือ *simple, compound, complex sentence* ถ้ามีความก่อน แล้วถ้าต้องใช้ *relative pronoun* เพื่อให้ถูกต้องใช้เป็น ซึ่งต้องเกี่ยวกับว่าไม่ได้ค่อยๆ ไม่เข้าใจได้อย่างนั้นนั้นเลย ดังนั้นเมื่อวางแผนก่อนจะสอนก็ต้องพร้อมก่อนจะสอน ให้ด้วยกันหรอกนี้
P: On Thursday, we will have a quiz on complex sentences, so I wanted to test their old [grammatical] knowledge I taught at the beginning of the term. I have taught them all the three types: simple, compound, and complex sentences. I reviewed these first before teaching the relative pronouns so that they will be able to use [what they have learned]. To be frank, the students did not quite get it; did not understand anything. So, yesterday before the test, I reviewed these again before they did the test. (Int.19P, Grammar; Students as deficient language learners; and Examination)

I noticed that Ploy’s teaching of IE lessons was largely based on the teaching of grammar. This is in keeping with what I previously discussed in Kamala’s and Maya’s lessons of IESP. Nevertheless, I learned from the Head of the English Department that IE ‘focuses on integrated basic skills of English plus cultural knowledge and understanding’ (Interview with the Head of English Department, 3rd November 2014). Thus, I asked Ploy to comment on the focus of the course:

Excerpt 51

P: I think that it focuses on writing the most because … for speaking, the chance that we will assess speaking skills is none; there is only term project in which five students will be given 10 minutes to speak, so it is impossible to evaluate that a kid speaks well or not. Even in classroom communication, the kids rarely respond to me in English. When I want to get my messages across quickly, I speak Thai. Sometimes, while teaching in English, the kids looked puzzled which made me feel frustrated, so I switched to Thai so that they would understand [the lesson]. If the kids do not understand [the lesson] and do not pass the exams, there will be a problem like, why? Did I not teach them well? … So, for the 100% English [policy] [sigh], I can say that it is not the case for this class … so when speaking English, they will talk among themselves. So, I need to speak Thai for their understanding. (Int.19P, Examination; Policy; Roles of Thai language; and Pressure on practitioners)

Related to insufficient opportunities for students to speak English in class, Ploy showed concern that the ‘100% English’ policy (i.e. EMI) could affect students’ understanding of the lessons. In this regard, Ploy expressed one of her concerns that if the students did not understand the lesson (due to the language barrier created by EMI), they might not do well in the exams. Consequently, she, as the teacher, would face a ‘problem’ and could be criticised (presumably by the team, fellow teachers and/or teachers in other schools) for not doing her
job well. This concern about students’ learning as linked to their performance in exams (see also Excerpt 44) was unique to Ploy’s data. This aspect of the data emerged, perhaps, because the period I was working with Ploy was close to the final exam. I also believed that because of our close relationship and trust, Ploy might have felt that she could be open with me which I very much appreciated.

In addition to her concern about students’ learning, her comment on the lack of evaluation of the speaking skills suggests her belief that whatever was taught must be tested. In other words, it was pointless to teach content that would not be assessed. This view was confirmed by her comments regarding the teaching materials prepared by the English 1 team. Below, Ploy was talking about a pronunciation lesson, an appendix at the back of the textbook:

Excerpt 52

P: ถามว่า pronunciation ตัวนี้ก็หมายถึงว่า มันไม่ย่อขั้นตอนในการที่จะนำเสนอในหนังสือเล่มนี้ เพราะว่าถ้ามันมีทุกบทถึงเรื่องของ vocabulary แต่มันไม่มีอะไรที่จะให้คะแนนของ pronunciation ถ้าในการสอบหรือการให้คะแนน และมันประสงค์ในการใช้ เพราะว่าปกติเราจุดประสงค์จะให้การเรียนมันจะไปตามตัวนั้น แต่ถ้าไม่มีสอบ pronunciation ในข้อสอบแบบนี้ที่มีเรียนและมันควรจะมีจัดเวลาควรจะมี 4-5 ข้อหรือ 10 ข้อ

P: What is the ‘Pronunciation’ for? It is not clear in this book’s presentation because there is the vocabulary part in each unit, but there is no evaluation or test at all for pronunciation, either in the exams or evaluation. Normally, when we set objectives, we usually test them. But as it stands, there is not pronunciation in the exam. In fact, there should be four to five or 10 items [to test pronunciation]. (Int.22P, Pronunciation and accent; and Examination)

Another example which demonstrates Ploy’s preoccupation with teaching for exam preparation was when she remarked on students’ goals in learning English. Since Ploy often commented on students’ lack of attention, I asked her how to boost students’ attention. She put it this way:

Excerpt 53

P: เด็กมักจะเอาคะแนนมาเป็นตัวล่อก … ส่วนมากเด็กต้องการคะแนนมาเป็นตัวกระตุ้นให้เด็กเรียน

P: The kids like scores … Mostly the kids are motivated by scores, but we cannot just give them what we want. (Int.21P, Examination; Student culture; and Professional experience)

For Ploy, students were primarily motivated by the points or scores obtained from assignments and examinations. Thus, she might assume that students were learning English to
pass the exams. This assumption tended to be common among all of the teachers in my study (see, for example, Kamala’s Excerpt 2 and Maya’s Excerpt 37).

6.3.5 Students’ learning and performance

Topics related to students’ learning and performance occurred frequently in my analysis of Ploy’s data. These topics, as exemplified in the excerpts above, concerned students’ carelessness (Excerpt 48); students’ ability to understand lessons and to retain what was learned (Excerpt 50); and students’ level of English proficiency (Excerpt 51). These comments not only suggested Ploy’s concerns about her students, but also a relationship between this theme and teaching grammar as demonstrated in the three excerpts below:

Excerpt 54

P: ถ้าจะรู้ว่าเด็กจะไม่เข้าใจเลย แต่เราต้อง focus ตรงนี้หมดถ้าไม่ได้ เพราะว่าตั้งแต่แรกพวกนี้เราสอนมาแล้ว แต่เด็กก็ไม่ใส่ใจ

P: For this one [a lesson about verb forms], I felt that the kids did not understand it at all, but I could not focus only on it because I have taught them this before, but the kids did not pay attention. (Int.17P, Students as deficient language users; and Grammar)

Excerpt 55

P: จริงๆตรงนี้ไม่ควรจะย ้าแล้วเพราะเด็กโตมากแต่ว่าผิดเยอะที่สุดเท่าที่เคยเจอ

I: capital letter

P: ใช่ค่ะ แต่จะใช้ capital letter ก่อนภาษาใหญ่ประโยคก็จะใช้ capital letter ตลอดเวลาเยอะมากค่ะ

P: In fact, this should not be emphasised again because the kids are no longer very young, but it was the most frequent mistake I have found.

I: Capital letters?

P: Yes. In sentences, the kids will use capitalised letters all the time. Very often. (Int.17P, Students as deficient language users; Grammar; and Accuracy)

Excerpt 56

P: ตัวอย่างเช่นการแต่งประโยคให้เต็มประโยคให้เป็น complete thought เด็กๆก็ไม่ได้ เด็กๆก็ไม่สามารถแต่งประโยคได้ ครบสมบูรณ์ ดังนั้นเราจะต้องมาก็ให้เด็กๆที่น่าจะตั้งประโยคได้เช่นต้องมี subject ต้องมี verb ต้องมีอะไร

P: For example, writing a complete sentence with a complete thought, the kids could not do it. So, I had to point out what we can do with the sentence, such as there must be a subject, a verb and so on. (Int.17P, Students as deficient language users; Grammar; and Accuracy)

The above excerpts were extracted from one interview. A recurring pattern emerged in that they demonstrate Ploy’s deep concerns regarding students’ ability to learn and retain
Specifically, the information she was referring to was grammar points which included capitalization, ‘the most frequent mistake’ her students made ‘all the time’ and ‘very often’.

In addition to the above relationship between Ploy’s attitudes towards students and teaching grammar, her attitudes tended to shape her perspectives regarding what she would teach. For instance, when she expressed that ‘the students did not quite get [the grammar point learned]’ and ‘did not understand anything’ (Excerpt 50), she said that she felt obliged to ‘review’ the lessons before the test. Further, in the excerpt below, she explained that she did not focus on teaching reading skills because she observed that students did not like to read:

Excerpt 57
P: ในเรื่องของ reading ยอมรับว่าไม่ค่อย focus ทำให้ไม่ค่อยสอนและต้องไม่ค่อย focus เพราะว่าเด็กยังไม่ได้สนใจ สนใจ เพราะเขาจะมีความรู้สึกว่าอยากทำอะไรที่เป็นกิจกรรมที่เป็นแบบ active มากกว่าที่จะนั่งรอนั่งนิ่ง ต้องไม่ชอบนั่งนิ่งนิ่งนิ่งเท่าที่เจ้า

P: For reading [skills], I admit that, as the instructor, I do not focus on teaching it because it wastes a lot of time. The kids are not interested because they like to do active activities more than to sit still and read; they don’t like reading as far as I have observed. (Int.19P, Student culture)

6.3.6 Teaching a native-like accent
A salient and unique theme in Ploy’s data was teaching a native-like accent. This is reflected in her teaching and in her interviews. For instance, in one lesson, she asked the class to identify the tense of each sentence she projected on the screen. She then pointed at a sentence and asked the class to convert it into a question. After the students had answered in unison and sounded monotonous, Ploy told them to repeat the sentence. She used special terms described below:

Excerpt 58
P: คำแสดงว่า ‘กระแดะ’ และ ‘ดัดจริต’ เนื่องจากถ้าใช้ความหมายจะได้เด็กรู้สึกของเราจะชอบขัน แต่ถ้ามันเป็นอะไรที่เด็กเข้าใจ ว่า ‘กระแดะ’ ถ้า ‘ดัดจริต’ นั่นหมายถึงการนั่งนิ่งนิ่งนิ่ง คำแสดงว่า ‘accent’ ต้องมีการ stress ต้องมีการ intonation ในการพูดภาษาอังกฤษ ไม่ใช่เพียงแค่พูดเป็นเสียงอื่นๆแบบ Tinglish แต่ต้องให้มีการขึ้นลงเสียงสูงต่ำ ถึงเป็น trick อย่างนี้เราทราบผูกกระacades คำ คำแสดงว่าเราจะต้องเปลี่ยนเสียงให้เป็นแบบกระแดะ ไม่ใช่แบบไทย

P: Note on the words kra-dae [meaning to exaggerate one’s acting] and dudjarit, [meaning to pretend]. I said that because I wanted the kids to feel amused, but they will remember well that it means they have to speak with a/an [native-like] accent. They have to stress [on some
sylables], use intonation when speaking English, not speak monotonously like Tinglish [Thai-English], but to have rising and falling intonation. It is a trick. When I say kra-dae and dudjarit, it is mutually understood that we [students] have to change to sound like farangs, not Thai way. (Int.17P, Pronunciation; Accent; NESs provide models; and L1 interference)

Ploy’s ‘special terms’ of kra-dae and dudjarit (in Thai, ‘กระแดะ’ and ‘ดัดจริต’ respectively) have similar meaning of pretending or acting unnaturally and pertaining to overtly feminine mannerisms. In this context, Ploy used the terms to refer to altering one’s accent or ways of speaking to approximate a native-like accent. For Ploy, students should try to speak English the way a farang (i.e. NES) would, and they should avoid speaking English with a Thai accent (i.e. ‘Tinglish’). Ploy used these two terms again later in the same interview when commenting on a listening activity (with a listening text from American Headway):

Excerpt 59

P: อันนี้เป็นการฝึกฟังเสียงเพื่อให้ลูกศิษย์ ‘ดัดจริต’ แล้วก็ ‘กระแดะ’ ตามซึ่งจะมีไม่บ่อยนักเพราะเวลาฝึกไม่มีพอ เพราะเราจะเน้นการเขียน

P: This was for listening practice so that students could imitate [the modelled speech] by dudjarit and kra-dae which [this kind of activity] does not happen frequently because there is not enough practice time as we focus on writing. (Int.17P, Pronunciation and accent; NESs provide models; and Written communication)

Ploy’s teaching of listening and speaking skills involved mimicking modelled speech (with a native-like accent and pronunciation). In addition to these examples, when I asked her how to improve students’ speaking skills, Ploy said that she would recommend that they imitate ‘the accent’ from movies or YouTube videos (Int.24P). Note that she repeated her focus on teaching writing here also.

When I asked her about the English varieties she preferred in her teaching, Ploy told me that she preferred an American (presumably a General American) accent. She explained that it was because the main textbook of IE is American Headway, and she personally preferred an American accent because it was clear and easy to understand.

Despite her personal preference for an American accent, Ploy used some of the audio-visual materials (prepared by the team) presenting non-native English pronunciation and accents in her English 1 lessons. For instance, in a class, she presented a slideshow about ‘Singlish’ (Singaporean English). It contained information about the particles which Singaporeans
usually add to the end of their sentences when speaking English (e.g. can la, can can’t, etc.). After that, she played a video clip about Bali (a tourism attraction in Indonesia), and said to the class that: ‘The woman in the video speaks with a typical Indonesian accent’. Then, she played another video clip about how Indonesian people speak English (e.g. Indonesian-English accent and the accent tag in Indonesian-English). She commented on the final clip:

Excerpt 60
P: ถ้าแบบปลอมออกไปไม่ใช่ของจริงเพราะเค้าก็ถามเด็กว่า คิดว่าเป็นสิ่งเด็กอินโดนีเซียก็ไม่ใช่ นั่นแปลว่าเด็กแยกได้ว่าเป็น English ที่เป็นอินโดนีเซียโดยคนอินโดนีเซียจริงๆหรือไม่
I: แล้วพวกอาจารย์ให้เค้าดูเพื่ออะไร
P: เพื่อให้เค้าแยกออกได้ว่าเพราะว่านั้นเค้าจะพูดถึงสิ่งของอินโดนีเซียและมันไม่เหมือนภาษาอังกฤษ มันแปลกๆ

P: This is not real [Indonesian English]. I asked the class if they think it was Indonesian [English]. They said no which means that they could spot if it was spoken by Indonesians or not.
I: Why did you show it to them?
P: So that they can identify [English as spoken by ‘typical’ Indonesian people] because [a text in the textbook] discussed Indonesian accent as it is funny; it does not sound like English; it is strange. (Int.22P, Diversity of English).

In my view, the speaker in the video was speaking English clearly without a heavy foreign (Indonesian) accent. Ploy commented that it was ‘not real’ by which I think she meant that the way the speaker spoke English was different from what she assumed ‘typical’ Indonesians would sound like. She then referred to how a lesson in the textbook discussed Indonesian English as ‘funny’, ‘does not sound like English’ and ‘strange’. However, as depicted in Figure 20, the text only discussed that Filipino English could be influenced by the Tagalog language. Therefore, such comments by Ploy were likely to be her own, or probably arose from her discussion with students in a previous class that I did not observe.

The above video clips (available on YouTube.com) were selected by the team. Ploy commented on using the materials provided by the team:

Excerpt 61
P: บางทีถ้าเราสอนตามแบบเค้า วิเคราะห์ไม่อยากทำให้หลงหัว แต่ก็ต้องจะสอนว่า เอกสารในเรารียอน [สอน] ไม่เหมือนชาวบ้านเค้า ถ้าต้องสอนคนหนึ่งที่จะให้คนดูเพื่อจะต้องต้องสอนเค้า เก็บตัวด้วยตัวเองเอง เพราะเค้าจะเห็นจากเรื่องเดิม เค้าจะมีความสุขกับการที่ได้เข้าใจแบบที่เป็นสิ่งที่แปลกเกี่ยวกับวัฒนธรรม ดังกล่าว เนื่องจาก Philippines ซึ่งทางอาจารย์ตั้งใจจะเป็นอินโดนีเซีย แต่ตั้งใจไปหา Tagalog ที่ยอดจะมีตัวอย่างให้เกิดพื้น เค้าก็รู้สึก
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P: Sometimes, I used their [the team’s] materials which I did not want to, but I am afraid that they will say why we learn [teach] differently … But when teaching, I like to find my own materials. I think I know my students and know what they like. I have been observing since I started teaching them. They would be happy when I showed them things to which they can relate. For instance, when we were studying about the Philippines language, the team already provided some materials which were different, but showed the class a video clip I found about Tagalog which was a bit funny. They seemed to be happy and watch it attentively. They were trying to catch the gist as the video had an English subtitle which the kids could read along and learn. Mostly, I try to find materials on YouTube to use in my classes. (Int.22P, World knowledge; Pressure on practitioners, Team-teaching, Experience of what works; and Student culture)

1.3 – Listening: Filipino English

Let’s have a look at how English is spoken in the Philippines.

Most Filipinos speak English very well. This is because they use English at school from kindergarten until the end of university. English is the only language used in the classroom in the Philippines. Filipino people have a unique style of speaking English. Remember, Filipino English is not bad English; it is just different in the way that British English is not the same as American English. Let’s look at some characteristics of Filipino English.

Some sounds are hard for Filipinos to say:

- the ‘f’ sound is said like ‘p’ so ‘fish’ sounds more like ‘pish’
- the ‘th’ sound is said like ‘d’ so ‘there’ sounds like ‘der’
- the ‘v’ sound is said like ‘b’ so ‘movie’ sounds like ‘mubie’

Also, in Tagalog there is no difference between ‘he’ and ‘she’. So Filipinos often use these incorrectly in English.

Let’s look at a video about the Filipino accent:

(Figure 20: A reading text about Filipino English)
In the above excerpt, Ploy voiced pressure she felt to use the designated materials, such as the video clips above. Nevertheless, she seemed to be positive about exposing students to the language and the varieties they might not be familiar with despite commenting on the language as ‘a bit funny’. In addition, while talking me through a video clip about a casino in Singapore (part of the course materials), she commented on the accent presented in the clip as:

Excerpt 62
P: แต่พูดตรงๆว่าต่อให้ฟังยังไงก็ไม่เข้าใจ ถ้าจะทำแบบเดิมๆ แล้วการที่ออกมาจาก YouTube มันดีที่ว่าเป็นสิ่งเสียงแท้จริงของคน Singapore แต่บางทีเด็กยังเข้าไม่ถึง ก็จะยากที่จะเข้าใจ ดังความที่ว่า ‘week’ หน้าเราจะมีสอบ เค้าจะเป็น listening เพื่อเอาไป writing ดังนั้นการฟังเพื่อจะเอาไปเขียนก็จะให้รู้ว่าแนวประมาณอย่างนี้

P: But to be honest, no matter how many times we listened to it, it was impossible to understand; it was too difficult for the kids. And when it was taken from YouTube, it is good that the accent is that of real Singaporean people, but sometimes, the kids do not understand anything. Next week, we are going to have a listening test in which students will be listening [for information] to write [a paragraph]. So, I wanted to show them an example of the test. (Int.18P, Diversity of Englishes; and Examination)

Although Ploy stated that showing how ‘real Singaporean people’ use English is a good thing, it was ‘impossible’ and ‘too difficult’ for students to understand. In this regard, Ploy voiced her concern about the students’ understanding of the text because the video clip was a model of the listening test in the then-upcoming week. Thus, if the students did not understand the content of the video, they would not do well on the test.

6.3.7 Teaching the cultural and intercultural dimensions
Ploy tended to be enthusiastic about teaching students beyond the linguistic content and beyond the designated teaching materials. In many lessons, she showed YouTube videos related to the topics she was teaching, for instance, about the Tagalog language, a history of cell phones and a babysitting job. She also expressed that she liked to teach ‘beyond the linguistic dimension’ such as teaching about ‘manners’ and ‘social life’ (Int.17P). This is supported by her statements regarding her preference of the English 1 course content (about ASEAN countries) over that of American Headway. She said, ‘English 1 is about social life, daily life and focuses on real life’. She explained what she meant by ‘real life’ as:
Excerpt 63

P: In that sense, I like to use movies, fictions or reading texts which are entertaining in my teaching. I like the kids to imagine that they would come across this in the future. For instance, we were learning about secondary education graduation in which there would be a prom. So, I told them to write a [mini] play and dress up as if they were going to a prom like what foreign teens do in their real life. It links to culture. (Int.25P, NES Culture)

From the above excerpt, Ploy’s notion of ‘culture’ was likely associated with a custom or way of life in the US, such as going to a prom as is typically depicted in Hollywood teen movies, and not common in Thai society. Nevertheless, Ploy said that she could not stray much from the designated content because she was ‘afraid that the kids will get lost and cannot do the exams’.
Excerpt 65

P: ถูกต้องเหมาะสมไม่ใช้เรามาโดยตรงเพียงประมาณ 50-60 sections ทุกอย่างจะต้องทำเหมือนกันเรื่อยๆนี้ทำให้น้องๆอื่นๆ สามารถในคลาสในเรื่องนี้เท่านั้นจะแทรกได้นิดหน่อยก็คือเวลาสอนในคลาสในเรื่องเนื้อหาแทรกได้นิดหน่อยแต่ไม่ไปไกลกว่านั้นเพราะถ้าดื้อด่าจะรอบเรื่องไปทำข้อสอบไม่ได้

P: At the tertiary level, we don’t own an entire course, but there are 50 to 60 sections. Everything must be done similarly; this topic only. I could only insert something a little, not too much because I am afraid that the kids will get lost and cannot do the exams. (Int.25P, Team-teaching; Pressure on practitioners; Course material; and examinations)

Summary of Ploy’s perspectives

Ploy tended to focus on teaching grammar, teaching writing for academic purposes and teaching a native-like accent. Much of her teaching method involved identifying linguistic structure such as tenses and sentence structure and elements of a text such as components of a paragraph. She also seemed interested in teaching students to use English accurately and to avoid using broken, incomplete and/or ungrammatical English as reflected in her use of special terms, the ‘hired wives’ language’.

Similar to Kamala and Maya, she was concerned about her students’ learning and performance. One of her concerns was her students’ low level of English proficiency. She voiced feeling pressure to comply with the university’s policy of using ‘100% English’ while having to prepare students for exams. Ploy’s assumptions about her students’ learning and performance were based on her perspectives and did not necessarily reflect students’ perspectives. Nevertheless, these assumptions tended to shape her teaching to a certain extent.

Regarding teaching spoken English, on the one hand, Ploy preferred an NES variety such an American accent and pronunciation. Her teaching of speaking and listening involved teaching students to imitate NES speech and to speak English the way NESs would (i.e. her terms of kra-dae and dudjarit). On the other hand, she possibly had negative attitudes towards non-native English pronunciation and accents such as the English spoken by those in ASEAN countries.

Finally, Ploy was interested in teaching students beyond the linguistic dimension and beyond the content of the textbooks. Regarding the cultural dimension of English, she opined that cultural content should be relevant to students’ lives. The example she gave likely linked
‘culture’ to English-speaking countries (i.e. the teaching of the target culture). Nevertheless, Ploy voiced that she could not teach much of the cultural dimension because she had to cover the designated course materials in order to help her students prepare for their exams or higher-level courses.

**Concluding remarks**

In this chapter, I identified themes in the data of my participants as summarised in Table 7.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Common</th>
<th>Kamala</th>
<th>Maya</th>
<th>Ploy</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Teaching grammar</td>
<td>1. Teaching grammar</td>
<td>1. Teaching grammar</td>
<td>1. Teaching grammar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>performance</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Teaching the cultural and</td>
<td>4. Teaching the cultural and intercultural dimension</td>
<td>4. Teaching the cultural and intercultural dimension</td>
<td>4. Teaching the cultural and intercultural dimension</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>intercultural dimension</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shared</td>
<td>5. Teaching for accuracy</td>
<td>5. Teaching writing for academic purposes</td>
<td>5. Teaching for accuracy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>6. Teaching writing for academic purposes</td>
<td>6. Teaching writing for academic purposes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7. ASEAN</td>
<td>7. English as linked to future careers</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 7: Themes identified in each teacher’s data

These themes represented the topics which frequently occurred in the data and those which I considered important to the teachers and/or relevant to my research aims. Some of these themes were unique to an individual teacher, some were common across all three teachers and others were shared by two teachers. Nevertheless, there were also nuances in their data. Analysing individual teachers’ data provided insights into their perspectives. In the following chapter, I discuss my insights gained from the data across the three teachers vis-à-vis my research questions.
Chapter 7 - TESOL Purposes, Paradigm Assumptions and Shaping Influences

Introduction
Building upon my analysis of the data as presented in the preceding chapter, I now return to the three research questions which guided my study. In particular, in Sections 7.1 and 7.2, I discuss the overarching themes identified by my analysis. These themes shed light on the teachers’ perspectives regarding the purposes of their teaching (RQ1) and their paradigm assumptions (RQ2). Being mindful that the perspectives of the teachers were embedded in a professional context, in Section 7.3, as informed by Holliday’s framework, I discuss the influences that possibly shaped their perspectives (RQ3).

7.1 TESOL Purposes
Regarding my first research question, ‘What are the perspectives of some Thai TESOL practitioners at a Thai public university regarding the purposes of their teaching of the English language?’, I identified three main themes:

1. teaching grammar and grammatical accuracy;
2. teaching for exam preparation; and
3. teaching writing for academic purposes.

7.1.1 Teaching grammar and grammatical accuracy
From what the teachers said to me in the interviews, as reinforced by what I observed in their lessons, their main purpose was the teaching of grammar, a priority they shared with other Thai teachers involved in similar studies (e.g. Vibulphol, 2004; Fitzpatrick, 2011) and in other EFL, Expanding Circle settings, for example, Vietnam (Hiep, 2005; Nguyen et al., 2016); Greece (Sifakis, 2008); Japan (D’Angelo, 2016); Taiwan (Luo, 2016).

Their grammar teaching largely involved teaching students to memorise the grammatical patterns such as ‘the blocks’ (Excerpts 21-24) and sentence structure (Excerpts 40-41). They also focused on the students’ ‘correct’ use of both written and spoken grammatical structure. The teachers often discussed with me the common grammatical mistakes their students made. For example, Kamala said that her students repeatedly made subject-verb agreement (Excerpt
Ploy expressed concern about students’ punctuation mistakes despite having emphasised it several times (Excerpt 48).

The notion of grammatical ‘correctness’ is, implicitly at least, based on accuracy linked to NES norms, i.e. students are expected to reproduce the language using native-like grammatical patterns or at least to use English in ways generally accepted by NESs. For instance, Kamala said that through using farangs’ names (e.g. ‘Peter’, ‘Jane’ or ‘Anna’) in grammatical exercises, students would see the correct use of English, ‘and if the students want to speak English like farangs, it has to be correct like these’ (Excerpt 5).

Further, as indicated by Maya in our interviews and in her teaching that I observed, a focus on NES-framed grammatical accuracy can lead to a preference for grammar-based teaching methods such as grammar-translation (Excerpt 23). Such methods can reinforce the accuracy focus of language teaching. In this sense, the preferred methods are supportive of the teachers’ main purpose (i.e. developing the students’ grammatical knowledge) more than developing students’ competence in (intercultural) communication (Hiep, 2005; Zhou, 2011). I discuss the teachers’ assumptions related to NES-framed accuracy (including pronunciation accuracy) further in Section 7.2.

7.1.2 Teaching for exam preparation

From my interviews with Ploy and Maya, it was clear to me that they felt committed to accomplish the ‘mission’ of helping students pass exams (and thereby pass the course) (Excerpts 1 and 25). From my professional experience, it appears that teaching to prepare for
examinations and teaching grammar are interconnected and mutually reinforcing; grammar-based teaching focuses on the students’ ability to reproduce the language accurately according to NES norms, and it is this ability which is measured through exams.

The link between grammar-based teaching and exam-based teaching also explains why the teachers in my study, similar to those in other studies (e.g. Prodromou, 1995, p. 14; Hiep, 2005, p. 336; Castro et al., 2004, p. 100; Zhou, 2011, p. 153; Nguyen, 2013, pp. 135-136), felt that they could not afford to waste time teaching beyond grammar. For instance, Kamala said that ‘We do not have opportunities to waste time doing trifling activities which can be entertaining … I think these activities are motivating, but when we have limited time, we can only select things that would help students’ (Excerpt 1).

She also said that ‘with the predetermined content to be tested, we have to select certain things for them to study and to review’ (Excerpt 2). This predetermined exam content was most likely grammar points and structure and other areas of linguistic competence such as vocabulary, reading and writing tasks. From my experience, these were common in English language testing at GPU. In addition, Maya mentioned the ‘mock exam’ she and other teachers in the team used to prepare students for upcoming exams. She told me that she ‘taught the class exactly the same [as it appeared in the mock exam]’ (Excerpt 22), and if the students could answer the mock exam questions, ‘they will be able to do the exam questions’ (Excerpt 25). The above examples suggest a tension between English language teachers’ priority of teaching grammar for exam preparation and the teaching of other skills such as communicative skills which is in line with that felt by the Vietnamese teachers reported in Hiep (2005).

7.1.3 Teaching writing for academic purposes

Observation of lessons being taught and interviews of teachers reflected that a significant portion of teaching time involved the teaching of writing skills (i.e. sentences, paragraphs, essays and report writing). This teaching focus reflected the English for Academic Purposes (EAP) agenda of the university’s GEE curriculum (as discussed in Chapter 4).

One teacher in my study, Ploy, prioritised the teaching of writing mainly to prepare students to study in the higher-level courses. While the other two teachers did not demonstrate that
they were particularly interested in a writing-focused approach, their lessons and interviews indicated that teaching writing nevertheless was significant in their teaching. Maya tended to teach students in ways which would help them complete their tasks and thereby fulfil their English language requirement. Teaching writing tended to be significant for Kamala, too, as she said that she forgot to discuss the meaning of a reading text because she was rushing towards a lesson about the structure of paragraph writing (Excerpt 17).

All teachers in my study usually taught according to the textbooks, except for Ploy. However, their teaching usually involved accuracy in sentence construction (as discussed in Section 7.1.1) and the teaching of the components of a piece of writing such as a thesis statement, a topic sentence, a concluding sentence, and supporting sentences (Excerpt 43). It also involved format (e.g. indentation) (Interview 13_M), connectors such as ‘first’, ‘second’, ‘third’ (Excerpt 29), and models of writing with clear, rigid structure and patterns for students to follow (e.g. Figures 18 and 19).

This ‘form-dominated approach’ that these teachers have adopted was the primary method used to teach writing in the 1960s and early 1970s (Raimes, 1991, pp. 408-409) and is still common in English language classrooms in Thailand and other Expanding Circle countries such as China (You, 2004) and Korea (Kim and Kim, 2005). However, this approach is less likely to encourage students to articulate their ideas (Hyland, 2003, p. 4) and/or to apply their knowledge in a new academic setting such as in Maya’s case (Excerpts 28-29, as discussed in Section 7.3).

7.1.4 ‘Our goal is to teach English, not “London is the world with diverse culture”. No.’

The teachers tended to be mostly concerned with teaching the linguistic dimension of English to prepare students for examinations and helping them study in GPU’s English-medium education. However, they also have perspectives regarding the cultural dimension (i.e. knowledge of and engagement with the target culture, students’ home culture and other cultures) and the intercultural dimension (i.e. the knowledge, skills and mindset helpful for English-medium IC). My analysis indicated that the teaching of the cultural and/or intercultural dimensions was not a purpose for the teachers despite:
• the encouragement from Thai and international TESOL scholars (e.g. Alptekin, 2002; Sifakis, 2004; Laopongharn and Sercombe, 2009; Baker 2011);
• the top-level policies for ASEAN citizens to use English as ‘the’ international language for IC within the region; and
• the stated objectives in the institutional syllabuses.

Only one teacher in my study, in just one of our interviews, made a comment which I think is closely related to the teaching of the intercultural dimension. She stated that she wanted her students to ‘see that other people are different, and learn the similarities and differences in order to live with others’ (Excerpt 15). In the other interviews, however, no such desires were articulated.

While the teaching of an intercultural dimension was nearly non-existent, in the lessons I observed and in our interviews, the teachers occasionally mentioned it. For instance, Ploy mentioned using a scenario of ‘going to a prom’ in students’ role-plays (as often seen in teenage Hollywood films) (Excerpt 64). In a similar vein, Kamala taught her students the expression ‘Bless you’ (Excerpt 14). Both teachers referred to their teaching as ‘culture’ which suggested to me that their understanding of ‘culture’ might link with NES cultures (i.e. the target culture). The association between ‘culture’ and the target societies contrasts the perspectives of their counterparts in other countries such as Japan (Stapleton, 2000, p. 301), Turkey (Bayyurt, 2006, p. 241) and Indonesia (Gandana and Parr, 2013, p. 238) as teachers in these studies questioned the relevance of target culture teaching.

In addition to the teaching of the culture of NESs and Inner Circle countries, the teachers in my study also demonstrated positive attitudes towards teaching the cultural aspects related to the cultures of ASEAN countries. For instance, when Kamala talked about showing her students a video clip about types of transportations in the Philippines, she stated that her students were ‘amused and excited’ to be learning about a neighbouring country (Excerpt 13). She added that they could learn a great deal from getting to know about Thailand’s neighbours, rather than focusing only on powerful countries such as European countries, the USA and Japan (Excerpt 18). Ploy also said that when teaching about the language of the Philippines, her students were happy when she showed them ‘things to which they can relate’ (Excerpt 61). While these examples might be related to the teaching and learning of specific
Having positive attitudes towards the cultural dimension of English, however, does not mean that the teaching of it was a priority for the teachers. In my classroom observations, they sometimes skipped over parts of the lessons which I think have potential for teaching the cultural dimension. For example, Kamala said she forgot to discuss the text about Vietnamese English with the students because she was rushing to teach the structure of the paragraph for paragraph writing (Excerpt 17). Maya, despite sharing her experience abroad with her students in one of the lessons I observed (Excerpt 34), stated that ‘our goal is to teach English, not “London is the world with diverse culture”. No.’ This statement was from an interview in which I asked her to comment on teaching students about other countries (Excerpt 33). It suggested to me that, in line with the findings of Nguyen et al. (2016, p. 172), Maya rejected the teaching of ‘cultures’. By using the pronoun ‘our’, she might be referring to TESOL practitioners in Thailand in general, and not only to her own position (Tantiniranat, 2015b). She added that students must study this dimension ‘on their own’, a view which echoes Stapleton (2000, p. 301). This attitude reflects a missed opportunity to provide students with knowledge beyond linguistics.

A possible reason for Maya’s view is that she might consider cultural content in English textbooks to be simply a platform for teaching ‘the language’, her term, by which I think she means the linguistic dimension, i.e. grammar and structure. This view echoes Onalan’s (2005 p. 229) study. Thus, unlike their counterparts in Vietnam (Tran and Dang, 2014), the cultural dimension of the English language and its teaching was not seen as important by the teachers in my study.

The teachers implicitly and explicitly share two main reasons why they were not keen to teach the cultural dimension. The first is that the cultural content in the course materials – such as the texts about Provence in France and about James Bond (both in Excerpt 34) – tended to be unfamiliar to them, and hence, they were sometimes uncertain about how to teach it. This perspective is consistent with McKay’s (2003) observation that target culture content ‘can result in bilingual teachers of English feeling ‘insecure’ when teaching unfamiliar cultural information (p. 10). This finding also supports studies conducted by Atay
In my study, the teachers reacted to unfamiliar content in different ways: they either researched to make the content familiar, similar to the teachers participating in Bayyurt’s (2006, pp. 242-243) study; or they skipped teaching this content altogether, a reaction the teachers in my study share with the teachers in Stapleton (2000, p. 301), Onalan (2005 p. 229), Young and Sachdev (2011, p. 95), and Nguyen et al. (2016, p. 172).

Another possible reason shared by all the three teachers is that some of the cultural content was irrelevant to lives of the students and the teachers. This point relates particularly to the content found in the international textbook used by the teachers, with passages, for example, about John Lennon and other celebrities from Western countries (Excerpt 63). Such content, as is typical of EFL textbooks in Thailand as well as in other Expanding Circle countries, encourages students to learn about the culture of the target societies of Inner Circle countries (McKay, 2002, p. 82; Kumaravadivelu, 2006c, p. 208; Baker, 2016b, p. 72). However, from our interviews, the teachers felt this content had little or no connection with the students’ own culture(s). Their view is consistent with Agar (1994), Kramsch and Sullivan (1996), Wongsothorn et al. (2002) and insights reported from other Expanding Circle contexts, for instance, Morocco (Adaskou et al., 1990, p. 7), Japan (e.g. Stapleton, 2000, p. 30), and Turkey (Bayyurt, 2006, p. 241). Target culture content might not be appropriate for Thai TESOL given the country’s need to develop students’ ability to communicate interculturally.

From what I learned from the teachers (e.g. Excerpt 52), my observations and my reflections as an insider, a possible reason for the low priority attached to cultural and/or intercultural dimensions in TESOL classrooms is the lack of a link with examinations. Despite being part of explicit course objectives, these dimensions are not included meaningfully in examination coverage (see, for example, Byram, 1997, p. 50 and Corbett, 2003, Chapter 9, for how the target culture might be assessed. See also Canagarajah , 2006a; Jenkins, 2007, pp. 241-244; Elder and Harding, 2008; Sharifian and Clyne, 2008 for how communicative skills and performance in IC might be assessed). In contexts such as mine where exam results are highly prized, the absence of the cultural and intercultural dimensions from the exams sends a powerful message to teachers that they are not a priority or as important as the linguistic dimension of English (Corbett, 2003, p. 192; Onalan, 2005; Young and Sachdev, 2011).
7.1.5 Summary of the teachers’ purposes

The teachers’ perspectives regarding the purposes of teaching English seem to be based explicitly and implicitly in the linguistic dimension of English while de-emphasizing cultural and/or intercultural dimensions. In particular, these purposes largely involved the development of students’ abilities to use ‘English for instrumental purposes’ (Canagarajah, 2006b, p. 27) such as for examinations and for academic purposes.

The anchoring of their perspectives in largely culture-free teaching could mean that Thai students are not well prepared for using English either as a foreign language (with cultural knowledge and awareness appropriate for communicating with NESs) or as an international language (with the knowledge, skills and mindset appropriate for communicating with NESs as well as NNESs).

As discussed in Chapter 4, the subject of the English language has a close relationship with cultural and intercultural learning possibilities, and perhaps an even closer relationship than all other subjects in the undergraduate curriculum of GPU (as well as that of most Thai universities) The absence of teaching of these dimensions in the English language classroom represents a missed opportunity for Thai HE to prepare Thai graduates to engage in English-medium intercultural interactions.

More importantly, the teachers’ perspectives are not aligned with the lead of the top-level policies. ASEAN aims to support ASEAN citizens ‘to become proficient in the English language so that the citizens of the ASEAN region are able to communicate directly with one another and participate in the broader international community’ (ASEAN, 2009, p. 69). This means that the development of the knowledge, skills and mindset essential for IC need to be an integral part of the teaching of English (e.g. Byram, 1997; Sifakis, 2004; Cogo, 2012; Baker, 2016b). My study suggests that this has not yet happened in TESOL practice in my context. The absence of comments (in my interviews with the teachers) regarding the ASEAN as well as Thai policies could also mean that the top-down policy aspirations (that ASEAN citizens can communicate using English for intercultural purposes) have not reached practitioners on the ground.
This tension between policy and what teachers think contradicted an assumption I had prior to my fieldwork. This is because ‘ASEAN’ was/is a buzzword, and the topics related to the ASEAN Economic Community (AEC), along with the ongoing regional integration, tend to be well represented in Thai mass media. Further, educational institutions in Thailand appear to be keen to educate students about related topics such as geographical information of ASEAN countries, flags, and national dress. Based on these observations, I expected the development of ASEAN to have had an impact on Thai education, and in particular on TESOL. However, while conducting my fieldwork near the end of 2014, the teachers rarely referred to the ASEAN integration except for Kamala who mentioned ASEAN on only two occasions (Excerpts 18-19). This suggests that the ASEAN integration has had little impact on the teachers’ perspectives.

The gap between the top-level discourse and the discourse of practitioners on the ground seems to be a recurrent theme in the relevant literature. For instance, a similar gap regarding language policies can also be seen in the Asia-Pacific region, i.e. Mainland China, Hong Kong, Japan, Korea, Malaysia, Taiwan, and Vietnam (Nunan, 2003), (intercultural) citizenship education in Europe (Byram, 2008, p. 129), the cultural and intercultural objectives in national foreign language curriculum in Turkey (Atay, 2005), and Communicative Language Teaching policy in Thailand (Fitzpatrick, 2011).

7.2 TESOL paradigm assumptions

Regarding my second research question, ‘What are the teachers’ paradigm assumptions regarding the teaching and learning of the English language?’, I identified five main themes related to the teachers’ assumptions about:

- native-like pronunciation;
- non-native pronunciation and accents;
- broken English;
- the students’ main goal in learning English; and
- students as deficient language users.

These themes mutually reinforce and are interconnected with each other as well as with the themes identified in the discussion of RQ1.
7.2.1 Native-like pronunciation

The teachers’ most prevalent assumption is that NESs provide models of pronunciation. This is evident in the interviews during which the teachers voiced their preference for audio-visual teaching materials presented by NESs who would deliver ‘correct’ pronunciation (Excerpt 8).

As with grammatical accuracy, the standard for correctness is ‘[to] know how to pronounce a word according to phonetic principles or IPA. In short, to pronounce correctly like NESs do’ (Excerpt 7). This view is similar to that reported in other studies that suggests that non-native English-speaking teachers (NNESTs), including Thai teachers of English, prefer native-like pronunciation (Pica, 1994, pp.72-73; Sifakis and Sougari, 2005; Methitham, 2009; Shibata, 2009; Kongkerd, 2013; Lim, 2016; Melchien, 2016). In addition, their view of teaching native-like pronunciation corresponded to an objective of the English 1 course that ‘Students will learn about word stress and the standard pronunciation of English’ (English 1 course syllabus). When I asked the main course-coordinator (who is a NES) what ‘the standard pronunciation of English’ could mean, he told me that it referred to how English is spoken by NESs such as himself and other native English-speaking teachers (NESTs) (English1 textbook writer and course-coordinator interview, date 22nd October 2014).

Related to the teachers’ preference for native-like pronunciation is an assumption that NNESTs may be less competent than NESTs in terms of pronunciation. Further, as based on my professional experience, NESTs are usually regarded as the reference for the English language in Thailand (Todd, 2006; Methitham, 2009; Boriboon, 2011). Although the teachers in my study are TESOL professionals as well as proficient bilinguals, they have doubts about their English. For example, Kamala felt that NNESTs, including herself, could be ‘wrong or not sure’ when modelling English (Excerpt 8) and worried that they could not model the language as well as NESTs. Thus, the perspectives of the teachers seem to differ from those reported in studies such as Lim (2016, p. 7) who reports that Cambodian teachers ‘seemed to be proud of their pronunciation and believed that, with adequate preparation, they could teach English pronunciation as effectively as a qualified NES teacher could’ (p. 7). However, the self-criticality (Seidlhofer, 1996; Jenkins, 2005, p. 149) of the teachers in my study – viewing themselves as less competent than NESs and NESTs – is consistent with insights reported in previous studies in Thai TESOL (Methitham, 2009; Boriboon, 2011, p. 47) and elsewhere
Underpinning the NES anchor for teaching is the teachers’ assumption that students are learning English to communicate with NESs, an assumption which has been argued as common in TEFL (Widdowson, 1997, p. 145; Jenkins, 2006b, p. 137; Sifakis and Fay, 2011, p. 290). This is evident in Kamala’s statement that ‘Many times, we cannot get our messages across when communicating with farangs because, although we are saying this word, farangs do not get it because it is wrong. It is mispronounced’ (Excerpt 7).

7.2.2 Non-native pronunciation and accents

The teachers preferred native-like pronunciation and, consequently, sought to correct less native-like pronunciation and accents. In our interviews, they pointed out some pronunciation ‘problems’ of Thai students and Thai people in general (as influenced by the Thai language) such as the replacement of the /r/ sound with that of /l/ (Excerpt 6) and the absence of the ending sounds in words (Excerpt 7). Further, in the lessons I observed, Ploy encouraged her students to kra-dae and dudjarit (to pretend or act unnaturally, i.e. to speak English with stress and intonation the way NESs would do). The teacher told me that students should avoid speaking ‘Tinglish [Thai-English], but to have rising and falling intonation’. She elaborated that ‘When I say kra-dae and dudjarit, it is mutually understood that we [students] have to change to sound like farangs, not Thai way’ (Excerpt 58). She also talked about a listening practice activity she used ‘so that students could imitate [the modelled speech] by dudjarit and kra-dae’ (Excerpt 59). This view is consistent with a study undertaken in China regarding teachers’ stigma of speaking ‘Chinglish’ (Wang, 2015) and one in Japan regarding teachers’ possible negative attitudes towards Japanese-English (Shibata, 2009).

In addition to ‘Tinglish’, Ploy commented on the speech presented by ASEAN speakers of English in the audio-visual materials as ‘funny’, and ‘strange’, which does ‘not sound like English’ (Excerpt 60). These examples suggest to me that the teachers possibly have negative attitudes towards non-native pronunciation and accents, a perspective which echoes other studies such as Murray (2003, p. 159), Jenkins (2007, pp. 184-185), and Melchien (2016, p. 29).
The teachers voiced a common reason they did not want to use non-native or ASEAN English models in their teaching materials. For them, these models of pronunciation and accents could be unfamiliar to their students. For instance, Ploy commented that the ASEAN English pronunciation and accent in the audio-visual materials she played were ‘impossible to understand’ and ‘too difficult’ for students to understand (Excerpt 62). Likewise, Kamala stated that English from NNESs:

is hard for the kids to understand. Sometimes, it might have to begin with native speakers speaking in a clear manner, meaning that there is no issue of a language barrier. English is difficult, so there’s no need to make accent another issue [for understanding]. (Excerpt 8)

An explanation why the teachers were concerned about their students’ understanding might be linked to potential test results. For instance, Ploy voiced her concern that her students would not do well in a listening test if they had to listen to non-native English listening texts (Excerpt 62). This link to testing might also explain why the teachers in my study preferred NES accents, especially a General American accent that they felt was clear and easy to understand.

The perspectives of the teachers in my study contrast with those of Cambodian English language teachers in Lim’s (2016) study. The teachers in that study were reported to have positive attitudes towards teaching ASEAN English varieties and reflect that it is important for them to introduce their students to ASEAN English varieties. In addition, negative attitudes towards non-native English, including the ASEAN varieties of the teachers in my study, does not necessarily align with the perspectives of Thai students. For instance, in Jindapitak’s (2015) study, many Thai university students, despite regarding native-like pronunciation and accents as models to be learned, also felt that the knowledge of how people in ASEAN countries speak English will benefit them in understanding ASEAN speakers (p. 271).

Lessons about ASEAN English pronunciation and accents were part of the materials of the English 1 course. It is possible that if it was the teacher’s choice, with their negative attitudes and with the lack of understanding regarding the purposes of teaching them, the use of non-native pronunciation and accents as models in the teaching, then, is less likely. This could
mean that Thai students are not sufficiently exposed to non-native English pronunciation and accents, including those spoken by ASEAN people.

### 7.2.3 Broken English

Related to the teachers’ purposes for teaching grammar and grammatical accuracy (Section 7.1.1) is their assumption that students should not use broken, incomplete and/or ungrammatical English. This is evident in the feedback Ploy gave to her students in a lesson I observed. In that lesson, when displaying a students’ paragraph on the screen, Ploy commented that it was the language of *mia chao* or hired wives (Excerpts 47-48). Even though her feedback was for written work which usually requires a high level of grammatical accuracy, it was her choice of words which struck me. It is a derogatory term, and the use of it in her instruction possibly implied a negative attitude towards (or stigma of), people who use English in ways which do not conform to NES norms.

The teaching of writing took up a significant part in their teaching time which might explain why the teachers were preoccupied with the teaching of grammar and grammatical accuracy. The written mode of English communication for academic purposes has implicit links to the NES norms and native-like accuracy (Seidlhofer, 2004, p. 223; McDonough et al., 2013, p. 192), and ‘[l]earning to write involved imitating and manipulating models provided by the teacher and was closely linked to learning grammar’ (Richards, 2002, p. 23). Note that although one teacher, Maya, compared what she understood as the ‘British’ and ‘American’ styles of teaching writing (Excerpt 29), neither she nor any other teacher in my study made any comments about the NES norms underpinning their teaching of writing.

### 7.2.4 Students’ main goal in learning English

The teachers tended to assume that students are learning English to pass exams and/or to study higher-level courses. For instance, Kamala and Maya explicitly said that their IESP students wanted to pass the exams (Excerpts 2 and 37 respectively). Ploy also shared this view by stating that students were usually ‘motivated by scores’ (Excerpt 53). This assumption echoes existing literature (e.g. Wood, 1996, as cited in Borg, 2003, p. 95; Spratt, 2005, p.12; Zhou, 2010, p. 154). Nevertheless, this perspective of the teachers might not match with what students think. For instance, students in Kayaoğlu and Akbaş (2016, p. 66)
reported that they wanted to be able to communicate or interact with other people using English.

### 7.2.5 Students as deficient language users

The teachers tend to view that students are deficient language users. It is evident in their discussion of students’ ‘problems’ in learning English and producing the required language. For instance, when talking about an upcoming test, Ploy commented on her students’ ability to understand grammar lessons as ‘[t]o be frank, the students did not quite get it; did not understand anything. So, yesterday before the test, I reviewed these again before they did the test’ (Excerpt 50). She also commented that her students ‘neither remember nor observe. They do not pay attention and are always careless. What can I do to solve this problem?’ (Excerpt 48). Maya also commented on her students’ ability to think ‘[t]hey cannot think; we have to tell them straight away’ (Excerpt 23). Kamala remarked that most of her students were ‘rather passive’ and needed a lot of guidance in doing class activities (Excerpt 3). These attitudes towards students were consistent with those of the teachers of English reported in Comber and Kamler (2004, p. 293), Jenkins (2006b, p. 139), Chen and Goh (2011, p. 336), Le and Phan (2013, p. 259).

As discussed in Chapter 2, the attitudes towards students as deficient language users is likely to be, in part at least, shaped by the goal of native-like competence underpinning (foreign) language teaching (Kramsch, 1998, p. 28; Jenkins, 2002; Timmis, 2002, p. 243; Cook, 2007, p. 240). This view towards students, in turn, could shape the teachers’ purpose for their teaching (Wood, 1996, as cited in Borg, 2003, p. 95; Sifakis, 2008, p. 233). This is because the achievement or not of the goal of native-like competence is typically measured through examinations. Thus, the teachers tended to assume that the students’ priority is to pass exams or to study higher-level courses (Excerpts 42 and 44). They then taught in ways which would help the students achieve these short-term, instrumental goals rather than to develop the ability to use English in communication. In this regard, the teachers might have a low expectation on what their students can do with the language as reflected in Maya’s case:

> My goal is, at least, the kids must pass the exams and what they would achieve is the knowledge of 10 grammar points. If they can tell me how present simple is used, that is satisfactory for me. My goal has been met. ... because that is the input we give them; we cannot expect more from them. I think that I will achieve the goal and be able to help them. The exam results will tell. If they pass, that is okay. (Excerpt 27)
Further, the low expectations of students might also be a result of the teachers’ association of students’ motivation in learning English with their fields of study i.e. an indicator of their possible future careers. Maya commented that students majoring in fields of study which would seem to have more of an opportunity to use English would be more attentive when learning English. On the other side of the coin, students whose future careers were less likely to require a high level of English proficiency or skills such as ‘a sports coach’, need to just complete the English courses as one of the ‘requirements’ of their degrees (Excerpt 38).

The teachers also reflected how GPU students might have lost their confidence during the course of their English studies. This paradox is evident in Kamala’s accounts. In an interview, she implied that the freshmen were more active than the older students. The latter group referred to sophomores, juniors or seniors who ‘have lost their confidence’ and ‘would rather not answer anything (Excerpt 9). She added that ‘this group of kids lacks confidence in using the language because they have failed [this course] so many times’ (Excerpt 10). Similarly, Maya stated that she had to encourage her students to study ‘because they have failed the course more than three to four times’ (Excerpt 25). This means that the more they studied English, the less they would feel confident about learning and using English. It also suggests that teaching which focuses on grammar for exam preparation purpose could be useless for Thai students.

7.2.6 Summary of the teachers’ paradigm assumptions

The teachers’ paradigm assumptions are often anchored in the concepts of NESs and NES linguistic norms, the dominant concepts in Teaching English as a Foreign Language (TEFL). Their perspectives could, in turn, reinforce the importance of NESs in Thai society given that the term ‘native speaker’ can be translated into chaokhongpasa or ‘the owner of the language’ (see also Methitham, 2009, p. 94). Their perspectives confirm a widespread view regarding NESTs in Thailand (e.g. Todd, 2006, Methitham, 2009, Boriboon, 2011, p.47) and elsewhere (e.g. Tsui and Bunton, 2000, p. 294 as cited in Llurda, 2009, p. 127; Golombek and Jordan, 2005, pp. 519-520; Graddol, 2006, p. 19).

Commentators in the Thai TESOL context – such as L. Baker (2016a, p. 37) following Foley (2005) – observe that a possible reason why ‘the native speaker paradigm’ remains dominant in Thailand is that the country hesitates to embrace ‘the ownership’ of the English language
as it might intrude on ‘the well-preserved Thai language and culture’. This observation might be relevant to my Chapter 1 discussion regarding the monolingual perception of Thailand (e.g. Smalley, 1994). However, this did not seem to be the case for my study as well as in my personal and professional experience. I discuss the influences that shape the perspectives I identified from my study below.

**7.3 Shaping influences**

Based on the understandings of the teachers’ perspectives, in this section, I discuss the insights I learned from my study regarding my RQ3, ‘What are possible influences that shape the teachers’ perspectives on the purposes of and paradigm assumptions underpinning TESOL in their context?’

Although coming from different personal and professional backgrounds, the teachers tend to share similar perspectives regarding the purposes of, and paradigm assumptions about, the teaching of the English language. Their perspectives suggest:

a) short-term, instrumental purposes such as teaching English for exam preparation and for academic purposes;

b) insignificance of cultural and/or intercultural dimensions; and
c) the assumptions linked to NESs and NES linguistic norms.

As previously discussed, their perspectives are not dissimilar to those of teachers reported in the relevant literature. Understanding the influences that possibly shape their perspectives, therefore, might be helpful for TESOL teacher education in my country and beyond. This understanding could inform the changes needed in order to move towards paradigms which address Thailand’s needs in this increasingly interconnected world.

Framed by Host Culture Complex Heuristic (1994), the concept of ‘deep action’ (ibid), and a small culture approach (1999) (as discussed in Chapters 2 and 5), I considered a web of possible influences surrounding the teachers within and beyond their host institution. Based on my analysis, it is evident that wider influences such as invitations from TESOL scholars for practitioners to move away from the dominant concepts of NESs and NES norms in teaching English as well as the lead coming from the top-level policies, have had little impact
on the teachers’ perspectives. On the other hand, their perspectives tend to be shaped by their teacher education experiences and by influences from their host institution.

7.3.1 Teacher education experiences

The teachers tended to be unaware of ‘paradigm possibilities’ (Sifakis and Sougari, 2005; Sifakis and Fay, 2011, p. 286). This absence of an awareness suggested to me that the pre-service and in-service teacher education and support they had experienced could be a powerful influence on their perspectives.

The teachers might regard their teaching as appropriate for their classroom and for their students’ needs. However, based on my analysis, their perspectives might not be well-informed by the discussions in TESOL regarding paradigms. In our interviews, they demonstrated awareness of different TESOL methodologies such as the Communicative Language Teaching (CLT) approach, Task-Based Learning (TBL), and Problem-Based Learning (PBL), but they did not demonstrate an awareness of how English might be taught differently than the TEFL and to reflect the status of English as global lingua franca. This is evident in my interview with Kamala who stated that ‘I always tell the kids that we [Thais] do not have to be farangs’ (i.e. in terms of accent) (Excerpt 7), and ‘the kids will know that there are not only [NESs], but there is diversity in use, pronunciation and accents’ (Excerpt 12). This suggested to me that the teacher was aware of the diversity of English in terms of forms and accents (Jenkins, 2000, 2006a; Sifakis and Sougari, 2005; Brown, 2012, Cogo, 2012). Still, she did not explain her perspectives on what that might mean pedagogically. Thus, her EIL attitudes, as well as her positive attitudes towards the teaching of the cultural and intercultural dimensions, were rarely translated into practice.

7.3.1.1 Pre-service teacher education

Many English language teachers in Thai universities, including two of the teachers participating in my study and I, obtained post-graduate degrees from English departments, had not been trained in terms of TESOL pedagogy nor been made aware of the range of TESOL paradigms available. Thus, the teachers tended to teach according to their ‘comfortable, tried-and-tested routines’ (Seidlhofer, 1996, p. 72), their backgrounds and personal interests (e.g. Excerpt 15) or based on their assumptions such as the one in relation to students’ goals in learning English. In addition, despite occasionally critiquing the lessons
in the textbooks (either those selected or designed by the course-coordinating teams), the teachers usually followed the textbooks and taught accordingly to complete the syllabus. This approach also applied to the predetermined content that was to be tested in exams (Excerpts 2 and 23).

However, there was an exception in my study as one of the teachers, at the time of my fieldwork, had just been trained in a MA TESOL programme at an overseas university. From my analysis, her perspectives tended to lean towards grammar-based teaching for exam preparation purpose much more than the other two teachers. Moreover, she told me that she ‘suffered’ trying to apply the academic writing skills she studied at GPU in the UK academic setting. On the one hand, she commented that what she was teaching (as well as what she studied) at GPU ‘cannot be used’ in the real world and that her tutors told her that ‘Nobody uses it anymore, and it’s unnatural’ (Excerpt 29). On the other hand, in her teaching of academic writing in the lessons that I observed, she seemed committed to teaching according to the designated lessons in the textbook. It is possible that she associated her teaching more with her experience as an undergraduate student at the university (GPU) and with what she observed as the typical teaching practice there (I discuss this further in the next sub-section) rather than her training as a MA TESOL postgraduate student abroad. This might mean that teachers’ extensive experience as a/an (undergraduate) student could influence their perspectives more strongly than their professional training (Borg, 2004, p. 274).

7.3.1.2 In-service teacher education and support

From my professional reflections, in-service English language teachers in universities tend to have limited opportunities for teacher education and professional development, especially opportunities which encourage teachers to reflect upon the purposes of, and assumptions about, their practices. In-service university teacher education largely depends on each university’s professional development schemes. This could mean that there is no uniform or specific guideline for the orientation of English language teacher education in Thai universities. From my experiences of teaching and my experiences in the field, there were not many training opportunities for English language teachers at the university. Kamala mentioned a CLT training provided by an international publisher whose textbooks were utilised at the university (and it took place before I left GPU). The talk by Professor Sandra McKay I attended at the university in 2012 (as noted in the Introduction to this thesis), however, was a rare case. Without a strong commitment from the university to pursue the
TEIL or other innovative paradigms and without adequate teacher development schemes, the teaching and learning of English at the university would remain unchanged.

In addition to professional development schemes provided by the university, other opportunities for in-service teacher professional development include participation in seminars or conferences outside the university. These events are usually arranged by other organisations such as Thailand TESOL. However, due to time, financial and other constraints, it is not always possible for teachers to take part in such activities.

7.3.2 The host institution cultures
I pointed out earlier that the teachers’ perspectives were not in line with the top-level policies and institutional curriculum documentation. Not only did the teachers have inadequate education and experience, but the possibility exists that they taught to conform to what they perceived to be dominant agendas of the university. These perceived agendas could be the result of the host institution’s cultures – observable and emerging patterns of shared behaviour and values, at both the surface and deep action levels (as discussed in Chapter 2). Below, I discuss two main host institution cultures that I identified, namely: the university’s English for Academic Purposes agenda as underlined by its EMI policy; and the university’s examination culture.

7.3.2.1 The English for Academic Purposes agenda
The GEE curriculum at GPU was partly designed to accommodate the university’s policy of using English as the medium of instruction (EMI). Since the EMI entails students’ ability to use English for their English-medium studies, the GEE curriculum incorporated English for Academic Purposes (EAP) elements such as ‘study skills’ (IE course syllabus) and ‘researching and discussion skills’ (English 3 course syllabus). However, in their teaching that I observed, and in what they said in our interviews, the focus tended to be mainly on the teaching of (academic) writing. The writing-focused EAP agenda of the university influenced the teachers’ practices and could influence their perspectives regarding the purposes of, and paradigm assumptions about, the teaching of the English language.

An overemphasis on the teaching of the written EAP could intensify teachers’ perspectives regarding NES norms. This is because, academic written discourse in English typically
adheres to native-like accuracy and writing conventions originated in the Inner Circle. Thus, the EAP agenda might conflict with the university’s stance on Teaching English as an International Language for intercultural communication (TEIL for IC). In addition, in a writing-focused EAP course such as English, 3, although it had an aim to develop students’ ‘awareness of communicative English in inter-cultural contexts’ (English 3 course syllabus), I did not find any relationship between the course and the intercultural dimension.

7.3.2.2 The university’s examination culture
The university’s examination culture manifested itself in my study in at least three aspects: the university’s ‘deep action’, the pressures felt by teachers, and the insignificance of the cultural/intercultural dimensions.

The university’s ‘deep action’
The teachers discussed a ‘mission’ given by the university to help students in the ‘special’ version of the remedial course to pass the exams. The teachers were invited to act as ‘tutors’ i.e. ‘to do what we can to help the kids pass exams’ (Excerpt 25) and to adopt a ‘cram school’ style of teaching in order to accomplish this mission (Excerpts 2 and 25). They told me that the class meeting time was reduced from six hours to three hours. Thus, the course-coordinating team decided to include only grammar lessons and reading activities in the teaching of the course. Further, 90% of the final grade was assigned to grammar-based tests, quizzes and exams. These changes and decisions of the university definitely shaped the teachers’ goals and methods of teaching. This is evident in Maya’s statements that ‘the real objective’ of the course was to help students pass the exams (Excerpt 26) and ‘So, my view regarding the objectives has changed in terms of what exactly I want the kids to achieve. I want the kids to pass the exams’ (Excerpt 30).

This special arrangement was originally set out to alleviate the problem of so many students failing the course. However, none of the changes were documented, i.e. the syllabus remained ‘normal’ (Excerpt 2). This phenomenon may be understood as ‘deep action’ of the host institution (Holliday, 1994, p. 131, as discussed in Chapter 2). While the ‘surface action’ is clearly seen, documented and reported, ‘deep action’, exists consciously or unconsciously in the ‘real world’ of a host institution. This deep action of the university with reference to exams was likely to shape the teachers’ perspectives (Gandana and Parr, 2013) as it possibly implied to the teachers that teaching for exam preparation purpose was the main priority of
the university. Recognising such deep action is significant because when referring to the objectives of a course, the teachers relied on the (perceived and/or actual) information from the course-coordinating team, the school or the university rather than what was written in the syllabuses or the surface level (see, for example, Excerpts 31 and 45).

The recognition of the ‘deep action’ within the university is significant in that it represents the unstated ‘real world’ practice within the institution by people involved, and it is vital to understand this aspect in addition to what is visible at the surface in order to introduce appropriate change to the institution (Holliday, 1994, p. 131). The examination culture, however, is not unique to this university, but based on my experience as a student and my relationship with other universities, it is also dominant at other Thai universities and elsewhere (Prodromou, 1995; Byram and Risager, 1999; Cheng et al., 2004; Hiep, 2005; Han, 2010; Young and Walsh, 2010; Fitzpatrick, 2011; Nguyen, 2013; Liyanage et al., 2014; Nguyen et al., 2016).

**The pressures felt by teachers**

The university’s examination culture could contradict its EMI policy because there is a tension felt by the teachers caused by the need to teach in ways which would fulfil the EMI (aka the ‘100% English’) policy and teaching in ways most likely to enable students to pass the exams. At the heart of this tension, for one teacher at least, lies the fear that students, if taught by using only English, might not understand the (grammar) lessons fully and consequently fail the exams (Excerpt 51). This tension, although it might not be directly related to the move away from the TEFL paradigm towards TEIL, potentially undermines the university’s endeavour to become an ‘international’ university. This is because the status of English as a lingua franca in such internationalised environments (Baker, 2016c) can attract international students and staff. But, if teachers are pulled away from the EMI policy (because of the exams-focused pressures they experience), then the university is unlikely to fulfil its aspiration of becoming an ‘international’ institution.

The teachers in my study, as well as other English language teachers at GPU, were generally under pressure to ensure that they did not pass or fail too many students. This is evident in the following statement of Ploy, ‘If the kids do not understand [the lesson] and do not pass the exams, there will be a problem like, why? Did I not teach them well?’ (Excerpt 51).
A possible explanation for Ploy’s pressure is that at the end of each semester, the course-coordinator of each course would report the results to the GEE committee who would consider if the grading results from each section were ‘normal’. If there was any extreme case of students passing or failing any course, the teachers might have to explain to the committee the reasons for the abnormality. Further, as discussed in Chapter 4, the course-coordinator would assess the performance of each teacher in their team at the end of each term as part of the teacher’s professional evaluation, and it could impact teacher’s future salary.

The pressures felt by the teachers could also come from other Schools. For instance, Maya told me that a teacher was asked by a senior lecturer from the School of Nursing to adjust a grade for a student so that the student could pass the course and maintain their original study plan (Excerpt 39). This information could also shape a teacher’s perspective regarding what mattered and what did not matter at the university.

The insignificance of the cultural and intercultural dimensions

The GEE curriculum at GPU set ‘intercultural skills’, ‘cross-cultural awareness in using English as an international language’ and ‘a greater understanding of the ASEAN region’ as some of its objectives. At the surface level, this suggests an attempt by the university to move towards TEIL for IC. In terms of the cultural dimension, the university utilised a locally-produced textbook featuring ASEAN countries in one of its GEE courses. In its implementation of the GEE curriculum, however, the cultural and intercultural dimensions of English were downplayed by higher priority items as discussed throughout this chapter.

Moreover, at the time of writing this thesis, I was informed by one of the teachers that the ASEAN-themed textbook was no longer in use at the university because of the criticisms from many teachers (some of which I heard during my fieldwork) that the textbook and its audio-visual materials were not professionally produced. Therefore, the university replaced it, as well as other locally-produced textbooks in the GEE curriculum (i.e. English 2 and English 3), with a series of textbooks from an international publisher (featuring American English). This reversal may have meant the discarding of the lessons about specific information about ASEAN countries as well as the lessons about non-native, ASEAN English pronunciation and accents. Furthermore, the reversal could have implications on the importance of the teaching of ASEAN awareness and cultures, and more broadly, on the TEIL for IC.
7.3.3 Summary of the shaping influences

My discussion of the influences that possibly shaped their perspectives suggests that there are discourse inconsistencies across Thai HE regarding paradigms and purposes of TESOL. These inconsistencies are, for instance, between:

- the aspirations of the teachers to teach in ways which develop students’ cultural and intercultural competence and the teachers’ exam preparation-based perspectives;
- the aspirations for TEIL for IC from the top-level discourse and the perspectives of the teachers on the ground regarding the purposes of, and paradigm assumptions about the teaching of English;
- the aspirations for TEIL for IC from the top-level discourse and coherent and adequate teacher education and pre- and in-service teachers support;
- the aspirations of the university for TEIL for IC and their English for Academic Purposes agenda;
- the aspirations of the university for TEIL for IC and the university’s examination culture; and
- the aspirations for TEIL for IC from the top-level discourse and the university’s examination culture.

In a summary, based on my discussion of the teachers’ perspectives, their professional context and the influences that possibly shape their perspectives, there seem to be three main competing paradigms within the GEE curriculum, namely: TEFL, TEIL and TEAP. Each of these paradigms is underpinned by assumptions and purposes as summarised in Table 8.

This three-way paradigm ‘battle’ might explain why the aspirations to move towards TEIL for IC cannot yet become reality in TESOL in Thai HE. Moreover, these competing forces are pulling TESOL in different directions. In this scenario, it is less likely that TESOL in Thai HE can serve the country’s needs in developing graduates who are equipped with the knowledge, skills and mindset essential for English-medium IC. Moreover, the paradigm ambiguity may not enable graduates to use English as a foreign language to communicate with NESs or enable them to use the language well in their English-medium studies.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Paradigm</th>
<th>Assumptions</th>
<th>Purposes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Teaching English as a Foreign Language (TEFL)                           | - NESs and NES norms                                                       | - Native-like competence (e.g. grammatical accuracy, native-like pronunciation)  
|                                                                        |                                                                             | - Examinations purposes (i.e. NES norms and native-like competence as ‘testable’ through exams)  
|                                                                        |                                                                             | - NNESs ↔ NESs communication                                               |
| Teaching English for Academic purposes (TEAP)                           | - NES norms (i.e. grammatical norms and academic English conventions)      | - Academic purposes (i.e. for English-medium HE)                          
|                                                                        |                                                                             | - The university’s EMI and ‘international’ position (indirect)             |
| Teaching English as an International Language (TEIL) (as manifested in syllabuses) | - EIL norms (i.e. students’ performance in using EIL for IC)               | - The knowledge, skills and mindset essential for English-medium IC (i.e. between NNESs ↔ NNESs and between NNESs ↔ NESs) |

Table 8: Competing TESOL paradigms and purposes in my study

Concluding remarks

In this chapter, I discussed the insights gained from my study in terms of my three research questions. First, in relation to RQ1, the main purposes of the teachers tend to relate to: a) the linguistic (and not cultural and/or intercultural) dimension of the TEFL paradigm; b) the exam preparation purpose; and c) the writing-focused English for Academic Purposes. Next, I identified the teachers’ paradigm assumptions (RQ2), the ones which are predominantly explicitly and implicitly associated with the notions of NESs and NES norms. Building on from these insights, I discussed the possible influences on their perspectives (RQ3). These perspectives tend to be shaped by insufficient teacher education and by their host institution culture. The teachers’ perspectives and influences that shaped their perspectives represent: a) the aspirations for moving towards teaching English which might better address Thai higher education’s needs in this intercultural age; b) teaching which prioritises the assessment of students’ linguistic proficiency against NES norms and competence; and c) teaching in ways which would enable students to use English in their English-medium higher education. These
three competing paradigms and purposes reflect the complexities which potentially hinder moving Thai HE towards appropriate and purposeful TESOL. They also have implications for the direction of TESOL in Thai HE, and perhaps for other similar Expanding Circle, EFL countries, too. I discuss these implications, as well as the contributions my study makes in the following chapter.
Chapter 8 - Contributions, Implications and Recommendations

Introduction
In this closing chapter, I begin by briefly summarising the main insights gained from my study (Section 8.1) as a prelude to discussing the contributions to the relevant body of knowledge my study makes (Section 8.2) and the implications of my study for policy and practice in Thailand and other similar settings (Section 8.3). I then bring my thesis to an end with my recommendations for future research (Section 8.4).

8.1 Summary of the main insights
My study investigated the perspectives of three, Thai national, TESOL practitioners in a Thai public university regarding their practices. Based on my analysis, the three main insights I have gained concern:

1) the short-term, instrumental purposes of TESOL – i.e. teaching English for exam preparation and (writing-focused) academic purposes rather than for IC;
2) the concepts of NESs and NES linguistic norms which are prevalent in Teaching English as a Foreign Language (TEFL) as well as Teaching English for Academic Purposes (TEAP); and
3) the divergent paradigms and purposes of TESOL between different sectors within Thai HE.

The teachers in my study predominantly focused on teaching the NES-framed linguistic dimension of English for exam preparation and academic purposes. Their assumptions tended to be underpinned by the notions of NESs as the reference point for the language (e.g. Golombek and Jordan, 2005, pp. 519-520; Snow, 2006; Todd, 2006; Llurda, 2009, p. 129; Methitham, 2009; Boriboon, 2011) and NESs linguistic norms (e.g. Pica, 1994, pp.72-73; Sifakis and Sougari, 2005; Methitham, 2009; Shibata, 2009; Kongkerd, 2013; Lim, 2016; Melchien, 2016). These assumptions have been underpinning TESOL in EFL, Expanding Circle countries for a long time, as well as in Thailand where there seems to be little momentum for change.
The teachers prioritised the NES-framed linguistic dimension while the teaching of the knowledge, skills and mindset for IC was nearly non-existent on the teachers’ radar. Further, the teachers tended to attach little value to teaching and learning about ‘cultures’ (Stapleton, 2000, p. 301; Gandana and Parr, 2013, p. 237; Nguyen et al., 2016, p. 172). The teachers in my study voiced two possible reasons: the cultural content tends to be unfamiliar to them; and that it tends to be irrelevant to lives of the students and the teachers. These reasons are not uncommon as previous studies (e.g. Adaskou et al., 1990; Castro et al., 2004; Bayyurt, 2006; Atay, 2005; Gandana and Parr, 2013; Jing, 2013; Nguyen et al., 2016) have pointed out. In addition to what the teachers said, my study indicated that absence of any planned assessment in the course syllabuses signifies a general lack of importance or relevance of the cultural/intercultural dimensions to the teachers (e.g. Corbett, 2003, p. 192; Onalan, 2005; Young and Sachdev, 2011).

Regarding the possible influences on the perspectives of the teachers regarding the purposes and paradigm assumptions, my study suggests that the teacher education they had experienced may not have adequately introduced them to paradigm possibilities other than the established TEFL paradigm, nor exposed them to how English might be taught differently for other purposes. In addition, the host institution culture tended to have repercussions on the teachers’ perspectives (e.g. Alptekin, 2002, p. 61; Le, 2004, p. 9; Jenkins, 2007, p. 246; Feryok, 2008; Sifakis, 2008, p. 231; Gandana and Parr, 2013, pp. 241-242). The influences identified in my study were the university’s English for Academic Purposes agenda and the university’s examination culture.

Finally, my discussion of the teachers’ perspectives and the influences on their perspectives suggests a set of competing paradigms with differing purposes in TESOL in Thai HE, namely:

1) Teaching English as a Foreign Language (TEFL) for exam preparation purposes;
2) Teaching English as an International Language for intercultural communication (TEIL for IC); and
3) Teaching English for Academic Purposes (TEAP) for English-medium HE and for the university’s aspiration of becoming an ‘international’ university.
These competing paradigms and purposes are pushing and pulling TESOL in different directions. This might explain why moving towards other newer paradigms such as TEIL which recognise English as a tool for IC has not yet become a reality in Thai HE.

8.2 Contributions to the body of knowledge

The main contribution of my study is to the substantial body of TESOL literature on paradigm possibilities and appropriacy. In the current literature, these discussions foreground three main themes to each of which, as discussed below, I believe my study contributes.

8.2.1 Context-sensitive TESOL

The first theme concerns a call for teaching of English that is appropriate for differing social contexts (e.g. Prabhu, 1990; Holliday, 1994; Kumaravadivelu, 1994; 2001; 2006c; Bax, 1995; 1997; 2002; 2003). My study sought to better understand how TESOL practices in Thai HE might be made more appropriate in this intercultural age, especially at a point in time when the country is playing its part in the increasingly integrated ASEAN region. This regional strategic development has many implications for intra-regional and international English-medium communication.

The issues of appropriacy in TESOL are mostly concerned with methodology or approach (e.g. questioning any under-considered embrace of Communicative Language Teaching). As with scholars such as Kramsch and Sullivan (1996), Alptekin (2002) and Le (2004), my study extended this concept to the area of TESOL paradigms, i.e. the sets of ideological assumptions underpinning the teaching and learning of English. It also introduced a way of understanding paradigm appropriacy through a framework suggested by Holliday which encompasses the notion of appropriate methodology (1994), the Host Culture Complex (HCC) heuristic (ibid), and a small culture approach (1999). This framework enabled me to conceptualise the overall picture of my study, and in particular, the HCC heuristic enabled a deeper analysis of the teachers’ perspectives which are complex and embedded in a web of influences.

8.2.2 TESOL paradigm possibilities

The second theme concerns TESOL paradigm possibilities (Sifakis and Fay, 2011) in this time when English has become (and will continue to be, for the foreseeable future) ‘the’
global lingua franca. My study highlights how the assumptions regarding NESs and NES
linguistic norms (as they underpin the TEFL and TEAP paradigms) might not address the
current needs of Thailand in preparing graduates to engage in English-medium IC. In this
regard, my study contributes to the body of literature challenging established assumptions in
TESOL and calling for a move towards more appropriate paradigms such as TEIL (e.g.
Smith, 1976; Baxter, 1983; Seidlhofer, 1996; 2005; Graddol, 1997; 2006; Jenkins, 2000;
2009; Alptekin, 2002; McKay, 2002; 2003; Crystal, 2003; Sifakis, 2004; 2008; Holliday,
2005; Bayyurt, 2006; Canagarajah, 2006b; Boriboon, 2008; 2011; Kachru, 2008; Matsuda,
2009; Sharifian, 2009; Shibata, 2009; Kirkpatrick, 2010; 2011; 2012; Baker, 2011; 2012;
2016b; Sifakis and Fay, 2011; Cogo, 2012; Dewey, 2012; Jindapitak, 2013; 2015; Jindapitak
and Teo, 2013; Kongkerd, 2013; Renandya, 2013; Trejo and Fay, 2013; Fay et al., 2016; Lim,
2016; Luo, 2016).

My study offers additional understanding of why the TEIL paradigm has not yet gained much
traction within many Expanding Circle countries including Thailand despite the literature-
based and top-down policy encouragement. It does so by offering some insights into the
continuing bottom-up (teachers), institutional (universities) as well as the top-down (policies)
adherence to exams-driven education.

In addition to TEFL, my study identified the TEAP paradigm as an important influence at the
institutional level as well as in the broader Thai HE. TEAP, especially the teaching of
academic writing, is associated with NES norms, native-like accuracy and conventions
originated in English-speaking academic communities (Canagarajah, 2001; Jenkins, 2014;
Baker, 2016c). Thus, without addressing these possible underpinning assumptions, TEAP
could intensify the NES-framed TESOL and impede the change in assumptions regarding the
ownership of English.

Finally, while my study contributes to a growing body of TEIL literature in Thai TESOL (e.g.
Jindapitak and Teo, 2013; Kongkerd, 2013), it also adds additional understanding to the
‘global perspective’ of TEIL literature (Sharifian, 2009, p. 2, see also Canagarajah, 2006b, p.
27).
8.2.3 TEIL for IC

The third theme concerns the integration of the intercultural dimension into language teaching (e.g. Byram, 1997; Kramsch, 1998; Corbett, 2003; Sifakis, 2004; Baker, 2011; 2016b; Cogo, 2012). My study argues that the teaching of the skills, the awareness, and the mindset helpful for IC should be regarded as an important purpose of the teaching and learning of English as an International Language in Thai HE.

My study offers additional understanding to the intercultural literature, specifically in ASEAN. It explored some selected ASEAN and Thai HE policies in the light of IC. More importantly, my study provides empirical understanding of the current situation regarding the teaching and learning of the intercultural dimension in Thai HE. Despite the aspirations from the top-level for ASEAN citizens to be able to communicate with each other (using English), my study indicates that, in practice, this dimension (as well as the teaching of ‘cultures’) tends to be overlooked by the teachers and the university.

8.3 Implications for policy and practice

My study has implications for TESOL in Thai HE and in other similar contexts. First, as teachers are at the heart of my study, there are implications for teacher education. Nevertheless, it seems implausible that teachers alone can change the direction of TESOL. Since teachers are embedded in, and their perspectives are largely shaped by, the Host Culture Complex, my study also has implications for Thai universities, the Office of Higher Education Commission (OHEC), and for the ASEAN association.

8.3.1 Implications for TESOL teacher education

Since teachers are key drivers of the teaching, teacher education is of great importance to the reorientation of TESOL. While I noted in the previous chapter that many English teachers in Thai universities did not have pedagogic training because it is not a requirement for their position, there are many graduate programmes in Thailand for pre-service and in-service TESOL teachers. Even so, Methitham (2014) observes that teachers enrolled in these programmes:

are coached to follow prototypical methods developed from Anglo-American cultural perspectives. These method packages are commercialized as the ‘best’ way to teach English, not only in Thailand, but also elsewhere around the world. In this climate, the teachers are reluctant to develop their own methodical approaches, design their own
curriculum, and make instructional judgment according to their prior experiences. Such ‘best’ teaching method packages discourage their potential and opportunity to become intellectuals who are autonomous and critical about their everyday teaching practice. (p. 26)

Therefore, teacher education programmes as well as teacher professional development schemes can help teachers: a) become aware of the purposes of, and their paradigm assumptions about, the teaching of English; and b) make informed choices regarding appropriate paradigms.

8.3.1.1 Awareness of the purposes and paradigm assumptions
To bring about changes in teachers’ perspectives and thus their practices, teachers need opportunities to critically reflect upon their practices (e.g. Bax, 1997; Warford and Reeves, 2003, p. 61; Ellis, 2006; Snow et al., 2006; Sifakis, 2008, p. 236; Seidlhofer, 2011; Dewey, 2015, p. 132). In this regard, teachers may need to evaluate whether their purposes for teaching and their paradigm assumptions align with the current local, regional and global situation of English. At GPU, the sign (reproduced as Figure 21 below) posted by an English language teacher in front of their office was aimed at students. However, teachers, too, should take note and become more aware of their exam-preparation based purposes of teaching English.

![Figure 21: ‘English is for life, not just the next quiz or exam!’ sign](image)

As informed by my study, the wider influences such as those related to the ASEAN and global integration were not apparent in the teachers’ perspectives. Thus, teachers require
more awareness of the current global situations (e.g. increasing interconnectedness and the roles of English in this) and of the movement toward regional integration. To begin with, teachers might consider the challenges of, and opportunities for, the ASEAN integration on their students’ future use of English. Following Sifakis and Sougari (2005, p. 483), one possible line of action would be to provide teachers with training which explicitly focuses on the current global English phenomenon. In my case, one topic might be the possible impact of the ASEAN’s English language policy on Thai graduates.

Teachers could also be made aware of how the spread of English and its global role have implications for EIL communication, and thus for their practices (Seidlhofer, 2004, pp. 227-228; 2011; Sifakis and Sougari, 2005, p. 483; Matsuda, 2009, p. 171; Wang, 2015). Similar to Dewey (2012), teachers need to understand the characteristics of English used in EIL communication. They need to be aware of their own possible negative attitudes towards English used in EIL settings which might not perfectly conform to NES linguistic norms (e.g. usually referred to as ‘broken English’, ‘errors’, ‘problems’ or ‘mistakes’) (p. 147).

A teacher in my study stated that non-native pronunciation and accents were ‘impossible to understand’ and ‘too difficult’ for students to understand. Therefore, if the teaching of non-native pronunciation and accents is an objective, students might need to be trained by being adequately exposed to how English is spoken by people around the world (Jenkins, 2000; 2006a; Matsuda, 2003; Sifakis and Sougari, 2005; Seidlhofer, 2011; Cogo, 2012), especially English as spoken by ASEAN people (e.g. Lim, 2016). This is in order to develop their tolerance for different accents associated with English usage (Derwing and Munro, 2009, p. 486) and train their ears to understand accents other than those of NESs. This could benefit their short-term goal of testing successfully as well as prepare them for future English-medium intercultural encounters.

Again, through reflections, teachers might become aware of their own possible negative perspectives towards non-native speech because those negative perspectives could possibly influence their students’ attitudes as well. This kind of reflection could also make the teachers realise that they – and not only NESTs – are proficient English language users (Prodromou, 2007), and that they also can be models for their students in EIL communication (Bayyurt, 2006, pp. 244-245).
8.3.1.2 Ability to make informed choices

Building on the teachers’ knowledge and awareness, TESOL teacher education might aim at enabling teachers to make informed choices of paradigm(s) for their teaching (and combinations of them perhaps). First, teachers need to acquire knowledge about a range of teaching and learning paradigms available to them. The discussion about paradigm possibilities needs to cover the linguistic, cultural and intercultural dimensions of English to demonstrate to the teachers that teaching English involves more than linguistic norms and competence.

There are several factors for teachers to consider in relation to paradigm appropriacy. As informed by my study, one of the important local influences concerns their students’ needs for learning English. For instance, do the students wish to master grammatical knowledge and/or communication skills? Do they prefer to strive for achieving native-like accuracy and/or becoming proficient EIL users? Sifakis (2004, pp. 245-246) provides some useful example questions for teachers to use. These questions may also be used to help raise the students’ awareness of EIL. Dewey’s (2012; 2015) ‘postnormative’ approach to language teaching provides opportunities for teachers to ‘generate location-specific, classroom-oriented innovative language models’ (Kumaravadivelu, 1994, p. 29 as cited in Dewey, 2012, p. 166). To consider appropriate model(s) and norm(s) for their classroom, teachers can ask themselves a set of questions with regard to the contextual conditions, the appropriacy and relevancy of the norm-driven teaching, the model(s) and norm(s) of English to be taught and additional pragmatic strategies required (Dewey, 2012, p. 166).

In addition to raising students’ awareness, teachers, too, may need to reflect upon their own views concerning students. This is crucial because the view towards students having a language deficit can shape the teachers’ expectations of what students can do. If the teachers have low expectations of their students, it seems highly possible that the students will not be developed to their full potential.

Beyond developing teachers’ awareness and knowledge of EIL for IC, teacher educators might consider developing ‘self-directing and self-determining teachers capable of reflecting upon, and shaping, their own pedagogic experiences, and eventually transforming such experiences’ (Kumaravadivelu, 2006a, p. 21). In settings where teachers are ‘allowed’ to teach in ways which they deem appropriate (Sifakis, 2007, p. 365), teacher education could
enable them to translate their awareness and knowledge into practice. Teachers should be able to design, implement and evaluate their plan of integrating EIL for IC in their own teaching practices (ibid, p. 370, see also Tantiniranat and Fay, forthcoming). Nevertheless, teachers are usually under influences from the host institution and the broader educational system. I discuss some recommendations for Thai universities and policy makers below.

8.3.2 Implications for Thai universities

It is important that universities are aware of their potential influences on teachers and the teaching and learning of English. Further, while the university in my study included a set of curriculum objectives which could be identified with the TEIL paradigm, this did not necessarily mean that the curriculum would be implemented accordingly. Universities might, therefore, consider two aspects. First, they need to be aware of their ‘deep action’ (Holliday, 1994). Deep action can reveal to teachers and students what the ‘real’ priorities are and may lead to the provision of TESOL that does not conform to the stated syllabuses. Thus, universities might explore how the English language curriculum is actually implemented, e.g. how it is influenced by the university’s hidden agendas or decisions related to TESOL.

Second, universities might need to consider their stance concerning paradigms. For instance, if TEIL for IC is considered, they might need to develop a curriculum which is oriented towards developing students to use EIL for IC and to develop ways of assessing students’ performance accordingly (e.g. Matsuda, 2003, pp. 723-724; Sharifian and Clyne, 2008, p. 36.8). Teachers’ voices need to be heard, and teachers need to be an active part of curriculum development. While the assessment of TEIL and intercultural competence is beyond the remit of my study, it is now clear to me that universities and the TESOL practitioners in them need to shift away from teaching grammar and grammatical accuracy for exam preparation purposes (Sifakis, 2008, p. 237). In addition, as discussed in Chapter 1, more and more Thai universities are striving to become international’ universities. English as the main medium of instruction (EMI) as well as EAP, therefore, are key elements in their General Education English curriculum. The universities might consider possible implications of the EMI/EAP on the overall objectives of the curriculum.
8.3.3 Implications for English language policies

My study has implications for both ASEAN’s and Thailand’s English language education policies. To begin with, despite its English-privileging policy, i.e. English as the only working language, ASEAN has no regional policy regarding English language education and might reasonably now address this void. In devising such a policy, ASEAN might take into account the complexities of the linguistic landscape of ASEAN countries, and, in particular, be attentive to the gaps in economic development and each country’s relationship with the English language – i.e. between ASEAN Outer Circle countries (Brunei, Malaysia, the Philippines and Singapore) and Expanding Circle countries (Cambodia, Indonesia, Laos, Myanmar, Thailand and Vietnam). Bearing in mind these gaps, ASEAN might identify support for each member country to narrow the gaps between the most and least developed countries and to increase the less developed countries competitiveness should English remain the regional lingua franca.

For Thailand, as noted in Chapter 1, there is ambiguity in the recent policy of the OHEC (2016) which aims to raise the standard of TESOL in Thai universities. However, in my view, the policy could potentially intensify the exams-driven and NES-framed teaching of English in Thailand. The OHEC, therefore, might consider developing a clear English language education policy for Thai universities. Ideally, the national policy should be in line with the ASEAN-level policy, but while the regional policy has not yet been devised, the OHEC could articulate clearly in its policy:

- its stance on English (e.g. English as a foreign language to be used to communicate mainly with NESs or as an international language for IC and how English for Academic Purposes fits on the spectrum);
- the students’ goals (i.e. what students can do with the English language); and
- appropriate assessments (e.g. for how English is used in the ASEAN region, see Kirkpatrick, 2014, pp. 31-32 for his suggestions regarding suitable assessment in the ASEAN context).

Finally, while the discourse of ‘intercultural (communication/communicative) competence’ is emerging in Thai HE policies, there is no clear definition of what this term might mean (Tantiniranat, 2015a, p. 162), and how these skills could be developed or meaningfully assessed. This vagueness can be counterproductive as universities might superficially adopt it
into their curricula. Again, as with any imported TESOL methodology and approach, the OHEC and Thai universities need to be critical about adopting a ready-made concept of ‘intercultural competence’ and related terms (Baker, 2015, p. 133).

8.4 Recommendations for future research

My study opens doors for possible future research in the area of paradigm appropriacy as understood from practitioner perspectives. Researchers might consider the following recommendations.

More similar studies might be carried out to involve more teachers within a university, or across different universities, or as a comparative study between those teaching at public and private universities in order to gain a wider and deeper perspective. Researchers might also consider investigating perspectives of foreign (including native English speaker) teachers in Thai universities regarding similar issues.

Future studies, if possible, might consider exploring perspectives of teachers working at different educational levels. For instance, researchers might conduct comparative studies exploring perspectives of teachers in universities and secondary schools in order to gain deeper insights into their perspectives, the influences which shape their perspectives, and more broadly, the overall TESOL structure of Thailand.

With reference to the finding in my study regarding teachers’ assumptions about students’ purposes for learning English, it is possible that what teachers think might not be in line with students’ perspectives (see, for example, Wang, 2015; D’Angelo, 2016). Further research might investigate possible incongruences between teacher and student perspectives in Thai universities regarding the purposes of teaching and learning English. Researchers could also explore differing domains such as accuracy, native-like pronunciation, non-native and ASEAN pronunciation and accents. In so doing, it will help to bridge understanding between teachers and students and make teaching and learning more engaging and purposeful.

As I noted in Chapter 3, few studies have investigated the Thai university TESOL context regarding the purposes of, and paradigm assumptions about, the teaching of English from in-service teacher perspectives. From my observation, many of the studies I referred to on
related topics in the Thai context are unpublished PhD theses conducted by Thai and non-
Thai nationals with affiliations to overseas universities, especially in the US or UK (including
my study). This indicates that considerably more research studies in this area and in this
research setting could be carried out to contribute to appropriate and purposeful TESOL.
Finally, informed by the EMI policy influences on the teachers’ perspectives and the TESOL
provision of the university in my study, future studies might seek to better understand
implications of EMI (a key to the internationalisation of HE) for the teaching of English in
this intercultural age. Researchers might explore the relationship (and tensions) between EMI
and differing paradigms (with their differing purposes) such as TEFL, TEIL and TEAP. The
resulting understanding might shed light on how to balance the proliferation of TESOL
paradigms in Thai HE (see, for example, Jenkins, 2014; Baker, 2016c, for discussions related
to EMI from an ELF perspective).

Concluding remarks
In this final chapter, drawing from my analysis and discussions in the preceding chapters, I
summarised the main insights from my study. Based on these insights, I considered potential
ccontributions of my study to the relevant body of knowledge and implications for policy,
practice and research. Nevertheless, more similar studies are required to lead to a
reorientation of TESOL in Thai HE.

As a final comment, my study arose from my personal and professional background in the
field of TESOL. Through my study, I had opportunities to reflect upon my own purposes of,
and assumptions about, the teaching of English while learning about those of my fellow
teachers. I became more aware that several assumptions we shared might not help students
thrive in this increasingly English-medium intercultural age. A mere change of teachers’
perspectives cannot change the direction of TESOL, and my study is only a small part of the
process. However, at a personal level, conducting this study helped me tremendously in
positioning myself as a TEIL educator with a more fine-tuned sense of purpose in my
profession.
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Appendices

Appendix A - Participant recruitment process

A.1 Participant recruitment email

Email message

เรียน อาจารย์...

ดิฉัน น.ส. สุตราภรณ์ ตันตินีรนาถ ขอเรียนเชิญท่านเข้าร่วมโครงการวิจัยที่มีวัตถุประสงค์เพื่อศึกษาความรู้ของ อาจารย์ผู้สอนภาษาอังกฤษชาวไทยเกี่ยวกับการสอนภาษาอังกฤษในระดับมหาวิทยาลัย ของไทย


หากท่านต้องการข้อมูลเพิ่มเติม กรุณาติดต่อ ผู้วิจัยทาง email: s.tantiniranat@postgrad.manchester.ac.uk

ขอแสดงความนับถือ
น.ส. สุตราภรณ์ ตันตินีรนาถ
PhD Student, The Manchester Institute of Education,
School of Environment, Education and Development
The University of Manchester, UK

English translation

Dear,

My name is Sutraphorn Tantiniranat. I would like to invite you to participate in a research project which aims to study perspectives of Thai national, English language teachers regarding English language teaching in Thai universities.

You can find the details of the project at the provided link. https://selectsurveys.humanities.manchester.ac.uk/TakeSurvey.aspx?SurveyID=98MK8p9K

Should you require further information, please contact the researcher at email: s.tantiniranat@postgrad.manchester.ac.uk.

Yours respectfully,

Miss Sutraphorn Tantiniranat
PhD Student, The Manchester Institute of Education,
School of Environment, Education and Development
The University of Manchester, UK
A.2 PIS and Consent Form (web-based questionnaire)

Part I: PIS form (online)
Part I. Participant Information Sheet

You are being invited to take part in a research project which is a part of Ms Sutraphorn Tantiniranat's PhD studies. Before you decide it is important for you to understand why the research is being done and what it will involve. Please take time to read the following information carefully and discuss it with others if you wish. Please ask if there is anything that is not clear or if you would like more information.

Who will conduct the research? Sutraphorn Tantiniranat, Manchester Institute of Education, University of Manchester, M13 9PL, UK

Title of the Research: TESOL Purposes and Paradigms in an Intercultural Age: Practitioner Perspectives from a Thai University

Aim of the research?: It aims to explore the perspectives of some of Thai TESOL practitioners regarding the purposes of English Language Teaching (ELT) and the appropriate paradigms for teaching it in Thailand.

Why have I been chosen?: You are chosen to participate in this study because you are a professional practitioner of English language teaching working in a Thai public university.
What would I be asked to do if I took part?: I would ask you to complete the attached questionnaire. Please keep this information sheet and sign a consent form. Please return the completed questionnaire and consent form to me as directed.

What happens to the data collected?
I will review the responses in the questionnaire. If you agree to take part in my research (Question 11), I will contact you to discuss further details.

How is confidentiality maintained?: The questionnaire will be seen only by me and I will keep your personal information strictly confidential.

What happens if I do not want to take part or if I change my mind?: It is up to you to decide whether or not to take part. If you decide to take part you are still free to withdraw at any time without giving a reason.

Will I be paid for participating in the research?: No payment will be made for taking part in the research.

Will the outcomes of the research be published?: The outcomes of the research will be published in anonymous form in PhD thesis, academic books and/or journals.

Contact for further information: Please contact me by email: s.tantiniranat@postgrad.manchester.ac.uk or Dr. Richard Fay, (Supervisor) by email: richard.fay@manchester.ac.uk.

What if something goes wrong?: If there are any issues regarding this research that you would prefer not to discuss with members of the research team, please contact the Research Practice and Governance Co-ordinator by either writing to 'The Research Practice and Governance Co-ordinator, Research Office, Christie Building, The University of Manchester, Oxford Road, Manchester M13 9PL', by emailing: Research-Governance@manchester.ac.uk, or by telephoning 0161 275 7583 or 275 8093

Part II. Consent Form

1. I confirm that I have read the attached information sheet on the above study and have had the opportunity to consider the information and ask questions and had these answered satisfactorily.

   - I understand that my participation in the study is voluntary and that I am free to withdraw at any time without giving a reason.
   - I agree to the use of anonymous quotes.
   - I agree that any data collected may be passed to other researchers.
   - I agree that any data collected may be published in anonymous form in PhD thesis, academic books and/or journals.

   ☐ Yes
   ☐ No

2. I agree to take part in the study.

   ☐ I am not interested in taking part in the study.

Name _______________________________
Date _______________________________
Email _______________________________
Telephone _______________________________
A.3 PIS and Consent Form for the main participants (teachers)

(Participant Information Sheet)

The purpose of this PIS is to provide information and consent form for the main participants (teachers) involved in the research project led by Ms. Sunatra Singhanana at the Manchester Institute of Education, University of Manchester, M13 9PL, UK.

Objectives of the research:

1) Conduct a thorough understanding of the teaching perspective of Thai teachers regarding the purpose of English language teaching and the appropriate teaching methods in Thai universities.

2) Thai teachers are invited to participate in the research project because:
   1) They are experts in teaching English language
   2) They teach English language in state universities and
   3) They teach English language to students in other disciplines.

Procedure for participation if you agree to participate in the research:

1) Keep this document and sign the consent form. You will be informed when you sign the consent form.
2) Participate in the research project by providing information and documents to the researcher.
3) The researcher will conduct interviews with you on your teaching experiences and perspectives.
4) The researcher will observe your classroom and record your teaching activities.

How the information will be used:

1) The researcher will transcribe the interview and send the transcript to you if you agree.
2) You will be asked to watch the recorded video of your teaching and comment on your teaching.
3) The researcher will not use the interview or video for any other purpose. However, some parts of the interview may be used in academic publications.

Privacy:

All information will be stored on a password-protected computer. The researcher will not disclose your name or university for the purpose of privacy. The information will be kept for 5 years and then destroyed.

If you do not want to participate in the research project or change your mind:

You can withdraw from the research project at any time without giving any reason.

Compensation:

There is no compensation for participating in the research project.

Duration of the research project:

The researcher will conduct interviews with you 5 times, each lasting no more than 1 hour, and will conduct classroom observations 8 times in 4 weeks.
สถานที่ในการวิจัย: ผู้วิจัยจะขอสัมภาษณ์ท่านในบริเวณมหาวิทยาลัย และเข้าสังเกตการณ์ในห้องเรียนที่ท่านสอน

การเผยแพร่และตีพิมพ์: ผลของการวิจัยจะถูกตีพิมพ์ในรูปแบบดุษฎีนิพนธ์, หนังสือ และ/หรือบทความวิชาการโดยไม่เปิดเผยข้อมูลส่วนตัวของท่าน

หากท่านต้องการข้อมูลเพิ่มเติม กรุณาติดต่อ: ผู้วิจัย email: s.tantiniranat@postgrad.manchester.ac.uk หรืออาจารย์ที่ปรึกษา Dr. Richard Fay email: richard.fay@manchester.ac.uk.

หากท่านได้รับการปฏิบัติที่ไม่ตรงตามที่ได้ระบุไว้ในเอกสารชี้แจงนี้ ท่านสามารถแจ้งผู้บริหารงานจริยธรรมและธรรมาภิบาลได้ที่: 'The Research Practice and Governance Co-ordinator, Research Office, Christie Building, The University of Manchester, Oxford Road, Manchester M13 9PL', by emailing: Research-Governance@manchester.ac.uk, or by telephoning 0161 275 7583 or 275 8093.
Participant Information Sheet

You are being invited to take part in a research project which is a part of Ms Sutraphorn Tantiniranat’s PhD studies. Before you decide it is important for you to understand why the research is being done and what it will involve. Please take time to read the following information carefully and discuss it with others if you wish. Please ask if there is anything that is not clear or if you would like more information.

Who will conduct the research? Sutraphorn Tantiniranat, Manchester Institute of Education, University of Manchester, M13 9PL, UK

Title of the Research: TESOL Purposes and Paradigms in an Intercultural Age: Practitioner Perspectives from a Thai University

Aim of the research?: It aims to explore the perspectives of some of Thai TESOL practitioners regarding the purposes of English Language Teaching (ELT) and the appropriate paradigms for teaching it in Thailand.

Why have I been chosen?: You are chosen to participate in his study because: 1) you are a professional practitioner of English language teaching; 2) you are teaching in a Thai public university; and 3) you are teaching at least two courses of English language to non-English major students. There will be up to 6 teachers participating in this study.

What would I be asked to do if I took part?: Please keep this information sheet and sign a consent form. Please return the signed consent form to me. In this research, I would ask you to take part in a series of semi-structured interviews on your perspectives regarding the English language teaching. I would also need your permission for me to observe and video record your English classes.

What happens to the data collected?
I will transcribe the interviews, and if you are interested, I will give you a copy of the transcript. I will use the videos from the classroom observations to invite you to reflect upon your own teaching. The transcripts and the videos will only be used by me and not be used for any other purpose. The transcripts might also be used to write and publish articles in academic journals. You are welcome to see the final thesis and/or a copy of the articles before they are published.

How is confidentiality maintained?: The data will be stored securely and sorted on my password-protected and encrypted computer. Your name, the names of other persons you mention during the interviews as well as the university will be changed so you will not be unidentifiable. The data will be archived for 5 years after which it will be destroyed.

What happens if I do not want to take part or if I change my mind?: It is up to you to decide whether or not to take part. If you decide to take part you are still free to withdraw at any time without giving a reason.

Will I be paid for participating in the research?: No payment will be made for taking part in the research.

What is the duration of the research?: I will ask you to participate in 5 interviews (maximum 1 hour each) and I will observe your 8 classes in the period of 4 weeks.

Where will the research be conducted?: The interviews and the classroom observations will be arranged at the university you are teaching.
Will the outcomes of the research be published?: The outcomes of the research will be published in anonymous form in PhD thesis, academic books and/or journals.

Contact for further information: Please contact me by email: s.tantiniranat@postgrad.manchester.ac.uk or Dr. Richard Fay, (Supervisor) by email: richard.fay@manchester.ac.uk.

What if something goes wrong?: If there are any issues regarding this research that you would prefer not to discuss with members of the research team, please contact the Research Practice and Governance Co-ordinator by either writing to ‘The Research Practice and Governance Co-ordinator, Research Office, Christie Building, The University of Manchester, Oxford Road, Manchester M13 9PL’, by emailing: Research-Governance@manchester.ac.uk, or by telephoning 0161 275 7583 or 275 8093.
จุดมุ่งหมายและกระบวนทรรศน์ในการสอนภาษาอังกฤษในยุคการสื่อสารระหว่างวัฒนธรรม: ทัศนคติของผู้สอนภาษาอังกฤษในระดับมหาวิทยาลัยในประเทศไทย (TESOL Purposes and Paradigms in an Intercultural Age: Practitioner Perspectives from a Thai University)

เอกสารยินยอมโดยได้รับการบอกกล่าว

(CONSENT FORM)

หากท่านยินยอมและเต็มใจที่จะเข้าร่วมงานวิจัยนี้ กรุณาที่เครื่องหมายถูก (✓) ในช่องขวามือ และลงลายมือชื่อด้านล่าง

1. ข้าพเจ้าได้อ่านข้อมูลของงานวิจัยข้างต้น มีโอกาสพิจารณาข้อมูลต่างๆ และได้เข้าใจตามเงื่อนไขแล้ว

☐

2. ข้าพเจ้าเข้าใจถึงการเข้าร่วมในการวิจัยเป็นไปอย่างยิ่งธรรมและข้าพเจ้าสามารถถอนตัวเมื่อใดก็ได้โดยไม่ต้องแจ้งเหตุผล

☐

3. ข้าพเจ้าเข้าใจถึงการมีส่วนเกี่ยวข้องกับผลการวิจัยและจะไม่ได้รับผลประโยชน์จากการวิจัย

☐

4. ข้าพเจ้ายินยอมให้ผู้วิจัยนำคำพูดหรือวัตถุที่ข้าพเจ้าให้มาใช้โดยไม่ต้องแจ้งเหตุผล

☐

5. ข้าพเจ้ายินยอมให้ข้อมูลที่จัดเก็บไว้ส่งต่อไปยังผู้วิจัยท่านอื่น

☐

6. ข้าพเจ้ายินยอมให้ข้อมูลที่จัดเก็บไว้ส่งต่อไปยังผู้วิจัยท่านอื่น หน่วยงาน และเครื่องมือวิเคราะห์

☐

ข้าพเจ้ายินยอมจะเข้าร่วมในงานวิจัยนี้

______________________________________
ชื่อผู้เข้าร่วมวิจัย

______________________________________
วันที่

______________________________________
ลายมือชื่อ

______________________________________
ชื่อผู้ให้ข้อมูลและขอความยินยอม

______________________________________
วันที่

______________________________________
ลายมือชื่อ
If you are happy to participate please tick (✓) the boxes on the right and sign the consent form below.

1. I confirm that I have read the attached information sheet on the above study and have had the opportunity to

☐ consider the information and ask questions and had these answered satisfactorily.

2. I understand that my participation in the study is voluntary and that I am free to withdraw at any time without giving

☐ a reason.

3. I understand that the interviews will be audio-recorded and my teaching will be video-recorded.

☐

4. I agree to the use of anonymous quotes.

☐

5. I agree that any data collected may be passed to other researchers.

☐

6. I agree that any data collected may be published in anonymous form in PhD thesis, academic books and/or journals.

☐

I agree to take part in the above project

____________________________________  __________________________  __________________________
Name of participant                            Date                            Signature

__________________________________________
Name of person taking consent                    Date                            Signature
A.4 PIS and Consent Form for persons in charge

(Participant Information Sheet)

ท่านได้รับเชิญให้เข้าร่วมการวิจัยซึ่งเป็นส่วนหนึ่งของการศึกษาที่มีผู้ชื่นชอบเป็นอาจารย์ของ น.ส. สุตราภรณ์ ตันตินีรนาถ กลุ่มที่ท่านจะ
ตัดสินใจเข้าร่วมในการวิจัยหรือไม่ให้ท่านใช้เวลาอ่านทำความเข้าใจเกี่ยวกับเป้าหมายของการวิจัย และสิ่งที่ควรต้องการก่อนที่ท่านจะเข้าร่วมใน
งานวิจัยนี้อย่างละเอียด ท่านสามารถปรึกษาแก่ผู้ชื่นชอบเพื่อช่วยในการตัดสินใจเข้าร่วมการวิจัย และกูรูปฏิเสธความผิดหวังโดยท่านมีข้อสงสัยหรือ
ต้องการข้อมูลเพิ่มเติม

ชื่อผู้วิจัย: น.ส. สุตราภรณ์ ตันตินีรนาถ สถาบัน Manchester Institute of Education, University of Manchester, M13 9PL, UK

ชื่อโครงการ: จุดมุ่งหมายและกระบวนทรรศน์ในการสอนภาษาอังกฤษในมุคการสื่อสารระหว่างวัฒนธรรม: ทัศนคติของผู้สอน
ภาษาอังกฤษในระดับมหาวิทยาลัยในประเทศไทย(TESOL Purposes and Paradigms in an Intercultural Age: Practitioner Perspectives from a Thai University)

วัตถุประสงค์ของการวิจัย: โครงการวิจัยนี้จัดทำขึ้นเพื่อศึกษาทัศนคติของผู้สอนภาษาอังกฤษชาวไทยเกี่ยวกับจุดมุ่งหมายของการสอน
ภาษาอังกฤษ และกระบวนการหรือรูปแบบการสอนภาษาอังกฤษที่เหมาะสมในประเทศไทย

ท่านได้รับเชิญให้เข้าร่วมการวิจัยนี้เพื่อ: ท่านเป็นผู้รับผิดชอบเกี่ยวกับการจัดการเรียนการสอนภาษาอังกฤษในสถาบันของ
ท่านข้อมูลที่ท่านให้จะทำให้ผู้วิจัยเกิดความเข้าใจเกี่ยวกับวิจัยดังกล่าวขึ้น

ขั้นตอนการปฏิบัติตามท่านเข้าร่วมโครงการวิจัย: กรุณาเก็บเอกสารนี้ไว้ และลงนามในเอกสารยินยอมโดยได้รับการบอกกล่าว  กรุณา
คืนเอกสารยินยอมโดยได้รับการบอกกล่าวที่ลงนามแล้วให้แก่ผู้วิจัยในการเข้าร่วมวิจัยผู้วิจัยจะขอให้ท่านแล้วเกี่ยวกับการเรียนการสอน
ภาษาอังกฤษในสถาบันของท่านจากตำแหน่งและมุมมองของท่าน

ข้อมูลที่ท่านให้จะถูกเก็บไว้เป็นอย่างไร: ผู้วิจัยจะจดบันทึกประเด็นและสรุปใจความจากการสนทนาและจะส่งส่วนให้ท่านที่
ต้องการผู้วิจัยจะไม่นำเสนอทางของท่านไปใช้เพื่อการอื่นเช่นข้อมูลที่ท่านให้จะเป็นส่วนหนึ่งของดุษฎีนิพนธ์และอาจนำไปใช้ประกอบการเขียน
และคิดเห็นในวารสารวิชาการสำหรับการอ้างอิงของผู้วิจัยเพื่อเป็นความเห็นของท่านที่มีต่อคิดเห็น

การรักษาความลับของข้อมูลที่จะถูกเก็บรักษาในคอมพิวเตอร์ส่วนที่เกี่ยวกับผู้วิจัย ผู้วิจัยจะเปลี่ยนแปลงข้อมูลส่วนตัวของท่าน ข้อมูลดังกล่าวท่านจะได้รับผ่านไป 5 ปีก่อนจะถูกทำลาย
หากคุณไม่ต้องการเข้าร่วมงานวิจัยหรือเปลี่ยนใจภายหลัง: คุณสามารถตัดสินใจเข้าร่วมโครงการหรือไม่ก็ได้ คุณสามารถถอนตัวออกจากโครงการวิจัยเมื่อใดก็ได้ โดยไม่ต้องแจ้งเหตุผล

ค่าตอบแทนที่จะได้รับ: ไม่มีการจ่ายค่าตอบแทนสำหรับการเข้าร่วมในงานวิจัย

ระยะเวลาของโครงการวิจัย: ผู้วิจัยจะขอสนทนากับคุณประมาณ 30 นาที - 1 ชั่วโมง

สถานที่ในการวิจัย: ผู้วิจัยจะขอสนทนากับคุณในบริเวณมหาวิทยาลัย

ผลของการวิจัยจะถูกตีพิมพ์ในรูปแบบดุษฎีนิพนธ์, หนังสือ และ/หรือบทความวิชาการโดยไม่เปิดเผยข้อมูลส่วนตัวของคุณ

หากคุณต้องการข้อมูลเพิ่มเติม กรุณาติดต่อ: ผู้วิจัย email: s.tantiniranat@postgrad.manchester.ac.uk หรืออาจารย์ที่ปรึกษา Dr. Richard Fay email: richard.fay@manchester.ac.uk.

หากคุณได้รับการปฏิบัติที่ไม่ตรงตามที่ได้ระบุไว้ในเอกสารชี้แจงนี้ คุณสามารถแจ้งผู้สานงานจริยธรรมและธรรมาภิบาลได้ที่: 'The Research Practice and Governance Co-ordinator, Research Office, Christie Building, The University of Manchester, Oxford Road, Manchester M13 9PL', หรือ email: Research-Governance@manchester.ac.uk, หรือโทรศัพท์ 0161 275 7583 หรือ 0161 275 8093.
Participant Information Sheet

You are being invited to take part in a research project which is a part of Ms Sutraphorn Tantiniranat's PhD studies. Before you decide it is important for you to understand why the research is being done and what it will involve. Please take time to read the following information carefully and discuss it with others if you wish. Please ask if there is anything that is not clear or if you would like more information.

Who will conduct the research? Sutraphorn Tantiniranat, Manchester Institute of Education, University of Manchester, M13 9PL, UK

Title of the Research: TESOL Purposes and Paradigms in an Intercultural Age: Practitioner Perspectives from a Thai University

Aim of the research?: It aims to explore the perspectives of some of Thai TESOL practitioners regarding the purposes of English Language Teaching (ELT) and the appropriate paradigms for teaching it in Thailand.

Why have I been chosen?: You are chosen to participate in his study because you are a person in charge of the ELT of your institution. Your insights will enable me to understand the context of my research better.

What would I be asked to do if I took part?: Please keep this information sheet and sign a consent form. Please return the signed consent form to me. In this research, I would ask you to talk about the English language teaching and learning at your university from your position and point of view.

What happens to the data collected? : I will take note on related issue and summarize our conversation, and if you are interested, I will give you a copy of the summary. The summary will only be used by me and not be used for any other purpose. The insights you provide will be a part of the basis of my PhD thesis. The information you provide will also be used to write and publish articles in academic journals. You are welcome to see the final thesis and/ or a copy of the articles before they are published.
**How is confidentiality maintained?:** The data will be stored securely and sorted on my password-protected and encrypted computer. Your name, the names of other persons you mention during the interviews as well as the university will be changed so you will not be unidentifiable. The data will be archived for 5 years after which it will be destroyed.

**What happens if I do not want to take part or if I change my mind?:** It is up to you to decide whether or not to take part. If you decide to take part you are still free to withdraw at any time without giving a reason.

**Will I be paid for participating in the research?:** No payment will be made for taking part in the research.

**What is the duration of the research?:** I would like to discuss you views in a conversation-like manner and it will last between 30 minutes – 1 hour.

**Where will the research be conducted?:** The meeting will be arranged at your university.

**Will the outcomes of the research be published?:** The outcomes of the research will be published in anonymous form in PhD thesis, academic books and/or journals.

**Contact for further information:** Please contact me by email: s.tantiniranat@postgrad.manchester.ac.uk or Dr. Richard Fay, (Supervisor) by email: richard.fay@manchester.ac.uk.

**What if something goes wrong?:** If there are any issues regarding this research that you would prefer not to discuss with members of the research team, please contact the Research Practice and Governance Co-ordinator by either writing to ‘The Research Practice and Governance Co-ordinator, Research Office, Christie Building, The University of Manchester, Oxford Road, Manchester M13 9PL’, by emailing: Research-Governance@manchester.ac.uk, or by telephoning 0161 275 7583 or 275 8093.
เอกสารยินยอมโดยได้รับการบอกกล่าว

(CONSENT FORM)

หากท่านยินยอมและต้องการที่จะเข้าร่วมงานวิจัยนี้ กรุณาทำเครื่องหมายถูก (✓) ในช่องที่ถูกต้อง และลงนามด้านล่าง

1. ท่านได้อ่านข้อมูลของงานวิจัยที่ท่านมี ได้มีโอกาสพิจารณาข้อมูลต่าง ๆ และได้เข้าใจง่ายพอได้แล้ว

2. ท่านเข้าใจดีว่าการเข้าร่วมในงานวิจัยเป็นไปอย่างอิสระและท่านสามารถถอนตัวเมื่อใดก็ได้โดยไม่ต้องแจ้งเหตุผล

3. ท่านเข้าใจดีว่าท่านอาจมีบทสนทนาถูกบันทึกเสียง

4. ท่านยินยอมให้ผู้วิจัยนำคำพูดของท่านไปใช้โดยไม่ต้องแจ้งเหตุผล

5. ท่านยินยอมให้ผู้วิจัยนำข้อมูลวิจัยส่งต่อผู้วิจัยท่านอื่น

6. ท่านยินยอมให้ผู้วิจัยนำข้อมูลไปตีพิมพ์ในดุษฎีนิพนธ์ หนังสือ และ/หรือบทความวิชาการ

ข้าพเจ้ายินยอมจะเข้าร่วมในงานวิจัยนี้

______________________________________
ชื่อผู้เข้าร่วมวิจัย วันที่ ลายมือชื่อ

______________________________________
ชื่อผู้ให้ข้อมูลและขอความยินยอม วันที่ ลายมือชื่อ
If you are happy to participate please tick (✓) the boxes on the right and sign the consent form below.

1. I confirm that I have read the attached information sheet on the above study and have had the opportunity to consider the information and ask questions and had these answered satisfactorily.

☐

2. I understand that my participation in the study is voluntary and that I am free to withdraw at any time without giving a reason.

☐

3. I understand that the conversation might be audio-recorded.

☐

4. I agree to the use of anonymous quotes.

☐

5. I agree that any data collected may be passed to other researchers.

☐

6. I agree that any data collected may be published in anonymous form in PhD thesis, academic books and/or journals.

☐

I agree to take part in the above project

____________________________________  __________________  __________________________________
Name of participant                          Date                          Signature

____________________________________  __________________  __________________________________
Name of person taking consent                Date                          Signature
Appendix B - Observation form

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Teacher code:</th>
<th>Class no.:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Subject:</td>
<td>Week: of</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date:</td>
<td>Time:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Room:</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Description of what happened</th>
<th>Points for discussion</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Observation summary:
### Appendix C - The fieldwork calendar

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 Fr</td>
<td>1 Mo</td>
<td>1 We</td>
<td>1 Sa</td>
<td>1 Mo</td>
<td>1 Th</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Tu</td>
<td>2 Tu</td>
<td>2 Th</td>
<td>2 Su</td>
<td>2 Tu</td>
<td>2 Fr</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Su</td>
<td>3 We</td>
<td>3 Fr</td>
<td>3 Mo</td>
<td>3 We</td>
<td>3 Sa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Mo</td>
<td>4 Th</td>
<td>4 Sa</td>
<td>4 Tu</td>
<td>4 Th</td>
<td>4 Su</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 Tu</td>
<td>5 Fr</td>
<td>5 Su</td>
<td>5 We</td>
<td>5 Fr</td>
<td>Public Holiday</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 We</td>
<td>6 Sa</td>
<td>6 Mo</td>
<td>6 Th</td>
<td>6 Sa</td>
<td>6 Tu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 Th</td>
<td>7 Su</td>
<td>7 Tu</td>
<td>7 Fr</td>
<td>7 Su</td>
<td>7 We</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 Fr</td>
<td>8 Mo</td>
<td>8 We</td>
<td>8 Sa</td>
<td>8 Mo</td>
<td>8 Th</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 Sa</td>
<td>9 Tu</td>
<td>9 Th</td>
<td>9 Su</td>
<td>9 Tu</td>
<td>9 Fr</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 Su</td>
<td>10 We</td>
<td>10 Fr</td>
<td>10 Mo</td>
<td>10 We</td>
<td>Public Holiday</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 Mo</td>
<td>11 Th</td>
<td>11 Sa</td>
<td>11 Tu</td>
<td>11 Th</td>
<td>11 Su</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 Tu</td>
<td>12 Fr</td>
<td>12 Su</td>
<td>12 We</td>
<td>12 Fr</td>
<td>LAST DAY OF INSTRUCTIONS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13 We</td>
<td>13 Sa</td>
<td>13 Mo</td>
<td>13 Th</td>
<td>13 Sa</td>
<td>13 Tu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14 Th</td>
<td>14 Su</td>
<td>14 Tu</td>
<td>14 Fr</td>
<td>14 Su</td>
<td>14 We</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 Fr</td>
<td>15 Mo</td>
<td>15 We</td>
<td>15 Sa</td>
<td>15 Mo</td>
<td>15 Th</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16 Sa</td>
<td>Depart Manchester</td>
<td>16 Tu</td>
<td>16 Th</td>
<td>16 Su</td>
<td>16 Tu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17 Su</td>
<td>Arrive Bangkok</td>
<td>17 We</td>
<td>17 Fr</td>
<td>17 We</td>
<td>17 Sa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18 Mo</td>
<td>18 Th</td>
<td>18 Sa</td>
<td>18 Tu</td>
<td>18 Th</td>
<td>18 Su</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19 Tu</td>
<td>19 Fr</td>
<td>19 Su</td>
<td>19 We</td>
<td>19 Fr</td>
<td>19 Mo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20 We</td>
<td>20 Sa</td>
<td>20 Mo</td>
<td>20 Th</td>
<td>20 Sa</td>
<td>20 Tu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21 Th</td>
<td>21 Su</td>
<td>21 Tu Exams</td>
<td>21 Fr</td>
<td>21 Su</td>
<td>21 We</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22 Fr</td>
<td>22 Mo</td>
<td>22 We Weak</td>
<td>22 Sa</td>
<td>22 Mo</td>
<td>22 Th</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23 Sa</td>
<td>23 Tu</td>
<td>23 Th Public Holiday</td>
<td>23 Su</td>
<td>23 Tu</td>
<td>23 Fr</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24 Su</td>
<td>24 We</td>
<td>24 Fr</td>
<td>24 Mo</td>
<td>24 We</td>
<td>24 Sa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25 Mo</td>
<td>25 Sa</td>
<td>25 Tu</td>
<td>25 Th</td>
<td>25 Sa</td>
<td>25 Tu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26 Tu</td>
<td>26 Fr</td>
<td>26 Su</td>
<td>26 We</td>
<td>26 Fr</td>
<td>26 Mo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27 We</td>
<td>27 Sa</td>
<td>27 Mo</td>
<td>27 Th</td>
<td>27 Sa</td>
<td>27 Tu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28 Th</td>
<td>28 Sa</td>
<td>28 Tu</td>
<td>28 Fr</td>
<td>28 Sa</td>
<td>28 We</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29 Mo</td>
<td>29 We</td>
<td>29 Su</td>
<td>29 Fr</td>
<td>29 Sa</td>
<td>29 Mo Depart Bangkok</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30 Mo</td>
<td>30 Sa</td>
<td>30 Tu</td>
<td>30 Sh</td>
<td>30 Su</td>
<td>30 Tu Arrive Manchester</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31 Su</td>
<td>31 Fr</td>
<td>31 We</td>
<td>31 Sa</td>
<td>31 Su</td>
<td>31 Mo</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix D - An example of a stimulated recall (SR)

1) I gave the following prompt to my participants:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Time in the video</th>
<th>Lesson/activity</th>
<th>Reflections</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 1.  | 1.24             | My ideal mate   | **What?** I was teaching my students to use adjectives to describe their ideal mates.  
**Purposes:** I wanted the students to be able to describe characteristics of people.  
**Why?** Adjectives are very important to know if you want to describe things and people. My students know a wide variety of adjectives but they only use the ones they are familiar with. So, I wanted them to recall what they already know so that they will use them more often. |
| 2.  | 1.37             | This is my ideal mate | **What?** I showed a picture of a handsome man  
**Purposes:** to exemplify my ideal mate.  
**Why?** I want to attract my students’ attention. So, I showed them a picture which I think attractive. |
| 3.  | 4.20             | Stress          | **What?** I was teaching my students about stressing using a rubber band and their hands  
**Purposes:** I wanted my students to know that there’re stressed syllables in English.  
**Why?** My students don’t stress when they pronounce English words. I think it’s influenced by their L1. |

Table 9: An example of a stimulated recall

2) I showed a practicum video (available at [http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=iISul9UQYvc](http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=iISul9UQYvc)) to the participants and informed them that I was going to pretend to be the teacher in the video and talk about some events in my teaching.

3) I pretended to talk about parts of the video as shown in Table 9 below.
Appendix E - An example of my reflective/reflexive account

2 Oct 14

1. From my classroom observation and SR interview with TC 1 [Kamala], I realised that the [participants’ responses regarding] the purposes of teaching and learning could be about anything. When teachers have opportunities to talk about any activities in their class and if I care enough to learn about it more even if the activity is not directly related to English language, I learned about the purposes to teach or help students in other areas such as to remind students to be attentive when doing homework or tests, being honest, strategies in learning e.g. how to memorise points learned and discipline.

Dilemma: If I ask the participants about their purposes of teaching English by using a question like ‘As an English language teacher, what do you expect your students to be able to do or what characteristics they should have?’, the response I receive would be too narrow, and it would prevent unexpected information to emerge. However, asking too broad questions, the answers might not be relevant to my research agenda. Therefore, the generality and specificity of questions needs to be balanced.

2. The teacher said that my questions during the interview made her realise that it was her fault ['บกพร่อง', i.e. flaw or error] in her teaching, and that she should have linked all activities together well (i.e. she should have asked students questions after they had read a passage about Vietnamese English). I then explained to her that it was not my intention to spot any mistakes in her teaching, but I made some observations about the activities in the class and her teaching. Anyway, I became aware that my research activities may affect changes in the teacher’s teaching.

(Translation)
### Fieldwork Data Log: Main participants

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Week</th>
<th>Kamala</th>
<th></th>
<th>Maya</th>
<th></th>
<th>Ploy</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Date</td>
<td>08-Sep-14</td>
<td>10-Sep-14</td>
<td>08-Oct-14</td>
<td>09-Oct-14</td>
<td>17-Nov-14</td>
<td>19-Nov-14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Type of data generated</strong></td>
<td>Observation summary (words)</td>
<td>Interview (Hours)</td>
<td>SR Notes (words)</td>
<td>Observation summary (words)</td>
<td>Interview (Hours)</td>
<td>SR Notes (words)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Amount of data generated</strong></td>
<td>824</td>
<td>00:32:37</td>
<td>592</td>
<td>585</td>
<td>428</td>
<td>283</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Date</strong></td>
<td>11-Sep-14</td>
<td>15-Sep-14</td>
<td>17-Sep-14</td>
<td>15-Oct-14</td>
<td>16-Oct-14</td>
<td>17-Oct-14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Amount of data generated</strong></td>
<td>823</td>
<td>334</td>
<td>642</td>
<td>181</td>
<td>363</td>
<td>564</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Date</strong></td>
<td>18-Sep-14</td>
<td>22-Sep-14</td>
<td>23-Sep-14</td>
<td>05-Nov-14</td>
<td>06-Nov-14</td>
<td>10-Nov-14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Amount of data generated</strong></td>
<td>965</td>
<td>974</td>
<td>320</td>
<td>617</td>
<td>785</td>
<td>1017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Date</strong></td>
<td>25-Sep-14</td>
<td>29-Sep-14</td>
<td>01-Oct-14</td>
<td>12-Nov-14</td>
<td>13-Nov-14</td>
<td>14-Nov-14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Amount of data generated</strong></td>
<td>348</td>
<td>373</td>
<td>494</td>
<td>337</td>
<td>272</td>
<td>1559</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Date</strong></td>
<td>02-Oct-14</td>
<td>08-Oct-14</td>
<td>362</td>
<td>00:36:06</td>
<td>Final Interview</td>
<td>190</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Amount of data generated</strong></td>
<td>563</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix G - A sample transcript

Interview 18 Participant: Ploy

Week 1 Date: 21 Nov 2014
Course: English 1
I = Interviewer, P = Ploy

P: วันนี้มีเด็กคนหนึ่งมาส่งงาน คือจริงๆเราไม่ได้ให้ส่งค่ะ แต่เด็กคนนั้นขยันอยากทำแล้วอยากจะรู้ว่าตัวเองทำถูกมั้ยก็เอามาให้ดูใน class ตอนเช้า ถ้าเป็น class ตอนบ่าย เกิดอย่างนี้ มันจะเป็นอะไรที่ที่จะเอาให้ดูพอสมควรก็จะเอาดูแล้วล่ะ ด้วยความที่รู้สึกว่าเป็นเรื่องไม่เกี่ยวกับเด็กนี้เท่าที่ทำกันนั้น เรายังคงแสดงแนวว่าเราจะเอาเรื่องนี้แล้ว จะส่งขอก่อน show แต่เปิดเดี่ยว ทุกอย่างเป็นเสีย เลือกเป็นในopot

P: ก่อน focus มาที่เรื่องว่าในเนื้อหาดังนี้ หน้าที่มีเนื้อหาตัวข้อใดจะชักให้เด็กเห็นว่าจะเรียน opinion paragraph มีเทคนิคเด้งอะไร ซึ่ง week หนึ่งเรียนได้และนำไปในเรื่องของการเขียน topic sentence ว่า topic ที่ดี คือแนวของการเขียนจะมี form ซึ่งเป็นระเบียบแนวทาง หรือเป็น form แบบเรียงของ conclusion จะมี form pattern เป็นต้นของเรื่อง หรือจะเป็นที่เรื่องนี้ ลูกนี้ต้องการให้ show ตนเองเด็กช่วยให้เด็กดังเด็กเขียนแบบนั้นที่เรานำให้ไป แต่ที่นี้ก็ยังเด็กนี้ไม่ได้ให้ point ของเรื่องเพราะหาได้ต่อต้นๆก่อนจะมีเด็กที่ต้องการแสดง In my opinion เราจะต้องอย่างไรในเรื่อง จริงๆให้ทำให้ 2 reason ทำให้ได้ ซึ่งต้องดูให้รู้สึกว่า ok, the first reason, the second reason คือเรื่องปกติ แต่เด็กจะไม่เข้าใจว่าเมื่อมี reason มันจะต้อง มีการจับประเด็นเพิ่มเติมหรือไม่ทำให้เด็กเข้าใจเรื่องจริงในการสอน

P: จริงๆแล้ววิธีนี้ [หนังสือเรียน] ถ้าเกิดเป็น digital file จะดีมาก เพราะเราสามารถ crop แล้วทำให้ใส่ได้เลยทำให้ดูได้ พอมาอย่างนี้รู้สึกเสียเวลาแล้วมันไม่งามนั่นคือเหตุผลว่าทำไมถึงอยากได้

P: อันนี้ก็คือจะให้รู้ว่าข้อใดนี้ ส่วนที่เป็น topic sentence เนี่ยมันมี point 2 point ได้แก่อะไรบางจุดจาก point 2 point แล้วก็มากล่าวเป็นได้ ให้เป็นสีเขียวเพื่อเป็นตัวแทนของ topic sentence

P: เลยก็เป็นสีเขียวเพื่อให้รู้ว่า point แรก เราเห็นว่าอาจจะต้องการฉันมาเป็นเด็กดังนี้ เพื่อให้เด็กนี้ต้องการคำสำคัญของเด็กนี้ที่มีโครงสร้างสั้นๆและจะสามารถเปลี่ยนได้ในประโยคได้ดีที่สุดอยู่ในเนื้อหาของเด็กนี้ ถ้าเป็นภาษาอังกฤษ เราจะต้องมีประโยคให้เด็กๆที่ถูกใจ 150 คำ เลยต้องให้เด็ก เขียนได้ให้เป็นอย่างยุ่งด้วยเนื้อหาที่ได้ให้มาต่อหัวเรื่องการสร้างประโยคที่จะประกอบประโยคที่ค่อยๆมาและจะเห็นการจับคู่ประโยคที่จะมาเป็นตัวเลือกที่มี 150 คำ แต่แต่ในเรื่อง เช่นไม่ได้ไปทุกอย่างต้องกันและจะต้องการให้เด็กเขียนที่ผ่านมาเป็นตัวเลขหรือประโยคที่ได้เมื่อตัวแยกจากข้อ number ดังนั้นก็จะมีประโยคที่มาประกอบประโยคคู่ประโยคคู่ ซึ่งช่วยให้เรานำหนังสือเรียน compound ประโยคมาต่อ compound complex มาแล้ว เลยเกี่ยวกับ compound complex รวมถึงการดึงข้อมูลข้อเรียนการใช้ transition words, FANBOYS เราจะดึงสิ่งนี้มาทำให้เด็กๆช่วยกันทำเรื่องสื่อความให้เด็กๆสร้างประโยค โรงเรียนไปถึงประโยคที่จะเรียน point ที่ 1 ให้เรียนจน

P: จะต้องสังเกตว่าเด็กนี้ 2 point ควรแล้วค่อยจะยืดเส้นเขียวเพื่อให้เขียนข้อเกี่ยวกับข้อต่างๆ ที่จะมี match กัน ก็คือ topic sentence กับ conclusion ควรจะไปด้วยกัน ไฟสีต่างกันเพื่อให้เด็กคิดถึงประโยคที่ต้องการจะทำให้ใช้ประโยคที่สามารถตรวจสอบได้ตามคำถามที่เป็น synonym มาให้เช่น

P: อันนี้ก็เหมือนกัน ให้เด็กดูเพื่อให้รู้ว่าความถูกต้องหรือไม่แต่ไม่ต้องกิน

P: ส่วนอันนี้ในเรื่องสิ่งที่ค่อยให้เด็กเขียนมาเป็นประโยคสั้นๆเรียนนี้เป็นประโยคที่มีประโยคหรือไม่ได้ให้เด็กสิ้นที่ไม่ให้ใจไม่ดี แต่ก็ไม่ mind ว่าจะต้องสรุปลงว่าจะเขียนแบบนี้กันว่ามันจะเป็นได้

P: ต้องอยู่ในใจว่าเด็กๆจะทำให้พูดออกมาให้เด็กเขียนเป็นประโยคที่จะเป็นประโยคที่มีประโยคที่จะสัมพันธ์กับประโยคสั้นๆหรือแต่จะมีประโยคที่จะเป็นประโยคที่มีประโยคได้ 1 ประโยคมันต้องมีข้อก่อนแล้วจะให้เด็กไปทำได้ 1 ประโยคที่มีประโยคสั้นๆ ซึ่งหลักหลักมีประโยคที่จะสัมพันธ์กับประโยคสั้นๆแต่ไม่ได้ ประเทศไทย นั่นคือประโยคที่เป็นประโยคที่จะสัมพันธ์กับประโยคสั้นๆ

P: อันนี้ก็ยิ่งเด่นๆ เพื่อให้เด็กเข้าใจว่าเราเขียนได้จะมีประโยคในประโยคที่ให้เด็กเขียน opinion น่าจะมีประโยคที่จะแสดงให้เด็กเขียนสิ่งที่ใช้เมื่อ มันได้ประโยคหรือเป็นประโยคที่เป็นประโยคที่ใช้เมื่อ
เป็นงานกลุ่มเพราะจะได้รับการพัฒนาและปรับปรุงอย่างต่อเนื่อง การถูกทำให้ครบถ้วนจึงทำได้ยากไม่สามารถที่จะทำเป็นงานกลุ่มนี้จะต้องมีการสื่อสารกันระหว่างเด็กที่จะมีความสุภาพที่จะคุยกัน เอกสารกับข้อกันข้อกันว่าจะทำอะไรก่อนว่าจะต้องทำอะไรลงที่จะทำอะไรได้จริงๆอะไรไม่ได้ serious กับการต้องทำอะไรพวกเราจะต้องแสดงให้เห็น แต่เราได้รู้ว่าถ้าอย่างนี้ยังคงขาดแคลนจะสามารถทำได้ก็ไม่ได้

ระหว่างนี้จะลอง show ด้วยกลุ่มให้ดูค่าเดียวแบบตัวอย่าง ได้เห็นตัวอย่าง 1,2,3 point ว่ามัน ให้ได้ 3 point คือกำหนดให้เด็กเป็นตัวอย่างเพราะจะใช้เป็นงาน ความของ essay ในการ_eng 2 ส่วนมากจะเป็นการลง 5 ความที่กำหนดคัดลอกได้ 3 point เมื่อเด็กกำหนดผลการกล้าจะได้กล้าพูดกันตรงที่จะเขียนเป็น Eng 2, point ที่ 1 เลือกเป็น paragraph body ที่ 1, paragraph body ที่ 2, paragraph body ที่ 3 ในนี้มันนี้ที่จะสอนในเรื่องของ essay เจำกันที่จะมีการสื่อสารกันเพื่อให้ครูทำในภาษาที่มีความ แต่ขณะเด็กจะเห็นว่าทำไปด้วยเพราะว่าจะต้องทำอย่างนี้มันเมื่อไรก็ต้องมีอย่างอื่นด้วยพี่ก็เลยใช้อันเดิมนี้ เพราะว่าอันนี้เด็กก็จะสับสนไง เพราะว่าอันนี้จะเกิดขึ้นได้บ้าง ให้เด็กเห็นทั้งนี้ล่ะ

จะเกิดจากอะไรได้บ้าง ให้เด็กเห็นทั้งนี้ล่ะ พยายามที่จะทำให้เด็กต้องให้สีสันขึ้นให้ได้หลายๆ สีแดงออกมาให้ได้ เพราะว่าอย่างนี้เป็นความที่เราต้องมี แต่ว่าปัญหาหรือการเรียงประโยคก็จะทำขึ้นไป อย่างวันที่เห็นคือไม่รู้จะทำให้ได้สิ่งที่เราต้องมีแต่เรายังไม่รู้ว่าจะทำอะไรได้ นี่คือข้อดีที่จะทำไม่ถึงจะต้องมี ไปลองฝึกฟังเอง ซึ่งจริงๆแล้วเด็กไม่มีตัว

ยากส์าหรับเด็กมากแล้วการที่เอามาตรงส่วนนี้คือเรามาเมื่ออย่างนี้เค้าจะหาเหตุผลอะไรมาแก้ได้

จากส่วนนี้ก็คือยกตัวอย่างของห้องที่ผ่านมาให้ดูว่าที่เด็กเค้าส่งมาเนี่ยแก้ให้แล้วแล้วก็ใช้สีมาประกอบ แต่ให้ดูแป๊บเดียวบางกลุ่มผิดสี พอผิดสีก็จะไม่ได้

ที่นี้สิ่งที่จะทำต่อไปก็คือ ด้วยความเวลาที่ในจากการทำงานที่ทำแล้วก็เอามาดูว่าสิ่งที่เด็กเขียนมาเด็กเข้าใจตามไม่

หลังจากที่เด็กทำงานมาแล้ว ก็เอามาดูว่าสิ่งที่เด็กเขียนมาเด็กเข้าใจตาม

เค้าจะเป็นงานกลุ่มเพราะว่าถ้ารู้ว่าเป็นงานเดี่ยวเนี่ยบางคนก็จะทำบางคนก็จะต้องทำแต่พอเป็นงานกลุ่มปุ๊บจะสังเกตว่าเด็กเค้บางกลุ่มเขียนไม่ได้เพราะเค้าไม่ได้มอง

จากที่แลกจึงจะไม่ยังอีก แต่ต้องการให้เด็กดูจากYouTube ที่ให้มาเนี่ยมันไม่เกิดตรงนี้ แต่มันไม่ใช่ว่าเขียนคานึงแล้วมันได้เลย เพราะว่าถ้าเขียนคานึงแล้วมันได้เลยก็จะเป็นสิ่งที่เรามี sense ของการ_search หาอยู่แล้ว เราก็สามารถหาได้ แต่ถ้ามีเหล้าสีมาไม่พอแล้วต้องการไม่สามารถที่จะจะเอาไปใช้ได้ นี่คือข้อดูว่าทำไม่ได้ตรงนี้คือ digital file ให้เราดู เพราะว่าในการเขียน URL ไม่มีใจใช้คำสอนคำเดิมเดินได้เลย

จะไปที่point ให้เด็กยันนั้นเราก็จะเป็นการแก้

เพื่อที่จะทำที่จะไปได้เลย ตัวความเท่านั้น class เราไม่พึงก็จะเข้าใจ

บางกลุ่มยินดี พอยังนั้นจึงจะเป็นการใช้ตรงนี้

ที่focus ไปที่การเขียน outline จะต้องศึกษาอย่างกลุ่มผู้สอนได้เพราะคนยินดีอย่างoutline โดยกลุ่มคนเดิมจะเขียนเลย ดังนั้นจากที่จะเป็น focus ที่ outline ให้เด็กเขียนค่าดังกล่าว แล้วทำแบบที่พวกเค้าอยู่เมื่อจะagree กับdisagree เมื่อคุณให้ความยันนั้น ที่2 agree จะมีคนให้ความยันนั้น ที่2 disagre จะมีคนให้

เห็นแต่เด็กจะทำกันว่าจะเขียนตรงไหน ที่1 agree จะเป็นสีเขียวสีเขียวจะเป็นสีแดงสีเขียวจะเป็นpoint กัดกลุ่มตามมาตรฐานpoint เลยก็ให้pick up มาแต่2 point เพราะว่าแต่ไปในplan ของผู้สอนนั้นแล้วจะได้2 point แต่จริงๆแล้วพี่จะบอกได้3 point เวลา2 point ก็ไม่เป็นไปที่นี่แล้วกลุ่ดของตัวนี้ให้เข้าตรงนี้ได้ point เพราะจะทำได้หรือเป็นการให้ได้ที่ focuses

บางกลุ่มยินดี ทำด้วยที่ผ่านมาให้เด็กที่จะดึงนี้ให้เด็กรักการเขียน

บางกลุ่มยินดี พอจะยินดีก็เข้าไปเรียน

บางกลุ่มยินดี ที่ผ่านมาให้เด็กที่จะดึงนี้ให้เด็กรักการเขียน

บางกลุ่มยินดี พอจะยินดีก็เข้าไปเรียน

บางกลุ่มยินดี ที่ผ่านมาให้เด็กที่จะดึงนี้ให้เด็กรักการเขียน

บางกลุ่มยินดี พอจะยินดีก็เข้าไปเรียน

บางกลุ่มยินดี ที่ผ่านมาให้เด็กที่จะดึงนี้ให้เด็กรักการเขียน

บางกลุ่มยินดี พอจะยินดีก็เข้าไปเรียน

บางกลุ่มยินดี ที่ผ่านมาให้เด็กที่จะดึงนี้ให้เด็กรักการเขียน

บางกลุ่มยินดี พอจะยินดีก็เข้าไปเรียน

บางกลุ่มยินดี ที่ผ่านมาให้เด็กที่จะดึงนี้ให้เด็กรักการเขียน

บางกลุ่มยินดี พอจะยินดีก็เข้าไปเรียน

บางกลุ่มยินดี พอจะยินดีก็เข้าไปเรียน
เห็นมือเท้า อะไรไว้ยังไงบ้าง ครั้งต่อมา จะสังเกตว่าเด็กจะมีโพยเต็มเลย เช่นเดียวเอามาสอนว่าถ้าอยากอ่าน

P: เด็กดังนี้แปลงภาษาจาก Intensive กับ Eng 1 ต่างกันที่เรื่องที่เป็นประโยชน์กับเด็กแต่ละคน แต่เด็กจะมี ability ที่ต่างกัน ต้องให้เด็กเข้าใจว่า เด็กที่ต่างกันในแต่ละระดับ มีความรู้ที่ต่างกัน ซึ่งมีการพัฒนาต่างกัน แต่เด็กที่ต่างกัน มักจะต้องมีการพัฒนาที่ต่างกันในแต่ละระดับ

I: ดีกว่าจะเรียนอะไร

P: Eng 1 ศึกษาความสามารถของเด็ก ถ้าเด็กมีข้อผิดพลาดก็สอน แต่ถ้าผ่านแล้ว เด็กจะอ่านต่างกัน ครั้งนี้สอนว่าเป็นที่ต่างกัน เด็กที่ต่างกันในแต่ละระดับจะเข้าใจว่าเป็นที่ต่างกัน

I: ขยายความนิดนึงนะคะ ถ้าพี่บอกว่าเด็กที่ต่างกันมีความรู้มากกว่า

P: มีความเป็นผู้ใหญ่มากกว่า

I: แต่เด็กนี้ก็เหมือนเด็กใช่อย่างนี้หรือเปล่าคือเด็กนี้เตรียมพร้อมให้มาเรียน Eng 1

P: ไม่ได้ต้องการให้เด็กนี้เรียน Intensive ด้วย เนื่องจากมันต้องใช้ในใจและคำของเด็กนี้เป็นที่ต่างกัน แต่เด็กนี้ต้องมีความรู้ที่ต่างกันในที่ต่างกัน ต้องคิดว่าเด็กนี้มีความรู้ที่ต่างกัน

I: และถ้าสมมติว่าเป็นเด็กที่ไม่เคยเรียนอ่านแล้วเริ่มเรียน Eng 1

P: พี่เชื่อว่าจะทำได้ เพราะมันต้องการไว้เป็นหนึ่ง เรื่องความสามารถของเด็กที่ต่างกัน ที่ต่างกันจะมีความรู้ต่างกัน เรื่องที่ต่างกันมีความรู้ที่ต่างกัน แต่เด็กนี้ต้องมีการพัฒนาที่ต่างกัน เด็กนี้ต้องมีการพัฒนาที่ต่างกัน

I: ขยายความค่ะว่า real life ให้หน่อยได้มั้ยคะ

P: คำว่า real life ก็คือต้องมีความเป็นไปในสิ่งที่พูดกันในประเทศ ถ้าเป็นภาษาอังกฤษในประเทศ Asia แล้วเรียนเป็นภาษาอังกฤษในประเทศ Asia ต้องให้เด็กอ่าน เด็กอ่านได้เรื่องเป็นเรื่องที่ต่างกัน ต้องให้เด็กอ่าน มันต้องสอดคล้องกับความที่แสดงให้เห็นว่าเด็กนี้ต้องมีความรู้ที่ต่างกันมากกว่า

I: อันนี้คืออะไรคะ
พ่อ: หมายถึงว่าสอน Eng 1 ได้ก็ทำได้

ไอ: Eng 1 คืออะไรนะ เรียกว่า

พ่อ: การเขียน paragraph แบบนี้เด็กทำได้ เพราะข้อผิดพลาดไม่ได้แตกต่างกันระหว่างเด็กที่เรียน Intensive กับเด็กที่เรียนอื่นนั้นมีผลที่จะทำให้เด็กที่เรียน basic ก่อน แล้วมาเรียนอื่นนี้ ซึ่งเด็กก็ทำได้

ไอ: รวมถึงเรื่อง discussion, presentation ว่าเขาทำได้

พ่อ: ให้เด็กพยายามฝึกนี้เด็กๆลงคอร์สมาจากโรงเรียนและแล้วเด็กก็จะทำได้เพราะเราจะเรียนระหว่างพวกตัวอย่างบางบางที่ทำได้

ไอ: แล้วพี่มีความคิดเห็นอย่างนี้ เคยบอกใครมั้ยหรือไม่

พ่อ: ยังไม่เคยบอกเพราะว่า เข้ามาสอน Intensive ถึงตอนนี้ แล้วเด็กก็ทำได้เหมือนกัน ด้วยเนื้อหาที่ไม่แตกต่างกัน focus ไปที่ ABC University เลยเหมือนกัน ABC University หมดเลย แล้วก็ทำให้เด็กๆรู้ว่า ABC University หมดเลย focus ไปที่ grammar ค่อนข้างเยอะ และแล้วพี่ทำ presentation หรือเส้นทางเป็น presentation ที่เด็กจะทำได้ แต่พี่ไปสอนให้เด็กๆรู้ว่าตัวเองมันไปทำ presentation ลงในตัวเองมันก็เห็นข้อแตกต่างเล็กน้อยซึ่งพี่ก็ทำ record เอาไว้เหมือนกัน

ไอ: ก็คือเรื่อง Green Park University นี้มันใกล้ตัวมันไป แต่สำหรับ Eng 1 อย่าง Indo, Malay, Singapore ไม่ได้ทำให้เด็กมันได้

พ่อ: ใกล้ตัวมันมีอยู่ในตัวมันไป เลยไม่ได้ทำให้ support ให้เด็กๆไป search หาข้อมูลได้ พอ GPU เนี่ย ด้วยความที่เด็กๆรู้ว่าตัวเองมันไป search หาข้อมูลมันไป เพราะทุกคนต้องอยู่ในตัวเอง ด้วยความที่มันไป search หาข้อมูลมันไป เพราะทุกคนต้องอยู่ในตัวเอง แล้วมันไปทำให้เด็กๆรู้ว่า มีมาก ๆ ที่เรียกว่า Vietnam จะมีเส้นทางสื่อสารภาษา Vietnam เลยทำให้ความรู้ความเข้าใจเป็นไปอย่างง่ายๆ ชัดเจนเป็นไปอย่างง่ายๆ วัฒนธรรม Vietnam อะไรไหมโจ汪มันบาง บางที่บางที่ก็เป็นไป บางที่บางที่ก็เป็นไป

ขอให้นำเสนอเพื่อนในห้องพี่มี video และ ppt ของเด็กๆอย่างนี้

(End of the Interview)
Appendix H - The description of codes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Categories / codes</th>
<th>Definitions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>I. Purposes</strong></td>
<td>stated or implied purposes of TESOL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Accuracy</td>
<td>emphases on accurate use of spoken and/or written English e.g. correct/grammatical structure, correct pronunciation and correct sentence structure in writing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Examination</td>
<td>preparation for examinations, tests, quizzes or the higher-level courses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Linguistic dimension</td>
<td>development of linguistic proficiency including Grammar (knowledge about forms, grammar and/or structures of English language); Oral communication (ability to communicate orally in English including, Pronunciation and Accent; and Written communication (the ability to communicate in written English)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Other skills and qualities</td>
<td>development of other (non-linguistic) skills such as critical thinking, time management and learning strategies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. World knowledge</td>
<td>development of general knowledge apart from that of English language including: Culture specific (specific information about other countries e.g. NES Culture); and Intercultural awareness (awareness of cultural similarities and differences)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>II. Assumption</strong></td>
<td>ideological understandings, values or beliefs about English and TESOL (i.e. paradigms)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Diversity of Englishes</td>
<td>diversity of English e.g. in varieties, dialects, accents and forms</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. English-medium interactions</td>
<td>users of English in English-medium interactions e.g. NNESs as users and NESs as models</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. NESs provide models</td>
<td>an assumption that NESs are the reference for the language and are models of the English language to be taught and learned</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Roles of English</td>
<td>how English is used in the world, the importance of English e.g. being a Language of academia, Language of international communication, Knowledge seeking tool and the language for Future careers.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Roles of Thai language</td>
<td>positive and negative roles of the Thai language in English classroom instruction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Student culture</td>
<td>perspectives on students e.g. Students as deficient language users (students’ poor performance) and L1 interference (negative impacts of Thai as the first language on the students’ English language ability and their learning of English)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

18 This code is close to being a Purpose, but I assigned it under the Assumptions category because the instances under this code suggest the teachers’ thinking about English and do not suggest what they wanted to achieve in their teaching. For instance, the statement ‘Aviation Business Majors will use English in their future career. That is why they pay attention when learning English’ suggested their assumption that English would be used in students’ Future career rather than suggesting a purpose of the teaching (compared with this statement: ‘I want them to use English in their career’ which would be coded as a purpose).

19 In the original HCC, this is viewed as what students bring and contribute to the class (e.g. intelligence, knowledge, experiences).
## III. Shaping influences

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>12. ASEAN</th>
<th>ASEAN integration and its possible effects on Thailand or Thai education</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>13. Host institution culture</td>
<td>perceived or actual <em>Policy</em> of the institution (i.e. any authoritative decision which directly or indirectly governed the teaching of English; <em>Curriculum</em> (i.e. implementation of English language education e.g. syllabuses, objectives, course materials, course management, and course evaluation criteria (Holliday, 1994, p. 196)); <em>Work culture</em> (i.e. how things were done at the institution e.g. organisation and management, team-teaching and how problems were dealt with); and <em>Pressure on practitioners</em> from the institution.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. International education</td>
<td>trends in international education e.g. bilingual education, the standardisation or liberalisation of education and debates in TESOL regarding the purposes of teaching the English language and paradigm assumptions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. Personal and professional experiences</td>
<td>teachers’ personal experience e.g. <em>Experience as English learners, Education and training</em> and <em>Experience of what works</em> (i.e. teachers’ understandings about teaching English directly gained from experiences in classroom)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Appendix I - Summary and frequency counts of codes assigned

Kamala's data

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code System</th>
<th>Inter.</th>
<th>Inter.</th>
<th>Inter.</th>
<th>Inter.</th>
<th>Inter.</th>
<th>Inter.</th>
<th>Inter.</th>
<th>Inter.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Purposes</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accuracy</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Examination</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Linguistic dimension</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grammar</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oral communication</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accent</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appropriate expressions</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Presentation skills</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Memorising scripts</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comprehensibility</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Confidence</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-verbal</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pronunciation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Written communication</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic English</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Models of writing</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other skills and qualities</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>World knowledge</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intercultural awareness</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Culture specific</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NSE culture</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Assumptions</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diversity of Englishes</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English-medium interactions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NNEs as users</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NNEs--&gt;NES</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NEEs provide models</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roles of English</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Language of academia</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Language of International</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knowledge seeking tool</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Future careers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roles of Thai language</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student culture</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students as deficient</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L1 interference</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shaping influences</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ASEAN</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Host institution culture</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Curriculum</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Team-teaching</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Course materials</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Class size</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pressure on practitioners</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work culture</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>gTwa (Phuu-yai)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>International education</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal and professional</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education and training</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Experience as English</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Experience of what works</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Maya’s data

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Purposes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accuracy</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Examination</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Linguistic dimension</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grammar</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oral communication</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accent</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appropriate expressions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Presentation skills</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Memorising scripts</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comprehensibility</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Confidence</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-verbal</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pronunciation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Written communication</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic English</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Models of writing</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other skills and qualities</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>World knowledge</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intercultural awareness</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Culture specific</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NSE culture</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assumptions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diversity of Englishes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English-medium interactions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NNESs as users</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NNESs---&gt;NCS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NESs provide models</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roles of English</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Language of academia</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Language of international</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knowledge seeking tool</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Future careers</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roles of Thai language</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student culture</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students as deficient</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shaping Influences</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ASEAN</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Host institution culture</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Curriculum</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Team-teaching</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Course materials</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Class size</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pressure on practitioners</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work culture</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>gTai (Puu-yai)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>International education</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal and professional</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education and training</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Experience as English</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Experience of what works</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Ploy’s data

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code System</th>
<th>Inter.</th>
<th>Inter.</th>
<th>Inter.</th>
<th>Inter.</th>
<th>Inter.</th>
<th>Inter.</th>
<th>Inter.</th>
<th>Inter.</th>
<th>Inter.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Purposes</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accuracy</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Examination</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Linguistic dimension</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grammar</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oral communication</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accent</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appropriate expressions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Presentation skills</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Memorising scripts</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comprehensibility</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Confidence</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-verbal</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pronunciation</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Written communication</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic English</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Models of writing</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Other skills and qualities</strong></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>World knowledge</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intercultural awareness</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Culture specific</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NSE culture</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Assumptions</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diversity of English</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English-medium interactions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NNES as users</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NNES-&gt;NESS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NNES provide models</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Roles of English</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Language of academia</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Language of international</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knowledge seeking tool</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Future careers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roles of Thai language</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student culture</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students as deficient</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L1 Interference</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Shaping Influences</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ASEAN</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Host Institution culture</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Curriculum</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Team-teaching</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Course materials</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Class size</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pressure on practitioners</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work culture</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education and training</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Experience as English</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Experience of what works</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>