UNIVERSITAT DE BARCELONA

Department of Modern Languages and Literatures and

English Studies

M.A. Thesis

It's not just what we say but also how we say it:

How non-native English-speaking teachers use their linguistic repertoire in the EFL classroom

Author: Sarah Schefers

Supervisor: Dr. Maria Luz Celaya

Academic year: 2020-2021

Facultat de Filologia i Comunicació
Dept. Llengües i Lit. Modernes i Estudis Anglesos

Gran Via de les Corts Catalanes, 585
08007 Barcelona, SPAIN
Tel. +34 934 035 686
Fax +34 933 171 249

UNIVERSITAT DE BARCELONA

Màster Oficial en Lingüística Aplicada
i Adquisició de Llengües en Contextos Multilingües
LAALCM

Dr. Maria Luz Celaya   . com a supervisor/a del treball (Tesina de
                    (nom i cognoms)

Màster) presentat com a requeriment per a l'avaluació de l'assignatura **Projecte de**

Recerca en Lingüística Aplicada

presentat per l'alumne/a: **Sarah Elizabeth Schefers   .**
                                                        (nom i cognoms)

amb el títol de: It's not just what we say but also how we say it:

                                How non-native English-speaking teachers use their linguistic

                                repertoire in the EFL classroom

certifico que he llegit el treball i l'aprovo perquè pugui ser presentat per a la seva defensa
pública.

I perquè consti i tingui els efectes oportuns signo aquest certificat en

Barcelona, a 21. de Juny de 2021

....

Dr/a.

Official MA programme in
Applied Linguistics and Language Acquisition in Multilingual Contexts (LAALCM)

Universitat de Barcelona

Non-Plagiarism Statement

This form must be completed, dated and signed and must be included at the beginning of every copy of the MA Thesis you submit for assessment.

Name and surnames:	Sarah Elizabeth Schefers
MA Thesis title:	It's not just what we say but also how we say it: How non-native English-speaking teachers use their linguistic repertoire in the EFL classroom
Supervisor:	Dr. Maria Luz Celaya

I HEREBY DECLARE THAT:

- This MA Thesis that I am submitting for assessment is entirely my own work and I have written it completely by myself.
- I have not previously submitted this work or any version of it for assessment in any other programme or institution.
- I have not used any other sources or resources than the ones mentioned.
- I have identified and included the source of all facts, ideas, opinions and viewpoints of others through in-text referencing and the relevant sources are all included in the list of references at the end of my work. Direct quotations from books, journal articles, internet sources or any other source whatsoever are acknowledged and the sources cited are identified in the list of references.

I understand that plagiarism and copying are serious offences. In case of proof that this MA Thesis fails to comply with this declaration, either as negligence or as a deliberate act, I understand that the examiner has the right to exclude me from the assessment act and consequently all research activities conducted for this course will be declared null and the MA Thesis will not be presented for public defense, thus obtaining the lowest qualification.

Date: 21/06/2021   Signature:

Sarah Elizabeth Schefers

It's not just what we say but also how we say it:

How non-native English-speaking teachers use their linguistic repertoire in the EFL classroom

Author: Sarah Schefers

Abstract

The primary goal of this study was to shift the geographical focus of research away from Europe and North America and into Asia. This was done to highlight the unique struggles faced and strategies employed by non-native English-speaking teachers (NNESTs) in Thailand while providing them with the opportunity to engage with theoretical frameworks that originated in Europe. This was done through a small, ethnographic study that focused on two teachers and how they use their linguistic repertoires in the classroom. It was found that while teachers are partially aware of the factors that impact what language they choose for specific classroom tasks, it is often their perceptions of their own proficiency that plays the largest role. It was also found that students often respond in the language that the teacher used to engage them in a communicative task. This leads to the conclusion that more should be done to promote NNESTs sense of identity as L2 users as well as their sense of agency as professional language instructors to promote greater use of the target language (TL) in the classroom.

Keywords: EFL, NNEST, Linguistic Repertoire, Code-switching, Classroom Observation

Abbreviations

EFL   English as a foreign language

CS   code-switching

NNEST   non-native English-speaking teacher

NEST   native English-speaking teacher

TL   target language

1. Introduction

By 2020, it was projected that there would be about 2 billion individuals learning and speaking English throughout the world (Robson, 2013). Most of these language learners will seek out the guidance and expertise of professional language instructors. Floris and Renandya (2020) have noted that, out of the roughly 15 million English language teachers working globally, 80% or 12 million were classified as non-native English-speaking teachers (NNESTs). This is a large section of the professional pool and is the primary focus of this study. Within that focus, this study has two primary goals. The first is to take theoretical frameworks that were developed and studied within a European context and apply them to Asian EFL classrooms. Both *Plurilingualism* and *Translanguaging* aim to focus language education on learners, allowing them to incorporate their full linguistic repertoire into the communicative tasks they are asked to perform. As Asian classrooms continue to transition away from more traditional, teacher-centred pedagogy, more language educators are interested in pedagogical theories that are student-centred. The second goal aims at providing an in-depth understanding of not only how non-native English-speaking teachers (NNESTs) use their languages in the English as a foreign language (EFL) classroom, but why they make the linguistic decisions that they do, and what impact their choices have on classroom communication. To do this, two Thai, public secondary school teachers were asked to perform a succession of tasks beginning and ending with class observations and discussions. This thesis will begin with a literature review (section 2) focusing on the native/non-native English-speaking teacher dichotomy, how teachers use language in the classroom, and plurilingualism and translanguaging in the classroom. The context, participants, procedure, and instruments will then be explained in the study (section 3). The results and discussion (section 4) will tie what was found throughout the interactions with the teachers back to previous literature while answering the research questions. Finally, the conclusion (section 5) will lay out the limitations of the study and suggest questions that research could address moving forward.

2. Literature Review

2.1 Introduction

Section 2.2 explores the dichotomy of native English-speaking teachers (NESTs) and NNESTs. Section 2.3 focuses specifically on the use of their shared native language in the classroom, with an emphasis on translation and code-switching (CS). Finally, section 2.4

explores the impact of plurilingualism and translanguaging on language used within the EFL context.

2.2 Native English-Speaking and Non-Native English-Speaking Teachers in the EFL context

As stated previously, 80% of professional English teachers around the world were classified as NNEST (Floris & Renandya, 2020). The prominence of NNESTs within the field of teaching EFL is sorely mismatched with their underrepresentation within both professional organizations and research (Hayes, 2018). Instead of benefitting from their wealth of experience and linguistic insight, Berns et al. (1999) pointed out that these outsiders are regulated to the role of observers within the very professional organizations that purport to represent them. The harmful effects of this discrepancy are compounded by the prevalence of the notion of the ideal native-English speaker that is found throughout SLA research (Agudo, 2017; Clouet, 2006; Floris & Renandya, 2020; Medgyes, 1992; Phillipson, 1992). This concocted entity is frequently held up as the gold standard for all language professionals, the ideal model of a language user and of a language instructor. This has been a point of contention within the field of language education and as such has been the subject of research for decades.

In their study examining English teacher position postings on an ESL website, Mahboob and Golden (2013) found that 79% required native-speaker status of the target language (TL) and a further 49% would only consider holders of specific passports. This confirms what had previously been found by Kachru (1992), namely, that there was an unofficial list of seven native English-speaking countries that governments and schools preferred to hire from. Governments often further discriminate against future potential English teachers by limiting the work visas to a smaller number of countries, most commonly the United States of America, Canada, the United Kingdom, Australia, and New Zealand (Anchimbe, 2006; Braine, 2013; Tatar & Yildz, 2010). This ignores the fact that many other countries have English as one of their many official languages and that it is becoming more and more common throughout the world for children to begin English as a foreign language as part of their primary education.

Additionally, many schools and governments are more concerned with appearance over substance. Rueker and Ives (2014) examined job advertisements throughout Asia and found that the ideal candidate was often described as young, white, and western in appearance. This agrees with previous research conducted by Tatar and Yildz (2010), focusing on the concerns and perceptions of NNESTs and local teacher candidates in Istanbul, Turkey. They found that

schools give preference to unqualified NESTs instead of qualified NNESTs despite their lack of certification, work experience, or linguistic knowledge. The impact of these government and school policies seeps into the relationships amongst the teachers themselves, as seen in Medgyes (1992). NESTs are often given preferential treatment and higher pay even if they lack any teaching experience or legally required accreditation (Tatar & Yildz, 2010). This leads to local NNESTs, who are all certified teachers, feeling that their experience and expertise are overlooked as teacher candidates. Beyond impacting hiring decisions, Tatar and Yildz (2010) also found that many schools assign specific topics to teachers based on their linguistic status. Directors mainly assigned grammatical or test-prep classes to NNESTs and higher level, more conversationally focused classes to NESTs. This in turn impacts how both NNESTs and NESTs define their roles as teachers and their status within their academic community.

The differential treatment experienced by NNESTs and NESTs often leads to experiences of psychological distress by NNESTs. Through teacher interviews and reading the candidate teachers' journals, Tatar and Yildz (2010) found that the largest toll was on their sense of identity and of agency as professional language instructors. Indeed, prejudicial views within the EFL profession were not limited to NEST controlled companies, departments, or institutions. When questioned, many NNESTs themselves stated that they prefer to hire NESTs due to their perceived superiority as language role models (see among others Floris & Renandya, 2020; Gurkan & Yuksal, 2012; Inbar, 2010; Llurda & Huguet, 2003; Reves & Medgyes, 1994). This means that oftentimes, a teacher's capacity to be effective in their role as a language educator gets reduced to their proficiency as a TL user. Many studies have also found that NNESTs have lower self-esteem and become more passive in their role as teachers when they are working with NESTs (Floris & Renandya, 2020). In reaction to this decrease in their sense of agency in NNESTs, Floris and Renandya (2020) argue that greater representation in professional associations, research, and the media would improve their sense of agency and value as language instructors. In the end, Liang (2009) notes that the hiring preference for western-looking NESTs over more qualified NNESTs not only is detrimental to the students' education but also cheapens the value of the credentials, knowledge, and experience we expect to see in language education professionals.

Another problematic component is that many studies researching NNESTs do so by comparing them to NESTs, as in Agudo, 2017; Clouet, 2006; Floris & Renandya; Medgyes, 1992. When this comparison is made, the most touted value of NNESTs is their shared native language with the students. This has been cited in numerous studies including Floris and Renandya, 2020; Hayes, 2018; Macaro, 2005; Medgyes, 1992; Medgyes, 1994; Mohebbi and

Alavi, 2014; Tatar and Yildz, 2010. Still, it is a comparison based on the individual teacher's status as a native or non-native speaker of a particular language. In contrast with the standard classification, Hayes (2018) argued that their nativeness to the educational context might be a better descriptor of the local teachers than their status as non-native English-speakers. They are instead native teachers to the institutions in which they are employed.

All teachers are going to need to work through their own personal and professional limitations to excel as language education professionals. The first step in self-improvement is self-awareness, and NNESTs are often aware of their own linguistic limitations. Medgyes (1992) gave questionnaires to NNESTs in which they indicated having some difficulty with fluency, pronunciation, grammar, vocabulary, idiomatic English, and listening comprehension. Issues like these have been cited as reasons for their inferior status when compared to NESTs as language instructors; however, it ignores an especially important detail. In the same article, Medgyes (1992) explains how NNESTs have often formulated language learning strategies to overcome these challenges. This gives them a great capacity to empathize with the struggles of their students.

Previous research has concluded that teachers, both NESTs and NNESTs, need to work together to provide their students with the most successful learning environment. This can be seen in studies such as Agudo (2017), Clouet (2006), Floris and Renandya (2020) and Medgyes (1992). While working together, it can be understood that the two groups serve different functions while bringing different strengths into the classroom. The NNESTs are able to serve as models of successful language learners. Their capacity to fulfil this unique role has been purported in numerous studies including Clouet (2006) and Floris & Renandya (2020) among others. On the other hand, NESTs are often touted as the models of successful language usage in studies such as Agudo (2017) and Phillipson (1992). The two groups fulfill different, complementary roles within the EFL classroom. As such, Medgyes (1992) proposed that the ideal NEST is someone who has acquired a high level of proficiency in the student's native language while the ideal NNEST is one who has acquired a high level of proficiency in the TL.

2.3 Use of the students' L1 in the L2 classroom. Translating and Code-Switching

"Throughout its history, the teaching and learning of foreign languages […] has been deeply rooted in, and determined by, the political and economic structure of the country" (Medgyes & Miklosy, 2000, 184). This pattern can be seen playing out in countries around the world. As English becomes more and more entrenched as the lingua franca of international business, entertainment, and research, greater pressure is being put on governments to provide

quality language instruction (Nagy & Robertson, 2009). For instance, Pan and Pan (2010) noted that countries such as Taiwan and Korea have implemented TL only policies in an attempt to provide their students with what they perceive as being improved learning conditions. Focusing on teachers in private language schools in Iran, Mohebbi and Alavi (2014) found that language centres, as well as private and public schools, have adopted a policy of English only instruction in a bid to not only attract a greater number of students but to also increase the fees they can demand from the students' families. Garcia (2009) examined how bilingual programs are structured and operated, noting that many have strict language separation policies. Faculty and students are expected to engage in specific languages for specific subjects, hours, or days by strict school policies. This trend was also seen in study abroad (SA) programs where the TL was taught in isolation from the languages spoken by the students in their native countries (Garcia & Otheguy, 2019). In more recent years, these policies have affected the development and proliferation of English-medium instruction (EMI) programs. These have become especially popular in Asia and have been the focus of several studies including those by Adamson and Anwei (2009), Hu (2007), Manh (2012), and Walkinshaw et al. (2017).

Unfortunately, most of these policy decisions have not been based on actual research (Mohebbi & Alavi, 2014). Instead, the push to exclusively rely on the TL has been based on commercial and political interests (Cook, 2010). These policies lead to a disconnect between the governmental policy of TL only within the classroom and the reality where the L1 serves a multitude of purposes as seen in Chang (2009), Ferguson (2003), Macaro (2005), Turnbull & Arnett (2002), and Wells (1999). However, current research has continued to show specific uses of the L1 within the EFL classroom can be beneficial to the students. Several key trends have emerged. Many teachers report using the L1 to teach grammar, to provide feedback, to explain abstract or complex vocabulary, to share cultural aspects of the TL, to build a sense of community with the students, and to maintain classroom discipline (Cook, 2001; De la Campa & Nassaji, 2009; Edstrom, 2006; Franklin, 1990; Harbord, 1992; Hayes, 2018; Mohebbi & Alavi, 2014).

Many studies have reported specific beneficial effects of the L1 being used in second language classrooms. Anton and Dicamilla's research (1998) showed that the L1 is a source of scaffolding; Shamash (1990) was interested in how the use of the L1 encouraged the students to use the TL more; and Turnbull (2001) studied how the use of the L1 increased student comprehension of the TL, among others. The avoidance of the L1 can also lead to some unique struggles, especially in lower proficiency level classes. To keep the TL input comprehensible,

Pan and Pan (2010) found that the teachers often had to modify their output in the TL to make it simpler, more direct, and more salient. This often makes the input less authentic and thus limits how useful it will be to the language learners acquiring the TL. Using the L1 can also be an effective way to reduce affective barriers as it allows the teacher to create a learning environment in which the students feel safe to learn and grow in their new language skills (Atkinson, 1987; Auerbach, 1993; Cook, 2001; Harbord, 1992; Johnson & Lee, 1987, to name but a few).

The use of the students' L1 by the teacher can take a variety of forms, the two most common being translation and code-switching (CS). It is important to note that the concept of translation that is used now is not the same as in traditional grammar-translation pedagogy; instead, Gonzalez-Davies (2017) defined translation as a mediation skill and a natural learning strategy that language learners access in order to complete a linguistic task. Indeed, translation is an activity bi- and multilingual individuals often engage in outside of the classroom environment for both personal and professional reasons. And yet, according to research conducted by Cook (2010) and Hall and Cook (2013), translation as a linguistic tool has been rejected by programs that rely on the natural communicative approach. Hall and Cook (2013) also found that there is a gap between mainstream research and the way translation is used in the classrooms. Cook (2010) referred to translation as a self-imposed blind spot that both exists in the classroom even while its existence is denied. According to Gonzalez-Davies (2017), the rejection of translation is perceived by teachers as having three main benefits. It limits the impact of the L1 on the acquisition of the TL, it prevents students from becoming overly reliant on their L1, and it maximizes students' exposure to the TL. However, this view is contrary to Cummins's Interdependence Hypothesis which states that language learners naturally rely on their previous knowledge, previous languages, and the commonalities they share when acquiring a new language (Cummins, 1984).

Previous research has found numerous benefits to the use of translation in the second language classroom. It has been found that translation involves higher and lower order cognitive skills such as remembering, applying, analyzing, and creating (see Anderson & Krathwohl, 2001). Other studies have pointed to how allowing students to use the full scope of their linguistic knowledge increases their sense of self-esteem and agency as language learners and by extension the instructors, leading to increases in their overall academic performances. This can be seen in studies such as Sugranyes and Gonzalez-Davies (2014) and Wilson and Gonzalez-Davies (2017). Focusing specifically on how the instructors use translation, Gonzalez-Davies (2017) described three specific linguistic patterns. The first is sandwiching

in which the TL is sandwiched between two translations in the students' L1 (L1-TL-L1). The second is a marked translation in which students are informed that this linguistic service will only be performed once (L1-TL or TL-L1). And the third is an unmarked translation in which the teacher does not indicate nor acknowledge their use of the L1 aside from providing the translation to students.

Another way teachers frequently use their L1 within the EFL classroom is the use of CS. The use of CS within the second language classroom has been heavily studied throughout the years by Braga (2000), Cipriani (2001), Greggio & Gil (2007), and Macaro (2001), among others. The recognition of the value of CS in research has unfortunately not translated into the classroom where it is often seen as being neither a linguistic tool nor an asset in second language acquisition (Macaro, 2005). In fact, Macaro (2000) found that most bilingual teachers view CS as a linguistic failure, a regrettable reality. The teachers viewed it as 'recourse to the L1', a view that was not impacted by the nationality of the teacher (Macaro, 2005). The reaction against CS is also due in part to the notion of the idealized bilingual. The coordinate bilingual model as proposed by Weinreich (1953) posited that bilinguals develop two independent language-specific lexicons that do not positively interact with one another. This is in stark contrast to more modern research in neurology which has supported the idea that linguistic information is stored in a singular location leading to cross-language activation to stimuli received via input (Libben, 2000).

Previous studies have shown that CS serves a multitude of different functions within the foreign language classroom. For example, Braga (2000) focused on the use of humour in the EFL classroom and how CS was used to create a more inviting classroom environment. Cipriani (2001) focused on how CS was used to encourage greater oral participation as the teacher used it to clarify the class activity and to encourage the students to speak English. And Macaro (2000) found that CS was used to fulfil a variety of functions including building relationships within the classroom, providing instructions, maintaining classroom decorum, and teaching grammar. When teachers avoid CS, they must modify the input that they provide to the students. This is either done through simplification, repetition, circumlocution, or avoidance which leads to less authentic input and decreased levels of interaction from the students (Macaro, 2005). Thus, the use of CS leads to the production of more realistic input for the students. CS also enables language learners (teachers and students alike) to lighten the load on their working memory, to interact with the TL more easily, and to utilize linguistic information stored in their long-term memories while reducing learner anxiety (Caballero & Celaya, 2019). Still, Macaro (2005) cautions that there is a point at which CS stops being a

communicative strategy, and the class then becomes an L1 class about the TL. Macaro (2001) and Macaro and Mutton (2002) both advocated that CS should be kept below 10% of the general classroom discourse.

While the value of the students' L1 is apparent, other studies have pointed to the need to limit the use of their L1. It has been argued that excessive use of the L1 limits the amount of input the students can receive in the foreign language classroom, which is especially important due to the lack of input outside of the classroom environment (Hayes, 2018; Mohebbi & Alavi, 2014). Wells (1999) argued that language educators should not be overly reliant on the L1 and that the L1 should not be afforded the same status as the TL in the classroom context. Harbord (1992) specifically advocated that the L1 should be reserved to explain concepts or ideas that are too complex or abstract to be explained succinctly in the TL, but that simpler explanations and instructions should be carried out in the TL. Instructions and explanations in the TL are forms of genuine communication, legitimate input that the students need to be exposed to to acquire the language. These findings have been supported by more recent research including that by Mohebbi and Alavi (2014) and Pan and Pan (2010). The precise and strategic use of the L1 can be one of the most useful language learning tools available to students and instructors (Cook, 2001; Swain & Lapkin, 2000; Wells, 1999).

2.4 Plurilingualism and Translanguaging in the EFL context

It is important to note that language often plays an integral role in the formation of identity on both the personal and national level. An individual is often described as Chinese, Spanish, English, or Thai (words that also denote recognized, national languages as well as national identities). This notion of one-nation, one-language, one-identity has been explored in a variety of papers including Baetens-Beardsmore (2003), Dooly and Unamuno (2009), Dooly & Vallejo (2019), Ludi & Py (2009), among others. Governments often take this into consideration when they design national curriculum standards. As Garcia and Otheguy (2019) claim, the monolingual identity of the state is preserved and all 'foreign languages' are regulated to an 'other' space reserved for communicating with non-nationals. Previous research by Del Valle (2000) and Garcia (2009) has shown that the monolingual lens impacts the way that bilingualism and multilingualism are both perceived. The impact of this linguistic bias has been far-reaching. Its impact on the personal level leads language learners to often abandon the study of a second language when they become discouraged at the prospect that they will never become a 'true bilingual' (Garcia & Otheguy, 2019). On the national stage, it led to many developing countries in Africa and Asia designing national curriculums that promoted a

unifying, identity-building, national language with a European language (often English) offered as a foreign language, as seen in Heller and McElhinny (2017) and Martin-Chazeaud and Celaya (2020).

It was in response to this monolingual bias that the theories of plurilingualism and translanguaging emerged. To understand either of these concepts, it is important to first understand the idea of the linguistic repertoire. This idea was first defined by Gumperz (1972), who described the repertoire as the summation of the linguistic resources available to a person for the purposes of engaging in a communicative act. This concept was further refined and utilized by researchers such as Ambrosio et al. (2014), Gumperz (1982), Ludi & Py (2009), Nikula & Moore (2019), and Ziegler et al. (2013), among others. According to the Council of Europe Language Policy Division, plurilingualism is "the dynamic and developing linguistic repertoire of an individual user/learner /.../ the fundamental point is that plurilinguals have a single, inter-related repertoire that they combine with their general competences and various strategies in order to accomplish tasks" (Council of Europe, 2018, 28). Another key element in plurilingualism is the protection it provides to the language learners' first language and their right to quality education (Helot & Cavalli, 2017). While the original intent of plurilingualism was to empower language learners with a greater sense of agency over their education, it has had the same effect on language teachers who are teaching a language that is not their L1. Oftentimes, NNESTs' sense of identity and value are tied to their perception of their own proficiency and how they compare to the ideal native speaker. Plurilingualism allows teachers to create a more empowered identity as both language learners and instructors while bringing to the classroom the full benefit of their individual linguistic repertoire (Wernicke, 2018). Canagarajah (2011) wrote about how concepts of proficiency need to incorporate the repertoire as a whole and not just focus on individual languages, while Lubliner and Grisham (2017) focused on the incorporation of students' cultural and linguistic resources into their classroom experience.

At the same time, Garcia & Wei (2014) noted that translanguaging improved the language learners' metacognition and their ability to fully understand the topic, and Creese & Blackledge (2015) studied how translanguaging can aid in how individual students develop their identities as language users. Another benefit that has been highlighted is how translanguaging in the classroom allows students to scaffold, using their more proficient language to prop up their TL as they improve their proficiency and confidence (Baker, 2011; Ebe & Chapman-Santiago, 2016; Garcia & Wei, 2014; Kampittayakul, 2018; Lewis et al., 2012) According to Garcia and Otheguy (2019), both concepts possess points of commonality.

Both terms are reactionary responses against the traditional understanding of bilingualism founded in the monolingual bias that has shaped foreign language education. They both focus on empowering the language learner with the full breadth and depth of their own linguistic repertoire, recognize the value and existence of the multilingual practices that occur in communities all over the world, argue that the way individuals use their linguistic repertoire is strategic, and aim to reconceptualize the way we understand languages and how they function (Garcia & Otheguy, 2019).

It is noteworthy that the ideas of plurilingualism and translanguaging emerged within the European context. As such, the bulk of research focusing on these theories within EFL classrooms have been based in Europe. It is the goal of this study to address this gap in the literature. By bringing these concepts into an Asian context, this study will explore how two local NNESTs can incorporate these ideas into how they teach EFL at two public secondary schools in Thailand. We will also examine how and why teachers use their languages in the classroom, what linguistic tools they rely on, and the impact of increasing self-awareness as well as knowledge of current research. These goals will aim to be accomplished through a collaborative process with the teachers as we use observational, reflective, and productive tasks to gain deeper insight into the research questions mentioned below.

RQ1: What factors impact the language choices of NNESTs in secondary EFL classrooms in Thailand?
RQ2: What is the impact of their language choices on classroom communication?
RQ3: To what extent will their language choices be influenced by participating in this study?

3. The Study

3.1 Context: The learning environment in Thai schools

In 2018, there were 63,450 Thai teachers teaching English to approximately 9.6 million children (Hayes, 2018). They work in the 37,175 primary and secondary schools that are located throughout the country, the vast majority being public institutions with a small minority associated with a temple or privately run ("*List of schools in Thailand"*, 2021). When schools were first established, the major city in each province had one primary school and two gender-segregated secondary schools. While today, there are more options available to families, these three schools tend to be the most prestigious. Admittance into these schools, especially the boys' high school (now co-educational), in larger cities is highly competitive with thousands

of students competing for hundreds of spots. Secondary schools compete for students with speciality programs focusing either in STEM or in foreign languages, charging higher tuition fees and offering a variety of perks including smaller class sizes, greater access to resources such as NES instructors, and international travel/study trips.

Within the class structure itself, students are ranked academically based on their average scores in English, Thai, Math, Science, and Social Studies. The average class size is forty to fifty students (Hayes, 2018). This means that class 1.1 will have the top fifty ranked students. Class 1.2 will have the next 50 students, and this will continue until the lowest class for that year. For the final three years of secondary education, students select an academic path to follow. The most gifted students are usually shepherded into the math and science track. The average or more creative students are placed within the arts and languages track. And the weakest students are put in the social science and Thai track.

The two schools in this study differ in several key aspects (for purposes of clarity, they will be referred to as school A and school B). School A is located in a city in central Thailand and is the former boys' high school. It has a student body of over 3,000 and is well-known for its science and math program. Admittance to this school is highly competitive, and students come from neighbouring provinces, residing in private student dormitories near the campus. In contrast, school B is located in a smaller northern town and has a student body of about 800. This school serves the local population; however, it suffers from 'brain-drain' as a majority of the more talented students from the region test into the larger, more prestigious high schools in the city.

3.2 Participants

There were two participants, one from each school. The information provided below was gathered through a questionnaire and our interactions throughout the study. All personal information has been anonymized to protect their privacy. They were allowed to choose the nickname they wished to be used as their alias.

Participant 1: Lucky is an English teacher at school A. Her L1 is Thai and her L2 is English, which she began studying in primary school. She identifies as monolingual. Lucky has been teaching for about 25 years and currently has a PhD in curriculum and instruction after obtaining an MA in English and a BA in the same subject. In addition to teaching English to lower secondary students, she is also a homeroom teacher, and she teaches in the school's scout program. Lucky serves as her department head and performs duties within the financial office.

Participant 2: Jane is an English teacher at school B. His L1 is Thai, his L2 is English, which he began studying in primary school. Jane began studying his L3, Japanese, about ten years ago, taking a 10-month, intensive course in Bangkok. He identifies as bilingual. Jane has been teaching for about 20 years and currently has an MA in English after obtaining an undergraduate degree in the same field. He teaches Japanese and English to upper secondary students. Additionally, he works in the academic affairs department as a registrar.

3.3 Instruments and Materials

<u>Questionnaire</u>

A questionnaire was given to the participants to gather information about their academic and professional backgrounds, their teaching environment, their linguistic repertoire, and how they perceive their use of languages in their school environment. The focused context and nature of this study necessitated that a questionnaire be created. It was piloted with a panel of 6 Thai linguistic professors employed at a major university in Bangkok and adjusted according to their feedback. The questionnaire was conducted via Google Forms (Appendix I). The use of questionnaires is common in studies that examine the beliefs, teaching practices, and other classroom behaviours of teachers as seen in studies such as Bell (2005) and Nikoopour (2017) among others. However, Gu (2016) noted that questionnaires, while useful in identifying trends, tend to be more exploratory in nature. Due to this limitation, further information-gathering tools were implemented. The questionnaire provided a basis with which to compare future observations.

<u>Interviews</u>

Semi-structured interviews were conducted every few weeks throughout the study. These were centred around discussions or completing a central task (see following three descriptions of tasks); however, the researcher allowed the participants to determine the speed and direction of the conversations. This was done to keep the participants engaged and to solicit their thoughts and feelings uncensored. Within EFL research, interviews are often paired with other forms of data collection such as questionnaires or observations to gain more insight into the participants' thoughts. This is especially true in research focused on teachers, as seen in studies such as Agudo (2017) and Mak (2011).

<u>Recorded Class-observations</u>

In-person observations are more common in EFL teacher research (Kent & Lee, 2018; Mak, 2011); however, recently, studies have used video or audio recordings of classes (Jing & Jing, 2018). Due to the current global situation, a self-observation scheme was created. Both participants recorded themselves on their phones teaching select classes. They also provided the researcher with a general outline of the classes and all the course materials (Appendix II). The researcher listened to the recordings and then discussed them with the participants. This task was completed twice; once to establish pre-study classroom language patterns and a second time to observe any potential impact from participating in the study.

Role Play

The teachers, under the guidance of the researcher, gave explanations and homework instructions pertaining to key grammatical structures they teach in the classroom. This was done in relation to two different situations: a high English proficiency class and a mixed English proficiency class. This task was completed twice in preparation for the final self-observation task (see Appendix III for instruction form used).

Literature Review

The literature review of this paper was turned into a tool for use with the participants to help them understand the state of current research within this subject. The first section on NESTs and NNESTs was not included as the researcher felt that the teachers might be uncomfortable with its content. This decision was reinforced through subsequent conversations with the participants. The four sections that were used focused on the use of the L1 in the L2 classroom, the impact of crosslinguistic influence, translating and code-switching, and plurilingualism and translanguaging. All sections were edited down to two to three pages each, to ensure that the participants would not feel overwhelmed by the amount of reading required. To this end, a bibliography was not included (see appendix IV, V, VI, and VII).

3.4 Procedure

Potential participants were contacted through work contacts of the researcher on Facebook and snowball sampling. All communication took place via email, Zoom, and the line app. Both teachers submitted an initial Google Form indicating their interest. They were contacted for an interview explaining the focus and scope of the study. Once they agreed to participate, they filled in the questionnaire which included a consent form. They were then interviewed a second time in which their responses in the questionnaire were discussed and the

13

first self-observation task was explained. The participants were given two weeks to complete every task. Upon completion and submission of their observation materials, the researcher reviewed them taking notes on how they used their languages within their classrooms. A third interview was conducted to discuss these classes and the teachers' feedback and reasoning for language choices were solicited. Next, the teachers were given two sections from the literature review. This was discussed with the researcher and the role-play task was completed. This procedure was repeated twice. Finally, the teachers were instructed to incorporate all that we had discussed into their teaching for a final self-observation task. This was reviewed by the researcher prior to the final interview.

4. Findings and Discussion

4.1 Introduction

It was the goal of this study to establish a collaborative relationship with the two participants based on mutual respect and open communication. This was done to foster more honest conversations around what are often quite sensitive topics. To this end, the researcher engaged in frequent communication with the two participants, using multiple means of communication including Facebook, Line, and email, as well as Google Forms and Docs. While formal communication based around tasks tended to occur every other week, more informal communication happened multiple times weekly throughout the study. The insights and information gathered will be presented following the order in which it was collected.

4.2 Questionnaire results

The primary goal of the questionnaire was to gather information concerning how the participants defined their role within their academic communities and their sense of identity as professional language instructors. One element that could be a factor in how teachers use their languages within the classroom (RQ1) is their sense of identity as language users. On the questionnaire, they were asked to self-identify, given the options of monolingual, bilingual, and multilingual. Lucky self-identified as monolingual and Jane self-identified as bilingual. This was unexpected as both teachers teach languages that are not their native language. They both teach English, and Jane also teaches Japanese. When asked for their reasoning behind their answers, they both cited a lack of sufficient proficiency required to claim the title of bilingual or multilingual. Lucky stated that she feels comfortable using English within an extremely limited context and so does not view herself as being bilingual. Jane stated that his

Japanese is basic and that he had only begun teaching it recently. He does view himself as being a Thai/English bilingual, stating that he majored in English for both his undergraduate and graduate degrees. This lack of confidence stemming from low perceptions of their own proficiency matches what others have found in numerous studies including Floris and Renandya (2020), Medgyes (1992), and Tatar and Yildz (2010). Their perceptions of themselves and their reluctance to identify with the languages that they teach may in part explain their reluctance to use the TL in the classroom.

4.3 First observation task results

Lucky

Examining the factors that impacted Lucky's choice of language usage (RQ1), several important patterns emerged. Most of her language choices in the classroom matched her self-reported responses to the questionnaire. For example, the most used language was Thai. It was used to give instructions, to explain the key concepts of the class, and to forge an emotional connection with the students through humour and empathy, as seen in Cipriani (2001) and Macaro (2000). English was mostly limited to technical, grammatical terms. When asked what specific purposes English serves in the EFL classroom, she said "*It's up to my topic. I mean that if I have to explain something complex or multidimensional, I try to use Thai to make them understand clearer.*" In response, I pointed out that she used more of the L1 with her more TL proficient class. Lucky replied, "*It's up to my skill. I think my skill is not good enough… I don't think that I can explain them to understand well by using English so that's why I use Thai.*"

In the questionnaire, she selected that it is important to use the TL to encourage the students to do likewise. During our discussion of her class recordings, however, Lucky was very insistent that as a Thai person, it is especially important that she speak Thai with the students. This connects with what previous research has stated about language and identity as cited in studies such as Dooly & Vallejo (2019) and Ludi & Py (2009). Her strong identification with her L1 also connects back to her identification as a monolingual speaker and her reliance on her native language in her English language classroom. Lucky also stated that she actively encourages the students to speak the TL, stating that "*I'm encouraging them to use English in class as much as they can.*" However, when we focus on the responses she solicited from her students, the impact of her language choices on classroom communication (RQ2), we found that the students often responded in the language that they were addressed in. If Lucky spoke

to them in Thai, they responded in Thai 100% of the time. When Lucky spoke to them in the TL, most responded in either the TL or a mixture of their languages. When this was pointed out to the participant, she continued to insist that her speaking the TL is not as important as the students speaking the TL.

Jane

Throughout the class recordings, the dominant language used by Jane was Thai. However, the time split between the two languages was closer to being even. Jane identifies as a bilingual user of Thai and English, and he seemed more confident switching between the two languages. The most common linguistic tool used by Jane was unmarked translation as described by (Gonzalez-Davies, 2017). He used this frequently when explaining core grammatical concepts and giving instructions. An interesting divergence between the two teachers was the language they chose to use when being playful with the students. Lucky told jokes in Thai. Jane told jokes in Thai and in English and his jokes were often repeated by some of the more vocal students for their personal amusement. This reflects to (RQ2) and the impact of their language choices on classroom communication. When Jane joked with his students in the TL, they responded back in the same language.

Focusing on (RQ1), what factors impact his choice of language usage in the classroom, a clear pattern based on context emerges. Jane said, "*when I explain difficult thing… to clarify my homework, then I use Thai language*." This matches previous research conducted by De la Campa and Nassaji (2009) and Hayes (2018) among others. We also spoke at length about how he used the L1 and humour to make the students feel comfortable with the class material and with participating in their activities. When asked about when he used English, Jane said "*easy question. They can answer my question. I usually use English and the easy word they can understand.*". This agrees with studies conducted by Harbord (1992), Mohebbi and Alavi (2014), and Pan and Pan (2010) which support the idea that use of the TL to explain simple concepts provides students with much needed authentic input.

4.4 Discussion of the Literature Review Sections

Throughout the interactive process, a clear divergence could be noticed between the two participants. Lucky earned her PhD, and she regularly conducts her own classroom-based research. Thus, she is more comfortable engaging with academic writing and concepts. This became especially apparent when we were discussing the sections of the literature review. She would ask specific questions about concepts, vocabulary, or sentence structure that she did not

understand. Lucky largely directed the course of those conversations. In contrast, Jane was more interested in being an active listener. He was very reluctant to express his own opinions. He had no questions of his own and had to be encouraged to engage with the ideas being presented. This matches previous research conducted by Floris and Renandya (2020), Hayes (2018), and Mohebbi and Alavi (2014) which found that NNESTs tend to take on a more passive role during their interactions with NESTs due to their perceptions of NESTs as being more proficient language users and instructors. Another key difference between the two teachers lay in how they approached the texts, themselves. While both admitted to having to read the sections multiple times, Jane added that he frequently relied on Google to translate sentences and paragraphs into his L1 to assist him in understanding keywords and concepts. Lucky, on the other hand, took extensive notes and highlighted words or phrases that she did not understand so she could ask about them later. Both participants were not interested in the section of the literature review focused on crosslinguistic influence in the EFL context. They found the concepts and terminology to be nebulous and thus not connected to their lived reality as professional language instructors. In following their lead, this section will be excluded from further analysis.

Lucky

Focusing on what factors impact the teachers' choice of language usage in the EFL classroom (RQ1), Lucky had some interesting and self-contradictory thoughts on the literature review and what it meant. Agreeing with Harbord (1992), Lucky stated that the L1 should be reserved to explain concepts or ideas that are too complex or abstract to be explained succinctly in the TL but that simpler explanations and instructions should be carried out in the TL. She even talked about a book on CS within EFL she had been given by her thesis advisor and a training she had attended on the topic of CS in the classroom. But then she went on to state that she disagrees with all of this because the use of CS in the EFL classroom is detrimental to the students. Lucky argued that it is important for teachers and students to think in the TL and that frequent CS prevents this from occurring. It is interesting to note that her concerns mirror the concerns of other teachers as cited by Gonzalez-Davies (2017), specifically that use of the L1 in the classroom will lead to teachers and students being overly reliant on the L1 and will fail to engage cognitively in the TL.

Based on her responses, it is possible that Lucky still holds to the idea of the coordinate bilingual model as proposed by Weinreich (1953) which sees bilinguals as possessing two separate, language-specific lexicons that do not positively interact. Unfortunately, this does not

match more recent studies that have shown a positive impact from the strategic use of the L1 in the EFL classroom as seen in studies such as Braga (2000) and Cipriani (2001) among others. It does match observations made by Macaro (2000) and later Macaro (2005) who found that many EFL teachers did not see CS as a valuable linguistic tool and instead saw it as a regrettable linguistic reality within SLA. Most interestingly, her comments do not match the realities of how she uses languages in her classes. It is as if she is describing an ideal that she herself is unable to attain but must still defend out of principle.

When looking at what factors impact how teachers use their linguistic repertoires in the EFL classroom (RQ1), Lucky stated that it is vital that NESTs do not speak Thai in the classroom with students ever. She said that while some of them claim to love the Thai language, it does not benefit the students for them to use it while they are teaching. In stark contrast, she was very defensive of how much Thai teachers use Thai in the classroom even while admitting that they use it too much. She said that NNESTs speak Thai instead of the TL because speaking English makes them feel uncomfortable, it is more difficult, and it is often a waste of time. She emphasised on several occasions that it is more important for teachers to encourage students to speak English than for them to speak it themselves.

Jane

While discussing what factors impact teachers' choices of language usage in the EFL classroom (RQ1), Jane was focused more on why Thai teachers use CS frequently. He said "*they don't have the confidence to use English in their class because they do not use it in daily life. In my daily life, they use Thai language only.*" As seen in Caballero and Celaya (2019), the use of CS by the language learner, in this case, the teacher, gives the speaker access to knowledge stored in their long-term memory while reducing negative emotions such as anxiety. He also feared that students would not be able to comprehend input delivered entirely in the TL, which matches previous research by Turnbull (2001), which showed that CS increased overall student comprehension of important concepts. Jane then stated that many teachers are afraid of making a mistake and consequently losing face in front of the students, which is a major concern within Thai culture. Personally, Jane stated that he tries not to worry too much about whether the English he uses is 100% correct or not, that he just uses English in the classroom to encourage his students to do the same. This matches the jocular nature of his classroom interactions with students and how he used Thai and English during his previously recorded classes.

Jane also spoke very openly in support of CS in the EFL classroom. He stated that this is most used by Thai teachers when they are unable to think of a specific word in the TL. He went on to say that CS is an especially useful tool as sometimes Thai students are unable to understand their English teacher when an utterance is delivered entirely in the TL. Jane did have a negative response to the mentioning of translation as a linguistic tool within the EFL classroom. He stated that CS is used by good and modern teachers while translating is old-fashioned and is favoured by much older teachers. Through conversation, it was determined that he was remembering the grammar-translation methodology that had been favoured when he had been a student in comparison to the more communicative-based approaches currently being used. The concept of pedagogically-based translation as described by Gonzalez-Davies (2017) was clarified and this led to a more productive discussion of how and when translation can be used successfully within the EFL classroom.

Jane, who works at a school that is closer to a land border, was far more interested in the concepts of translanguaging and plurilingualism. He stated that he had heard of plurilingualism and that he had done some research into the term on his own, seeking further information in his L1 to increase his level of understanding. Jane stated that he had been able to find information in Thai on plurilingualism; however, the researcher had not been able to find any previous research that focused on plurilingualism within a Thai context. He had never heard of translanguaging and only one study had been found on the subject within the Thai context, (Kampittayakul, 2018). He agreed that both topics need further study within Asia.

4.5 Role Play results

The main purpose of this task was to encourage both teachers to be more cognitively aware of their utterances of what percentage are in their L1 or the TL. They were asked to explain a grammatical feature and then instructions for a homework assignment. They were asked to do this twice, once for a high proficiency group of students and once with a mixed proficiency group of students. This variable was selected as both teachers indicated that the proficiency levels of their students were one of the primary determinants in how they use their linguistic repertoire in the classroom. When asked what percentage of the discourse should be in the TL for a high proficiency group of students, both teachers indicated it should be as close to 100% as possible, so that was their goal. For the mixed proficiency group of students, the goal of 50% TL use was decided mutually.

Both teachers selected what concepts they would like to focus on. Lucky talked about cohesive devices which was the topic for the previous class recordings. She then selected

identifying the main verb in a sentence which was the focus in her final observations. Similarly, Jane chose reported speech, the topic from his initial recordings and conjunctions, the subject in his final recordings. Both teachers indicated this was due to the recency of having to speak about these topics in their classes. The recordings of these activities were transcribed into a Word Document with the assistance of two professional English/Thai translators (see appendix VIII for the transcription and translations. The portions that are used in the thesis are underlined).

<u>Lucky</u>

The main difference between the two student profiles was the depth and detail that was provided in the explanations and instructions when Lucky was allowed to use her L1. This can be seen clearly in her instructions for the first task (cohesive devices). In the mixed proficiency class, she clearly states what she is looking for in this assignment and reminds the students to write an outline first. When forced to communicate fully in the TL, her instructions are less clear and come across more like suggestions as she struggled to access the vocabulary required to complete the task. The use of the L1 by Lucky reduced her affective barriers such as anxiety, enabling her to communicate more effectively and fluently (Gonzalez-Davies, 2017). Lucky seemed more comfortable when she was not expected to communicate fully in the TL. Caballero and Celaya (2019) had similar findings, noting that equipping speakers with the knowledge stored in their long-term memory of their L1 enables them to communicate more easily in the TL. Lucky used unmarked translations to reiterate key pieces of information such as definitions, explanations, and instructions. Her use of the L1 in this way matches what was found by Macaro (2000).

Mixed Proficiency Class
นักเรียนลองเขียนงานเขียนไม่เกิน 150 คำ ในหัวข้อที่นักเรียนชอบอะค่ะ เลือกมา 1 หัวข้อ (Please write a paragraph of not more than 150 words in a topic you like. Choose one topic.) และหลังจากนั้นก็นักเรียนฝึกใช้ cohesive devices ที่เราเรียนไปนั้น ทั้ง 7 8 9 10 ประเภท (Then I'd like you to practice using 7-8-9-10 types of cohesive devices we have studied.) ในงานเขียนของตัวเองให้มากที่สุดเท่าที่จะมากได้นะคะ (Use as many as you can in the paragraph.)แล้ว ก่อนเขียน อย่าลืมลงมือเขียน outline ก่อน (Well, before writing, do not forget to make an outline.)

Jane

The most notable difference was in the overall length of recordings and the complexity of the language use. When expected to speak only in the TL, much simpler language patterns emerged with shorter explanations. This was predicted by Macaro (2005) and Pan and Pan (2010). Avoiding the L1 led Jane to heavily modify his output, favouring simplicity and saliency. When he was encouraged to use his L1, 3 out of 4 situations produced longer recordings with higher rates of fluency. Interestingly, the number of English words used increased significantly in half of the recordings, as well. This agrees with previous findings that the use of the L1 encourages greater use of the TL as seen in (Shamash, 1990). When encouraged to use his L1, Jane provided deeper explanations, focusing on explicitly describing how the verb tense would need to shift and encouraging students to produce the new required verb tense. This matches previous research by Macaro (2000) that found that teachers often used the L1 to explain complex concepts. Jane also included more examples in the L1, matching the findings of Cipriani (2001). This can be seen clearly in his instructions for the first task (conjunctions) in which the high proficiency group did not receive any examples at all.

Mixed Proficiency Class
ตัวอย่าง ๆ (for example) Ah yesterday your brother talk to you I eat ice cream... เห็นไหมครับ (do you see?)I eat ice-cream ฉันกินไอศครีม (I eat ice-cream.)Okay first อันดับแรก (First) write his sentence เขียนประโยคก่อน ว่ายังไงนะครับ (Write the sentence first. What is it?) I eat [...] ice cream you write it and after that you have to change his sentence to your own okay now try for example my brother told me that okay I, is it I, he, change I to he and which the verb eat you have to change to from ate [...]

Very good and ice-cream do you have to change it? No, ok very good then your sentence is My brother told me that he ate ice-cream ok?
High Proficiency Class
Okay this is your homework today okay I want you to write three sentences about what your friend to speak to you yesterday three sentences but listen to me the first one the first thing you have to write his or her sentences direct sentences and after that you try to change him or her sentence to your own sentence in direct speech okay understand yes or no but if yesterday you didn't talk to your friend or someone else okay you can use your family sentences from your mother or your father or sister or brother if three sentences okay understand

4.6 Final class observation results

When they were asked to complete the initial recording, both teachers were asked to teach their classes like they normally would. I was careful during our initial conversations to not indicate that any type of classroom behaviour or language would be preferred or discouraged. Instead, I told them that I want to hear what their normal classes are like. I want to be a silent witness in their classrooms. The teachers felt, and I agreed, that they were largely able to forget that they were recording their lessons once they began the actual act of teaching, interacting with the students, and conducting their lessons. For the final observation, they were asked to do the opposite. They were asked to be mindful of everything we had discussed, of the research summaries they had read, of the role-play tasks we had completed, and to incorporate all of that into how they taught. The same goal of 50% use of the TL from the role-play task was kept as both teachers felt this would be beneficial to them. While this falls far from the 10% advocated in both Macaro (2001) and Macaro and Mutton (2002), it was decided by the three of us that it represented a more realistic goal for them.

Lucky

The final class recordings from Lucky were of classes that were mostly students performing independent work. She apologized and stated that with the end of the academic year quickly approaching, she had to use the classes she had available. Lucky did state that she tried to speak more of the TL, but due to the nature of the class and the type of work the students needed to complete, she felt that their L1 would be the more appropriate language. She did have shorter utterances in Thai and used more frequent CS, even joking with the

students in the TL. When we were discussing the factors that impacted her language choices (RQ1), I pointed out that the class she identified as the weakest, 3/7, was the class that she spoke the most TL in and the class with the highest proficiency, 3/1, had more L1. She said she is not sure why she did this, but a possible explanation might be her fear of losing face in front of a class where she perceives the students as having a higher level of proficiency than she does. This is a common problem in Thailand as the younger generation benefits from greater exposure to the TL at younger ages.

When asked about the impact of her language choice on classroom communication (RQ2), Lucky pointed back to another linguistic choice made by the government that impacted both her language choices and ultimately those of her students as well. She reminded me that Thai teachers are required by all schools to submit their lesson plans in Thai. You plan what you will teach and teach what you planned. Therefore, if your lesson plans are in Thai, you are more likely to conduct the class in the same language. Throughout the study, specific instances in her classes were discussed where students responded to her in the language she addressed them in. When she spoke the TL, they mostly responded in the same language. And when she spoke Thai, they always responded in Thai.

When we were discussing the extent to which her language choices will be influenced by participating in this study (RQ3), Lucky had a positive, though slightly vague response. She said, "*I learned new things, new vocabulary, new strategy… I apply this in my classroom and while I am teaching, I think when I stand in front of class and I have something in my mind, I have a plan… I conscious… when I go into class with your blueprint or your article I teach the same topic but I conscious.*" When asked for three things she learned from her participation, she said "*I think teacher should use English in class as much as you can, and if they don't understand, do not blame them but you try another way to explain them. It is your duty to explain them. And the third thing, all things you do in class you have to concern them first. The first person you have to think of is them, not materials or lesson or anything else. You must focus on your students.*"

Jane

Similarly, to Lucky, Jane did not hit the goal of 50% TL use. In fact, his use of the TL decreased from his initial recordings. When we were discussing what factors impacted his choice of language (RQ1), we realized that the curriculum itself was having an impact. The initial observations were the last two lessons in a unit, so they were going over concepts that had been mostly mastered and were being refined. Jane said that might make him feel more

confident in speaking the TL as the students would be less likely to be confused. However, the last observations were the first two lessons in a new unit, so he wanted to make sure they understood all key grammatical features completely. Interestingly, Jane too switched to more frequent CS with shorter utterances in the L1. While the amount of Thai increased, it was more frequently punctuated by words and phrases spoken in the TL. When we spoke about why Thai teachers specifically rely so heavily on their L1, Lucky said, "*I think the most important thing is the teacher not confident in themself to speak English in their class because I think they are afraid it is wrong to speak to the student and the student remember what they taught. Most of them is shy to speak English to the student so they use less English in their class.*"

When we were discussing the extent his language choices will be influenced by participating in this study (RQ3), Jane said, "*the teaching strategy in English, how to encourage the student to go to their target English is the best thing I learned.*" When I asked him how this will impact his teaching, he laughed and said "*Maybe, maybe. Up to the situation but I will try to use the English. I will try my best.*" Jane was more interested in hearing my opinions and my suggestions rather than offering his own.

5. Conclusion

When examining what factors impact the language choices NNESTs in secondary EFL classrooms in Thailand, it was found that the responses given by teachers do not completely match the reality of their classrooms. While both teachers stated that it is the needs of the students and the complexity of the topic that determines what language they use to complete specific communicative tasks, it was apparent with both that their own levels of proficiency and sense of identity with the TL were also major factors. When considering the impact of their language choices on classroom communication (RQ2), it was found that students usually responded in the language they were addressed in by the teachers. Both teachers said their primary objective was to encourage the students to speak the TL; however, only one teacher, Jane, acknowledged the impact of his linguistic decisions on his students. Lucky did make a valid point concerning the role of lesson plans on the classroom discourse. As all teachers are required to submit lesson plans in Thai, the teachers themselves structure the lesson in the common L1 and not the TL. This would have an impact on how they use their linguistic repertoire. Finally, the extent to which their participation in this study will influence how they use their linguistic repertoire in the future (RQ3), both teachers indicated an increase in their metalinguistic awareness. While no major differences were noticed between the initial and final class observations, both teachers reported being more mindful of how they were using

their languages. And some minor changes were noticed such as shorter utterances in the L1 and more frequent switches to the TL.

This study did have several major limitations. Due to the current global situation, none of the observations was conducted in person and some of the classes observed took place online. The uncertainty of the time created extra pressure on teachers and students alike as everyone had to adjust to changing governmental guidelines that impacted how classes were conducted. This likely impacted potential participants, making them reluctant to agree to take place in the study. The original goal was to have between 6 to 8 teachers participate, with half being native-Thai speakers and half being NNESTs who had travelled to Thailand to teach. The low number of participants and the lack of non-local NNEST perspectives will have to be addressed in future research.

Possible research could address these limitations by taking place in person with a wider selection of participants, collaborating with the full foreign language department at the two main high schools in a city to examine how they use their languages within their academic community, their department, and within their classrooms. Another branch of research, based on their responses to the questionnaire, could examine the impact of self-identification as a monolingual vs bilingual on how NNESTs use their linguistic repertoires in the classroom. To what extent does their identity impact their language choices? How does their sense of agency impede or empower them as professional language instructors? Finally, it would be interesting to study the impact of the language used to construct lesson plans on how teachers use their languages in the classroom. Are lessons planned in the TL more likely to produce a classroom environment more conducive to soliciting the TL from both the NNESTs and their students?
Word count: 10,844

6. Bibliography

Adamson, R. D., & Anwei, F. (2009). A Comparison of Trilingual Education Policies for Ethnic Minorities in China. *Compare: A Journal of Comparative and International Education*, 321-333.

Agudo, J. d. D. M. (Ed.). (2017). *Native and Non-native Teachers in English language classrooms: Professional Challenges and Teacher Education*. De Gruyter Mouton.

Agudo, J. d. D. M. (2017). What EFL Student Teachers Think about their Professional Preparation: Evaluation of an English Language Teacher Education Programme in Spain. *Australian Journal of Teacher Education*, 62-76.

Ambrosio, S., Araujo e Sa, M. H., & Simoes, A. R. (2014). The role of universities in the development of plurilingual repertoires: the voices of non-traditional adult students. *Procedia: Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 12-18.

Anchimbe, E. A. (2006). The native-speaker fever in English language teaching (ELT): Pitting pedagogical competence against historical origin. *Linquistik Online*.

Anderson, L., & Krathwohl, D. (Eds.). (2001). *Taxonomy for Learning, Teaching, and Assessing. A Revision of Bloom's Taxonomy of Educational Objectives*. Lavoisier.

Anton, M., & DiCamilla, F. J. (1998). Socio-cognitive functions of L1 collaborative interaction in the L2 classroom. *Canadian Modern Language Review*, *54*, 314-342.

Atkinson, D. (1987). The mother tongue in the classroom: A neglected resource? *ELT Journal*, 241-247.

Auerbach, E. (1993). Re-examining English only in the ESL classroom. *TESOL Quarterly*, 9-32.

Baetens-Beardsmore, H. (2003). Who is Afraid of Bilingualism? In J.-M. Dewaele, A. Housen, & L. Wei (Eds.), *Bilingualism: Beyond Basic Principles* (pp. 10-27). Multilingual Matters.

Baker, C. (2011). *Foundations of bilingual education and bilingualism*. Naughton & Gunn Ltd.

Bell, T. R. (2005). Behaviors and Attitudes of Effective Foreign Language Teachers: Results of a Questionnaire Study. *Foreign Language Annals*, 259-270.

Berns, M., Barrett, J., Chan, C., Chimkuma, Y., Friedrich, P., Hadjidimos, O. M., Harney, J., Hislope, K., Johnson, D., Kimball, S., Low, Y., McHenry, T., Palaiologos, V., Petray, M., Shapiro, R., & Ramirez Shook, A. (1999). Hegemonic discourse revisited. *International Journal of Applied Linguistics*, 138-141.

Braga, M. d. C. d. O. (2000). Humor in the EFL classroom: a sociointerationist perspective. *Dissertacao*.

Braine, G. (2013). The NNS Movement and its Implications for ELT in Asia. In *Contextualizing the pedagogy of English as an International Language: Issues and tensions* (pp. 12-25). Cambridge Scholars Publishing.

Caballero, N., & Celaya, M. L. (2019). Code-switching by primary bilingual EFL learners: a study on the effect of proficiency and modality of interaction. *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism*.

Canagarajah, S. (2011). Translanguaging in the classroom: Emerging issues for research and pedagogy. *Applied Linguistic Review*, 1-28.

Chang, C. Y. (2009). Teacher's use of students' L1 in an EFL classroom. *Unpublished Master's thesis*, *National Cheung Kang University, Taiwan*.

Cipriani, F. (2001). Oral participation strategies in the foreign language classroom: an ethnographic account. *Dissertacio*.

Clouet, R. (2006). Native vs Non-Native Teachers: A Matter to Think Over. *Revista De Felologia*, 69-75.

Cook, V. J. (2001). Using the first language in the classroom. *The Canadian Modern Language Review*, *57*(3), 402-423.

Cook, V. J. (2010). *Translation in Language Teaching*. Oxford University Press.

Council of Europe. (2018). *Common European Framework of Reference for Languages: Learning, Teaching, Assessment. Companion volume with new descriptors*. European Union.

Creese, A., & Blackledge, A. (2015). Translanguaging and identity in educational setting. *Annual Review of Applied Linguistics*, 20-35.

Cummins, J. (1984). Wanted: A Theoretical Framework for Relating Language Proficiency to Academic Achievement among Bilingual Students. In C. Rivera (Ed.), *Language Proficiency and Academic Achievement* (pp. 2-19). Multilingual Matters.

De la Campa, J. C., & Nassaji, H. (2009). The Amount, Purpose, and Reasons for Using L1 in L2 Classrooms. *Foreign Language Annals*, *42*(4), 742-759.

Del Valle, J. (2009). Monoglossic Policies for a Heteroglossic Culture. Misinterpreted Multilingualism in Modern Galicia. *Language and Communication*, 105-132.

Dooly, M., & Unamuno, V. (2009). Multiple Languages in one Society: Categorization of Language and Social Cohesion in Policy and Practice. *Journal of Education Policy*, 217-236.

Dooly, M., & Vallejo, C. (2019). Bringing Plurilingualism into teaching practice: a quixotic quest? *International Journal of Bilingual Education*, 81-97.

Ebe, A. E., & Chapman-Santiago, C. (2016). Student voices shining through. In O. Garcia & T. Kleyn (Eds.), *Translanguaging with multilingual students* (pp. 57-82). Routledge.

Edstrom, A. (2006). L1 use in the L2 classroom: One teacher's self-evaluation. *The Canadian Modern Language Review*, *63*(2), 275-292.

Ferguson, G. (2003). Classroom code-switching in post-colonial contexts: Functions, attitudes, and policies. *AILA Review*, 38-51.

Floris, F. D., & Renandya, W. A. (2020). Promoting the value of Non-Native English-Speaking Teachers. *PASAA: A Journal of Language Teaching & Learning in Thailand*, 1-19.

Franklin, C. E. M. (1990). Teaching in the target language. *Language Learning Journal*, 20-24.

Garcia, O. (2009). *Bilingual Education in the 21st Century: A Global Perspective*. Wiley/Blackwell.

Garcia, O., & Otheguy, R. (2019). Plurilingualism and translanguaging: Commonalities and Divergences. *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism*, 17-35.

Garcia, O., & Wei, L. (2014). *Translanguaging: Language, bilingualism, and education*. Palgrave Macmillan.

Gonzalez-Davies, M. (2017). The use of translation in an Integrated Plurilingual Approach to language learning: teacher strategies and best practices. *Journal of Spanish Language Teaching*, 124-135.

Greggio, S., & Gil, G. (2007). Teacher's and learner's use of code switching in the English as a foreign language classroom: a qualitative study. *Linguagem & Ensino*, 371-393.

Gu, P. Y. (2016). Questionnaires in language teaching research. *Language Teaching Research*, 567-570.

Gumperz, J. J. (1972). Introduction. In J. J. Gumperz & D. Hymes (Eds.), *Directions in Sociolinguistics: The Ethnography of Communication* (pp. 1-25). Blackwell.

Gumperz, J. J. (1982). *Discourse Strategies. Studies in Interactional Sociolinguistics*. Cambridge University Press.

Gurkan, S., & Yuksal, D. (2012). Evaluating the contributions of native and non-native teachers to an English Language Teaching program. *Procedia- Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 2951-2958.

Hall, G., & Cook, G. (2013). Own-Language Use in ELT: Exploring Global Practices and Attitudes. *ELT Research Papers 13*.

Harbord, J. (1992). The use of the mother tongue in the classroom. *ELT Journal*, 350-355.

Hayes, D. (2018). Non-native English-speaking teachers, context, and English language teaching. *System: An International Journal of Educational Technology and Applied Linguistics*, 1-11.

Heller, M., & McElhinny, B. (2017). *Language, Capitalism, Colonialism: Toward a Critical History*. Toronto University Press.

Helot, C., & Cavalli, M. (2017). Bilingual Education in Europe: Dominant Languages. In O. Garcia, A. Lin, & S. May (Eds.), *Bilingual and Multilingual Education* (pp. 471-488). Springer.

Hu, G. (2007). The Juggernaut of Chinese-English Bilingual Education. In A. Feng (Ed.), *Bilingual Education in China: Practices, Policies, and Concepts* (pp. 94-126). Multilingual Matters.

Inbar, O. (2010). English only? The linguistic choices of teachers of young EFL learners. *International Journal of Bilingualism*, 351-367.

Jing, N., & Jing, J. (2018). Teacher Talk in an EFL Classroom: A Pilot Study. *Theory and Practice in Language Studies*, 320-324.

Johnson, R. K., & Lee, P. M. (1987). Modes of Instruction: Teaching strategies and student responses. In *Language education in Hong Kong* (pp. 99-121). The Chinese University Press.

Kachru, B. B. (1992). *The other tongue: English across cultures*. University of Illinois Press.

Kampittayakul, T. (2018). A Role of Translanguaging in Improving Thai learners' Interactional Competence in Dyadic English as a Foreign Language Tutorial Sessions. *PASAA*, 80-111.

Kent, D., & Lee, J. E. (2018). Exploring Native-English-Speaking EFL Teacher Classroom Observations: Perspectives and Expectations. *The Journal of Asia TEFL*, 829-837.

Lewis, G., Jones, B., & Baker, C. (2012). Translanguaging: Developing its Conceptualization and Contextualization. *Educational Research and Evaluation*, 655-670.

Liang, J. (2009). The courage to teach as a non-native English teacher: The confessions of a Christian teacher. In *Christian and critical English language educators in dialogue: Pedagogical and ethical dilemmas* (pp. 163-172). Routledge.

Libben, G. (2000). Representation and processing in the second language lexicon: The homogeneity hypothesis. In *Second Language Acquisition and Linguistic Theory* (pp. 228-248). Oxford.

List of schools in Thailand. (2021, February 4). In Wikipedia. https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/List_of_schools_in_Thailand#:~:text=There%20are%2037%2C175%20schools%20in,schools%20and%203%2C679%20private%20schools.

Llurda, E., & Huguet, A. (2003). Self-awareness in NNS EFL Primary and Secondary School Teachers. *Language Awareness*, 1-14.

Lubliner, S., & Grisham, D. L. (2017). *Translanguaging*. Rowman & Littlefield.

Ludi, G., & Py, B. (2009). To be or not to be... a Plurilingual Speaker. *International Journal of Multilingualism*, 154-167.

Macaro, E. (2000). Issues in target language teaching. In K. Field (Ed.), *Issues in modern foreign language teaching* (pp. 171-189). Routledge.

Macaro, E. (2001). Analyzing student teacher's code switching in the foreign language classrooms: theories and decision making. *The Modern Language Journal*, 531-548.

Macaro, E. (2005). Code-Switching in the L2 Classroom: A Communication and Learning Strategy. In E. Llurda (Ed.), *Non-native Language Teachers. Perceptions, Challenges, and Contributions to the Profession* (pp. 63-84). Springer.

Macaro, E., & Mutton, T. (2002). Developing language teachers through a co-researcher model. *Language Learning Journal*, 27-39.

Mahboob, A., & Golden, R. (2013). Looking for Native Speakers of English: Discrimination in English Language Teaching Job Advertisements. *Voices in Asia Journal*, *1*(1), 72-81.

Mak, S. H. (2011). Tensions Between Conflicting Beliefs of an EFL Teacher in Teaching Practice. *RELC Journal*, 53-67.

Manh, L. D. (2012). English as a Medium of Instruction in Asian Universities: The Case of Vietnam. *Language Education in Asia*, *3*(2), 263-267.

Martin-Chazeaud, A., & Celaya, M. L. (2020). The Role of Languages for Succeeding in Tests: An Experimental Study in Secondary Schools of Rural Senegal. *Journal of Popular Education in Africa*, 202-221.

Medgyes, P. (1992). Native or non-native: Who's worth more? *ELT Journal*, 340-349.

Medgyes, P. (1994). *The Non-Native Teacher*. MacMillan.

Medgyes, P., & Miklosy, K. (2000). The language situation in Hungary. *Current Issues in Language Planning*, *1*, 148-242.

Mohebbi, H., & Alavi, S. M. (2014). An Investigation into Teacher's First Language Use in a Second Language Learning Classroom Context: A Questionnaire-based Survey. *Bellaterra Journal of Teaching & Learning Language & Literature*, 57-73.

Nagy, K., & Robertson, D. (2009). Target Language Use in English Classes in Hungarian Primary Schools. In *First Language Use in Second and Foreign Language Learning* (pp. 66-86). Multilingual Matters.

Nikoopour, J. (2017). The Relationship between Emotional, Social, Cultural, Spiritual Intelligence and EFL Teachers' Teaching Effectiveness. *Journal of Language Teaching and Research*, 138-148.

Nikula, T., & Moore, P. (2019). Exploring translanguaging in CLIL. *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism*, 237-249.

Pan, Y.-C., & Pan, Y.-C. (2010). The Use of L1 in the Foreign Language Classroom. *Discussions on Theoretical Issues*, 87-96.

Phillipson, R. (1992). *Linguistic Imperialism*. Oxford University Press.

Reves, T., & Medgyes, P. (1994). The Non-Native English Speaking EFL/ESL Teacher's self-image: An International Survey. *System*, 353-367.

Robson, M. (2013). *The English Effect: The impact of English, what it's worth to the UK and why it matters to the world*. British Council.

Ruecker, T., & Ives, L. (2014). White native English speakers needed: The rhetorical construction of privilege in online teacher recruitment spaces. *TESOL quarterly*, 733-756.

Shamash, Y. (1990). Learning in translation: Beyond language experience in ESL. *Voices*, 71-75.

Swain, M., & Lapkin, S. (2000). Task-based second language learning: The uses of the first language. *Language Teaching Research*, 251-274.

Tatar, S., & Yildz, S. (2010). Empowering Nonnative-English Speaking Teachers in the Classroom. In *The NNEST Lens: Non-Native English Speakers in TESOL* (pp. 114-128). Cambridge Scholars Publishing.

Turnbull, M. (2001). There is a role for the L1 in second and foreign language teaching, but... *Canadian Modern Language Review*, *57*, 531-540.

Turnbull, M., & Arnett, K. (2002). Teachers' uses of the target and first language in second and foreign language classrooms. *Annual Review of Applied Linguistics*, 204-218.

Walkinshaw, I., Humphreys, P., & Fenton-Smith, B. (2017). EMI Issues and Challenges in Asia-Pacific Higher Education: An Introduction. In *English Medium Instruction in Higher Education in Asia-Pacific*. Multilingual Education.

Weinreich, U. (1953). *Languages in contact: Findings and problems*. Linguistic Circle of New York.

Wells, G. (1999). Using L1 to Master L2: A Response to Anton and DiCamilla's "Socio-Cognitive Functions of L1 Collaborative Interaction in the L2 Classroom. *The Modern Language Journal*, 248-254.

Wernicke, M. (2018). Plurilingualism as an agentive resource in L2 identity. *System: An International Journal of Educational Technology and Applied Linguistics*, 91-102.

Wilson, J., & Gonzalez Davies, M. (2017). Tackling the Plurilingual Student/Monolingual Classroom Phenomenon through translation. *TESOL Quarterly*, 207-219.

Ziegler, G., Durus, N., & Sert, O. (2013). Plurilingual Repertoires in the ESL Classroom: The Case of the European School. *TESOL Quarterly*, 643-650.

PARTICIPANT CONSENT FORM & QUESTIONNAIRE

The participant agrees to take part in this research study being conducted by Sarah Elizabeth Schefers as part of her M.A. thesis for the University of Barcelona.

The participant understands that all personal information provided will be treated with the strictest confidence.

Data will be used for research purposes only; it will not be possible to identify any specific individual from the data reported as a result of this research. Each participant will be assigned an alias and all biographical data that could be used to determine their identity will be carefully generalized.

The raw data will be accessible only to the researcher, Sarah Elizabeth Schefers, and her thesis advisor, Dr. Maria Luz Celaya.

The participant is free to withdraw at any stage of the project and will not be required to give any justification. Upon notification of withdrawal from participation, all data collected will be discarded in order to respect the participant's decision and their privacy.

The participant confirms to have read and completely and fully understands the information provided in this document.

By filling in your email below, the participant is giving their consent. *
Required

1.   Email *

_____

Instructions

Please answer the questions below. Your time and honesty are deeply appreciated.

2.   1. What is your birth date? *

_____

Example: January 7, 2019

3.   2. What gender do you identify as? *

Mark only one oval.

- ( ) Female
- ( ) Male
- ( ) Other: _____

4. 3. What is the highest level of education you have completed? *

Mark only one oval.

- ( ) Bachelor's degree
- ( ) Master's degree
- ( ) PhD
- ( ) Other: _____

5. 4. What did you major in university? *

_____

6. 5. How many years have you been teaching? *

_____

7. 6. What grade levels do you have previous experience teaching? *
   Check all that apply.

- [ ] Prathom 1-3
- [ ] Prathom 4-6
- [ ] Mathayom 1-3
- [ ] Mathayom 4-6

Other: [ ] _____

8. 7. What is the name of your school? *

9.   8. How long have you been teaching at this school? *

10.   9. In what type of setting is your school located? *

Mark only one oval.

- ( ) amphur / อำเภอ / town
- ( ) tambon / ตำบล / village
- ( ) changwat / จังหวัด / city

11.   10. Approximately how many students currently attend your school? *

12.   11. Approximately how many teachers are in your department? *

13.   12. How many teaching hours are most teachers responsible for in an average week? *

14.   13. How many hours will you teach per week this semester? *

15.   14. Aside from English, what other subjects do you teach? *

Check all that apply.

☐ Scouts

☐ Homeroom

Other: ☐ _____

16.   15. What other administrative duties are you responsible for? *

_____

_____

_____

_____

17.   16. How many hours do you need to dedicate to these duties each week? *

_____

18.   17. How many hours do you need to dedicate to these duties each week? *

_____

19.   18. What do you identify as your primary role within your school? *

Mark only one oval.

⬭ teacher

⬭ administrator

⬭ secretary

⬭ guidance

⬭ counselor

Other:

20.   19. What secondary roles do you fulfil in your school? *

Check all that apply.

☐ teacher

☐ administrator

☐ secretary

☐ guidance counselor

Other: ☐ _____

21.   20. How do you identify as a language user? *

Mark only one oval.

◯ monolingual - capable of communicating in one language bilingual

◯ - capable of communicating in two languages multilingual -

◯ capable of communicating in 3 or more languages

22.   21. What other languages have you studied (not including English)? *

_____

23.   22. What language do you feel most comfortable using to express yourself in general?
        Why? *

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

24.   23. What language do you feel most comfortable using to interact with your students outside of the classroom environment? *

_____

25.   24. What language do you predominately use in your classroom? *

_____

26.   25. What are the three main factors that impact your use of the target language, English, in the classroom? *

Check all that apply.

☐ the proficiency level of the students

☐ the complexity of the topic

☐ my own proficiency level

☐ the emotional state of the students

☐ the nature or sensitivity of the topic itself

Other: ☐ _____

27.   26. What are the three main factors that impact your use of the native language, Thai, in the classroom? *

Check all that apply.

☐ the proficiency level of the students

☐ the complexity of the topic

☐ my own proficiency level

☐ the emotional state of the students

☐ the nature of sensitivity of the topic itself

Other: ☐ _____

28.   27. I think it is important to use the target language (English) in the classroom to... (Please choose your top two choices) *

Check all that apply.

☐ serve as an example of a successful language learner

☐ form personal connections with my students encourage

☐ them to use the target language Other:

☐ _____

29. 28. I think it is important to use the student's native language in the classroom to... (Please choose your top two choices) *

Check all that apply.

- [ ] create a more personal bond with my students
- [ ] explain grammatical or other linguistic elements
- [ ] promote the free flow of ideas and opinions
- [ ] motivate students to participate more actively
- [ ] encourage students to engage with the ideas being discussed Other:
  - [ ] _____

30. 29. What materials do you use in your classroom? *

Check all that apply.

- [ ] A formal textbook published outside of Thailandf
- [ ] A formal textbook published within Thailand
- [ ] Materials I created for my classroom

Other: [ ] _____

31. 30. Who selected the materials you use in your class? Do you have the final decision on how you structure your classes? *

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

32. 31. Over the course of the study, I am going to be providing you with research summaries. Possible topics include phonics, translanguaging, gamification, etc. Please list two subjects you are interested in learning more about. *

_____

Appendix II: Self-Observation class description sheet

Class description: Please describe the students you will be teaching. What grade level are they? What is their ability level? How often do you teach them? What is their classroom like?
Focus: What is the focus of this lesson? What are your goals?
Materials: What materials will you be using? Is this lesson based off of a textbook? Will the students have access to a handout or a PowerPoint presentation?
Activities: What activities did you have the students complete? Did they work individually, in pairs/groups, or as a class?
Final notes: After completing the class, do you have any final thoughts?

Please submit this paper along with the recording you made of your lesson and any handouts you have for your class. Please be careful to label everything with your name and the date.

Appendix III: Role Play Instruction sheet

Instructions for the Explanation:

Choose a grammatical concept that you teach every year and feel knowledgeable about. You will need to give a 2-to-3-minute explanation to your students. Please adjust your language selection to match their proficiency level. How would you teach this topic to a mixed proficiency class? To a high proficiency class?

Topic:

Jane:

Lucky:

Instructions for the Homework Assignment: You now need to give them a homework assignment to reinforce the concept covered in class. How would you give this assignment to a mixed proficiency class? To a high proficiency class? What information would you need to include?

Assignment:
Jane:
Lucky

Appendix IV: Use of the L1 in the L2 classroom

"Throughout its history, the teaching and learning of foreign languages… has been deeply rooted in, and determined by, the political and economic structure of the country" (Medgyes & Miklosy, 2000, 184). This pattern can be seen playing out in countries around the world. As English becomes more and more entrenched as the lingua franca of international business, entertainment, and research, greater pressure is being put on governments to provide quality language instruction. The push to improve the general level of English to increase access to greater economic and academic resources has placed greater and greater pressures on language educators as schools. It also creates a disconnect between the governmental policy of target language only within the classroom and the reality where the L1 serves a multitude of purposes as seen in Chang (2009), Ferguson (2003), Macaro (2005), Turnbull & Arnett (2002), and Wells (1999). Focusing on how teachers use the L1, Macaro (2009) proposed that this could be classified in one of three ways, the virtual position, the maximal position, and the optimal position.

According to the virtual position, the target language can only be learned in a fully immersive environment. The classroom serves as a virtual reality simulator of the native language landscape in which students receive the high levels of input required for acquisition (Macaro, 2009). This idea is based mostly off theories that posit that it is through input that we learn a language; therefore, it is the quantity and quality of that input that matters most. The maximal position holds that it would be ideal if the target language was used solely within the foreign language classroom environment; however, Macaro (2009) recognizes that this is an ideal that few classrooms would be able to attain and fewer still to maintain. This is due to the flawed nature of the instructor, the students, and the context itself. Within this position, a great deal of guilt is assigned to the use of the L1 as it indicates a failure to live up to the linguistic ideal. Finally, the optimal position recognizes the value of the L1 and how its use might enhance the students' capacity to acquire the target language by allowing them to utilize valuable cognitive mechanisms (Macaro, 2009). This is supported by the Cognitive Processing Theory which states that the L1 and TL are stored in the same mental lexicons, utilizing the same short and long-term memories. Hence, activating the one, will aid in the activation of the other (Macaro, 2009). The importance of the L1 as a tool for acquiring the target language has been well documented in previous research (Kroll, 1993; Libben, 2000; Ellis, 2005). Research done by Anton and DiCamilla (1998) has shown that banning the use of the L1 forces language learners to ignore several valuable tools in language acquisition.

In line with this three-fold perspective on the use of the L1 in the classroom, both previous and later research has shown specific uses of the L1 within the EFL classroom can be beneficial to the students. Throughout most of it, several key trends have emerged. Many teachers report using the L1 to teach grammar, to provide feedback, to explain abstract or complex vocabulary, to share cultural aspects of the target language, to build a sense of community with the students, and to maintain classroom discipline (Mohebbi & Alavi, 2014; Harbord, 1992; De la Campa & Nassaji, 2009; Cook, 2001; Franklin, 1990; Edstrom, 2006; Hayes, 2018). Research still needs to be done into how precisely the L1 is used to attain these goals and the amount of class time that is spent in each language. Anton and Dicamillas's research (1998) showed that the L1 is a source of scaffolding, Shamash (1990) was interested in how use of the L1 encouraged the students to use the target language more, Turnbull (2001) studied how use of the L1 increased student comprehension of the target language, etc.

The avoidance of the L1 can also lead to some unique struggles, especially in lower proficiency level classes. To keep the target language input comprehensible, Pan and Pan (2010) found that the teachers often had to modify their input in the target language to make it simpler, more direct, more salient. This often makes the input less authentic and thus limits how useful it will be to the language learners acquiring the target language. Using the L1 can also be an effective way to reduce affective barriers as it allows the teacher to create a learning environment in which the students feel safe to learn and grow in their new language skills (Atkinson, 1987; Cook, 2001; Harbord, 1992; Auerbach, 1993; Johnson & Lee, 1987).

Other studies have pointed to the need to limit the use of the L1. It has been argued that excessive use of the L1 limits the amount of input the students can receive in the foreign language classroom, which is especially important due to the lack of input outside of the classroom environment (Mohebbi & Alavi, 2014; Hayes, 2018). Wells (1999) argues that language educators should not be overly reliant on the L1 and that the L1 should not be afforded the same status as the target language in the classroom context. Harbord (1992) specifically advocates that the L1 should be reserved to explain concepts or ideas that are too complex or abstract to be explained succinctly in the target language, but that simpler explanations and instructions should be carried out in the target language. Instructions and explanations in the target language are forms of genuine communication, legitimate input that the students need to be exposed to acquire the language. Still, precise, and strategic use of the L1 can be one of the most useful language learning tools available to the students (Atkinson, 1987; Cook, 2001; Wells, 1999; Swain & Lapkin, 2000).

Appendix V: The impact of CLI on the EFL context

In 1972, Selinker described an interlanguage as "a separate linguistic system based on the observable output that results from a learner's attempted productions of a TL (target language) norms (Selinker, 1972, 214). This definition has since been expanded and refined in several ways. In his original paper, Selinker (1972), went on to describe the interlanguage as the means by which the language learner attempts to express meanings in a language they have not fully acquired. Another common definition of interlanguage has been a linguistic continuum spanning between the native language and the target language, with any given point along the spectrum being a learner originated interlanguage (Martinez & Cabrera, 2002). The more proficient the learner becomes in their target language; it is theorized the less they will rely on their native language. It is the incompleteness of the learner's linguistic system that leads to transfer, originally (Odlin, 1989). It was the capacity of the native language to influence or interfere with the development of the target language that led many schools and countries to adopt strict language segregation policies.

These topics have been deeply explored by Garcia and Otheguy in several papers. In her 2009 paper, Garcia examined how bilingual programs are structured and operated, noting that many have strict language separation policies. Faculty and students are expected to engage in specific languages for specific subjects, hours, or days by school policy (Garcia, 2009). This trend was continued in study abroad programs where the target language was taught in isolation from the languages spoken by the students in their native countries (Garcia & Otheguy, 2019). In more recent years, these policies have affected the development and proliferation of English-medium instruction (EMI) programs. These have become especially popular in Asia and have been the focus of several studies including those done by Adamson & Feng (2009), Walkinshaw et al. (2017), Hu (2007), and Manh (2012). It is noteworthy that none of these institutional directives match the linguistic reality of the classroom environment where language instructors and learners often mix languages while communicating with each other. Unfortunately, it does lead to both instructors and students to feel like they have failed to live up to an idealized standard.

The focus on target language only in the classroom was prompted in part by conceptions of the interlanguage and crosslinguistic influence; particularly borrowing and transfer. It is important to note that both terms describe the use of the non-target language within the target language and the two terms have been used interchangeably in research articles. Corder (1991) made a clear theoretical split between the two stressing that they fulfilled different roles linguistically. Borrowing was originally defined as the use of one language in another; often when there was no available corresponding word within the target language (Odlin, 1989). In 1992, Corder added to the definition of borrowing stating that it is

an element of language use, a tool in the arsenal of multilinguals (Corder, 1992). He went on to add that the phenomenon of borrowing is situation dependent and extremely personal. If it were merely a function of the relationship between the L1 and the target language, then all language learners with the same linguistic profile would exhibit the same patterns of borrowing (Corder, 1992). Continuing with his work, Lakshamanana and Selinker (2001), described borrowing as being very situation dependent and more likely to occur in circumstances in which the linguistic capacity of the language learner fails to meet the needs of the communicative situation.

The second linguistic phenomena is transfer. With its troubling past in behaviorism, Odlin (1989) did a good job of defining it within the scope of linguistics. He noted that transfer is not the consequence of habit formation, it is not always a case of the language learner relying on their native language as other languages can be transferred from, and that it has the capacity of being either negative or positive (Odlin, 1989). Lakshamanana and Selinker (2001) noted that there are two general understandings of how transfer occurs within second language acquisition. The model of full transfer or full access states that all abstract syntactic properties of the L1 system will be transferred initially to the newly formed interlanguage. This view was supported by research conducted by Schwartz and Sprouse (1994) and Sprouse and Schwartz (1998). In contrast, partial transfer limits the role of the native language in that only certain elements will be transferred into the initial interlanguage, mostly excluding functional features. This model has been supported by research conducted by Eubank (1994) and by Vainikka & Young-Scholten (1994; 1996). Another hypothesis that has been proposed is the ignorance hypothesis of language transfer which states that we transfer into our interlanguage those linguistic features we lack due to ignorance (James, 1977). Corder (1992) disagreed with this hypothesis stating that this does not actually describe transfer as no linguistic elements were being transferred and that instead specific elements of the first language were being incorporated into the interlanguage.

The idea of the interlanguage has held a massive influence on the course of research into second language acquisition over the years. It can be seen a a vast variety of studies including Pallotti (2017), Huebner (1983), Wang (2009), Al-Sobhi (2019), Klein & Perdue (1997), Bardovi-Harlig (2014), Saez (2015), and Aljumah (2020). In his paper on applying the interlanguage approach to teaching, Pallotti (2017) argues that a key distinction needs to be made between interlanguage the noun and interlanguage the verb. He argues that not only is it a linguistic phenomenon that can be studied, but it is also an approach that can be taken in the teaching of a second language. Central to the idea of interlanguaging is the concept that the interlanguage itself is an independent linguistic system (Pallotti, 2017). This idea has been advocated by others, notably in a paper analyzing the interlanguage from the learners'

perspective which stated the "interlanguage must be analyzed in its own terms, independently of not only the target language but also of the native language. Although rarely carried out, this motif has been implicated in the Interlanguage Hypothesis from the beginning." (Lakshamanan & Selinker, 2001, 408).

This shift from interlanguage as noun to verb would have two key impacts in the classroom according to Pallotti. First, it would necessitate the shift from a teacher focused classroom to one focused on the students and their interlanguages, giving them the tools they need to develop their language more fully. This aligns with the shift from the traditional teacher-centered didactics of the past to a more communicative approach advocated in most teacher training programs currently (Pallotti, 2017). By shifting the focus to one based in interlanguaging, students would be afforded greater levels of agency over their learning process (Andrade & Evans, 2013), the classroom environment could encourage greater interactions between students of varying linguistic proficiency levels and backgrounds (Mastruserio Reynolds, 2015), and students would be more correctly classified by what communicative skills they had mastered than by either their status as native/non-native or the skills they lack (Cook & Wei, 2016). This would also lead to a change in the way that teachers are educated. In the past, "teachers' starting point, understandably, was not 'how do learners learn?' but rather 'how do I teach?'" (Ellis & Shintani, 2014, 321). According to Pallotti (2017), this would need to change.

The second major shift would be in how language learners' errors are understood. Instead of comparing the interlanguage to either the native or target language, it needs to be understood as an independent system that the learner is constructing through a system of hypothesis testing and experimentation. There is a logical, systematic approach that is being created by the language learner, who is often relying on universal grammatical principles which are then over or under applied within the target language. These utterances are created by the language learner in good faith as they would not knowingly produce errors. Instead of judging or grading the language learner on the linguistic components they have not mastered, it would be better to gain a deeper understanding of what is causing them to form faulty hypotheses and provide them with the required information. The goal of any form of language education is to provide the language learners with the tools required to produce the target language without errors; however, Pallotti (2017), argues that this can best be accomplished by understanding the functional misapplication that lay at the heart of the learners' missteps. Interlanguaging has opened up the field of EFL to a new perspective that places a greater emphasis on the language learner and their internal resources, and it is this change in focus that has led to the development of other ideas like plurilingualism and translanguaging.

Appendix VI: Translating and Code-switching

Use of the students' L1 by the teacher can take a variety of forms, the two most common being translation or code-switching. It is important to note that the concept of translation that is used now is not the same as in traditional grammar-translation pedagogy; instead, Gonzalez-Davies (2017) defines translation and proposes the term pedagogically in the EFL classroom as a mediation skill that utilizes the students' full linguistic background in order to complete a linguistic task. Indeed, translation is an activity bilinguals often engage in outside of the classroom environment for both personal and professional reasons. And yet, according to research conducted by Cook (2010) and Hall and Cook (2013), translation as a linguistic tool has been rejected by programs that rely on the natural communicative approach even though it is a tool that is used frequently within bi and multilingual communities. These classroom practices are not based on research. Hall and Cook (2013) found that there is a gap between mainstream research and the way translation is used in the classrooms. Cook (2010) referred to translation as a self-imposed blind spot that both exists in the classroom even while its existence is denied. According to Gonzalez-Davies (2017), the rejection of translation is thought by some teachers to have three benefits. It limits the impact of the L1 on the acquisition of the target language, it prevents the students from becoming overly reliant on their L1, and it maximizes the students' exposure to the TL. However, this view is contrary to Cummins Interdependence Hypothesis which states that language learners naturally rely on their previous knowledge, previous languages, and the commonalities they share when acquiring a new language (Cummins, 1984).

Previous research has found numerous benefits to the use of translation in the second language classroom. It has been found that translation involved higher and lower order cognitive skills such as remembering, applying, analyzing, and creating (see Anderson & Krathwohl, 2001). Other studies have pointed to how allowing students to use the full scope of their linguistic knowledge increases their sense of self-esteem and agency as language learners and by extension the instructors, leading to increases in their overall academic performances. This can be seen in studies such as Sugranyes and Gonzalez-Davies (2014) and Wilson and Gonzalez-Davies (2017). Focusing specifically on how the instructors use translating, Gonzalez-Davies (2017) cited three specific linguistic patterns. The first is sandwiching in which the TL is sandwiched between two translations in the students' L1 (L1-TL-L1). The second is a marked translation in which students are informed that this linguistic service will only be performed once (L1-TL or TL-L1). And the third is an unmarked

translation in which the teacher does not indicate nor acknowledge their use of the L1 aside from providing the translation to the students.

Use of code-switching within the foreign language classroom has been heavily studied throughout the year by Braga (2000), Cipriani (2001), Greggio & Gil, (2007), and Macaro (2001) among others. The recognition of the value of code-switching in research has unfortunately not translated into the classroom where it is often seen as being neither a linguistic tool nor an asset in second language acquisition (Macaro, 2005). In fact, Macaro (2000) found that most bilingual teachers view code-switching as a linguistic failure, a regrettable reality. The teachers viewed it as 'recourse to the L1', a view that was not impacted by the nationality of the teacher (Macaro, 2005). According to Dickson (1992) the use of code-switching limited the amount of TL input the students would receive, and Pica (1994) argued that the use of code-switching prevented negotiation of meaning, an important tool in language acquisition. The reactions against code-switching are also due in part to the notion of the idealized bilingual. The coordinate bilingual model as proposed by Weinreich (1953) posited that bilinguals develop two independent language-specific lexicons that do not interfere with one another. This is in stark contrast to more modern research in neurology which has supported the idea that linguistic information is stored in a singular location leading to cross-language activation to stimuli received via input (Libben, 2000).

Previous studies have shown that code-switching serves a multitude of different functions within the foreign language classroom. For example, Braga (2000) focused on the use of humour in the EFL classroom and how code-switching was used to create a more inviting classroom environment. Cipriani (2001) focused on how code-switching was used to encourage greater oral participation as the teacher used it to clarify the class activity and to encourage the students to speak English. And Macaro (2000) found that code-switching was used to fulfil a variety of functions including building relationships within the classroom, providing instructions, maintaining classroom decorum, and teaching grammar. When teachers avoid code-switching, they have to modify the input that they provide to the students. This is either done through simplification, repetition, circumlocution, or avoidance which leads to less authentic input and decreased levels of interaction from the students (Macaro, 2005). Thus, the use of code-switching leads to the production of more realistic input for the students. Code-switching also enables language learners (teachers and students alike) to lighten the load on their working memory, to interact with the target language more easily, and to utilize linguistic information stored in their long-term memories while reducing learner anxiety (Macaro, 2005)

Appendix VII: Plurilingualism and Translanguaging in the EFL context

It is important to note that language often plays an integral role in the formation of identity on both the personal and national level. An individual is often described as Chinese, Spanish, English, or Thai (words that also denote recognized, national languages). This notion of one-nation one-language one-identity has been explored in a variety of papers including Baetens-Beardsmore (2003), Dooly and Unamuno (2009), Dooly & Vallejo (2019), Ludi & Py (2009), etc. Governments often take this into consideration when they design national curriculum standards. The monolingual identity of the state is preserved and all 'foreign'languages' are regulated to an 'other' space reserved for communicating with non-nationals (Garcia & Otheguy, 2019). Previous research by Del Valle (2000) and Garcia (2009) has shown that the monolingual lens impacts the way that bilingualism and multilingualism are both perceived. The impact of this linguistic bias has been far-reaching. From the personal level, where language learners often abandon study of a second language when they become discouraged at the prospect that they will never become a 'true bilingual' (Garcia & Otheguy, 2019) To the national stage as many developing countries in Africa and Asia designed national curriculums that promoted a unifying, identity-building, national language with a European language (often English) offered as a foreign language (Heller & McElhinny, 2017) in order to increase their national access to the global market.

It was in response to this monolingual bias that the theories of plurilingualism and translanguaging emerged. To understand either of these concepts, it is important to first understand the idea of the linguistic repertoire. This idea was first defined by Gumperz (1972), who described the repertoire as the summation of the linguistic resources available to a person for the purposes of engaging in a communicative act. This concept was further refined and utilized by researchers such as Ambrosio et al. (2014), Gumperz (1982), Ludi & Py (2009), Nikula & Moore (2019), and Ziegler et al. (2013).

According to the Council of Europe Language Policy Division, plurilingualism can be defined as "the repertoire of varieties of language which many individuals use and is therefore the opposite of monolingualism; it includes the language variety referred to as 'mother tongue' or 'first language' and any number of other languages or varieties" (Council of Europe, 2007, 8). Within the European context, the ideal plurilingual is seen as someone possessing a level of competence in a repertoire of languages as well as a tolerant view of the language usage and varieties of others (Garcia & Otheguy, 2019). Instead of focusing on one language at a time, language learners are encouraged to gain a level of communicative competence in a variety of languages. This goal is accomplished through the incorporation of

the full scale of their linguistic repertoire and by allowing them to fully rely on the communal and familial linguistic assets as well.

Another key element in plurilingualism is the protection it provides to the language learners' first language and their right to a quality education (Helot & Cavalli, 2017). While the original intent of plurilingualism was to empower language learners with a greater sense of agency over their education, it has had the same effect on language teachers who are teaching a language that is not their L1. Oftentimes, a

non-native teachers' sense of identity and value are tied to their perception of their own proficiency and how they compare to the ideal native speaker. Plurilingualism allows teachers to create a more empowered identity as both language learners and instructors while bringing to the classroom the full benefit of their individual linguistic repertoire (Wernicke, 2018). Garcia and Otheguy (2019) point out that plurilingualism and translanguaging had diametrically opposed origins, with plurilingualism first originating within the halls of power of the European Union while translanguaging was first coined by a Welsh linguistics researcher to describe the linguistic landscape of his home (Garcia & Otheguy, 2019). The two also diverge in how they conceptualize the storage of linguistic knowledge within the language learner. With plurilingualism conforming to the notion of separated loci for each language, translanguaging has them merged together into a shared mental space. The idea of a single linguistic repertoire is one of the key aspects of translanguaging that separates it from other theories (Vogel & Garcia, 2017).

Garcia and Otheguy (2019) stated that Translanguaging was first coined by Williams in 1994 in Welsh, trawsiethu, to describe the way that English and Welsh were being used by language learners and instructors in the classroom environment. Since then, the underlying definition has been expanded and refined. Canagarajah (2011) wrote about how concepts of proficiency need to incorporate the repertoire as a whole and not just focus on individual languages, Lubliner and Grisham (2017) focused on the incorporation of the students' cultural and linguistic resources into their classroom experience, Garcia & Wei (2014) noted that translanguaging improved the language learners' metacognition and their ability to fully understand the topic, and Creese & Blackledge (2015) studied how translanguaging can aid in how individual students develop their identities as language users. Many studies and papers have highlighted the impact of translanguaging has had in the classroom, particularly in allowing students to scaffold using the language they have the greatest confidence in to prop up their other languages as they build greater proficiency (Baker, 2011; Ebe & Chapman-Santiago, 2016; Garcia & Wei, 2014; Kampittayakul, 2018; Lewis et al., 2012).

While plurilingualism and translanguaging diverge on several key points, Garcia and Otheguy (2019) are quick to point out that they do possess points of commonality. Both are reactionary against the traditional understanding of bilingualism founded in the monolingual bias that has shaped language education. They go on to state that both focus on empowering the language learner with the bull breadth and depth of their own linguistic repertoire, recognize the value and existence of the multilingual practices that occur in communities all over the world, argue that the way individuals use their linguistic repertoire is strategic, and that both aim to reconceptualize the way we understand languages and how they function (Garcia & Otherguy, 2019). It is also noteworthy that both of these concepts originated within the European stage and are just now starting to be reshaped to describe a more Asian context.

Appendix VIII: Transcription and Translation of Role Play Task

Task 1 Lucky Explanation Mixed Proficiency Cohesive Devices

ค่ะนักเรียน วันนี้เราจะเรียนเรื่อง Cohesive device นะคะ (Hi students! Today we are studying cohesive devices.) Cohesive device คืออะไร (What is a cohesive device?) Hi Cohesive device is words or phrases we use to connect our ideas or connect parts in our texts in writing texts or something like that   ก็คือเป็นเหมือนกับเครื่องมือที่เชื่อมโยง (It is like a tool which connects) ที่ใช้ในการเชื่อมโยงความของข้อความที่เราจะเขียนให้มันต่อเนื่องกัน (…which connects the message of the texts we write to make them flow) ให้มัน flow กัน ให้มัน connect (…to make them flow…to make them connect.) อย่างเช่น เรามีไอเดียที่หนึ่งที่สอง เราก็ connect กันด้วยตัว device ตัวนี้นะคะ (For example, we have idea 1, idea 2, and we connect them by using this device.) ซึ่ง ถามว่าทำไมเราถึงต้องใช้ (Why do we do this?) เพราะว่าเราต้องการที่จะให้งานเขียนเรามันสอดคล้องสัมพันธ์กัน (Because we want our writing to be well-connected and coherent.) While we use this devices we use them to connect ideas to make our writing task flow or I mean that its a high cohesion or coherence they are something like that there are two types of cohesive devices that I will present you today ก็มี 2 แบบนะคะนักเรียนขา แบบแรกก็คือ (There are two types, my dear students, this first one is) Grammatical cohesion and the second one is lexical cohesion แบบแรกก็คือ เราจะเป็นลักษณะของการใช้เครื่องมือที่ช่วยให้เกิดการเชื่อมโยงข้อความ ที่เน้นในเรื่องไวยากรณ์ ที่ดูในเรื่องไวยากรณ์ (The first one is…it's like we use a tool to connect texts. We focus on grammar. We pay attention to grammar.) And the second thing แบบที่สอง เราจะทำให้งานเขียนของเรามีความสอดคล้องกันในเรื่องของการใช้คำศัพท์ ซึ่ง (The second one, we will make our writing coherent in terms of vocabulary usage…by that) Why we use this devices That because we don't need to use the same word in our writing task it's very boring if you use words words and words for all your passage

Task 1 Lucky Explanation High Proficiency Cohesive Devices

Okay so now cohesive devices could be words or phrases that we use to connect the ideas or the ideas or connect a part of our text to make it flow there are many kinds of many many types of cohesive devices but today I would like to focus on only two main types so for me I divided into two main types the first one is grammatical grammatical cohesion and the second one is lexical cohesion grammatical focus on the grammar I mean to make your grammar flow and lexical can be focus on vocabulary or words that you use to make your writing cohesion

Task 1 Lucky Instructions Mixed Proficiency Cohesive Devices

Okay so I think you yeah I think we understand and after we discussion I think we understand what is a cohesive device and why do we use it and how many types of them so for the next step I would like you to practice about I would like you to adapt or apply the things we have learned today in your writing task you practice how to use it in your writing so please use all types of devices in your writing นะคะ (please) so your writing task would not be at least 150 words โอเคค่ะ เราเรียนกันแล้วครูอยากให้นักเรียนฝึกนะคะ (Ok, now that we have studied it, I'd like you to practice.) นักเรียนลองเขียนงานเขียนไม่เกิน 150 คำ

ในหัวข้อที่นักเรียนชอบอะค่ะ เลือกมา 1 หัวข้อ (Please write a paragraph of not more than 150 words in a topic you like. Choose one topic.) และหลังจากนั้นก็นักเรียนฝึกใช้ cohesive devices ที่เราเรียนไปนั้น ทั้ง 7 8 9 10 ประเภท (Then I'd like you to practice using 7-8-9-10 types of cohesive devices we have studied.)ในงานเขียนของตัวเองให้มากที่สุดเท่าที่จะมากได้นะคะ (Use as many as you can in the paragraph.)แล้ว ก่อนเขียน อย่าลืมลงมือเขียน outline ก่อน (Well, before writing, do not forget to make an outline.) แล้วก็ งานเขียนที่ดีจะต้องมี เค้าเรียกว่าอะไรนะคะ มี main idea มี unite มี (Good writing should have…what do we call it? Oh a main idea.)ที่ main idea ชัดเจนว่าจะเขียนเรื่องอะไร (You should have a clear main idea of what you are writing about.)ทีนี้ ให้โฟกัสที่ 2 อย่างคือในเรื่องของ cohesive devices และในเรื่องของความเป็น unity หรือ unite ของงานเขียนนะคะว่า (And I'd like you to focus on 2 things: cohesive devices and unity or how you unite your ideas.)

เราเขียนเรื่องวันสงกรานต์ ก็ต้องโฟกัสไปที่วันสงกรานต์อย่างเดียว โอเคค่ะ

(For example, if you write about the Songkran festival, you should focus on Songkran only. Ok guys.) And so I think if you have any problems about task you can ask your friend or maybe again you ask me also by line or by email

Task 1 Lucky Instructions High Proficiency Cohesive Devices

 Okay I think all of you understand about the concept of cohesive devices and I would like to assign you a task for you to practice how to use it in your writing task first of all you learned a lot from the examples and you understand them well so could you please write choose one topic you are familiar with like my family my food my favourite singer or my songkrang day you choose the topic that you like and could you please write not more than 150 words and please use all of the things we have learned today like could suppose that there are 5 subtypes of grammatical cohesions and 5 subtopics of lexical cohesion I would like you to use or to apply this topic or this knowledge that we learned or that we discussed today in your writing task so please choose as many devices as you can in your writing but but but you have to think about the the the to define your writing you have to have to think you have to decide or you have to write an outline an outline will force you to to think about what is the main idea of your writing please do not please do not focusing more focusing on cohesive devices but could you please care about the the the unit of your passage

Task 2 Lucky Explanation Mixed Proficiency Identifying main verbs

Okay student today we are going to talk about lovely unit 14 นักเรียนคะ เรียนบทที่ 14 นะคะ เรื่องก็คือ (Students, today we are studying unit 14. The topic is) Marie Celeste is some kind of ship เป็นชื่อเรือชนิดหนึ่งนะคะ (It is the name of a ship) so there are 6 paragraphs in there มี 6 ย่อหน้า (There are 6 paragraphs) And I need volunteer to read each sentence in English and then while you friend read could you underline or circle ครูอยากให้นักเรียนอาสาสมัครนะคะ อ่านภาษาอังกฤษ (I'd like some volunteers to read English.) ประโยค คนละประโยค (Each volunteer read one sentence.)

ในขณะที่เพื่อนอ่านก็ขีดเส้นใต้หรือวงกลมคำที่เป็น verb อะค่ะ (While they read, you underline or circle verbs.) So could you please focus on only on verb in each sentence นักเรียนขีดเส้นใต้เฉพาะคำสำคัญคำเดียวที่นักเรียนคิดว่ามันเป็นคำศัพท์สำคัญของประโยคนั้น (You underline one important word…one word that you think is important for the sentence.) One word only And then for the second activity we are going to talk about the meaning of each sentence And then for the third แล้วรอบที่สามเนี่ยครูจะบอกว่า (On the third round, I'm going to tell you…) So please don't forget to underline the verb So don't forget to underline the main verb once or if you like to make a circle do it don't forget to do it because อย่าลืมที่จะขีดเส้นใต้นะคะ เพราะว่ากิจกรรมที่ 3 เนี่ย

คุณครูจะเอาคำศัพท์ที่นักเรียนขีดเส้นใต้เนี่ยมาเรียงลำดับ(Do not forget to underline because in the third activity, I'll put the underlined words in order.) it is very important กิจกรรมที่ 3 ครูก็จะเอามาร้อยเรียงกันแล้วเล่าให้ฟัง นักเรียนเข้าใจไหมคะ(In Activity 3, I will connect the words and tell you a story. Do you understand?)

Task 2 Lucky Explanation High Proficiency Identifying main verbs

Okay okay class today we are going to study about verb in unit 14 its in the title or any sentence or something like that okay so there are 6 paragraphs here and I need volunteer to read english sentence by sentence and then we are going to talk about the meaning in Thai and for the third round I would like you to underline or make a circle the main verb words and you think its the main verb words so lets go step by step and please notice that before you underline or make a circle you have to analyze the sentence structure first and you please focus on the tense of the verb that verb has the same each verbs has the same tense so for this all passage we focus on past tense so i would like you oh no we we are here we are going to write a example and I will do for you for the first paragraph in the first one so lets start now I need a volunteer now

Task 2 Lucky Instructions Mixed Proficiency Identifying main verbs

So we finished the first part of our lesson and now I would like you to read the main passage นักเรียนขา เราฝึกกันไปบทอ่านหนึ่งแล้วนะคะ (My dear students, we have read one passage.) ทีนี้ คุณครูจะให้นักเรียนฝึกเพื่อให้ (Today I'd like you to practice more in order to…)

To review or check your understand what is the main verb or sentence structure or something like that ก็เดี๋ยวครูให้นักเรียนอ่าน passage เรื่องใหม่ (I'd like you to read a new passage)

เพื่อที่นักเรียนจะได้ฝึก ครูอยากจะเช็คความเข้าใจที่เราเคยเรียนเคยสอนกันนะคะ

(so that you get some more practice. I'd like to check your understanding after we learned together.) So I give you 7 minutes or 10 minutes which one do you prefer 10 10 10 is okay I give you 10 minutes to read the main passage and then could you please underline the word the verb that we have we have done for the last

passage right ครูจะให้นักเรียน 10 นาทีนะคะ ในการการอ่านบทอ่านใหม่นี้ (I'm giving you 10 minutes to read the new passage.) แล้วให้นักเรียนขีดเส้นใต้ เหมือนที่เราเคยเรียน ที่เคยอ่านบทที่ 1 เมื่อกี้ค่ะ (Then you underline, just like you did in the first reading passage.) The first passage And then you do the same that you did last time You do it after I count one two three again one and then and then could you do it yourself first do not copyyour friend and then don't care about is right or wrong ครูให้เวลา 10 นาที ทำด้วยตัวเอง ห้ามลอกเพื่อนนะคะ ผิดก็ได้ ถูกก็ได้ ไม่เป็นไร (I'm giving you 10 minutes. Do it yourself. Do not copy your friends' answers. You may be wrong or you may be right and that's ok.)And then we will discuss your answer I will use a PowerPoint to discuss the right answer with you I mean that in our classroom okay okay one two go do it

Task 2 Lucky Instructions High Proficiency Identifying Main Verbs

Homework and to check your understanding about the main verbs and for sure that you are understand and the things that I that we are that I taught you or that we discussed in the last few units or something like that so I would like to ask you to read these passage again and underline the sentences and could you please make a circle before you make a decision which one is the main verb could you please focus on the tense of each verb plus we do the same be careful read carefully before you make decision but and after that we discuss about this again in a gorup in a class I mean that I will use a powerpoint to project your assignment and then we'll discuss again about is this right or is this wrong what should what things that we have missed or something like that okay please or could you finish in seven minutes is it enough for you or not if if you all agree with me could you do it now and then we will discuss about your answers and find a solution

Task 1 Jane Explanation Mixed Proficiency Reported Speech

Okay everyone please listen again okay okay okay

please listen again okay yesterday yesterday

my mom worked in the kitchen is okay the kitchen

what does it mean kitchen do you know the kitchen

kitchen is the place you can cook ทำอะไรก็ได้ (do whatever you want)

Okay you can cook okay kitchen what does it mean in Thai

ห้องครัว (kitchen) And then she saw a cat a bad cat in the kitchen

Okay okay then today I will reveal I will present you

what my mother talk to me yesterday okay understand yes or no

เดี๋ยวพรุ่งนี้ เดี๋ยววันนี้ (So tomorrow, well today) today ครูจะมาบอกว่าเมื่อวานนี้ (I'm going to tell you what my mother said to me yesterday.) yesterday what my mother talk to me อะไรที่แม่ของพวกเขาพูด(What did their mother say?)

My mother told me that she saw a cat in her kitchen

the day before okay listen again my mother told me that she saw a cat in her kitchen the day before

โอเคครับ มีอะไรแตกต่างไหม (Ok. Is there any difference?)

What is different? No no okay who know that what is the meaning

มันมีความหมายว่าไงครับ ซาร่า (What does it mean 'Sarah)Please help your friends ซิ

เข้าใจไหมครับ (Do you understand?)Understand? No? งั้นครูก็จะมารายงานเนอะ มา reported speech ของ another person ของคนอื่นที่พูดไว้นั่นเอง (So, I'm going to tell you the reported speech of another person, or of the person who spoke before.)

Task 1 Jane Explanation High Proficiency Reported Speech

Everyone today we will talk about reported speech what is important for you because yesterday my mother told me that she saw a cat in her kitchen and now I want to tell you about my mother told me yesterday in my own sentences kids listen to me okay listen to me my mother told me that she saw the cat in her kitchen the day before okay again please listen to me again please my mother told me that she saw a cat in her kitchen the day before okay

Task 1 Jane Instructions Mixed Proficiency Reported Speech

นักเรียนครับ(Students) This is your homework

เป็นการบ้านนะครับ ง่ายมาก (This is your homework. It is very easy.)

For today, very easy I want you to write three sentences three sentences

okay understand okay three sentences come from like your

friend or your family speech of speak to you yesterday

okay again yesterday your family or your friend what they speak to you you write it เขียน

(write) for example ตัวอย่าง ๆ (for example) Ah yesterday your brother talk to you I eat ice

cream

I eat ice cream เห็นไหมครับ (See?)I eat ice-cream ฉันกินไอศครีม (I eat ice-cream.)

Okay first อันดับแรก (First) write his sentence เขียนประโยคก่อน ว่ายังไงนะครับ (Write the

sentence first. What is it?) I eat what ice cream you write it and after that you have to change

his sentence to your own okay now try for example my brother told me that okay I is it I he

change I to he and which the verb

eat you have to change to from ate how do you spell ate and ice

Very good and ice-cream do you have to change it? No, ok very good then your sentence is

My brother told me that he ate ice-cream ok?

เข้าใจไหมครับ (Do you understand?)

Task 1 Jane Instructions High Proficiency Reported Speech

Okay this is your homework today okay I want you to write three sentences about what your

friend to speak to you yesterday three sentences but listen to me the first one the first thing

you have to write his or her sentences direct sentences and after that you try to change him or

her sentence to your own sentence in direct speech okay understand yes or no but if yesterday

you didn't talk to your friend or someone else okay you can use your family sentences from

your mother or your father or sister or brother if three sentences okay understand

Task 2 Jane Explanation Mixed Proficiency Conjunctions

Hello everyone สวัสดีครับ (Hello)

Okay today วันนี้ วันนี้เราจะทำเรื่องใหม่ วันนี้ครูมีเพื่อนใหม่ มาสองคน คนแรกนะ (Today, today we will do something new. Today I have two new friends, the first one)

Today we have friends The first one his name is Ramsey okay Ramsey and the second one his name is Panda เห็นมั้ยครับ (Do you see?) Panda and Ramsey are friends เป็นเพื่อนกัน โอเคนักเรียนครับ แพนด้า แอ็นด แรมซี่ สองคน เป็นอะไรเอ่ย เป็นสัตว์ เป็น animal เก่งมากครับ (They are friends. Ok, students, what are Panda and Ramsey? Animals? Yes, they are animals. Good job!) Panda and Ramsey Both of them are animals

เป็นสัตว์นั่นเอง เพราะฉะนั้น นักเรียนฟังนะครับ วันนี้ครูจะพูดประโยค (They are animals. So, listen to me. Today I'm going to say sentences.)

Listen to me Ramsey is an animal okay Ramsey is an animal and Panda is an animal too ได้ไหมครับ ได้เนอะ แรมซี่ เป็นสัตว์ โอเค และแพนด้าเป็นสัตว์ เหมือนกัน เพราะฉะนั้น ทั้งสองตัวเป็น อะไรเหมือนกันครับ (Did you get it? Ok? Ramsey is an animal. Ok? And Panda is an animal, too. So what are they? The same thing right? animals) the same thing right animal

Ramsey The same thing And today we will connect two sentence into one

Listen to me Ramsey and Panda are animals Ramsey and Panda are animals

มีอะไรแตกต่างไหมครับ ใช่แล้วเราใช้ and เข้ามาเชื่อมนั่นเอง and แปลว่าอะไรเอ่ย in Thai you know that? (Is there any difference? Yes, we use "and" to connect them. Do you know what "and" means in Thai?) What does it mean and in Thai do you know that and what does it mean and is In Thai it is mean และ แรมซี่และแพนด้าเป็นสัตว์เหมือนกัน (In Thai it means Ramsey and Panda are animals.) Ramsey and Panda are animals

Task 2 Jane Explanation High Proficiency Conjunctions

Hello today we have two friends Ramsey and Stanley okay everyone please look at this my friend okay this is Ramsey Ramsey is an animal right and next Stanley is an animal too okay and then Ramsey A and B I don't remember their names A is an animal B is an animal and both of them are the same thing they are animals then today we have two sentences right A is an animal and B is an animal too and now today we will join two sentences into one sentence okay listen to me again please A is an animal yes A is an animal B is an animal okay then A and B are animals listen again A and B are animals okay what is difference?

Task 2 Jane Instructions Mixed Proficiency Conjunctions

Okay good morning everyone สวัสดีครับทุกคน (Hi everyone) Last time we learned about conjunction right what does conjunctions mean คำเชื่อม(conjunctions)There were 5 conjunctions do you remember? จำได้ไหมครับ (Do you remember?) and nor but yet for แล้วเราก็มีคำสั้น ๆ ให้เราจำได้ (And we have a short word to help you remember.) And you remember write FANBOY F คืออะไรครับ (What is F? F is for.) A คือ and. (A is and.)N คือ nor.(N is nor.) B คือ but. (B is but) O คือ or.(O is or.) Y คือ yet (Y is yet.) Okay very good and today you have to write 5 sentences ห้าประโยค use conjunctions ที่เราเรียนมา (Five sentences. Use the conjunctions we have studied.) Use conjunction for example you think about your family สมาชิกครอบครัวนักเรียน ชอบ fruit ผลไม้อะไร (What fruit do your family members like?) What he she or they like to eat fruit For example แม่ (Mother) My mother like banana my father like banana both of them like banana โอเค ชอบกล้วยเหมือนกัน But I love I like coconut Then you can make two sentences For example พ่อและแม่ (Father and mother) My mother and father like banana เขียนได้เลย (You may write it now.) Father and mother, my mother and father like banana. You can write it now. ข้อนี้เราใช้ conjunction อะไรครับ "Which conjunction should we use in this sentence?" My mother and my father like banana Next my mother like banana but I like coconut Right it is but ข้อนี้เราใช้ อะไรครับ conjunction (Which conjunction should we use in this sentence?) Ok two sentences Next three sentences your turn

Task 2 Jane Instructions High Proficiency Conjunctions

Last time we learned about conjunction do you remember what is it what they are and okay next or but okay and nor and yet do you remember fanboys F A N B O Y S F stand for for A stand for and N stand for nor B stand for but O stand for or Y stand for yet and last one S stand for so no… only one fanboy sorry sorry okay and today this is your time the first one think about your family you have many member in your family okay your family you have many member in your family what they like about them fruit what fruit they like in your family for example me I have my mother my father and I my mother like banana okay my father like banana too but I like coconut you understand my mother like banana my father like banana too and I like coconut okay okay now think about your family okay what they like fruit they like and you have to write into five sentences use the conjunctions we learned okay for example the first one my mother and my father like bananas okay number two my mother likes bananas but I like coconuts 5 sentences use conjunctions this is your task for today